

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING BY WILLIAM S. MARTIN, No. 9 GEORGE STREET.

TERMS—\$2 00 if paid in advance; or \$3 00 payable within six months. A liberal discount to Agents who become subscribers.

Notions of removal, orders for discontinuance, and Communications must be sent to the Editor. Small Notes of Address Books received in payment of postage.

SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA. THE CASE OF THE REV. ALBERT BARNES.

Continuation of proceedings—Reported for the N. Y. Ob.

Mr. McKimney. We are establishing doctrines which our own and our neighbour's children are to be taught for centuries, perhaps, to come. Thousands on thousands of the youth of our land are concerned in the judgment we shall pass.

Mr. Moore. I had made some examination of Mr. Barnes's book before I came to this House; and since then I have listened with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

better as soon as possible. That has been said. And now moderator, if it is come to this, and if it is our constitution which thus prevents the spreading of erroneous doctrine, it is time for this Synod to speak out, and to express its sentiments in such a manner as shall be effectually felt in our churches.

Mr. Moore. I had made some examination of Mr. Barnes's book before I came to this House; and since then I have listened with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

in it, even though all the rest were ever so good and ever so sound, I should vote to condemn it. This is a book for the use of our youth to form the minds of those who are to follow us; and in at least some parts of it the fundamental doctrines of our holy religion are denied.

Mr. Moore. I had made some examination of Mr. Barnes's book before I came to this House; and since then I have listened with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

dence which was before the lower court, is before this court: 3. That the course of trial has been perfectly fair and orderly: 4. That the charges have been sustained by proof. As we have a large latitude of remark, I shall throw myself upon the indulgence of my brethren, if, in the course of my observations, I may say any thing that shall conflict with votes of the Synod.

Mr. Moore. I had made some examination of Mr. Barnes's book before I came to this House; and since then I have listened with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

with a direction to take it up, and dispose of it in a constitutional manner, or stay all further proceedings in the case, as circumstances may require. So if this case comes before us on this ground, all we can do is to maintain the appeal.

Mr. Moore. I had made some examination of Mr. Barnes's book before I came to this House; and since then I have listened with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

Mr. McKimney. I have heard with pleasure and interest to the arguments of the friends of the book. I think he has fully satisfied six of the charges. His argument in reference to the others I did not hear, having been detained from the House by indisposition.

term, and that when he talks about the guilt of Adam's sin not belonging to his posterity, he means no more than that they had no personal participation in Adam's sin.

JOURNAL OF MR. LOWRIE FROM CALCUTTA. [Concluded.]

Sept. 8.—On the evening of the 6th, I reached Ghazpur (Ghazepore) and stayed the Sunday with the chaplain, a pious, amiable, and excellent man; in whose family I had the pleasure of meeting two or three pious officers, connected with the military at this station.

Cultivation of Rose Bushes. Altar of Roses. The country around is extensively covered with rose bushes, which are cultivated for the purpose of manufacturing rose water, and the famous roses of India.

Sept. 9.—Passed a Conductor's fleet of boats, some 30 or 40, carrying military stores to different stations of the army. Passed also the native town of Seidpur, a place of some business. No incidents of much interest occurred.

Description of Benares, Present Idleness. Sept. 11.—Reached the fat-famed city Benares (Benares). The appearance of this city is certainly very fine, as one approaches it on the river.

Sacred Places. Pilgrimage. Images of the Linga, Mosque of Aurangzeb. Benares is held sacred for ten miles around, though particular places in it are considered peculiarly holy.

des, it is also their Athens. There are many private schools in which Secarist is studied under learned Brahman Pandits, who are supported by a show of liberality and express a well counterfeited horror at sectarianism. This has always been the policy of the Congregationalists of our Church, and by the success with which it has been played, our Church has been brought to the verge of ruin. If our observation has not deceived us, the anti-sectarian cry has always been most loudly raised by those who have been actuated by sinister motives; it is notorious that heretics in all ages of the Church have employed it, and it is equally notorious that they who use it in our own Church, do so for the express purpose of levelling the barriers which have been erected to oppose the progress of error.

The Editor of the Cumberland Presbyterian by the aid of italics and notes of admiration (!) represents these views as absolutely unheard of until advocated by us, and pleads most lustily for the unity of the Church. We turn our eyes to the West and inquire who is the man who so bitterly inveighs against sectarianism? Gentle reader, it is the official editor of a new sect, which in late years has sprung up in the western country, styled Cumberland Presbyterians, who originally broke off from the Presbyterian Church because they did not believe in its Calvinistic standards, and who are from year to year boasting of their increase as a sect! Alas for consistency! One thing is obvious; just in proportion as Presbyterians lose their denominational attachments, the Cumberland Presbyterians may hope to fill their ranks; a very good reason truly why they should denounce our sectarianism.

