

WATCHMAN OF THE SOUTH.

B. R. WREN, PRINTER,

WILLIAM S. PLUMER, EDITOR.

CORNER OF F AND 12th STREETS.

VOL. I.

RICHMOND, THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1837.

No. 1.

The Office of the WATCHMAN OF THE SOUTH is at the corner of F and MAYO streets.

TERMS.

The WATCHMAN OF THE SOUTH is published weekly on Thursday, at \$3.00 per annum, payable in advance, or \$3.50 if payment is delayed six months. All bank notes, current in any of the States where subscribers reside, will be received in payment for the paper: Virginia or United States bank notes will be a convenience to the Editor.

All Ministers and Elders friendly to the paper are authorized to act as agents. Promptness is confidently expected in all agents.

All letters and communications should be sent to Wm. S. Plumer, Richmond, Va., post paid. An adherence to this rule will impose a trifling tax upon individuals, while a neglect of it will make the aggregate amount very onerous to the editor, and beyond what the receipts of the paper will justify his encountering, except on orders for the paper or advertisements of money.

ADVERTISEMENTS not inconsistent with the character of the paper will be admitted at 75 cents per square for the first, and 50 cents per square for each subsequent insertion.

No subscription will be received for less than 12 months. Notices to discontinue the paper must be given one month previous to the termination of the year for which the individual has subscribed. It is important that this rule should be attended to. Where arrearages are not paid, the right to discontinue the paper is reserved.

For the Watchman of the South.

DO YOU FORGIVE ALL YOUR ENEMIES?

Forgive all my enemies? What a question! It is enough to forgive one's friends. It is cowardly to forgive enemies. It is unnatural too. Besides, I have always admired the Roman virtues. My creed is, that forbearance is weakness, and forgiveness, a downright meanness. If I were to forgive all my enemies there would be no end to the insults I should receive. A man must respect himself, if he would have other people respect him. I never had any disposition to forgive. I harbor malice against no man; but I cannot love him who injures me. How can I?

But why do you ask me the question? It troubles me. Did any man ever forgive all his enemies? Is there any reason why a man of spirit should forgive? Can a man forgive without degrading himself? And even if he should forgive some petty offenders, how can he forgive all his enemies? I am concerned about the matter.

Still I must repeat the question—"Do you forgive all your enemies?" It is your duty to do so. Hear the reasons.

In the first place, he who does not forgive his enemies will often mistake his friends for foes. Being revengeful, he will be suspicious. He will misconstrue men's actions, and misjudge their motives. Should any give him that rare token of valuable friendship which consists in affectionate reproach, he would esteem it unkind. For the same reason, he would cherish jealousy of temper, and would mark almost all actions with an evil eye. Now, turning friends into foes, in this way, is a bad business; it is self-torment.

But suppose that some, whom you suspect, are your real enemies. Perhaps you have given them much provocation. If so, they are only as bad as yourself. Their fault does not cancel yours, nor can their sin be a cloak for your criminality. At least, be honest, and divide the blame with them.

Although your enemy wantonly intends to do you evil, yet God may superintend to do you good. So his hatred shall not hurt and may even benefit you. Thus the plotting of Joseph's brethren led to his promotion at the court of Pharaoh. The curses of Shimei were the precursors of David's triumphant return to the holy city. "Let him alone," said the royal fugitive, "and let him curse for the Lord hath bidden him. It may be the Lord will requite me good for his cursing this day." In like manner, when your enemies assail you, look up to God and say—

"When men of spite against me join,
They are the sword, the hand is thine!"

And He will not suffer the sword to prosper against you.

God commands you to lay aside all malice—to put off anger, wrath, and bitterness—to recompense to no man evil for evil—to forbear and to forgive. He who breaks God's commandments must bear God's anger.

They who do not exercise forgiveness shall not receive it. He who lives and dies unpardoned, lives and dies unpardoned. The true witness hath said: "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." What terror these words bear to all the unforgiving!

Not to forgive is a daring assumption of the awful prerogative of God. "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." Surely, God will resent your indecent intrusion of yourself into his judgment-seat. So the blow which you aim at your fellow-sinner and fellow-servant, will return upon your own soul.

The best and wisest men in every age have practised forgiveness. When Stephen was enduring that dreadful death by stoning, he cried: "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." All the martyrs followed his example. When reviled, they did bless. And saints of later times have done the same. How creditable it is to the memory of one of the Reformers, that "he never forgot any thing except injuries." Who would not be like such men?

To forgive the most bitter enemies is to be like Jesus, who beholding the unfeeling cruelty of his enemies, in mocking his dying agonies, yet in that dreadful hour, found time not only to pray for their forgiveness, but also to frame an argument in extenuation of their guilt—"Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." Would you not be like Christ? Can you ever be satisfied until you awake in his likeness?

You wish to be great. Then remember that there is more greatness in ruling your own spirit, than in taking a city. The poorest of all the contrite souls has the pre-eminence over him who should subdue the earth to his sceptre; but should not subdue his own passions. "It is the glory of a man to pass over a transgression." To err is human. To revenge is devilish. To forgive is divine.

It is a mark of peculiar guilt and folly not to forgive. The best authority teaches, that "anger rests only in the bosom of fools," and that to "hate a man is to be a murderer."

Forgiveness often converts foes into friends. It may thus affect your enemies. It would be very pleasant to secure the good will of those who dislike you. But resentment will only irritate and enrage. No enemy is won by hatred. Leviathan is never thus taken. "Grievous words stir up anger." It is a "soft answer that turns away wrath." Learn to overcome evil with good.

Remember too that you are not much hurt until your soul is hurt. The bitterness of enemies is not the bitterness of death. Who can harm you if you follow that which is good? Malignity in striking one dagger against the bosom of its object, buries ten in the heart of the assailant.

The most expensive of all methods of being equal to your foe is to hate him. The cheapest mode of gaining a lawful and undoubted advantage over him is to forgive him.

He, who does not forgive, must prepare for strife and every evil work. Now, it is a wise rule to leave off contention before it be meddled with. Defile not thy conscience, imbitter not thy life with wars and fightings.

Besides, you and your enemy will soon stand together at the same bar of omniscient judgment. If he has to be judged, so have you. Nor can you deny that you have often and very wickedly sinned against God. Why should you not be merciful that you may obtain mercy? You owe your Lord ten thousand talents. Why should you not forgive your fellow-servant fifty pence? If God bring you into judgment, you cannot answer for one of a thousand of your heinous sins against him. Does it then become you to be unforgiving respecting the few and slight offences committed against yourself?

Christianity is practically worth very little to him whom it does not enable to triumph over all his sinfulness. To embrace the bitterest enemy in the arms of holy benevolence is one of the earliest and simplest and grandest achievements of vital and evangelical piety. Shall your religion be worthless?

Prayer for your enemies will be much more likely to make them ashamed and miserable, until they cease their hostility, than any thing that revenge can inflict. Even persecution herself hath been known to grow pale, and to quake under the influence of hearty prayer.

