WATCHMAN OF THE SOUTH.

DEVOTED TO THE PROMOTION OF PRACTICAL PIETY, THE DIFFUSION OF RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE, AND THE PROPAGATION OF THE DISTINCTIVE TENETS AND INSTITUTIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

VOL. II.—No. 6. RICHMOND, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1838. Whole No. 58.

From the Presbyterian.

THE END OF THE WICKED.

Some years ago there lived in the south of Scotland a young man of respectable connexions, who, besides possessing superior talents, had received a sound Christian education. In his early days he had been strictly conscientious in the discharge of filial duties, and the observance of the common decencies and proprieties of life. Such, in fact, was the excellence of his character, and such the extent of his attainments, that he held a very high place among the young men of the borough where he lived. His parents were proud of their son, and looked forward to his proving their comfort and their stay in their declining years. In short, all thought well of him, and there appeared to be little danger of any serious deviation from the paths of rectitude, as he had passed unsullied through the days of heedless youth. The family in which this young person belonged, were, I believe, decidedly pious, and their acquaintances generally of the same character. All this led the subject of our remarks into frequent and serious conversation concerning the great fundamental doctrines of our holy religion, and in consequence of his talents and education, he soon acquired a clear comprehension, not merely of the doctrines themselves, but of the mode of defending them against the various objections which are current among infidels. Nay, such was his love of argument, that he was accustomed to display his skill in urging the infidel cavils, and so great was his tact and talent on these occasions, that it was often difficult for uneducated persons to make a satisfactory reply, or to blunt or repel his subtle weapons. For a while this dexterity attracted the more notice, among his associates, as it was clearly understood that he did not hold the objections as his own, but merely suggested them for the purpose of eliciting truth in new forms, and drawing out of pious minds what, till thus hoed, they had scarcely known they possessed—Yet, alas! this habit became in his case a fatal snare, and proved his utter ruin. Proud of his abilities, and anxious, on every occasion, to display his attainments, he sought opportunities of exhibiting his wonderful tact in making the worse appear the better cause. His companions and friends seeing the perversion of his mind, withdrew from his company, after in vain remonstrating with him upon the unfortunate habit which he was fast acquiring. If not cured by reproof, one would have thought he might have been reclaimed, by finding none with whom to engage in idle controversy. But evils indulged blunt the best perceptions of the soul, and pride and ambition, when cherished, became ruling passions; and just as one class of persons, who were necessary to feed these passions, eluded him, another was sought from whom the desired gratification might be obtained. And so far did this cherished and growing evil carry him, that the interval between morning and afternoon services on the Sabbath was employed in this favorite exercise. Then, and especially on sacramental occasions, he used to join himself to the little groups of pious country persons who, on a fine summer's day, were seen assembled in the open fields to spend that portion of sacred time in recounting what they had heard. It soon became a particular amusement to Mr. B. to start some difficulty, and carry it on till he had put to silence the chief men in these companies. Principle became more and more vitiated, and every amiable and proper feeling became still more feeble, as he saw pious parents put to blush before their children, by whom they had hitherto been revered as their leaders and teachers in matters of religion. But as right principle and pious conduct are a present reward, so bad principle and ungodly conduct are a present curse, and may ever be taken as forerunners of coming evil. Sooner or later the sin of such men will find them out, God's word cannot fail; just because God's power cannot fail. Every profane Esau has the true and all-powerful God against him. Every one who jests with divine things, and makes a practice of dissecting the character of God, and of trampling on the best feelings of his fellow-men, must expect, if mercy prevent not, to be in his turn made the jest of a God of burning jealousy and eternal justice. "Behold ye despisers, and wonder and perish." "I will mock when your fear cometh." "I will laugh when desolation cometh upon you."

These new sources of low gratification, this wicked and worthless employment of talents, that might have been turned to a very different use, soon came to an end, and we find him seeking in the alehouse what he could no longer obtain on the sacred hours of the Sabbath, and among the happy little companies of God's dear people. But where all scoff at divine things, the chair of the scoryful is no high place, no great dignity; and such a clear and indelible impression of this is engraved on our common nature, that the very qualification for which clubs of such profane persons elect their chairman is that he excels all his fellows in the iniquities to which they are addicted, and that he has ability, boldness and tact, to utter the unhallowed jest, in cases where every other among them would feel abashed and dispirited. Horrid ambition! How like the character of Satan as drawn by the immortal Milton, "Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven." In this new field he soon attained such notoriety and boldness, as to engage in deeds so impious, that we cannot even think of them without feeling an inward horror. One Sabbath morning, when they had risen from their profane revels, they in one band betook themselves to the neighboring hills to spend the holy day in amusements, with the view of recovering from the inebriation of the past night. Knowing that it was the Lord's day, they attempted in every way to ward off the solemn impressions which were ever and anon returning upon them, they began to ridicule the services of the sanctuary, and to strengthen their sinking fortitude by the repeated laughs which those unhallowed jests called forth. How true is it, that evil men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived! They glory in their own shame, and drink in iniquity as the ox drinketh water. His conduct was, as might be expected, fatal to his reputation in the place of his nativity, and he had as much shame left as to make him leave it without delay. He had had a prosperous business, but now it was gone; he had had a good name, but now he was so infamous that he could not bear to live among his former companions. Sabbath-breakers are perpetually deteriorating in character. There is an overwhelming load of guilt accumulating on their heads, and a penal evidence gathering on their own character, showing that it is not moral principle or piety that keeps them what they are, but a mere combination of circumstances, the removal of change, of any one of which, might at completely and effectually break them down, as in the case of this poor man. On leaving the place of his nativity, he repaired to the metropolis of Scotland, where, for several years, he dragged out a miserable existence. He wrought at his business for some time, and might have done well, but under the influence of habits of intemperance, all his feelings and affections were perpetually assimilating to a lower and a still lower grade of companionship. All labor was at length given up, and those haunts of wickedness and scenes of dissipation and wretchedness, which, alas, are fearfully numerous in our large cities, became the places of his most frequent and favorite resort.

And who that remembers these scenes of profanation and death ever returns? "She hath cast down many wounded; yea, many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death." But now his last, his worst, companions must be encountered—disease, poverty, mental wretchedness, and an untimely death. "If our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live?" How can the transgressor escape when God makes inquiry for blood? "If he that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses, of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace."

When laid on the bed from which he never again rose, he was visited by one of those pious country persons whom he had much grieved and offended by his conduct. From this Christian friend I had the account of his sufferings and the state of his mind in the last stage of his earthly career. This friend had been indefatigable in seeking him out, and when he found him, no less kind and attentive in visiting him. The bodily state of Mr. B. was loathsome beyond description, but his mind was still more wretched even than the body was loathsome. His pious friend presented the Lord Jesus to him, in all his freeness and fulness, as the Saviour of sinners, and able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him." He assured him, "that the blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sins." But the poor unhappy man could take no comfort from any thing he said, and found no consolation either in the character or work of the blessed Redeemer. He was, to all appearance, left to eat the fruit of his own doings, and was filled with his own devices. Remorse and despair had taken possession of his mind, and the very thought of God caused terror, and the very name of Jesus created the greatest uneasiness. His conscience was so all that was addressed to him was, "I know all that as well as you do, but I can find no relief from it." During the last visit which his friend paid him, never paid him, the sufferer begged him not to speak to him any more of these things, as he felt as if the flames of hell were kindling in his soul already. This was his final attempt to exclude the last lingering rays of the Sun of Righteousness. What an awful illustration of that passage of the word of God—"If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."