Since writing the above, we have seen in the same paper a long Address by the Rev. Professor Beard, to the Licentiates and Candidates of Cumberland College, in which, among other matters he says: "You are not to be sectarians, but you are Cumberland Presbyterians in principle; (a nice distinction) this is right; while you wish and pray for the prosperity of Zion in all her branches, you are not without feelings of particular interest for the prosperity and usefulness of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church." We think we may fairly quote the Cumberland Professor against the Cumberland Editor.

THE PRESBYTERIAN. THURSDAY, March 24, 1836.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—In consequence of matter lying over from last week, various communications have been crowded out of the present number of our paper.

PROFESSOR HALSEY.—The communication of Dr. Miller, will be read with interest. His name was, as we think, very improperly introduced by Professor Halsey, in the article upon which we commented last week. Dr. Miller's note gives a very different aspect to the whole affair.

We find some pointed questions propounded to Professor Halsey in the last number of the N. Y. Observer. If he will honestly answer them, we shall be able more fully to understand the complexion of his doctrinal faith.

SYNOD'S PROCEEDINGS.—We wish our readers to understand that we are in no sense accountable for the errors which appear in the history of proceedings as reported for the New York Observer. We do not feel ourselves at liberty to alter, and have not done so except in this day's copy, in which we placed Mr. Annan's name, instead of Mr. Allen's, and Mr. Barber's name instead of Mr. Dunlap's. Mr. Dunlap made no speech on the occasion, as he was providentially compelled to leave Synod before the time in which the speech was made. The report as given to-day is by no means as well executed as the preceding parts.

ECCLESIASTICAL.—The Rev. Arthur B. Bradford of the Presbytery of Philadelphia has received a unanimous call to the Presbyterian church in Clinton, New Jersey. We know not whether he designs to accept it.

NEW YORK OBSERVER.—This paper will find it difficult to defend itself against the charge of a breach of professed neutrality. In its remarks of last week on Dr. Junkin's letter it becomes still more entangled. Every person and thing which is thoroughly New School, is pronounced by it to be "in good standing." It gives us however one piece of information, viz. that when Dr. Spring "ascertained that some of the opinions charged on Mr. Barnes as heresy, were opinions which he himself held, he wrote to Dr. Junkin requesting him to erase his name from the recommendation." We ask, is it at all credible that Dr. Spring was ignorant of the nature of the charges against Mr. Barnes when he signed the recommendation?

NEW SCHOOL MEASURES.—We refer our readers especially to a communication extracted from the Pittsburg Christian Herald. It is an alarm note to the Watchmen of Zion!

HOUSE OF REFUGE.—The Annual Report of this truly interesting institution, affords strong proof of its usefulness. The salutary instruction imparted to its inmates, and the habits of industry in which they are trained, have been the means of rescuing many youthful delinquents from vice and ruin, and restoring them to respectable society. During the eight years in which this institution has been in operation, eight hundred and thirty four boys and girls have participated in its kindly and fostering charity.

SECTARIANISM.—The Editor of the Cumberland Presbyterian professes great horror at the views which we recently expressed, that it would be well for the Church to which we belong, if it would become more sectarian than it is, that is, more decided in its preference of the great features by which it is distinguished. Our sentiments on this subject are fully sustained by common sense and sanctioned by common practice. An individual in uniting himself with a particular denomination of Christians is presumed to be actuated by partiality in the selection; or in other words, he makes his choice in consequence of some peculiar traits, which in his judgment, give a superiority to that denomination over others. In this way he becomes a sectary, or the member of a particular sect, and if his choice has been an enlightened one, it is expected that he will furnish strong evidence of his particular attachment. This attachment may be perfectly consistent with entire charity for others, just as a man may love his own child better than all other children, while at the same time, he neither does nor wishes them harm. The amount of all we have said on this subject, is that every man should be consistent in his profession, and that he should not profess a preference which his actions falsify. We honour the Episcopal and Methodist who, while he avoids proscriptive bigotry, strongly avows his attachment for his own peculiarities which he believes are most accordant with the rule and spirit of the Gospel, and we extend the same respect to a true-hearted Presbyterian. That another doctrine should prevail in our Church on this subject, is easily accounted for;—there are many nominal Presbyterians who have become connected with the Church from motives of convenience, while entertaining a secret repugnance to many of its peculiarities, and with a view

to shield their own disingenuousness, or eventually to produce a change by first diminishing the strength of denominational attachments, they put on a show of liberality and express a well counterfeited horror at sectarianism. This has always been the policy of the Congregationalists of our Church, and by the success with which it has been played, our Church has been brought to the verge of ruin. If our observation has not deceived us, the anti-sectarian cry has always been most loudly raised by those who have been actuated by sinister motives; it is notorious that heretics in all ages of the Church have employed it, and it is equally notorious that they who use it in our own Church, do so for the express purpose of levelling the barriers which have been erected to oppose the progress of error.