Eternity is near. Unconquered glories or terrors will soon strike awe into every soul of man. Then all the petty strifes among the potshers, will be divested of their unreal consequences; and many things on earth regarded as great, will consume away like fat of lambs. Look at the grounds of your enmity. Can you justify it in eternity? Thus are you called and urged to the duty of forgiveness. More sublime sanctions attach to no human obligation.

And now do you forgive all your enemies? Perhaps you say, "I can forgive, but I can't forget." If you mean that you cannot erase from the tablet of your memory all impression, so as to be wholly unable to recollect the offence, then you are not required to forget. In this sense Jehovah does not forget our offences. Yet he says, "their sin and their iniquities will I remember no more." Now we are required to forgive as he does. Therefore, when you are required to forget as well as forgive, the meaning is, that you must not willingly retain a remembrance of the offence—thoughts of it must not be cherished—the recollection of it must not awaken animosity; nor must the repetition of the offence rekindle old anger or hatred. You must also forgive, however often the offence be repeated, though it be seven times a day, or seventy times seven. You must love your enemy; pray for him; wish well to him; do him good; if he be hungry, feed him; if he be thirsty, give him drink; if he be naked, clothe him. And you must do all sincerely, habitually, benevolently, willingly, not for a pretence, nor by constraint of the fear of hell. The sorrows and sufferings of your most cruel, unrelenting and persevering foe must be no matter of joy to you.

"He that is glad at calamities shall not be unpunished." You must "love your enemies." To do so is the badge of discipleship in the school of Christ, and the token and pledge of eternal life. If you find no such spirit in you, then you are a guilty, unpardoned, unholiness, in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity. Therefore you must be converted. You must be born again. In malice you must become a child. Without a thorough change of heart you cannot be saved. The alternative is regeneration or perdition. You must be born again, and your enemy slain, or you must sink to endless woe. M. R.

Selected for the Watchman of the South.

RULES FOR ORDERING OUR CONVERSATION ARIGHT.

1. Begin and end every day with God. He is the Alpha and Omega, make him so. When you awake let your thoughts be first of God—not of the world, or vanity. Lift up your heart in thankfulness for the rest of the night—for the health of the morning.

When you are up, you must make a more solemn business of it. God expects to find you somewhere alone, every morning—Afterwards in the family. In a well ordered conversation, the man dares not go about worldly business, till he and his family have been together to worship God. In the evening worship God in your families also—Pray alone—Close the day with God. Let prayer be the key of the morning, and the bolt of the evening. And see to the manner of it—that it be done after a due order. "I will wash mine hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar, O Lord."

2. Set the Lord always before you. He is always before you. His eye is always upon us. But do you set him before you? "Mine eye is ever toward the Lord." Behold as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of a mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God." Do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, to the glory of God.

3. Be good husbands of time, especially of opportunity time. Time is precious. Ask dying people. Ask damned people. An inch of time is worth a wedge of gold. I believe that whenever God gives grace to a man, from that time he will value time at another rate than before. Especially value opportunities. These are the cream of time, whether of doing or getting good. Improve them. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it. Time may last and opportunities be gone. "Go to the ant thou sluggard." This present day is a price, improve it. Think what shall I do for God, or for my soul, this day.

4. Be diligent in your calling. Each of us ought to have a calling. We are not to stand idle in the market place of this world. "Be diligent to know the state of thy flocks." Whatsoever your calling is therein abide with God. Let it be never so mean, if honest, and followed diligently with an eye to God, he accepts us. Take heed of inordinateness. Those are too busy who cannot find time from their calling to attend the service of God. Be industrious in the fear of God.

5. Look well to the duties of your particular relations. It is a certain truth that you are really what you are relatively—as husbands and wives, parents children, brothers and sisters, masters and servants and fellow servants. A well ordered conversation discharges the duties of each of these relations with all might in the fear of the Lord. "I and my house will serve the Lord." Not only in immediate acts of worship, but in all family relations and duties. The 2d and 3d chapters of St. Peter's first Epistle are to direct in the several relations. All is comprised in one word—Love. Walk in love, and dwell in love. There is no walking, no dwelling like this. They that dwell in love, dwell in God, and shall be with him forever.

6. Be careful what company you keep. Ps. 1: 1—Acts. 2: 40. Be not delighted in that company that you would not be with forever. "I am the companion of all them that fear thee."

7. Set a watch over the door of thy lips. By our words we shall be justified, by our words condemned. Some say, our lips are our own! Do not say so. Do not think so. The sound of the vessel discovers the emptiness of it. Those that are bound for Canaan must not speak the language of Ashdod. Be the first to begin a good discourse, never be the first to let it fall.

8. Acknowledge God in all thy ways. Knock at his door. Beg of him guidance and direction, success and a blessing. Ask of his mouth, Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do? Own him in your successes. In your disappointments acknowledge him.

9. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Do not rob God.

10. Die daily. Let no day pass without some serious thoughts or words about death and the grave. This will help to make you serious. Do something every day to make your dying day comfortable.

11. Honor the Lord with thy substance—that is, dishonor him with no part of it, and pay him his rent out of it, in charity to the poor. They are God's receivers, and are always with us.

12. Make Christ your All in All. Make Christ your righteousness; for nothing we do, is, or can be acceptable to God. None but Christ. None but Christ. Live upon him. Live by him. Live through him.—Philip Henry.

EIGHT USEFUL DIRECTIONS.

1. Let not the wisdom of the world be your guide.
2. Let not the way of the world be your rule.
3. Let not the wealth of the world be your chief good.
4. Let not the cares of the world encumber you.
5. Let not the comforts of the world entangle you.
6. Let not the crosses of the world disquiet you.
7. Be not too fond of life.
8. Be not too fearful of death.

Matthew Henry.

Go a step nearer Heaven, endeavor to master some evil temper, and break loose from some worldly tie every day. Victory over one sin on right grounds will pave the way to an easy conquest of all.—Adam.

EXAMINATION.

Are our meditations of God frequent and sweet, and the aspirations of our souls, like incense perpetually mounting before him? Is it our chiefest joy to think on his name, and on his attributes, on his works and on his words? Do we resign our souls entirely to his pleasure, acquiesce in his will, obey his precepts, and trust his promises? Is his favor, life, his providence our protection; his spirit our guide; his word our counselor, and his kingdom the inheritance for which we are earnestly looking, and daily preparing? Amidst all the changes of a transient life, can we say to the sea of passions, fears and cares within, *Be still!* and can we lean on God, as on a rock, immovable and calm amid the surrounding storm? Nay, can we not only rest on him, when we contemplate the greatness of his power, but rejoice and triumph in him, when we view the glory of his grace as manifested in Christ Jesus? Do we realize ourselves in his presence; pant after higher and more frequent communion with him in this world, and ardently and affectionately long to see him, and to be forever with him in the other.—Smith's Sacred Office.