THE WIDOW'S SON.

In one of our little villages which stands on the sea-shore, there lately lived a widow and her little son, a lad of about ten years of age. She had formerly seen better days. Her husband was a respectable sea captain; and supported his family in ease and affluence. But amidst his own and the hopes of his family, he was lost at sea. The widow had two little sons, one of six years old, and the other, above mentioned, then an infant. She retired from the circle in which she had long moved with fortitude, and purchased a neat little cottage, which stands by the water's side. Here she brought up her little boys, and early endeavored to lead them "in the way they should go." She felt herself to be a pilgrim below, and taught her sons that this world was never designed for our home.

In this manner this little family lived, retired, beloved, and respected. The mother would often lead her children on the hard sandy beach, just as the setting sun was tipping the smooth blue waters with his last yellow tints. She would then tell them of their father who was gone, and with her finger would often write his name upon the sand, and as the next wave obliterated every trace of the writing, would tell them that the hopes and joys of this world are equally transient. When the eldest son had arrived at the age of twelve, he was seized with an unbounded desire of going to sea. He had heard sailors talk of their voyages, of visiting other climes, and other countries, and his imagination threw before him a thousand pleasures could he visit them. The remonstrances and entreaties of a tender parent, and an affectionate little brother, were all in vain. He at length wrung a reluctant consent from his mother, and receiving from her a Bible, a mother's blessing and prayers, he embarked on board a large brig. He promised his mother, as he gave it her, that he would read the word daily read his Bible, and as often commit himself to God in prayer. A few tears and a few sighs escaped him, as he saw the last blue tints of the native shore sink from his sight—for there was the cottage of his mother, and all the joys of his childhood; but all was novelty around him, and he soon forgot these pangs, amidst other cares and other scenes. For some time he remembered his promise to his mother, and daily read the Bible; but the sneers of the wicked crew recalled his mind from reviewing the instructions of his pious mother, and he placed his Bible in the bottom of his chest, to slumber with his conscience. During a severe storm, indeed, when it seemed as if destruction was yawning to receive every soul on board, he thought of his mother—his home—and his promises—and in the anguish of his heart, resolved to amend, should his life be spared. But when the storm had subsided, the seas were smooth, and the river sun bright, drawing near his native land, great waters, he forget all his promises, and it now seemed as if the last throb of conscience was stifled. No one of the crew could be more profane—no one more ready to scoff at that religion, which in his childhood and innocence he had been taught to love and revere.

After an absence of several years he found himself once more drawing near his native land. He had traversed the globe over, but during all this time he had neither written to his mother, nor heard from her. Though he had lost all her restraint and blunted the finer feelings of his nature, yet his bosom thrilled with pleasure at the thought of once more meeting his parent and brother. It was in the fall of the year that he reached, and on a lovely eve in September, walked towards his long-deserted home. Those only are acquainted with the pleasures of the country, who have spent their early days in youthful retirement. As the young sailor drew near the spot where he spent his early days—as he ascended the last sloping hill which hid from his sight the little stage on which he had acted the first scenes in the drama of life, his memory recalled to his mind all the scenes of his "happier days," while fancy wandered deceitfully that hours equally agreeable would again be enjoyed. He now saw the rising hills over which he had so often roamed—the grove through which he had often wandered while it echoed with the music of the feathered tribe—the gentle stream on whose banks he had so often sported—and the tall spire of the temple of Jehovah—all tended to inspire the most interesting sensations. He drew near the cottage of his mother, and all there was stillness. Nothing was to be heard save the gentlest murmurs of the unruffled waves, or the distant barking of a village dog. A solemnity seemed to be breathed around him, and, as he stopped at his mother's door, his heart misgave him, though he knew not why. He knocked, but no one bade him enter. He called—but no answer was returned, save the echo of his own voice. It seemed like knocking at the door of a tomb. The neighbor, hearing the noise, came, and found the youth sitting and sobbing on the steps of the door. "Where," cried he with earnestness, "where is my mother and my brother? Oh I hope they are not—"

"If," said the stranger, "you inquire for widow ——, I can only pity you. I have known her for a short time, but she was the best woman I ever knew. Her little boy died of a fever about a year ago, and in consequence of fatigue in taking care of him, and anxiety for his recovery, worn out sea, the good widow herself was buried yesterday." "Oh, hundred" cried the youth, "have I staid just long enough to kill my mother! Wretch that I am—show me the grave—I take a dagger in my hands—let me die with my mother—my poor brother—my poor Jamie!"

"Hold, friend," said the astonished neighbor, "you are the widow's eldest son. I have a letter for you, which she wrote a few days before she died, and desired that you might receive it, should you every return."

The stranger retired to his cottage, and went to the house of the neighbor. A light being procured, the young man threw down his bundle and hat, and read the following short letter while his manly cheeks were covered with tears:

"My dearest, only son—when this reaches you, I shall be no more. Your little brother has gone before me, and I cannot but hope and believe that he was prepared. I had fondly hoped that I should once more have seen you on the shores of mortality, but this hope is now relinquished. I have followed you by my prayers through all your wanderings. Often while you little suspected it, even in the dark cold nights of winter, have I wept for your son. There is but one thing which gives me pain at dying; and that is, my dear William, that I must leave you in this wicked world, as I fear, unreconciled to your Maker! I am too feeble to say more. My glass is run. As you visit the sods which cover my dust, oh, remember that you too must soon follow. Farewell—the last breath of your mother will be spent in praying for you—that we may meet above."

The young man's heart was melted on reading these few words from the parent whom he so tenderly loved; and I will only add, that this letter was the means in the hand of God, of bringing this youth to a saving knowledge of the Saviour. It is in hope that he is now a very respectable and pious man, and that we may learn from daily experience as well as from Scripture, that "*praying breath*" shall never be spent in vain.—*Todd's Sketches.*

THE REDEEMER'S TEARS.