The Editor of the Cumberland Presbyterian by the aid of italics and notes of admiration (!) represents these views as absolutely unheard of until advocated by us, and pleads most lustily for the unity of the Church. We turn our eyes to the West and inquire who is the man who so bitterly inveighs against sectarianism? Gentle reader, it is the official editor of a new sect, which in late years has sprung up in the western country, styled Cumberland Presbyterians, who originally broke off from the Presbyterian Church because they did not believe in its Calvinistic standards, and who are from year to year boasting of their increase as a sect! Alas for consistency! One thing is obvious; just in proportion as Presbyterians lose their denominational attachments, the Cumberland Presbyterians may hope to fill their ranks; a very good reason truly why they should denounce our sectarianism.

Since writing the above, we have seen in the same paper a long Address by the Rev. Professor Beard, to the Licentiates and Candidates of Cumberland College, in which, among other matters he says: "You are not to be sectarians, but you are Cumberland Presbyterians in principle; (a nice distinction) this is right; while you wish and pray for the prosperity of Zion in all her branches, you are not without feelings of particular interest for the prosperity and usefulness of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church." We think we may fairly quote the Cumberland Professor against the Cumberland Editor.

MORE UNION.—A circular has been published in Massachusetts, proposing union of action in the promotion of Sabbath School instruction, in which we find the following passage; "what a delightful sight to see Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Universalists, &c. all joined in amicable deliberation upon this holy and engrossing subject!" The Editor of the (Unitarian) Christian Register of Boston, in referring to this liberal scheme of union remarks:

"It binds together by the bonds of sympathy and love the disciples of a common Master, who, under other circumstances, are too apt to think that they show the sincerity of their faith, by the zeal they display in the cause of their own sect, as able and constant partisans."

We must confess that we cannot keep pace with such a march of religious improvement; but it is not improbable that some in our Church may yet discover that Unitarianism, and Universalism, are merely "errors of the head and not of the heart," and may be admitted as holding with us for "substance of doctrine" provided they are not accompanied by "viciousness of life."

SYNOD OF ULSTER.—Our readers may possibly remember that a year ago, we remarked with regret that the Synod of Ulster, after their successful battle against Arianism, had recognized the license of several candidates who offered some, but as it was supposed, unimportant exceptions to the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. We predicted that unless they should recede from this position it would eventually occasion them much trouble; and we are now happy to state that they have changed their ground, as may be seen by the following resolution.

"Whereas doubts appear to exist respecting the meaning and extent of the resolution of the last Synod, not to sustain any exceptions opposing the doctrine of the confession of faith; and whereas it is most desirable in itself, and indispensable to a renewal and maintenance of communion with other Presbyterian churches, to adhere to an unqualified subscription of the Westminster Confession of Faith: this Synod do now declare, in accordance with the resolution adopted at the last meeting of this body, that they will not, from this time forth, receive any exceptions or explanations from candidates for the ministry, and declare that all who in future wish to become licentiates or ministers of the church, shall subscribe its standards in terms of the following formula: 'I believe the Westminster Confession of Faith to be founded upon, and agreeable to, the word of God, and as such I subscribe it as the confession of my faith.'"

MODERN IMPROVEMENTS.—It is frequently and confidently alleged in vindication of the New Theology, that it obviates by its modes of exposition and explanation the most serious and formidable objections which sinners are accustomed to urge against the Gospel plan, and consequently, prepares the way for their reception of it under the new modification. If we should deny this, our denial would be attributed to our blind bigotry; for the sake of argument then we will to a certain extent, admit the position, that the new divinity divests the sinner of some of his strongest objections to the Gospel. Calvinism is of all other systems, the one least calculated to gratify the feelings of an unrenewed heart, and considering its structure, we are not surprised that every sinner should promptly and obstinately object to it. The whole scheme is extremely humiliating, and offers not one solitary encouragement to self-complacency in man. It meets us in the outset with the unwelcome doctrine that our nature is wholly depraved; or in other words that our "heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked;" a representation by no means flattering to our self-esteem. Not only this, it pays but a poor compliment to our rational and moral faculties, by denying to them any power to overcome this depravity, while it attributes the whole conquest to the undesired operations of the Holy Ghost. It proceeds further, and insists that God in his sovereign pleasure has elected a fixed number from the human family, for whom alone Christ died, and to whom alone the benefits of his redemption shall be applied. It does not stop here, but represents even the regenerate as entirely dependent on daily communications of grace that they may live to the glory of God and persevere in holiness. Now we say, that it is not at all wonderful, that a scheme so humiliating to human pride should be seriously objected to by every sinner.