We know our readers will be pleased to know that Dr. Chalmers is making additions and corrections to his own writings and having them published in a uniform edition. These works are reprinted in New York. The first volume is on Natural Theology. The second paragraph of this work contains the following sublime sentences:

"And while the spirituality of God's nature places Him beyond the reach of our direct cognizance, there are certain other essential properties of His nature which place Him beyond the reach of our possible comprehension. Let me instance the past eternity of the Godhead. One might figure a futurity that never ceases to flow, and which has no termination; but who can climb his ascending way among the obscurities of that infinite which is behind him? Who can travel in thought along the track of generations gone by, till he has overtaken the eternity which lies in that direction? Who can look across the millions of ages which have elapsed, and from an ulterior post of observation look again to another and another succession of centuries; and at each further extremity in this series of retrospects, stretch backward his regards on an antiquity as remote and indefinite as eyes? Could we by any number of successive strides over these mighty intervals, at length reach the fountain-head of duration, our spirits might be at rest. But to think of duration as having no fountain-head; to think of time with no beginning; to uplift the imagination along the heights of an antiquity which hath positively no summit; to soar these upward steps till dizzy by the altitude we can keep no longer on the wing; for the mind to make these repeated flights from one pinnacle to another, and instead of scaling the mysterious elevation, to lie baffled at its foot, or lose itself among the far, the long-withdrawing recesses of that primeval distance, which at length merges away into a fathomless unknown; this is an exercise utterly discomfiting to the puny faculties of man. We are called on to stir ourselves up that we may take hold of God, but the 'clouds and darkness' which are round about Him" seem to repel the enterprise as hopeless; and man, overborne by a sense of littleness, feels as if nothing can be done but to make prostrate obeisance of all his faculties before Him.

For the Watchman of the South.

Below the reader will find the opinions of two good men on a very important subject.

Paul says—"Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful, are beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the word of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but dotting about questions, and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.—1 Tim. 6: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.—1 Tim. 6: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Scott in his notes on this passage, says—"The apostle next directed, that Christians, who were 'under the yoke' of slavery, should quietly attend to the duties of their lowly situation; 'counting their own masters' entitled to all the respect, fidelity, and obedience which that superior relation demanded; and not supposing that their religious knowledge, privileges, or liberty, gave them a right to despise their heathen masters, to speak or act disrespectfully to them, to disobey their lawful commands, or to expose their faults to their neighbors. This they ought to attend to, that 'the name of God might not be blasphemed,' and his truth and worship reviled, among the Gentiles, by means of the failure of Christian servants in acknowledged duties. And such of them as enjoyed the privilege of 'believing masters,' ought by no means to despise them, or withhold from them due respect and obedience; because they were brethren in Christ, and so upon a level in respect of religious privileges; but rather 'to do them service,' with double diligence and cheerfulness, because of their faith in Christ, and their interest in his love, as partakers of the inestimable benefit of his salvation. This shews, that Christian masters were not required to set their slaves at liberty; though they were instructed to behave towards them in such a manner, as would greatly lessen and nearly annihilate the evils of slavery. It would have excited much confusion, awakened the jealousy of the civil powers, and greatly retarded the progress of Christianity, had the liberation of slaves by their converts been expressly required by the apostles; though the principles of both the law and the gospel, when carried to their consequences, will infallibly abolish slavery. These things Timothy was directed to teach and enforce, as matters of the greatest importance; and if any persons taught otherwise, and consented not to such salutary words, which were indeed the words of Christ 'speaking by him,' and an essential part of 'the doctrine according to godliness,' he must be considered as a self-constituted ignorant man, who, being puffed up with an opinion of his own abilities, was ambitious of distinction and applause, though entirely unacquainted with the real nature and tendency of the gospel. It is not absolutely certain, to what set of men the apostle referred; but, as many of the Jews deemed it unlawful to submit to heathen governors; it is probable, some of the Judaizing teachers inculcated, that the worshippers of God ought not to obey heathen masters; and so paid their court to servants, by persuading them that they ought to assert their liberty. But there might be others also, who disregarded and despised these practical instructions; while their attention was taken up with curious and nice speculations. Such persons ought, however, to be considered as doting, or talking wildly, like sick and delirious persons, about hard questions and disputes of words, names, forms, or notions, which had no connexion with 'the power of godliness.' Indeed, these questions and disputes tended to excite envy and competition between one and another, angry contests for victory and pre-eminence, mutual revilings and calumnies, injurious suspicions and jealousies; and absurd, obstinate, and violent controversies, between men 'of corrupt' and carnal 'minds,' who were destitute of the real knowledge of the truth and its sanctifying efficacy, and who only sought their own secular advantage; supposing religion to be valuable, in proportion as it tended to enrich them; as if gain and godliness had been but two names for the same thing! Thus they wanted to persuade the Christian servants, that the recovery of their liberty was to be considered as a Christian privilege of great value, which they ought to claim, whatever the consequences might be; and from the same principle, they sought worldly lucre by their religious profession, and as their leading object. From such men Timothy was exhorted 'to withdraw himself;' and neither have acquaintance with them, nor spend his time in disputing against them."

In his Practical Observations on the same passage, Scott says—"It is most important to the honor of the gospel, that professed Christians should perform their various relative duties; and that 'servants count their own masters worthy of all honor,' even though they may be unbelievers. Their condition indeed, in this favored land of liberty, allows them to change one situation for another; but the precepts of scripture do not at all permit them to behave with disrespect to the persons, or disregard to the lawful commands of those whom they serve; nor yet to return affronting answers, or to speak of their master's faults to others without cause; but rather to weep over them and pray for them in secret, when they are ungodly and unreasonable. Alas! how grievously are 'the name and gospel of God blasphemed,' through those servants, who love to discourse and dispute about doctrine and sermons, in families averse to such subjects; and then behave with impertinence in their places, if not with sloth, dishonesty, and unfaithfulness! Thus thousands are fatally prejudiced against the gospel. Nay, this is so little attended to, that many masters who would be glad to have pious servants, and to behave to them like brethren, as far as it is consistent with domestic subordination, are often wearied out, and tempted to prefer servants who know not the gospel, and are regardless of religion, because of the mis-conduct of many who profess it. Indeed, some servants whose sincerity is unimpeached, through a lamentable mistake, suppose equality in religious privileges to imply equality in the family; and thus they act, as if they 'despised their believing masters,' and their authority; giving them rude answers, and either neglecting their business, or doing it in their own way; as if it was a part of their Christian liberty! Whereas they ought to honor and serve them, with the greater diligence and alacrity; because 'they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit.' No doubt there are violations of duty, equally inexcusable, committed by those who stand in the opposite relation; and zealous professors of evangelical doctrines are necessary to believing servants choosing to live in irreligious families, by behaving in so unchristian a manner to such as have come among them, expecting better treatment.—Ministers are bound to teach and enforce the duties of all ranks and orders of men, in the church and the community; and 'if any one teach otherwise,' and speak contemptuously of these exhortations, and consent not to 'salutary words,' which are indeed the words of our Lord, and a part of 'the doctrine according to godliness,' he ought to be deemed 'a proud man, who knoweth nothing,' whatever his gifts and profession may be; and he should be pitied and shunned, as a distempered man, who is infected by the love of abstract 'questions, and strifes about words; whereof cometh envy, contention, reviling, evil surmisings, and perverse disputing.' This is manifest from daily observations; to these things 'men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth,' are peculiarly addicted; especially when they can make them

subservient to their emolument and reputation, being disposed to think that the best religion, by which they can get the most money or worldly advantage in one form or another. Instead of engaging in controversy, with such mercenary, self-wise, and ignorant wranglers, who will not consent even to the apostle's word, or to those of Christ himself; we should withdraw from them, and thus protest against them, and leave them to dispute by themselves or with one another."