All the tears that Jesus shed on earth, were tears of compassion. Those he wept over Jerusalem, were, perhaps, the most tender and the most numerous. There was much pathos in the transactions at the tomb of Lazarus. But that was the grave of a friend, and he was surrounded by those who were yet freely flowing for their recent loss. He gazed upon a rebellious and guilty city, thronged with his bitterest enemies, who thirsted for his blood. He foresaw the suffering he was about to endure without her gates. These, however, elicited no tears. He looked further to the temples of wrath, that were gathering over her towers, and were soon to burst in desolating judgments upon her children. This opened the fountain of his compassionate sorrows, and if tears alone could have saved her, she had not spoken unto. But I fear, that he saw a complishment of Jerusalem's woes with only the common interest of a student of history? Can I contemplate the present state of her outcast children, and remain dry-eyed? Can I be the brute of a tear? Surely, the callous indifference of Christians to the condition of the children of Israel, has been a part of the curse denounced upon unbelief. Yet I feel, it has been less than a partial curse to ourselves. "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee." O Saviour! let one of these tears like thy precious love. Were I more like thee, I could not pass a day without shedding many a secret tear, without pouring forth many a fervent prayer, without using some means for the salvation of perishing sinners.

Rev. J. East.

PROOFS OF THE TRUTH OF A FUTURE STATE.

Translated from the French of Massilon.

It all is to end with us, if man is to expect nothing after this life, if this is our proper sphere and the only felicity that we can propose ourselves, why are we not happy here? If we are born but for the pleasures of the senses, why cannot they satisfy us? and why do they always leave a fund of disgust and sorrow in our hearts? If a man is not above a brute, why does he not pass his days like it, without care, without inquietude, without disgust, without sadness, in the enjoyment of the senses and the flesh? If man has to expect but a temporal happiness, why is it not to be found upon the earth? Whence comes it that riches vex him? that honors fatigue him? that pleasures weary him? that the sciences confound him, and irritate his curiosity without satisfying it? that reputation tortures and embarrasses him? and that all these cannot fill the immensity of his heart, but still leave him something to desire? All other creatures, being contented with their destiny, appear happy, after their wishes, in the situation in which, the Author of nature has placed them. Flower the stars, tranquil in the firmament, quit not their orbits to enlighten another earth, the earth, regular in its motions, attempts not to take the place of the stars: the animals crawl in the country without envying the fate of man who inhabits cities and sumptuous places: the birds sport in the air without thinking that any creatures on earth are happier than themselves. All is, in a manner, happy in the place assigned to it by nature. Man alone is restless and discontented; man alone is a prey to his disease; torn by his fears, punished by his hopes, and becomes sad and unhappy in the midst of his enjoyments: man alone meets with nothing here below, on which to fix his heart. Why is this? O man! Is it not because you are misplaced below; that you are made for heaven; that your heart is greater than the world; that the earth is not your proper sphere, and that all you see is unworthy of the last Godt! Answer if you can, or rather interrogate your heart and you will be faithful.

If there will not be a future state, what design worthy of his wisdom could have influenced him to create men? What! would he have had no other view in forming them than in forming beasts? Man, that being so noble, who is endowed with such high ideas, such vast desires, such great sentiment, susceptible of love, of truth, of justice; man alone of all creatures capable of a serious destiny, if known only to God from the Author of his being; that man made for the eternal to miss a small number of days like a beast, that he should be born, grow, and perish like a beast, that he should be the sport of every blind being, in playing so contemptible a part—he would have appeared upon the earth, but to present a spectacle laughable, and worthy of pity! and after that he would return to his native nothingness, without having made any use of that vast mind, and that elevated heart, which the Author of his being had given him. O God! where would have been your wisdom here, to have made so great a work, but to glut the ravages of time, to have placed men upon the earth, but to wanton with your power, and refresh your leisure by that variety of spectacle.

In fine, if all dies with the body; what is it that has been able to persuade all men of every age, and every country, that their souls were immortal? What has inspired mankind with such a strange idea of immortality?—Would a sentiment so remote from the nature of man, if born but for the gratification of his passions, have been able to prevail upon the earth? For if man, like a beast, is made but for the inheritance of time, nothing would have been more incomprehensible to him than the bare idea of immortality. Would lumps of clay, animated to have no object but a sensual felicity, ever have been able either to comprehend, or to conceive such noble sentiments, and such sublime ideas? Notwithstanding, that idea, astonishing as it is, has become the idea of all; that idea, opposite even to our senses when man apparently dies like a beast, is established throughout the earth: that sentiment, which could not have been invented in the universe, has met with an universal reception in the bosoms of all nations; the most savage, as well as the most cultivated; the most polite, as well as the most rude; the most unfaithful, as well as the most submissive to faith. For look back, even to the birth of time, survey all nations, read the history of kingdoms and of empires; hear those who return from remote Islands: the immortality of the soul has always been and is yet the belief of all the nations of the universe. The knowledge of a single God is not so general; his glory, his power, his immensity, have been annihilated (if I may use the expression) in the hearts and minds of men; but the sentiments of the immortality of their souls has never been effaced from their hearts. They all figure to themselves, a religion that our souls will inhabit after death, and in forgetting God, they have not been able to forget themselves. Or, whence comes it that men so different in temper, worship, country, sentiments, even in figure, and who hardly appear to be of the same species, nevertheless all agree in this one point, all will be immortal? This is no delusion; for how will you account for the agreement in it of men of every age and every country? It is not a prejudice of education, for the manners, customs, and worship, which commonly implant prejudices, are not the same among every people; the sentiment of immortality is common to them all. It is not a sect; for besides that, it is the universal religion of the world, this doctrine has no chief, nor protector. men are persuaded of it themselves, or rather it is inspired by nature and it alone from the beginning of things, has passed from generation to generation, and is still maintained upon the earth. Of you, who believe yourselves to be but a lump of clay, depart from the world in which you find none like you; go then and seek in another earth, men of a different kind, and similar to brutes,—or rather look upon yourselves with horror, to find that you are alone in the universe, revolt against all nature in disavowing your own heart, and acknowledge a sentiment common to all, the common impression of the Author that created them."

"FEED MY LAMBS."

I ONLY SAID SO.

"Now, Sarah Anne," said Alphonso, looking manfully, "I'll cut your head off."

Sarah Anne began to cry. "Alphonso," I said, "why do you talk in that naughty manner?"

"Please, governess, I didn't mean to do it," said the child; "I said so."

"But," I replied, "it was telling a story, then; and that was very wicked indeed."

"I only said so." These words still occupied my thoughts, for some time after the above occurrence. I know many people that "only say so;" they say things they do not mean, and think it no harm. But is it no harm to utter an untruth? Is it no harm to say what we know is false? I remember when I was a child, being very much frightened at a man who lived near my mother's, who always threatened to pinch my nose off. Now, he never did it, but he often pretended to do it; and whenever I saw him coming, I used to run away. My sisters would sometimes try to convince me that he "only said so;" and have often tried to hold me when they saw the man coming, to prove to me that he did not intend to hurt me, but in vain. I was afraid of that man until I likewise grew old enough to understand "only said so."

But I hope my young readers never tell stories under the cover of "only said so." I assure you, my dear children, it is offensive in the eyes of God; he declares, "lying lips are an abomination unto the Lord;" and what is lying? Is it not to say what you know to be false? How vain, then, to think to excuse yourself with, "only said so!"

IT'S MORE THAN I DARE DO.

"I say, Frank," cried a little boy of eight years of age to one of fourteen, as they were coming out of school one Sunday afternoon, "are you going to slide to-night?"