Modern divinity has discovered what it proclaims as a remedy for this evil and which obviates all the "strong reasons" of the objecting sinner. It addresses him soothingly in terms like the following: "The holy Scriptures do not calculate that

noble nature with which God has endowed you; it has received no taint from the spoliary of Adam, and is free therefore from original and inherent corruption; no man becomes a sinner except by his own voluntary act, and the same volition which made him a sinner can cause him to cease from sinning; and the statement of Christ is unlimited in its nature, and if sinners choose, it may be unlimited in its application; man possesses powers of which he may well be proud, and if he can only be induced to exert them, he can be every thing which God has required him to be; if all the world would at this moment put forth their power, the millennium would instantly occur in the full blaze of its glory."

Our readers will certainly agree with us that this scheme softens the asperities of Calvinism, and must be wholly objectionable to sinners inasmuch as it encourages them in a high opinion of their own powers. That sinners generally should find much difficulty in embracing this system than that of rigid Calvinism, is to us a matter of no surprise.

Here, however, a difficulty occurs, if the system true? It does not accord with the testimony of God in his word! We know it to be less objectionable to the sinner, but does that make it true? If we should carry out the system, and tell the sinner that all his sins were venial, and that God was not so tyrannically severe as to punish them with final perdition, but, on the contrary, being infinitely benevolent, he was most willing that men should seek their own gratification in any way which they desired; the scheme would be still less objectionable to sinners, and multitudes would immediately flock into the church. Would this success in winning sinners, however, be any proof that the representation of their full liberty to sin, was accordant with the word of God? If according to the boast of the new divinity, their scheme is true because it is less objectionable to sinners, Universalism must be still nearer the truth and more worthy of acceptance. We recently heard a sermon from a Presbyterian pulpit, in which the new school divinity was brought to bear in answering the "strong reasons" of a sinner for remaining in impenitence; the views presented were similar to those before stated as belonging to this school, and the whole discourse was calculated to make a sinner feel very happy in the consciousness of his own plenary ability to step into heaven whenever he pleased. But we could not avoid such reflexions as these.—If the sinner is satisfied with these statements, is it probable that God is equally satisfied? If the sinner may act so prominent a part in his own conversion, where is the honour due to the Holy Ghost, and where is the grace of the gospel? Are not the most vital truths sacrificed with a view to make the gospel more palatable to the carnal heart? Is not the great position of divine revelation inverted, let God be exalted and man abased? Is not man here exalted, and God robbed of his glory? Alas! that such doctrines should ever be published to deceive and ruin the impenitent! The objections of sinners forthwith must be answered, and for this purpose the Gospel must not be explained, but explained away, and this is the greatest achievement which has been made by the New School divinity. Still this sacrifice of unpalatable truth to silence the cavilling of a sinner, is utterly unprofitable; it brings no honour to the minister who can thus deceitfully handle the word of God, and it tends only to deceive and undo the sinner. If he converts himself according to the doctrine of ability here inculcated, he will either perish in the self-deception, or be compelled to apply humbly to God to perform the work anew. Where then the advantage? The fruits of this doctrine may be seen in spurious revivals, false conversions, frequent apostacies and a church once happy and once blessed, lying prostrate and bleeding.

PEACE.—We had designed to offer some reflexions on the subject of peace in the Church, particularly in relation to a circumstance of recent occurrence; but, in a great measure the necessity is obviated by an excellent article which we copy from the American Presbyterian, and place under our editorial head to give it greater prominence and secure its perusal. It speaks our sentiments, and will probably accord with the views of most of our readers. Brethren who urge peace by charging others with biting and devouring one another, are perhaps a little deficient themselves in a peaceful spirit; and in sustaining their position from the word of God, while they abound in texts prohibiting personal strife, forget that we are required to contend earnestly for the faith,—to buy the truth, and not to sell it, even for the sake of a seeming peace. The noisy advocates for peace, as far as we can learn, mean nothing more than this: the orthodox are too belligerent—they should suffer men to mar the doctrines of the Gospel as much as they please, unmolested—let God take care of his own truth without our meddling! Such is the plain interpretation of their language, as well as their conduct. We estimate the duty of a steward of God, of a watchman on the walls of Zion, differently. A minister as a steward is faithfully to keep the deposit entrusted to him by his Master, and as a watchman he is to sound the alarm when the enemy approaches, and we might add, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, he is to defend the faith against all assaults. Now we will let the writer in the American Presbyterian speak for us:

"Mr. Editor.—Your correspondent 'Nevins,' insists on great liberality and forbearance as the duty of every Christian, (which no doubt is true) and he condemns those who declaim, or condemn the errors of others, as the cause of the commotions in the church; whilst with an unsparring hand he very consistently can accuse the venerable Synod of Philadelphia of disgracing their office, 'dishonouring their Master, and bringing a reproach upon the cause of Christ;' of 'uncharitable and ungentlemanly conduct;' as being 'passionate, uncharitable, disorderly, and unbecomingly noisy with all the faults of that Synod, I am persuaded, inflaming and irritable expressions were not used in that body with reference to any brother."