Doddridge in a note on the word translated doting, says—"It is so well known that *doting* signifies a person in a *distempered* state, that it hardly required the pains which Dr. Abraham Taylor has taken to prove it, by a large collection of authorities. Bishop Wilkins would render it, *he is sick of questions, or of the wrangling disease*, with which, it is much to be lamented, that the Christian clergy, as well as *laity*, have so generally been infected in almost all ages and nations. *Wilk. Sermon*, p. 73. The word here seems to express the effect of a disease upon the mind, in which view, *doting* appeared a more proper word than *doting*."

NEW MEASURES.

As early as 1827, Dr. Hyde, of Lee, expressed himself as follows, in a letter to a christian brother: "are you aware that errors and delusions are creeping into the church? I greatly fear the consequence of the new measures to promote revivals of religion in the western part of the state of New York. The division has begun among ministers, and among those who are called evangelical ministers. The evil is incalculable. Some very popular ministers, called orthodox, are rapidly verging towards Pelagianism, never did I see the church in greater danger, though it is an age of revival, and of unparalleled missionary efforts. May the Lord preserve us from going with the current. We must watch and pray." The same year, Dr. Hyde witnessed a great revival among his own people, attended with great excitement and resulted in the accession of a large number to his church. But when speaking of gathering these converts into his church, he says, "it has been a great work—far greater than any former revival, especially to lead them cordially to acquiesce in that part of the Confession of Faith adopted by the church, which makes the *sinner wholly dependent on the sovereign mercy of God*. There is at this time, so far as I can learn, a prevailing desire throughout the land to have this all-important truth explained away. Many young preachers who are zealous and popular, give instructions to sinners, which savors too much of arminianism, and the influence of such instruction is spreading. It has been felt among my own people, but God is above men, and he can and will support his own truth." "Human wisdom and human efforts never humbled the proud heart of any one of Adam's race."

"I have exactly the same views of the best means of promoting a revival of religion which you so cautiously expressed in one of your late letters. Foreign aid at such times is often very dangerous. A faithful, praying exemplary minister is clothed with salvation and his best aid in a time of revival, and at all times, in revivals and active churches. The plan of sending out evangelists as *revival men* where there are settled pastors is no part of that wisdom from above—it comes from a bad source. If pursued, it will distract and rend the churches. It is to me strange, that some of my brethren whom I highly value, should advocate this plan."

DR. HYDE'S MEMOIR.

For the Watchman of the South.

To the Rev. William S. Plumer:

Rev. and dear Brother—I received and read with peculiar interest your communication of the 3d instant. I had been before informed of the enterprise of publishing a new weekly paper, in which you have engaged, and do most cordially wish you success in your undertaking. You are, no doubt, well aware that the undertaking is an arduous one; but, in the present state of things, it appears to me indispensably necessary. The influence of the press is, at this day, so potent, and is spled with so much zeal by the enemies of truth and order, that the friends of both cannot afford to be deprived of an agency so essential.

When you request me to appear, under my own name, as one of the friends of your enterprise, I am sensible that you entirely overrate the value of my opinions, both in regard to their correctness and their influence. But this is not a time to bandy compliments or to adjust the precise limits of friendly partialities. I have no doubt that you are engaged in a righteous cause; and, such as I am, I am quite willing to take my stand among the number of its friends. I consider the publication in which you are embarked, as urgently called for, and as eminently adapted to do good at the present crisis, if conducted as I am confident it will be. The Southern States (in which your paper will chiefly circulate) at all times important and interesting—have become peculiarly so, in an ecclesiastical view, in consequence of the measures of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. It is due to that noble judicatory; to the best interests of truth and righteousness; to the Southern Churches; to yourself; and to the venerable brethren who acted with you, to explain and vindicate the great principles maintained, and the decisive, but wise and necessary measures, adopted by that Assembly. I am too old to do much more than to "bid you God speed," and to pray for you. But if you consider these as of the least value, they will be undeservedly at your service.

I have expressed entire confidence that the *Watchman of the South*, while it will ever be marked with firmness, and with unyielding fidelity to orthodoxy and Presbyterian order, will be conducted in such a manner as to exemplify the meek and benevolent spirit of the gospel. Yet it cannot have escaped any one's notice that many of the publications of those who side with the minority of the last Assembly, bear a character which it is difficult to meet with a calm, untroubled temper. Still let us endeavor, even with such antagonists, to "speak the truth in love," and to "overcome evil with good."

Among the various positions assumed by the brethren of that party, none has surprised me more than this—That the Assembly, by declaring four Synods to be no longer connected with the Presbyterian Church, virtually dissolved itself; that the Church has ceased to exist; that, as an organized body, it is dead; and that, if ever brought into a state of action again, it must be in virtue of a new organization. This, if I understand it, is contended for, and proposed to be acted upon by the new-school party; and, if we may consider them as serious in their statements, very high expectations are entertained of being able to maintain this ground. I repeat, that among all the arguments and claims of those brethren, none have filled me with more surprise than this. It strikes me as one of the most untenable and even absurd positions ever assumed by sensible men. Even admitting, for a moment, that the measure in question was altogether unobjectionable, rash, and irregular; what then? No such consequence would follow as is here supposed. As well might it be alleged, that, when an individual

member of a church is unjustly and irregularly excluded from its communion, the church is thereby dissolved, and that the excluded member may sue for a portion of its property. As reasonable would it be to say, that when a Presbytery unjustly deposes one or more of its members, or rashly withdraws all connection with one of its congregations, it is as if that act of discipline dissolved as a Presbytery, and liable to a civil prosecution. Did any man in his senses, ever dream of such a consequence? I have always supposed that a majority of every ecclesiastical body must govern; and that, even when that majority committed mistakes in deciding on its measures, either disciplinary or prudential, so long as it infringed no law of the land, it was not liable to the interposition of civil courts. The General Assembly existed long before those Synods were formed or thought of. Why should it cease to exist because they are dissolved? Surely it may be the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; its well now, when it embraces only nineteen Synods, as four months ago, when it embraced twenty-three. And this appears to have been at the time the opinion of the brethren themselves forming the majority of the Assembly. For, after the four Synods were dissolved, those brethren continued to sit in the Assembly for a number of days, and to transact business, arguing, remonstrating, and offering protests, as if they considered the body as still in existence. At what subsequent period did they make the discovery that the Assembly all this time was dead; that their own acts were null and void; and that the closing scene, dissolving that Assembly, and calling another in 1838, was a solemn nullity, enacted by a number of individuals, who had ceased, ten days before, to have any organized existence?