"Hush! hush! Bill; don't talk so loud; some of the teachers will hear you," was the reply.

"Well, Frank, shall you go?" whispered Bill.

"I say, but I must go and ask mother first."

"O stop, now, Frank."

"No; no; that's more than I dare do."

"Why?"

"Because mother will scold me if I do" and as Frank made this remark, he turned round to walk towards his home.

"Frank, I am waiting for you," said a child who was standing a few paces forward, leaning over the leaves of his hymn book: "my father is going to stop in the schoolroom a little while, and he says you can see me safe home; will you come, Frank?"

"Yes, Bobby, that I will," said Frank, taking hold of his young friend on the other hand; "I'm go home, and come back as quick as I can."

"Where are you going to meet him?" asked Robert.

"At the pond in the White Farm Meadow."

"O Frank! are you going to slide?"

"Yes, Robert," said Frank colouring.

"I thought I heard you say it was more than you dare do?"

"I said, to stop without leave."

"Whose leave, Frank?"

"Mother's, of course."

"O, but you ought to get God's leave, Frank, because to-day is God's day, and we should keep it holy; I should think we must not play without his leave."

"I can't ask him," said Frank, looking confused; for his conscience told him he was wrong.

"Yes you can, Frank; you can kneel down and say, 'O Lord, may I slide?' but I know you must not; it's more than I dare do, and it's more than you dare do; I know it is, Frank." said Robert, earnestly.

"There's your sister, Robert; so I'll bid you good bye."

"Good bye, Frank; don't you go sliding, now."

The next Sabbath we were all assembled as usual in the school-room; the superintendent was calling over the names; at last he said, "Frank Ede." "Not here, sir," replied his teacher.

"Does any one know any thing of Frank Ede?" asked the superintendent, looking round the school.

"I do, sir," said little Robert Lenton, stepping from his seat, the tears rolling down his cheeks.

"Where is he, Robert?"

"He went to slide last Sunday, sir, and the ice broke, and he fell in and was drowned."

Frank dared not disobey his mother, yet he dared to disobey one infinitely greater, his God! the maker of heaven and earth! He was afraid of his mother's scolding him, yet he could boldly dare the anger of an offended God. My dear children, are any of you like Frank? Take warning by his example, and never again break the express commands of God; particularly, never break the Sabbath! Pray to God to help you, and he will do so; and if ever you feel tempted to profane his holy day, in any way to break his laws, think of Frank, and say, "It's more than I dare do."—*S. S. Journal.*

JOHN BUNYAN'S CONFESSION OF FAITH.

Of Election.

1. I believe that election is free and permanent, being founded in grace, and the unchangeable will of God. "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace; and if by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace, otherwise work is no more work." Neither the purpose of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth who are his. In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated, according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

2. I believe that this decree, choice or election, was before the foundation of the world; and so before the elect themselves had being in themselves. For God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were, stays not for the being of things to determine his eternal purpose by; but having all things present to him, in his wisdom he made his choice before the world was.

3. I believe that the decree of election is so far from making works in us foreseen the ground or cause of the choice, that it containeth in the bowels of it, not only the persons, but the graces that accompany their salvation. And hence it is said, that "We are predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son," not because we are, but "that we should be holy and without blame before him in love. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. He blessed us according as he chose us in Christ." And hence it is again that the salvation and calling of which we are now made partakers, is no other than what was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, according to his eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

4. I believe that Christ Jesus is he in whom the elect are always considered, and that without him there is neither election, grace, nor salvation. "Having predestinated us to the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace. That in the dispensation of the fulness of time, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth, even in him. Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

5. I believe that there is not any impediment attending the elect of God, that can hinder their conversion and eternal salvation. "Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? &c. What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the elect hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded. For Israel hath not been forsaken, nor Judah of his God, of the Lord of hosts, though their land was filled with sin against the Holy one of Israel." When Ananias made intercession against Saul, saying, Lord, I have heard by many of this man how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem, and here he hath authority from the high priest to bind all that call upon thy name. What said God unto him? "Go thy way, for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel."

6. I believe that no man can know his election, but by his calling. "The vessels of mercy, which God afore prepared unto glory, do thine claim a share therein: "Even us, say they, whom he hath called, not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles; as he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, and her beloved, which was not beloved."

7. I believe, therefore, that election doth not forestall or prevent the means which are of God appointed to bring us to Christ, to grace and glory; but rather putteth a necessity upon the means, that God appointed in his word, for chosen to be brought to heaven that way; that is, by the faith of Jesus Christ, which is the end of effectual calling. "Wherefore the rather brethren give diligence to make your calling and election sure."

For the Watchman of the South.

PROVERBS FROM MATTHEW HENRY; COLLECTED FROM THE ORIGINAL COPY OF "HENRY'S EXPOSITION."

No. XV.

Suited to the times.

1. It is not only our wisdom, but our duty, to live according to our estates, and not to spend above what we have.

2. It will have a great influence upon our constancy in religion, never to forsake the assembling of ourselves together.

3. It is of great use for each of us to write down what we observe as most affecting and edifying to us, out of the scriptures and good books, and out of the sermons we hear.

4. Let not those who are called men of business think that this will excuse them from making religion their business.

5. He that has a house of his own, should dedicate it to God, that he may have a church in his house.

6. Quicquid amas cupias non placuisse nimis—we should moderate our affections for things which we are tempted to love inordinately.

7. When men take to drink they forget the law, (Prov. xxxi. 5.) even that fundamental law of honoring parents.

8. Qui tacet, concentive vediter—silence implies consent.

9. Modesty is the hedge of chastity.

10. The comfort we have in our particular enjoyments, should lead us to be thankful for our share in public peace and plenty.

11. Consideration is the first step towards conversion.

12. From every place there is the same way to heaven.

13. What God has made our duty, we have reason to expect opportunity and assistance from him for the doing of.

14. The good we exhort others to, we should ourselves be examples of.

15. Those that would bring great things to pass must rise early. Love not sleep, lest thou come to poverty.

16. God's gracious appearances for his church and people, ought to be improved by us for the encouragement of our faith and hope for the future.

17. Those that are unchurched will be soon undone.

18. Those that will be wise when they are old, must be industrious when they are young.

19. God will help those that help themselves.

20. It is a dangerous thing to attempt the building up of that which God will have to be destroyed.

21. It becomes penitents, in the confession of their sins to God, to be very particular, not only "I have sinned," but, "In this and that instance I have sinned."

22. The oneness of the church's enemies should shame the church's friends out of their discords and divisions, and engage them to be one.

23. They have the hosts of the Lord, that have the Lord of hosts engaged for them.

24. We must take the comfort of what we have, though we cannot compass all we would have. S. D.

Communicated for the Watchman of the South.

LETTER III.

HAMPDEN SIDNEY, Aug. 9th, 1794.

My good acquaintance,—I don't know where you will go to sermon to-morrow. I suspect you will have to stay at home, to read and to write to me. If you should undertake the letter, let *Jesus* be the subject of your letter.—Christians should always have something to say about Jesus. He employs the tongues of angels, and of the spirits of the just made perfect.