"He cries loudly for peace, forbearance, and overlooking the faults of others; and at the same time is accusing and condemning better feelings of being guilty of the most offensive conduct. True, he does not tell us which party has so far departed from a Christian and gentlemanly conduct, only the Synod; of course I presume he alludes to the majority; but be that as it may, I have made these remarks to show how perfectly partisans are blinded and suffer their judgment and better feelings to be carried away by party zeal. This brother, of course, belongs to the peace party, all forbearance, mildness, and love; yet no belligerent in the ecclesiastical contest uses more offensive and hostile epithets; like the great Addison, he is guilty of the same error he is writing to condemn. I duly appreciate his motive, and wish him would say something must be done to restore peace and harmony to our beloved Zion. I also agree with him, that it is high time for the 'moderate men' to take their proper stand, and no longer 'run with the hare, and hold with the hound;' let their

influence be all thrown where it sentimentally belongs, that it may be seen who are on the Lord's side—so that all who are on his side may as one man oppose error of every kind; for this is opposed to the Lord, I am far from approving any unkind, illiberal, or unchristian remark or conduct of the Synod, but I must say, in my judgment, that Synod, notwithstanding all its faults, has acted most nobly in the case of Mr. Barnes; and what is most to be wondered at, is, when we consider human frailty and passion, under the perplexing, twisting, shuffling conduct of the 2d Presbytery, there was not more warmth manifested. The errors in question are not "petty differences," or mere philosophical speculation, nor yet of minor importance; but they are of vital importance, calculated in their very nature and consequences to sweep away the foundation and hope of every Christian.

If the charges brought against Mr. Barnes are true, then I am thrown back on the same infidel foundation I occupied twenty years ago—I have no hope of salvation through the righteousness of a crucified Saviour! However philosophic may cover over this rotten foundation, yet they believe to be reasonable, consistent and beautiful, yet to me, who have with burning interest and zeal glory built a system on this foundation that led to atheism, the drapery thrown around it is too imperfect to prevent my recognising an old acquaintance. I am not accusing Mr. Barnes and those who hold with him, of being infidels; far from it; I hope and trust they are pious men; but when under any form we are disconnected from the condemnation in Adam, however plausible may be our theory and ingenious our plans, in truth and effect we are thereby disconnected from Christ. I know the theory of some is so ingenious, that whilst they deny the doctrine, yet they rest on Christ! But an unprejudiced investigation will show them the strength of their Saviour's works, and if of works it cannot be of faith. The remedy for man's recovery must be adapted to his condition, otherwise it is inappropriate and will not answer the end. If erroneous views concerning the true condition of man, will lead to false views of his recovery. If by the disobedience of Adam we are brought into condemnation; then a suitable Saviour would be one by whose obedience we could be justified. If we only inherit a sinful nature from Adam, and that all sin consists in voluntary actions, we cannot be condemned in Adam, but for our sinful volitions or actions. Then a suitable Saviour would be one that would impart unto us a holy nature, so that by our holy volitions or actions we would be justified—for if we are not justified on the same ground of our condemnation, there is no fitness or propriety in the thing; so if we are not condemned in Adam, only for our sinful volitions or actions, then we are not receiving or inheriting a sinful nature from him; neither can we be justified in Christ only in receiving from him a holy nature—so whatever views we entertain of the condition of man, if we are consistent, must be our corresponding views of the plan of recovery. So in my view the controversy is a vital one, and as my hopes of salvation are alone in the merits of Christ, that I may be in a situation to have those merits applied to me, I must be in the condemnation with Adam; and he who disconnects me from the one, disconnects me from the other.

Now, sir, in my view, the way to settle the controverted peace and the church, is for men to have distinct and definite views of fundamental doctrines; and if all cannot agree, let those who differ from the standards of the church honestly and peaceably withdraw. They are the persons that keep up strife by introducing strange doctrines, and by insisting on their retaining, when they are not of us, for if they were of us we should be agreed of their cause to be no strife? Or if they hold to our standards, but must explain our doctrines in a new way, so as to give offence to others, this in effect is teaching new doctrines, and necessarily will cause strife. Why insist on their new way if it in effect the same as the old? If they are so tenacious of their new way, they cannot or will not give it up—then peaceably withdraw—this is certainly duty if their way is essential—so that a line of discrimination may be drawn between the good and the new better way; but if their new way is not essential, why persist in it at the expense of the peace, harmony, and purity of the church. When Paul's brethren were weak, and by his eating meat he would cause his weak brother to offend; rather than this he would not eat meat as long as the world stood. Now let those strong brethren manifest his spirit, and not cause their weak brethren to offend by their philosophy, and we shall have peace. BACKWOODS.