The foregoing remarks are made on the supposition, which I have admitted for argument sake, that the measure of the General Assembly in dissolving four Synods, was altogether unconstitutional. But I am persuaded that it was not so; nay, that it was the only measure which the General Assembly could have taken for effectually purifying and tranquilizing the Church; and that it was, in every point of view, consistent with the spirit of our ecclesiastical constitution. Can any one doubt that, if any one Presbytery or Synod now connected with the General Assembly should be persuaded that a majority of our Churches had become corrupt and disorderly, and that it was no longer for their edification to remain connected with us—they would have a right peaceably to withdraw? There is no clause of our Constitution, indeed, which provides for such a case; but the essential and indefeasible rights of conscience, must ever be considered as claiming and establishing such a privilege.

And, in fact, the "Preliminary Principles" prefixed to our Form of Government can only be interpreted as including and securing this privilege. Here a minority withdraws, and has a right to withdraw from the majority. But suppose the converse of this case; suppose the General Assembly to be, on good ground, perfectly satisfied that one or more of her Presbyteries or Synods were radically corrupt and disorderly; that any longer connection with them would endanger the purity and peace of the whole Church; and that the disease was so deep and extended, that the ordinary forms of process could not reach or remove it. Shall we deny to a majority a right which a minority is acknowledged to possess—the right of peaceably withdrawing from all connection with such corrupt and dangerous member or members? If the General Assembly had deposed the ministers belonging to those Synods, or excluded their congregations from the Christian church, there might have been some complaint against the act of withdrawing from them. But nothing of this kind was done or attempted. The contrary is expressly declared. Their ecclesiastical organization is not touched. They are still in possession of their names and powers as Presbyteries and Synods. All that has been done is to declare that we can no longer co-operate with them as Presbyteries. Suppose that, instead of being dissolved, they had been cited to answer for their irregularities, and to correct them. Does not every one see that an overwhelming majority of all those Synods, and of all the Presbyteries which composed them, being Congregationalists, would have delayed and evaded, and given rise to another six years' conflict; in the meantime, gaining strength every year, and making more certain our ultimate subjugation to their will? (On the other hand, if regular process had been commenced against each minister and ruling elder, or committee man, composing those bodies, is it not manifest that there must have been several hundred cases of process; and that a series of conflicts would have been commenced adapted to keep the Church in a state of agitation and turmoil for ten, perhaps twenty years to come? How much better; how much more in conformity with the spirit of our constitution, to take the summary course which was adopted—a course which, though not in so many words, laid down in our "Form of Government," is in perfect harmony with its whole spirit, and which deprived the dissolved Synods of no privilege but the unfair and unrighteous one of governing real Presbyteries, while they refused to submit to the government which they imposed—the privilege of departing every day, themselves, from essential Presbyterian principles; and at the same time, of being the most clamorous about imaginary departures from the system on the part of those who really love and obey it!

We hear much about the organization of our Church being dissolved, and its charter forfeited. This charter was obtained from the Legislature of Pennsylvania thirty-eight years ago. I have often examined it, and have recently given it a fresh perusal; and feel utterly at a loss to imagine the ground of the allegations so frequently and confidently made. What clause in that charter has been violated? Which of its provisions has not been strictly complied with? I am compelled to believe, that those who have indulged in the greatest license of language on this subject, have never seen the document in question.

We hear also of the minority of the last Assembly commencing suits for their share of the permanent funds, held by the Trustees of the Assembly. These funds are of two sorts; those which have been given for the support of the Theological Seminary at Princeton; and those which were collected thirty years ago, if not more, to be held in trust by the General Assembly forever, and the interest expended, under the direction of that body, in conducting domestic missions. Of course, the moment those funds pass out of the hands which received, and at present hold them, a breach of trust, and a forfeiture will be incurred. Besides, an appeal may here be made to the just and honorable feelings of those brethren. Not one dollar of those funds, of either class, was ever contributed by any member of any of the Synods in question. Would they be willing to accept, much less to demand a dollar of them in such circumstances as those?

Another thing grieves me. Our brethren of the minority give out that they mean to retain their ecclesiastical organization, and to come up in force to the next Assembly, and demand their seat, and, of course, a re-union with that body. I am not sure what name ought to be given to a feeling of instinctive abhorrence in my breast, which would forever keep me back from such a movement; a movement having for its object to force a connection with a Christian body who did not wish to receive me, and who believed that they would be more united and more happy without me. Whether the prosecution of it would be equally repugnant to my principles and feelings. As to the tendency of such movement to promote Christian harmony and love, I cannot imagine any one to be so far gone in absurdity as to dream of it.

I am, Rev. and dear Sir, most cordially, your brother in Christ,
SAMUEL MILLER.
Princeton, August 14, 1837.

From the Hartford Watchman.
WHAT SHALL WE DO FOR THE HUNDRED TALENTS?

On a certain occasion, the king of Judah hired an army out of Israel for a hundred talents of silver, the more effectually to strengthen himself in his warlike enterprises. "But there came a man of God to him, saying—O, king, let not the army of Israel go with thee, for the Lord is not with Israel, to wit, with all the children of Ephraim. But if thou wilt go, do it, be strong for the battle. God shall make thee fall before the enemy; for God hath power to help and to cast down. And Amaziah said to the man of God, but what shall we do for the hundred talents, which I have given to the army of Israel? And the man of God answered, the Lord is able to give thee much more than this."

This example is important in several respects. In the first place, it teaches us that God is displeased with his people, when, in his cause, they resort to the principles or aid of worldly policy. It seemed politic to the king of Judah to strengthen his hands by hiring men out of Israel. But in doing this, he depended on numbers and appearances, rather than on correct principles. The men of Israel were then in a state of rejection—they were in appearance, and perhaps in profession, on neutral ground between the cause of truth and the cause of error; but like all who profess neutrality in such a case, they were real enemies to the truth, and would ultimately betray it. It was then no addition to the strength of the people of God to hire such auxiliaries. If they went forward in this vain confidence, God would make them fall before their enemies. This should be a warning to all those who, in support of a good cause, resort to the principles of a worldly policy. Such policy may do in a bad cause; that is to say, it may not be inconsistent, but it will not help, but will injure a good cause. Many good men, like Amaziah, greatly mistake in this matter. They betray and ruin the most important interests, by calling in the aid of those who have no sincere attachment, and whose motives are all mercenary and selfish.

They may think, perhaps, that it is only the wisdom of the serpent which dictates this course. But if it has the wisdom of the serpent, it lacks the harmlessness of the dove, and is therefore inadmissible. The best way to deal with neutral characters is to leave them to their neutrality, which the Judge of hearts will duly appreciate. But to hire an army of neutrals to fight the battles of truth and righteousness, is highly preposterous.

In the second place—this example teaches us that good men may be left to such a state of mind as to think more of their money than of anything else.