"Jesus the Lord, their harps employs,
Jesus my love they sing,
Jesus the name of both our joys,
Sounds sweet from every string."

When I recollect from experiences, and when I read the character of christians in books, I always have some hope that God has changed my heart. But when I find myself indulging vain thoughts and wicked, abominable desires, I am afraid I secretly love sin. The deadness of my affections, the formality of my duties, are beyond description. Could you see my heart for one half hour, sometimes when I am alone, and know the thoughts that pass them, you would never entertain any good opinion of me afterwards.

A brood of vipers, snakes, and toads
Within my heart do crawl,
And loathing views, in various modes
Do for indulgence call.

Well divine grace is sufficient to cast out all these, and to fill me with purer desires after himself. O may I find my happiness in God, or remain restless after *him*. My soul in his absence is a dark, forlorn chaos, for it cannot center upon earthly things for happiness. I know that his favor is life, and his loving kindness rather to be chosen than life. But practice contradicts my existence.

"For the silly, wandering mind
Loth to be too much confined,
Roves and takes its daily tours,
Coasting round the narrow shores,
Narrow shores of flesh and sense,
Picking shells and pebbles thence;
Or she sits at fancy's door,
Calling shapes and shadows to her."

May heavenly love inspire your soul, and enable you to continue steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord.

Your most ob't servant,
For Jesus sake,
DRURY LACY.

WATCHMAN OF THE SOUTH.

RICHMOND, Oct. 4, 1838.

A PROPOSAL.

It is proposed that a Convention be held in Philadelphia, on the Monday preceding the meeting of the next General Assembly, to take into consideration the subject of the best means of promoting the great cause of Missions, foreign and domestic, the cause of Education for the ministry, the cause of revivals of religion, and whatever else may promote the extension of *pure* and *undefiled* religion, especially through the instrumentality of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The Convention to be composed of such delegates as the several Presbyteries may appoint in the ratio established for representation in the General Assembly. Such a meeting, with the divine blessing, we doubt not, will be eminently useful. The Lord give it favor in the eyes of all our churches.

We have received a number of communications for the present No., but are obliged to defer them until next week.

Since the pieces below went to press, we understand from a private friend, that Dr. Graham and Wm. Maxwell, Esq. have expressed their determination to accept of their recent appointments.

We learn from the Western Presbyterian Herald of Sept. 20, that the Rev. Robert D. McMartin, of Balkstown, N. Y., has been elected to the Presidency of St. Hanover College, In., and has accepted of the office.

We are happy to inform the friends of the Rev. A. E. Wilson, M. D., that he has safely arrived in this city. He purposes remaining in the South for the coming winter. He expects to attend the approaching meeting of the North Carolina Synod. The other two brethren associated with him in the Mission to S. E. Africa, have not returned to this country.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

We are informed, that our readers that the Rev. S. L. Graham, D. D., has been duly elected Professor of Biblical Literature, and the Rev. N. H. Harding, Professor of Church History and Church Government in this institution. We are sorry, however, to add that the latter gentleman, before the rising of the Board of Directors, gave notice that he declined accepting the appointment. It is confidently stated that Dr. Graham will feel it his duty to accept the appointment. Provision has been made for the temporary supply of instruction in the Languages by a competent teacher, so as to allow the present Professor and Dr. Graham (should he accept) to devote more time to the department not yet filled. On the whole, we feel fully justified in expressing the belief that the institution in this institution the ensuing year will, *in all respects*, be such as its friends desire. We are glad to hear that there is a prospect of quite an accession of new students at the opening of the next session. The Board has ordered the calling of the Electoral College, at the time of the spring meeting of the Board, for the purpose of filling every appointment of instruction in this Seminary.

There was a large meeting of the Directors and of the Electors; and besides the usual business, some measures were adopted for the furtherance of the interests of the Seminary, which will be properly explained in due time.

HAMPDEN SIDNEY COLLEGE.

It gives us pleasure to announce that Wm. Maxwell, Esq., of this city, (late of Norfolk) has been elected to the Presidency of this institution. We have not heard whether he will certainly accept; but we hope that for the sake of the College he may see his way clear to devote his varied acquirements and his useful talents to the promotion of the interests of the venerable institution over which he has been invited to preside. Its prospects, in regard to students, have (as we have heard) not been so good for some time. It has our best wishes.

PRESBYTERY OF CHILICOTHE.

This Presbytery held its stated meeting recently in Ripley. The subject of the division of the church was brought up by the following paper.

Resolved, That the table be called, that every member may say with which of the two bodies in the Presbyterian church he stands.

The members expressed their preferences as follows: For Old School, 18; for New School, 10; Non Liquets, 9.

"No second organization took place. Several of the elders, and some of the ministers, begged for delay for various reasons which were forcible. And I have no doubt the result will be to make the majority still greater. You may expect that a large majority in the Synod of Cincinnati will declare on the same side."

Thus written a correspondent of the Western Presbyterian Herald.

THE LOUISVILLE PRESBYTERY

Held its fall meeting at Bardstown, Ky., on Sept. 11. It unanimously approved of the measures of the General Assembly which met according to adjournment in the Seventh church, Philadelphia. As a specimen of their resolutions, we subjoin their *third*.

Resolved, That this Presbytery deem union of counsel, and of effort, and mutual confidence, as far more important than numbers, and indispensable to the honor and prosperity of religion, and while we desire none of our members to separate from the church they prefer to do so, we are deliberately of opinion, if there be any persons connected with this Presbytery, who are unwilling to adhere to the General Assembly as the proper tribunal to submit to its acts, to support its policy—to encourage and sustain its institutions, and to abstain from the exercise of powers of all those measures and institutions which are hostile to its policy and influence, that candor, brotherly kindness, peace, and the welfare of Zion, as far as its interests are committed to us, require that such persons should no longer seek to maintain a connection with this Presbytery. Adopted unanimously.

PRESBYTERY OF MARION.

This body met at Marysville, Ohio, Sept. 7, 1838 We subjoin their second resolution.

Resolved, That we approve of the course pursued by our commissioners, to the last General Assembly, and by others with whom they associated, in effecting an organization of the General Assembly, upon the principles of the *constitution*, which declares, that "it shall represent in one body *all* the particular churches of this denomination, and that it shall consist of an equal delegation of bishops and elders, from each Presbytery.

Yeas, 14; Nays, 10; Non Liquets, 2.

VINCENNES PRESBYTERY.

We give their resolution on the question of adherence to the Assembly.

Resolved, That the Vincennes Presbytery does and will adhere to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, which held its sessions in the Seventh church in Philadelphia in May last.

Yeas, 9; Nays, 2; Non Liquet, 1. One of the Nays has withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Presbytery.

CLINTON PRESBYTERY.

This judicatory met at Lexington, Miss., July 21, 1838. After two days discussion, it declared in favor of the New School Assembly. The vote stood by the ministers stood 4 to 3. The minority met and constituted themselves the true Clinton Presbytery. The following is their first resolution.