MISSIONARY.—By the politeness of a friend we have been furnished with a letter from one of the missionaries which lately embarked at Philadelphia. The letter is dated December 24th, at sea, 34 days out, and was sent from Pernambuco, at which port the missionary ship touched. The letter states that the missionary company with few exceptions had suffered greatly from sea sickness, but at that date had nearly recovered. They spent their time principally in study and religious exercises. The writer remarks: "we have no reason to complain, for a happier band of brethren and sisters than we are, I suppose never crossed the ocean; our accommodations are of the first order, and the Captain is one of the most friendly and obliging men of his profession, not only to us but to all his men, and consequently all is peace and harmony."

AGRICULTURE.—The spirit of revolution which has to a considerable extent infected and maddened the popular mind both in church and state, has never been presented under a more alarming form, than in the terms of the following handbill which has been circulated through our city.

MONOPOLY.

"Monopoly is but another name for selfishness, or self-serving, and proceeds from depravity. It is dangerous to liberty, opposed to equality of rights, and to the true happiness of mankind; who are all created equal, and equally endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights."

"All enactments made binding amongst men, which import to some exclusive privileges over others, tend to make the pursuit of happiness unequal; and hence, infringe an unalienable right, the equal pursuit of happiness: whether such enactments assume the form and title of Charters, Deeds, or any other form and title, whatsoever."

An individual holding an exclusive right to property, under the form and title of what are called DEEDS, becomes, in fact, as much a monopolist as an association holding an exclusive right to property to the same amount under the form and title of what are called CHARTERS. A similar association be even called a United States Bank."

"All monopolies are dangerous to liberty, and every exclusive privilege granted to some, over others (under whatever title or form it is done) has cohered in itself the principle of monopoly, is oppressive and unjust, and that which is unjust in principle, Law cannot make just."

These disorganizing views are well calculated to be popular with the idle, ignorant and unprincipled portions of our population, to which, the prospect of wealth without the toil of industry, must have overpowering attractions. It is in our country a new exposition of equality, that the industrious and enterprising are to accumulate wealth to be distributed among the indolent and vicious. Not only legislative charters, but deeds which secure to individuals the enjoyment of their own earnings, are condemned as unjust and illegal monopolies which should be discontinued and violently assailed. In this we see the fruit of those corrupt political manoeuvres by which an attempt has been made to arouse the passions of the people at large against what has been styled the aristocracy.

In this country there is no aristocracy, except such as is made by superior talents and superior enterprise, and unless the law can reduce all men to a perfect level in these respects, the doctrine of equality as above advocated, must be rejected as silly in the extreme. Under our favoured government all men are equal in law; they enjoy alike its protection; every path to wealth and honourable distinction is alike opened for all; but if under the same circumstances some should outstrip others in the race, equity requires that they should be protected in the profits of their success.

The doctrine of the levellers would destroy all distinction between educated refinement and ignorant vulgarity; between industry and idleness; right and wrong; justice and injustice. If there was any excuse for the Spartan Lycurgus and the Roman Gracchi in proposing to reduce the rich by a distribution of their lands among the people at large, it must have been found in circumstances which do not exist in this country. All wealth is not now, as then, concentrated in the hands of comparatively few; neither are the rich able and willing now, as then, to oppress the poor and reduce them to a state little superior to slavery. If no man were permitted to hold property under the protection of law, the result would be that all incentives to industry would be removed, and society would by an inevitable retrocession, soon assume the improvident and idle habits of savage life. Even on the supposition that such a distribution of property was made as is evidently aimed at in the foregoing article, how long would the equality exist? Just so long as superior talents and enterprise would enable their possessors to outstrip their fellows in the acquisition of wealth. And must there again be a division to restore equality? Exactly so, or in other words, the industrious must work to maintain the vagabond.