When the man of God told Amaziah that he should not prosper in his enterprise, and that it must be abandoned, the first thing which he thought of, was the loss of his money. He seems to have forgotten his folly and inconsistency, and the danger into which he had brought the cause of God, and the only question with him was, what shall we do for the hundred talents? The love of money is the root of all evil, and is a prominent feature in the human character. And when it remains unsubdued in good men, it constitutes a blemish in their characters, a stumbling block in their example. How many men, whom God has furnished with the means of eminent usefulness in his cause, would be a blessing to the church and the world, if the first question with them were not that of Amaziah, what shall we do for the hundred talents? This is their weak side, the alloy in their gold, the dead flies in their ointment, the blot in their characters, the clog to their usefulness, the drawback in their example. And could I whisper to the ear of any one dear brother whom I see entangled in this snare, I would say to him, never mind the hundred talents, give them to Christ in promoting his cause, and they will be the best stock which you possess. When I see a good brother sleeping on the lap of covetousness, I feel like shouting at him—O, brother Sampson, awake, and escape from your Delilah, before she shears your locks, and the Philistines be upon you.

In the third place, this example teaches us that when good men fall into the sin of covetousness or parsimony, God is wont to strip them of the idol, by leaving them to circumstances in which the loss of money is inevitable. God took care that his servant Amaziah should be preserved from the fatal confederacy, but then he left him to go so far in his folly as to lose his money. And the reason probably was, that he loved the money too well. And so when any of his children fall so far under the power of this temptation as to cling to the hundred talents while they forget every thing else, or very inadequately remember it, they may expect that God will leave them to make some foolish bargain, or to fall into the hands of some sharper, or to suffer losses and failures by the bad management or misapplication of others. When I see a Christian man brooding over his funds with idolatrous fondness, and contriving every way to evade or avoid a demand for the cause of truth or benevolence, I look out for some stroke of the rod on his beloved idol. I expect to hear that his hundred talents are gone, in spite of his watchful care. O that monied Christians were wise, that they would devise liberal things for Zion, how much happier for themselves, and for their influence upon others, would be their example, than when their benevolent affections are bound in a golden chain.

A PLAN OF UNION
Between Presbyteries and Congregationalists in the new settlements, adopted in 1801.

The report of the committee appointed to consider and digest a plan of government for the churches in the new settlements, was taken up and considered, and after mature deliberation on the same approved, as follows:

Regulations adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in America and by the General Association of the State of Connecticut, (provided said Association agree to them,) with a view to prevent alienation and promote union and harmony, in those new settlements which are composed of inhabitants from those bodies.

1st. It is strictly enjoined on all their missionaries to the new settlements, to endeavor by all proper means, to promote mutual forbearance and accommodation between those inhabitants of the new settlements who hold the Presbyterian and those who hold the Congregational form of church government.

2d. If in the new settlements, any church of the Congregational order shall settle a minister of the Presbyterian order, that church may, if they choose still conduct their discipline according to Congregational principles, settling their difficulties among themselves, or by a council mutually agreed upon for that purpose; But if any difficulty shall exist between the minister and the church or any member of it, shall be referred to the Presbytery to which the minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; if not, to a council consisting of an equal number of Presbyteries and Congregationalists, agreed upon by both parties.

3d. If a Presbyterian church shall settle a minister of Congregational principles, that church may still conduct their discipline according to Presbyterian principles; excepting that if a difficulty arise between him and his church, or any member of it; the cause shall be tried by the Association, to which the said minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it, otherwise by a council, one half Congregationalists and the other

half Presbyterians, mutually agreed on by the parties.

4th. If any congregation consist partly of those who hold the Congregational form of discipline, and partly of those who hold the Presbyterian form; we recommend to both parties, that this be no obstruction to their uniting in one church and settling a minister; and that in this case, the church choose a standing committee from the communicants of said church, whose business it shall be, to call to account every member of the church, who shall conduct himself inconsistently with the laws of christianity, and to give judgment, on such conduct; and if the person condemned by their judgment, be a Presbyterian, he shall have liberty to appeal to the Presbytery; if a Congregationalist, he shall have liberty to appeal to the body of the male communicants of the church; in the former case the determination of the presbytery shall be final, unless the church consent to a further appeal to the Synod, or to the General Assembly; and in the latter case, if the party condemned shall wish for a trial by a mutual council, the cause shall be referred to such council. And provided the said standing committee of any church shall depute one of themselves to attend the Presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery, as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church.

On motion Resolved, That an attested copy of the above plan be made by the stated Clerk, and put into the hands of the delegates of this Assembly to the General Association, to be by them laid before that body for their consideration; and that if it should be approved by them, it go into immediate operation.

From the Presbyterian.
THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.

Mr. Editor.—The General Assembly in its legislative capacity, adopted the regulations for the government of the churches in the new settlements, in 1801; and the same body, with the same capacity, repealed them at their last sessions. Every Legislature has an inherent right to repeal its former acts, upon the ground of policy or expedience; and I see no reason why it should not exercise that power over an act considered unconstitutional, as was done by Congress in repealing the Alien and Sedition law. The opinion of the legislature does not, indeed, decide the Constitutional question, or disturb contracts and vested rights; but the question, *per se*, furnishes a legitimate and sufficient motive for that department to act upon; and the repealing act in such case must be taken to be lawful until it shall be declared unconstitutional and void, by the judicial department. But our General Assembly, with a government peculiar to itself, possessing (as I have already said) the three co-ordinate branches in one body, has the sole and exclusive right, on all questions of government, discipline, or doctrine, to decide on their constitutionality. If there be any other tribunal possessing this power, where is it? I know of none. Shall the courts of justice be called on to decide for us? If we have come to this pass, we had better dispense with our committee of commissions, and call in a justice of the peace at the meeting of every Assembly, to judge whether the commissioners, in attendance have a right to seats or not. So long as Church and State are kept within their respective and appropriate spheres, uncontrolled by each other—the Church judging and deciding for itself on its proper ecclesiastical concerns—and the State deciding on all the political and civil rights of its citizens, we have nothing to fear. But let the Church transcend its proper boundaries and attempt to control the civil authorities, as on the question of Abolition—or let the State, by its constituted authorities, assume the power of controlling the ecclesiastical affairs of our or any other Christian denomination, and we have much to alarm us. Sooner than witness the unnatural union of Church and State in our happy land, let us rather see them both annihilated and resolved into their original elements, and let us scramble again for a new Church and a new State—separate and distinct. But to the point. It has been contended that although the act of 1801 was unconstitutional and void, yet there are rights grown up under it, which are not destroyed by the repeal. Very well, be it so. If the churches formed under the Plan, or individuals, have acquired property by virtue of the act, their rights will be protected. The exclusion of the Synods from the Presbyterian Church could not and never was intended, to affect the titles or property of churches or individuals. But the case of Fletcher and Peck, decided in the Supreme Court of the United States, has been quoted to sustain the vague notions of the minority. I see nothing new in that case, and it derives all its importance from the amount at stake, and from the delicacy of exposing the corruption and rashness of the legislature of a respectable State. Constitutional questions are of common occurrence, both in the Federal and State courts. The Supreme Court of the United States have adjudged 8 cases under the acts of Congress, and 36 under State laws. Six of the former and 10 of the latter were held to be constitutional, the others not. The principles which governed Fletcher and Peck, and which apply to the case under examination, may be seen in Vanhorne and Dorrance, Calder and Bull, Marbury and Madison, McCulloch and Maryland, Dartmouth College, Charles River Bridge, and many other cases in the Reports of the Supreme Court. It would be tedious and unprofitable, in this place, to draw up a formal argument; but I may be indulged in stating a few of the principles alluded to. For example.