Resolved, That we most cordially approve of the proceedings of the General Assembly of 1837 and 1838, in their noble effort to purify the Church from Heresy and Schism, which this unscriptural proceeding, and that we hail these events as together constituting one of the brightest epochs which have ever dawned on the history of our church, and as a delightful token of better days

The Editor of the New Orleans Observer in speaking of the action of this body states in connection that "Of the other Presbyteries in Mississippi and Louisiana are nearly or quite unanimous, in sustaining the true General Assembly, and the sacred principles and order of the Presbyterian Church."

DUELLING—No. II.

"Thou shalt not kill."—*Exodus* xx. 13.

Of the two classes of criminals described in our last No., viz. suicides and duellists, the former, the awful doom and final state of the wicked, says:

"Ah groans that make my soul to pause, lamenting there
Were seen the *duellist* and suicide.
This thought, but thought amiss, that of himself
He was entire proprietor, and lord
When he was tired of Time, with his own hand
He opened the prison of Eternity.
And sooner than the devils hoped, arrived
In Hell. The other, of resentment quick,
And, for a word, a look, a gesture, deemed
Not scrupulously exact in all respect,
Prompt to revenge, went to the Judge of all
For *double murder* armed, his son, and his
That on himself he had not power to kill.
The first, in pagan books of early times,
Was heroism pronounced, and greatly praised
In fashion's glossary of latter days
The last was honor called, and spirit high.
Alas! 'twas mortal spirit, honor which
Forgot to wake at the last trumpet's voice
Bearing the signature of Time alone,
Uncurrent in Eternity, and base
Wise men suspected this before; for they
Had seen—ah! sorrowful sight imagined, spoke
Admiringly of honor, lauded oft
The noble youth, who, after many rounds
Of boxing, died; or, to the pistol shot,
His breast exposed, his soul to endless pain;
But they who most admired, understood
This honor best, and on its altar laid
Their lives, most obviously were fools; and what
Fools only, and the wicked understood,
The wise agreed was some delusive shade
That with the mist of morning had its birth."

Now what can be said in defence of a practice so wholly unjustified and so utterly repugnant to all good laws, both human and divine?

1. We shall perhaps be told that the practice, though evidently in opposition to divine law, and though contrary to the laws of the land, is yet in accordance with the laws of honor, and is for the government of gentlemen. This code for gentlemen is the despotic and cruel system of laws, which maintains duelling. Respecting it we would observe,

1. That it is immoral, both in its precepts and penalties, both in theory and practice. It violates all the charities of life—all the moral obligations under which man is placed. It requires those subject to it to regard forbearance as a weakness, and forgiveness as down right meanness. It takes diabolical passions and exalts them to a seat among the virtues, and puts revenge and murder above patience and meekness. A more immoral system for the regulation of human conduct could not be devised.

2. This code is full of absurdity. It places the injurer and the injured, the aggressor and the aggrieved on the same footing. If a man has already been greatly injured and complains of it, he may yet have to submit to a still greater injury, viz. the loss of his life by the man who first injured him.

3. This code is perfectly useless. It elicits no truth in any controversy. It determines not who is in error or who is guilty. It proves no man brave. It seldom proves a man a coward. It does not prove a man to be a good marksman, because the excitement is almost always such as to hinder sharp shooting. It never adds to the solid reputation of any man. Surely it never adds to the comfort of the duellist himself.

4. This code is very bloody, not only in its laws but also in its results. In 172 duels, 63 persons were killed and 93 wounded, and 48 of them desperately. The four last duels we have heard of were fatal to four lives lost on the ground. There have been men who have fought from ten to thirty duels, and in most cases they have killed their antagonist at their first exchange of shots. There is such a being now in the United States. Such persons establish a reputation for bloodthirstiness and for murder, which makes them a terror to all men. In this land who has not sighed and groaned and wept over some one fallen in a duel. Three of our own friends have fallen the last 18 months and gone to eternity. Of this code smells horribly of human blood.

This code, therefore, so immoral, so absurd, so useless, so bloody in all its requirements and in all its results, can never justify that kind of murder, which is connected with duelling.

But perhaps we shall be told that the practice of duelling maintains in the world much of that courage, which is so useful and ornamental to human character. We do not deny the value of true courage. One of the first lessons we ever learned from a father said a number now in heaven, was, that next to the sin of not fearing God, stood the sin of fearing the face of any human being. We consider courage, therefore, as a most valuable quality. Indeed, we can hardly see much courage as the good man. "The righteous are as bold as a lion but the wicked flee when no man pursueth." But what is the courage which is generally praised? Barbarous! Is it not courage? It is generated by the fear of God. He, who fears God, fears nothing else." Addison says courage is "that heroic spirit inspired by the noble principle of doing what is right, and will protect us in its prosecution." Seneca teaches that "courage is properly the contempt of hazards *according to reason*, but that to run into danger from *mere passion*, is not courage but madness." Cicero declares "that sort of courage which disregards the rules of justice, and is displayed, not for the public good, but for private selfish ends, is altogether blameable, and so far from being a part of true virtue, that it is indeed a piece of the most barbarous inhumanity." The stoic philosophers defined "true courage a virtue contending for justice." Pliny (as quoted by the Roman Orator) has thus expressed his opinion: "As that sort of knowledge which is not directed by the rules of justice, ought rather to have the name of design and subtlety than wisdom and prudence; just so that bold and adventurous mind, which is hurried on by the stream of its own passions, and not for the good of the public, should rather have the name of *fool hardy and daring*, than valiant and courageous." This kind of courage, which is calm, rational, firm, mild, and self-possessed we praise, we honor. We do not consider disinclination to it. It is no more to be put along side of the fierce malignity, which raves and rages and thirsts for vengeance, than the pure gold is to be esteemed like dross and cinders. There is also a sort of courage which is the offspring of nervous sensibility in some, which enables them with great coolness of blood to stand in the midst of danger. But the oyster possesses this quality to a much greater degree than any man. I suppose no one would contend that this quality is a virtue. As to true courage, therefore, we say duelling has no tendency to promote it or even to evince it. Every man who keeps that cowards go to the field and even that they often make a respectable appearance there. None will deny this. And none, whose opportunities of observation have been considerable, will doubt but the effect of duelling on any amiable man, who has killed his antagonist, is to make him nervous, melancholy, restless, and timid. Of all men, we believe none come nearer suffering the pains of hell on earth than a sensitive amiable person who has killed a man in a duel. Such a deed makes no man courageous. On the contrary, it tends only to cowardice.

For a system thus composed and leading to such results, we dare not apologize—a system born in superstition, nourished in depravity, justified only by the phrenzies of madness—a system forbidden by all sacred principles of law, morals and religion—a system against which the solemn protestations of the living, the been regrets of the dying, the unsheltered orphanage and the early widowhood of thousands lift up their awful voice —a system, which humanity are rolled in blood, whose tenderest mercies are cruelty embittered, whose brightest hopes are spoiled and dashed by the fell gnaw of the undying worm—a system, which outrages decency, violates morality, which invades the holy sanctuary of domestic love and pours the utmost cruelty of an unrelenting severity into bosoms never before made to drink in any anguish.