A leveller was once asked what he would do in the event of such a distribution; his reply was that he would enjoy himself on the spoils like a gentleman. But said the interrogator, this course would soon dissipate your possessions, and reduce you to your previous condition, and what would you then do? Call for another division to be sure, was the reply. This is the doctrine; a yearly if not a semi-annual division would be necessary to maintain the equality. It may be supposed that the notion we are combating is too chimerical to be seriously entertained by any; but this is a mistake. It is extensively diffused; it is popular among certain classes, and it would be carried into effect if there was the requisite power. But is there not danger that such power some day, and perhaps not far distant, may be attained? Let every good citizen look at the mass of native population which has but loose notions of the distinction between *meum* and *tuum*; let him look at the incredible influx of the lowest classes of foreigners from Roman Catholic Europe; let him remember with how much facility the rights of citizenship are secured, particularly the elective franchise, and let him mark the arts of ambitious politicians who, to secure their objects, will pretend to advocate the cause of the poor in opposition to the rich, and create bitter jealousies in their minds against them as their oppressors, thus arraying one portion of the community against another, as if the rights of one could be obtained only by the overthrow of the other; let him ponder these facts, and judge whether there be any danger that an Agrarian law with all its odious, hateful, and fraudulent features, may not one day be seriously proposed. Premonitory symptoms are already apparent, and it will require the combined energies of Law, Gospel, and diffused Education, to prevent the actual invasion of the disease.

NOTICE TO REVIEWERS.—The Literary and Theological Review in a recent number contained, in many respects, a very just and able review of "Finney's Lectures," with which Mr. Finney had no just reason to be satisfied. A writer in the Buffalo Spectator, pathetically deprecates the severity of the Review as "an affectionate fratricide, a kind of loving butchering of a brother," and says: "I am sorry it bears marks of such intellectual strength; and doubly grieved that the writer appears so much at home, so much in his element when heung brother Finney in pieces."

The inference to be drawn is, that a man is no better than a butcher who will review and condemn a heretical book.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA.

Washington College is in the town of Washington, Pennsylvania, on the great national turnpike, at nearly an equal distance from Brownsville, Pittsburg and Wheeling. The population of this country is large, and distinguished for temperance, industry, wealth, and intelligence.

The site of the Institution is in the eastern part of the borough, and has a very pleasant location. In addition to the original College buildings, which are of considerable extent, a large and handsome new edifice is now in an advanced state, and will be complete for occupation early in the ensuing summer.

There are three Libraries: the College library, three or more belonging to each of the literary societies of the Institution, affording ample opportunity for profitable reading. There is also a Cabinet, containing already many curiosities and mineral specimens, to which valuable additions are making continually.

The faculty of this Institution, consists of a principal and four professors, also a tutor. The principal and four professors, also a tutor. The principal and four professors, also a tutor. The principal and four professors, also a tutor.

The number of students, during the present session of 1835-36, has been from 100 to 115; of these 24 belong to the senior, and 20 to the junior class in College.

The conduct of the students is orderly and studious; a large portion of those in the higher classes is professedly pious; among these is a "Society for inquiry into Missions."

Each student is required to recite, at least twice on every day, excepting Saturdays, when all the members of the regular College classes meet together for declamation, select reading, and reading compositions, subject to criticism by students and professors.

Punctual attendance on public worship, on the Sabbath, is required, at such places and with such denomination as shall be signified by parents or guardians, or be preferred by students themselves; and in general, all practicable care is employed in guarding and promoting their moral interests.

Students board in private families, or in the College Club. In the former, the expense is one dollar and seventy-five cents per week, including room, bed and boarding. In the Club, and in respectable families in the vicinity of town, the expense little exceeds one dollar. Tuition is

\$12 50 per session, or \$25 per annum, including all College charges. Expenses of boarding, tuition, washing, and fuel, in private families would little exceed \$100.—In Club, it would be considerably less.

There are two regular vacations, April and October. The summer session commences on the first of May;—the winter session on the first of November. Each session 21 weeks.

In healthiness, pleasantness, and morality, Washington is inferior to few, if to any places in our country; and young gentlemen desirous of taking a Collegiate course may enjoy there as many advantages, and as cheaply, pleasantly, and safely, as at any other Institution.

In compliance with a request of the Board of Trustees of this College, the foregoing summary statement is made, by D. M. CONAUGHTN, President of Washington College.

March 10, 1836.

For the Presbyterian.

DR. MILLER'S REPLY.

Mr. Editor.—My name has been recently brought before the public, by the Rev. Professor Halsey, of the "Western Theological Seminary," in a manner which requires some further explanation than his statement furnishes. I do not in the least incaluate the intentions of my Reverend Brother in making the statement referred to; but it appears to me liable to misapprehension, that I think it my duty to give a more particular and intelligible view of the occurrence to which he alludes.

Dr. Halsey, in order to illustrate and confirm his general position, that it has long been deemed fair and honest to subscribe the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, provided the individual subscribing believed all "the essential or fundamental doctrines," although he might differ from it as to some points of minor importance—gives the following example:—"The Rev. Dr. Miller of Princeton, was admitted, notwithstanding his objections to the Confession, chapter XXIV."—"The following is an account of the fact as it really occurred.