"Every act of the Legislature, repugnant to the Constitution is *ipso facto* void; and it is the duty of the court so to declare it." (Therefore I say it was the duty of our Assembly to declare the act of 1801 void.) "That one legislature is competent to repeal any act which a former legislature was competent to pass; and that one legislature cannot abridge the powers of a succeeding legislature, are principles, the correctness of which, so far as it respects general legislation, can never be controverted. But where legal estates are vested under a constitutional law, they cannot be annulled by the legislature." When then a law is in its nature a contract, and absolute rights have been vested under that contract, a repeal of the law cannot divest those rights." "The Supreme Court of the United States will not annul an act of Congress for impairing the obligation of contracts simply; because it is not the Congress but the States that are restricted by the constitution in this particular." The case of the Dartmouth College came under this rule;—the charter contained a contract and there were vested rights under it; and the Court held that the repealing act was a law impairing the obligation of contracts, and therefore void. The case of Fletcher and Peck was simply this. The legislature of Georgia, in the year 1795, having full power under their constitution, passed an act granting a large body of land in the Yazoo country, to four companies, for a valuable consideration, and received payment; but the act was obtained by gross fraud. At their next session, the legislature repealed the act and declared it null and void, and caused the evidence of it to be expunged from the records. The Court held, that as this was a contract executed, and rights of property were vested by it—as the legislature had constitutional power to pass the act, and were party to the contract—as the question was in its nature a question of title—and as the defendant is a purchaser of the grantees for valuable consi-

deration, without notice of the fraud, therefore his title is valid. Now there is nothing in all these cases at variance with the action of our Assembly, but every thing necessary, by analogy at least, to support that action. This I could easily prove by applying the principles to our case, but it would occupy too much space. No right of property or of civil privilege has been invaded by the action of the Assembly; it is only an ecclesiastical privilege of which the Synods are deprived; and therefore the remedy, if any, must be sought for in the ecclesiastical and not in the common law courts.

But the case of the Charles River Bridge, decided in the Supreme Court of the United States at their last sittings, applies strongly to the one under consideration. A charter was granted to this Bridge Company, with privileges and profits, for a term not yet expired. Another charter was afterwards granted to the Warren Bridge Company, near the same place, which absorbed all the profits of the former. In a suit by the former company against the latter, the question was whether there was a contract, expressed or implied, in the first charter. The Court held that there was none, and that therefore there was no violation in granting the latter charter. "It is clear," said the Court, that the plaintiffs must place themselves on the ground of contract; and cannot support themselves upon the principle, that the law divests vested rights. It is well settled by the decisions of this Court, that a State law may be retrospective in its character, and may divest vested rights; and yet not violate the Constitution of the United States, unless it also impairs the obligation of contracts." Satterlee v. Matthews cited.

Where then is the pretence for a suit at law? And where are the abuses so loudly trumpeted abroad? The true Presbyterians of the excluded Synods ought to see and acknowledge that the action of the Assembly was precisely the thing to suit their case. The door is open and they have nothing to do but to come into the Church of their decided preference and enjoy its privileges, undisturbed by those who belong, or ought to belong, to another church, or to no church, and that there was no other practicable mode of making the separation, without great delay; which would have consummated a scheme for revolutionizing the Church. It is said, however, with an air of triumph, that whatever might have been the character of the Plan of Union, the churches created under it were recognized and formed into Synods by the General Assembly, and were therefore constitutional—especially as the churches were recognized in 1821, when the Constitution was amended and republished. The answer is ready. It was unconstitutional to adopt the Plan and to act under it, as has been abundantly proved, the Plan is still and must forever remain unconstitutional, until it shall be adopted by the Presbyteries. You may recognize and practice under error for a century and it will be error still—time does not change its character. A presumption may arise, by lapse of time, of the loss of papers, in common law proceedings; but here the rule does not apply—there is nothing for it to act upon. It is a simple fact, and that recorded. The Assembly, at the time of amending the Constitution and of forming the Synods, either knew that these churches were of a mixed and disorderly character, and were not really Presbyterian, or they did not know it. If they were ignorant of the fact, they were either deceived or they were negligent; but their ignorance does not cure the error—it was acting upon false grounds, and was therefore groundless and void. If they were deceived, then the deception was a fraud, and vitiated the transaction. If they knew the fact, then they were wilfully guilty of violating the Constitution anew, in a most palpable manner, by giving form to such heterogeneous masses, and calling them Presbyterian churches. I cannot see, therefore, how you can expect to arrive at truth and order by pursuing or multiplying errors; or by what system of ethics a man shall be absolved from the guilt of one offence by the commission of another. Suppose the General Assembly should form a Synod of Congregationalists, professing as such, they observing the order, government, and discipline of their own Church, and suppose this act should be tolerated for 36 years, would the Assembly be excluded from repairing the breach it had made in the walls of our Zion? And yet the case at issue is as strong.

I will conclude this number by adopting the sentiment of the Missionaries of the Sandwich Islands: "We fondly cherish the sentiment that the Church of God is never improving faster, as a body, than when it is undergoing a process of purification and discipline."
A PRESBYTERIAN.

WATCHMAN OF THE SOUTH.
RICHMOND, AUGUST 31, 1837.

THE NAME of our paper has been a little changed since the Proposals were first issued. We did not then know that there was a paper in Charleston called the Southern Watchman. We wish to infringe on the rights of none. Our present name is more pleasant to the ear, if not to the eye. Our friends, therefore, will please speak of the WATCHMAN OF THE SOUTH.

OUR PROSPECTS are, perhaps, as good as we had any right to expect. Our proposals have been out less than five weeks, and we already have a list of more than seven hundred subscribers. Strong assurances are given us that we shall be supported. In most of our towns we have some subscribers, and in some of them large lists. In the country, too, our friends have been active, and have sent us very large lists from some places. It must be remembered, however, that we have not yet half enough subscribers to support the paper for one year, without allowing the Editor any thing for his services. Those who wish the paper to succeed will, therefore, see the necessity of great exertion in its behalf for some time to come. Some of the most important places, both in Virginia and North Carolina, have not been heard from, except that efforts are making for the Watchman.

TO THOSE ERRORS which have noticed, in a friendly way, our proposals, we feel greatly indebted. Besides the papers generally in Richmond, we have received copies of the Charlottesville Advocate, the Petersburg Constellation, the Warrenton (N. C.) Reporter, the Southern Christian Herald, and the Presbyterian, together with a political paper published in Columbia, S. C., the name of which is lost, all of which commend our enterprise to the notice of their readers. Doubtless other papers have done the same, but they have not yet reached us. To all such we repeat this expression of our thanks.

OF THE FIRST NUMBER, a very large edition is printed. It is sent to many gentlemen, in the hope that they may approve our design and forward their own names and those of their friends. Should any feel indisposed to favor our plan, they will please hand the paper to some one, who does approve our course, or put it into the hands of the Postmaster, to be returned to us as the law directs.