Shall any one rise up and vociferously demand that we award to such a system, so fruitful in dire results, the meed of honor? The demand can never be granted. Humanity cannot, God forbid it. Honor? Sacred honor? Honor is an honorable thing. Honor is a jewel, a sacred name. Honor delights in the esteem of the wise and the good, but it cannot be duellist. Honor is tender-hearted, humane and generous. Under its mighty impulse Sir Philip Sidney, though wounded and faint from the loss of blood, with his own hand from him a bottle of wine, ordering it to be given to a wounded soldier who was carried by him and who turned an eager look towards the refreshing beverage—saying "Thy necessity is greater than my necessity mine." Such are the deeds of honor. Honor never willingly mingles the tears of widows and orphans with the blood of husbands and fathers. Honor in the first, in pagan books of early times, Was heroism pronounced, and greatly praised In fashion's glossary of latter days The last was honor called, and spirit high. Alas! 'twas mortal spirit, honor which Forgot to wake at the last trumpet's voice Bearing the signature of Time alone, Uncurrent in Eternity, and base Wise men suspected this before; for they Had seen—ah! sorrowful sight imagined, spoke Admiringly of honor, lauded oft The noble youth, who, after many rounds Of boxing, died; or, to the pistol shot, His breast exposed, his soul to endless pain; But they who most admired, understood This honor best, and on its altar laid Their lives, most obviously were fools; and what Fools only, and the wicked understood, The wise agreed was some delusive shade That with the mist of morning had its birth."

Now what can be said in defence of a practice so wholly unjustified and so utterly repugnant to all good laws, both human and divine?

1. We shall perhaps be told that the practice, though evidently in opposition to divine law, and though contrary to the laws of the land, is yet in accordance with the laws of honor, and is for the government of gentlemen. This code for gentlemen is the despotic and cruel system of laws, which maintains duelling. Respecting it we would observe,

1. That it is immoral, both in its precepts and penalties, both in theory and practice. It violates all the charities of life—all the moral obligations under which man is placed. It requires those subject to it to regard forbearance as a weakness, and forgiveness as down right meanness. It takes diabolical passions and exalts them to a seat among the virtues, and puts revenge and murder above patience and meekness. A more immoral system for the regulation of human conduct could not be devised.

2. This code is full of absurdity. It places the injurer and the injured, the aggressor and the aggrieved on the same footing. If a man has already been greatly injured and complains of it, he may yet have to submit to a still greater injury, viz. the loss of his life by the man who first injured him.

3. This code is perfectly useless. It elicits no truth in any controversy. It determines not who is innocent or who is guilty. It proves no man brave. It seldom proves a man a coward. It does not prove a man to be a good marksman, because the excitement is almost always such as to hinder sharp shooting. It never adds to the solid reputation of any man. Surely it never adds to the comfort of the duellist himself.

4. This code is very bloody, not only in its laws but also in its results. In 172 duels, 63 persons were killed and 93 wounded, and 48 of them desperately. The four last duels we have heard of were fatal to four lives lost on the ground. There have been men who have fought from ten to thirty duels, and in most cases they have killed their antagonist at their first exchange of shots. There is such a being now in the United States. Such persons establish a reputation for bloodthirstiness and for murder, which makes them a terror to all men. In this land who has not sighed and groaned and wept over some one fallen in a duel. Three of our own friends have fallen the last 18 months and gone to eternity. Of this code smells horribly of human blood.

This code, therefore, so immoral, so absurd, so useless, so bloody in all its requirements and in all its results, can never justify that kind of murder, which is connected with duelling.

2. But perhaps we shall be told that the practice of duelling maintains in the world much of that courage, which is so useful and ornamental to human character. We do not deny the value of true courage. One of the first lessons we ever learned from a father said a number now in heaven, was, that next to the sin of not fearing God, stood the sin of fearing the face of any human being. We consider courage, therefore, as a most valuable quality. Indeed, we can hardly see much courage as the good man. "The righteous are as bold as a lion but the wicked flee when no man pursueth." But what is the courage which is generally praised? Barbarous! Is it not courage? It is generated by the fear of God. He, who fears God, fears nothing else." Addison says courage is "that heroic spirit inspired by the noble principle of doing what is right, and will protect us in its prosecution." Seneca teaches that "courage is properly the contempt of hazards *according to reason*, but that to run into danger from *mere passion*, is not courage but madness." Cicero declares "that sort of courage which disregards the rules of justice, and is displayed, not for the public good, but for private selfish ends, is altogether blameable, and so far from being a part of true virtue, that it is indeed a piece of the most barbarous inhumanity." The stoic philosophers defined "true courage a virtue contending for justice." Pliny (as quoted by the Roman Orator) has thus expressed his opinion: "As that sort of knowledge which is not directed by the rules of justice, ought rather to have the name of design and subtlety than wisdom and prudence; just so that bold and adventurous mind, which is hurried on by the stream of its own passions, and not for the good of the public, should rather have the name of *fool hardy and daring*, than valiant and courageous." This kind of courage, which is calm, rational, firm, mild, and self-possessed we praise, we honor. We do not consider disinclination to it. It is no more to be put along side of the fierce malignity, which raves and rages and thirsts for vengeance, than the pure gold is to be esteemed like dross and cinders. There is also a sort of courage which is the offspring of nervous sensibility in some, which enables them with great coolness of blood to stand in the midst of danger. But the oyster possesses this quality to a much greater degree than any man. I suppose no one would contend that this quality is a virtue. As to true courage, therefore, we say duelling has no tendency to promote it or even to evince it. Every man who keeps that cowards go to the field and even that they often make a respectable appearance there. None will deny this. And none, whose opportunities of observation have been considerable, will doubt but the effect of duelling on any amiable man, who has killed his antagonist, is to make him nervous, melancholy, restless, and timid. Of all men, we believe none come nearer suffering the pains of hell on earth than a sensitive amiable person who has killed a man in a duel. Such a deed makes no man courageous. On the contrary, it tends only to cowardice.

For a system thus composed and leading to such results, we dare not apologize—a system born in superstition, nourished in depravity, justified only by the phrenzies of madness—a system forbidden by all sacred principles of law, morals and religion—a system against which the solemn protestations of the living, the been regrets of the dying, the unsheltered orphanage and the early widowhood of thousands lift up their awful voice —a system, which humanity are rolled in blood, whose tenderest mercies are cruelty embittered, whose brightest hopes are spoiled and dashed by the fell gnaw of the undying worm—a system, which outrages decency, violates morality, which invades the holy sanctuary of domestic love and pours the utmost cruelty of an unrelenting severity into bosoms never before made to drink in any anguish.