When I was licensed by the Presbytery of Lewes, between forty and fifty years ago, just before standing up to make the profession and engagement required of candidates for license, I informed the Presbytery, that the only article in the Confession of Faith concerning which I had the smallest doubt was a short clause in the fourth section of the 24th chapter, which treats "of marriage and divorce." The clause was this—"The man may not marry any of his (deceased) wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, &c." I had happened, a few weeks before, to attend to a discussion of the question, whether a man might lawfully marry the sister of his deceased wife; and my mind was brought into a state of doubt on the subject. Of this I thought it my duty candidly to inform the Presbytery, assuring them that I could heartily adopt every other article of the Confession. They unanimously concluded that this doubt was no valid obstacle to my subscribing in the usual form, which I accordingly did, and was forthwith licensed.

Soon afterwards my doubts were removed, and I became satisfied that the Confession of Faith, in relation to the matter in question, took the wisest, safest, and most scriptural ground. For a number of years before I ceased to be a pastor, I thought it my duty to decline sanctioning any matrimonial connection condemned by the clause referred to, and to set my face in every proper way against it.

It has given me, I confess, some pain to be held up to view as objecting to a whole chapter of the Confession of Faith, without discrimination; and to have the impression probably made and left on the readers of Dr. Halsey's letter, that I still adhered to objections, or rather doubts, which were entirely dismissed many years ago. Besides, if I do not altogether mistake, that respected Brother was distinctly informed, seven or eight years since, when it was proposed to expunge the clause in question from the Confession of Faith, that I objected to the proposal, and was earnestly desirous that the clause should be retained.

I am, Sir, very respectfully yours, SAMUEL MILLER.

Princeton, March 16, 1836.

From the Pittsburg Christian Herald.

NEW SCHOOL PREPARATIONS FOR THE NEXT ASSEMBLY.

[The following article ought indeed to awaken all the real friends of truth in the Presbyterian church. It is from the pen of one far from whom we are ready to pledge our own veracity, that he will neither mistake nor exaggerate; and still more, one who has been associated and numbered with the peace or moderate-men, but whose attachment to the standards of our church, never has been and cannot be questioned. We ask seriously, we ask confidently, can men who love the truth, can men who regard their ministerial engagements as duties? Can men who are actuated by the principles of honour or common honesty act thus? Answer these questions as we may, such are the men who are now being brought into contact, and who, in despite of our most ardent desires to live in peace, and conduct our establishment in peace, will force us into collision by the most insidious acts, while they make the highest claims to all that "is lovely and of good report" for themselves.]

EDITOR OF HERALD.

To the Members of the Presbyteries in Connexion with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

Brethren.—A solemn and perhaps decisive period in the history of our beloved and highly favoured church is approaching very rapidly, and will soon arrive. At the next General Assembly it will probably be determined whether we shall continue to be one church, and be relieved from corrupting and distracting influences from different sources; or be divided into two or three or more contending sects. Alas! then, a brother in the ministry, however unworthy he may be, who has watched the movements of contending parties with an anxious, and in some degree, impartial eye, to say a few words on one or two very important topics, to your utmost care.

It is well known, that at the last Assembly, great effort was made to obtain an expression of opinion on the subject of slavery, that should be favourable to the principle of abolition in its recent form. Of the effect of such a movement on the southern portion of our church, there can be but little, if any doubt. An immediate separation would, probably, in the present state of things, be the necessary result. A committee was appointed by the last Assembly, to prepare a report on this agitating question, to the next Assembly; and there is reason to expect that it will be pressed from other quarters.

The Rev. Albert Barnes of Philadelphia, it is equally well known, has been suspended from the doctrine of an appeal at the last Assembly, and has appealed to the next Assembly. This case has excited much feeling, and feeling of opposite kinds. The Rev. Lyman Beecher, D.D. has also been charged with heresy and other sins, and acquitted substantially, on the trial of his case, in the Synod of Cincinnati. From this decision, notice of an appeal has been given, and it also may go up to the Assembly. That those who are immediately interested in these cases, and their friends will make great efforts to gain the ascendancy in the next Assembly, may be expected. Such efforts will in some form be made by both parties. And if the body shall be composed of those who are heated combatants, what, I pray you, will be the consequences?

Allow me to inform you, if you are not already acquainted with the fact, that the friends of one of the parties in appeal, (Mr. Barnes) are now operating vigorously and systematically, for the purpose of securing a majority in the next Assembly. Do you ask what they are doing any thing more than using the periodical press, and ordinary correspondence and conversation, as all parties do, in a greater or less degree? This question I must answer in the affirmative.