PARTICULAR ATTENTION is invited to the practical matter contained in our pages. Our aim is to feed the people with knowledge. We are not unmindful that we, and our readers all soon be in eternity; and that preparation for our great last change must now be made. We trust our pages, so far from retarding any "on their Zion Way," will help them forward.

THE AMOUNT OF ORIGINAL MATTER in the present paper is small, because we publish some weeks earlier than we expected; and because we wish to make room for other matter of a nature required by the present state of our church. We hope our friends will take time to read the article quoted from the Alton Observer, a new-school paper, and also that taken from the Hartford Watchman, a paper supported by orthodox Congregationalists of Connecticut.

OUR AGENTS will please take notice, that besides the regular facilities for transmitting money by mail, at our risk, the Synods of North Carolina and Virginia will soon meet; and some one, duly authorized, will attend those meetings, and receive any amount, which may be there paid over. A list of Agents may soon be expected to appear in the Watchman.

THREE OR FOUR NUMBERS of the Watchman may be expected before the meeting of either of the Synods. After that our paper will, probably, be suspended for two or three weeks, in order to give time for subscription lists to come in, and for every man to go to Synod, who may choose to do so. We hope that such returns will be made by the 8th of October, as shall ensure the success of our enterprise.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY, for last General Assembly, a Review of the proceedings of the last General Assembly, covering 78 pages. It is calm, lucid, dignified, and solemn. We are pleased to hear that it will be extensively circulated in a pamphlet form. We may have occasion to refer to it hereafter. For the present we give merely a short note, which may be found on page 465. It relates to the Synod of the Western Reserve, declaring itself to be Congregational.

The New York Evangelist of June 24, 1837, quotes from the Ohio Observer, a paper edited, it is said, by the stated clerk of the Western Reserve Synod, an editorial article advising the Synod "to declare itself an independent body, changing its name, perhaps, for the Western Reserve General Association; and modifying its rules as circumstances shall seem to require. This done, then let the presbyteries resolve themselves into associations, still maintaining the principles of government on which they have ever acted, and abiding by the same rules, with such alterations as may be thought necessary." The spirit of the whole article is such as becomes a christian minister, and is, in this respect, a striking contrast with the humiliating tone and language of almost all the new-school papers in their notices of the proceedings of the General Assembly. We refer to the article in the Ohio Observer as additional evidence, that public sentiment in the Western Reserve is decidedly in favor of Congregationalism. The moment the motives, whatever they may be, for maintaining the name and form of Presbyterianism, derived from their connexion with the Assembly, cease to operate, they avow their preference for Congregationalism. It remains to be seen what effect foreign influence may have on their determinations.

ONE THOUSAND COPIES of this and several succeeding numbers will be retained by us so as to furnish new subscribers from the first.

PRESERVE YOUR PAPER.—Carelessly as newspapers are generally treated, there are still few things more interesting than an old file of papers, if they ever had merit sufficient to command attention. How often do persons regret that they have lost the first number. It breaks their set. A large portion of every religious newspaper ought to contain matter of permanent value. Preserve, therefore, this and each subsequent number of the Watchman of the South.

OUR NOTICES OF DEATHS AND MARRIAGES must of course be very limited, or mere reprints from other papers of this city, until our correspondents and exchange papers shall enable us to fill up the deficiency.

NEW-SCHOOL CONVENTIONS.
We lately observed, in a northern paper, a call for four new-school Conventions. Whereupon we said—"Quis furor iste novus?" We presume the proceedings of the Auburn Convention will be carefully spread before the Southern churches before long. Our readers will do well to remember that this Convention meets in the heart of one of the dissolved Synods, that not a presbytery, (so far as we have heard) South of the Potomac, has any part in it, and that it is made up of four times the number of delegates that presbyteries are allowed to send to the General Assembly. In this way, it is easy to get up a "Great Meeting," "Immense Assembly," &c. We shall judge it by its fruits, not its numbers.

NEW DIVINITY.
We are often asked, in our journeyings, as well as at home, What is the New Divinity? The question is as comprehensive as it is important. We intend, from time to time, to endeavor to answer it. And that there may be no mistake, we shall employ, chiefly, if not exclusively, the language of those, who profess to like the new doctrines. In doing this, we shall make a free use of any helps in our power. We shall find special assistance from a pamphlet published by Rev. Daniel Dow.

Moral Agency.—"It will not be denied that free moral agents can do wrong under every possible influence to prevent it. The possibility of a contradiction in supposing them to be prevented from doing wrong is, therefore, demonstrably certain. Free moral agents can do wrong, under all possible preventing influence."—Ch. Spec., 1830, p. 563.

"But this possibility that moral agents will sin, remains, (suppose what else you will,) so long as moral agency remains; and how can it be proved that a thing will not be, when for aught that appears it may be. When in view of all the facts and evidence in the case, it remains true that it may be that evidence or proof can exist that it will not be."—Ch. Spec., 1830, p. 563.

"We know that a moral system necessarily implies the existence of free agents, with the power to act in despite of all opposing power. It is his fact sets human reason at defiance, in every attempt to prove that some of these agents will not use that power and actually sin."—Ch. Spec., 1831, p. 617.

"God not only prefers on the whole that his creatures should forever perform their duties rather than neglect them, but proposes, on his part, to do all in his power to promote this very object in his kingdom."—Ch. Spec., 1832, p. 600.

God's Happiness Diminished.—"It is admitted that what men have done to impair the blessedness of God by sin, has not failed of its results in the actual diminution of his blessedness, compared with what it had been, had they obeyed his perfect law."—Spirit Pilgrims, Vol. 5, p. 693.

Depravity.—"A child enters the world with a variety of appetites and desires, which are generally acknowledged to be neither sinful nor holy. Committed in a state of utter helplessness to the assiduity of parental fondness, it commences existence, the object of unceasing care, watchfulness, and concession, to those around it. Under such circumstances it is, that the natural appetites are first developed; and each advancing month brings them new objects of gratification. The obvious consequence is, that self-indulgence becomes the master principle in the soul of every child, long before it can understand that this self-indulgence will interfere with the rights, or entrench on the happiness of others. Thus, by repetition, is the force of constitutional propensities accumulating a bias towards self-gratification, which becomes incredibly strong before a knowledge of duty or sense of right and wrong, can possibly have entered the mind. That moment—the commencement of moral agency, at length arrives."—Ch. Spec., 1829, p. 366.

"At what moment, this point of moral agency commences, it is not for us to say.

"Why, then, is it so necessary to suppose some distinct evil propensity—some fountain of iniquity in the breast of the child previous to moral action?"—Ch. Spec., 1829, p. 366.

"Infants die. The answer has been given a thousand times; but it dies also. But Mr. Harvey replies, 'Animals are not subjects of the moral government of God.' Neither are infants previous to moral agency; for what has moral government to do with those who are not moral agents?"—Ch. Spec., 1829, p. 373.

"It has been shown, that infants stand on precisely the same ground with animals, as far as the present subject is concerned. For neither of them are moral agents nor subject to moral government."

"A brute, or the soul of an idiot, might live forever without being sinful.

"Animals, and infants previous to moral agency, do there-