Shall any one rise up and vociferously demand that we award to such a system, so fruitful in dire results, the meed of honor? The demand can never be granted. Humanity cannot, God forbid it. Honor? Sacred honor? Honor is an honorable thing. Honor is a jewel, a sacred name. Honor delights in the esteem of the wise and the good, but it cannot be duellist. Honor is tender-hearted, humane and generous. Under its mighty impulse Sir Philip Sidney, though wounded and faint from the loss of blood, with his own hand from him a bottle of wine, ordering it to be given to a wounded soldier who was carried by him and who turned an eager look towards the refreshing beverage—saying "Thy necessity is greater than my necessity mine." Such are the deeds of honor. Honor never willingly mingles the tears of widows and orphans with the blood of husbands and fathers. Honor in the first, in pagan books of early times, Was heroism pronounced, and greatly praised In fashion's glossary of latter days The last was honor called, and spirit high. Alas! 'twas mortal spirit, honor which Forgot to wake at the last trumpet's voice Bearing the signature of Time alone, Uncurrent in Eternity, and base Wise men suspected this before; for they Had seen—ah! sorrowful sight imagined, spoke Admiringly of honor, lauded oft The noble youth, who, after many rounds Of boxing, died; or, to the pistol shot, His breast exposed, his soul to endless pain; But they who most admired, understood This honor best, and on its altar laid Their lives, most obviously were fools; and what Fools only, and the wicked understood, The wise agreed was some delusive shade That with the mist of morning had its birth."

Now what can be said in defence of a practice so wholly unjustified and so utterly repugnant to all good laws, both human and divine?

1. We shall perhaps be told that the practice, though evidently in opposition to divine law, and though contrary to the laws of the land, is yet in accordance with the laws of honor, and is for the government of gentlemen. This code for gentlemen is the despotic and cruel system of laws, which maintains duelling. Respecting it we would observe,

1. That it is immoral, both in its precepts and penalties, both in theory and practice. It violates all the charities of life—all the moral obligations under which man is placed. It requires those subject to it to regard forbearance as a weakness, and forgiveness as down right meanness. It takes diabolical passions and exalts them to a seat among the virtues, and puts revenge and murder above patience and meekness. A more immoral system for the regulation of human conduct could not be devised.

2. This code is full of absurdity. It places the injurer and the injured, the aggressor and the aggrieved on the same footing. If a man has already been greatly injured and complains of it, he may yet have to submit to a still greater injury, viz. the loss of his life by the man who first injured him.

3. This code is perfectly useless. It elicits no truth in any controversy. It determines not who is innocent or who is guilty. It proves no man brave. It seldom proves a man a coward. It does not prove a man to be a good marksman, because the excitement is almost always such as to hinder sharp shooting. It never adds to the solid reputation of any man. Surely it never adds to the comfort of the duellist himself.

4. This code is very bloody, not only in its laws but also in its results. In 172 duels, 63 persons were killed and 93 wounded, and 48 of them desperately. The four last duels we have heard of were fatal to four lives lost on the ground. There have been men who have fought from ten to thirty duels, and in most cases they have killed their antagonist at their first exchange of shots. There is such a being now in the United States. Such persons establish a reputation for bloodthirstiness and for murder, which makes them a terror to all men. In this land who has not sighed and groaned and wept over some one fallen in a duel. Three of our own friends have fallen the last 18 months and gone to eternity. Of this code smells horribly of human blood.

This code, therefore, so immoral, so absurd, so useless, so bloody in all its requirements and in all its results, can never justify that kind of murder, which is connected with duelling.

2. Public sentiment can be rectified, if all good men will do their duty. Cruel and bloody and pagan as this demon is, he can be banished. Let all good men who hate blood and murder, be fearless and decided in their opposition to duelling, and the work will be accomplished one time too. Public attention has of late been turned to the subject. The supreme judiciary of the nation has set a most praise-worthy example.

The Judges of the Supreme Court were informed by a Committee of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of one who lately fell in a duel. The Court having conferred together on the subject, "after mature and solemn deliberation," adopted the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the Justices of the Supreme Court entertain a high respect for the character of the deceased, sincerely deplore his untimely death, and sympathize with his bereaved family, in the heavy affliction which has fallen upon them.

"*Resolved*, That with every desire to manifest their respect for the House of Representatives, and the Committee of the House, by whom they have been invited, and for the memory of the lamented deceased, the Justices of the Supreme Court cannot, consistently, with the duties they owe to the public, attend in their official characters, the funeral of one who has fallen in a duel.

"Ordered, that these proceedings be entered on the minutes of the Court, and that the Chief Justice enclose a copy to the Chairman of the Committee of the House of Representatives."

Let all men who reverence law follow this example, and good must result.

4 Let all men not settle the question as to whether they will *ever* fight a duel. Put not off the decision of the question until the day of temptation shall come. That will be too late. Now is the time to act. Let men who are arriving at conclusions, too, let none forget what Mr. Wilberforce has said, viz. "In the judgment of that religion which requires purity of heart, and of that Being to whom thought is action, he cannot be esteemed innocent of this crime, who lives in a settled, habitual determination to commit it whenever circumstances shall call upon him so to do. This is a consideration which places the crime of duelling on a different footing from almost any other. Indeed, there is, perhaps, no other which mankind habitually and deliberately resolve to practice, when the temptation shall occur. It shows, also, that the crime of duelling (in the sense of preconceived determination to commit it whenever the occasion may demand) is more general among the higher classes than is commonly supposed, and that the sum of the guilt which this practice produces is great, beyond what has, perhaps, been conceived, It will be the writer's comfort to have solemnly suggested this consideration, that the practice will be more easily and impious practice might be suppressed. If such there be, which he is strongly inclined to believe, theirs is the crime and theirs the responsibility, of suffering it to continue."

5. Lastly. The whole subject in its present aspect shews the importance and necessity of a more general prevalence of the spirit of the gospel. The reason why men do not fight duels is because they fear God, and do not fear God as they ought. The reason why men murder each other at so horrid a rate is, that they have never received the spirit of the Son of God. If God's laws could be brought into more solemn regard, the laws of honor (falsely so called) would fall into utter desuetude. If love to God and love to man were the prevailing principles, the Holy Ghost implanted in every bosom this horrible, blood-detesting monster crime.

COMMUNICATION.

For the Watchman of the South.

EAST HANOVER PRESBYTERY.

This judicatory met at Hanover Court House, on the 20th of September. The meeting was quite full and services of the occasion were quite interesting.

Mr. Jas. M. Ball having satisfactorily undergone the usual trials, was licensed to preach the gospel.

Mr. James M. Allen, a member of the church in Petersburg, was taken under the care of Presbytery as a candidate for the ministry.

A call from the church of Prince George to Mr. G. W. McPhail, to become their pastor, was presented and put into Mr. McPhail's hands. He subsequently declared his acceptance, and the following arrangements were made for his ordination and installation, viz. Presbytery shall meet at the Lebanon church, in Prince George, on Friday, the 26th of October. Mr. Plumer to preside and deliver the charge to the people, and Mr. Spottswood be his alternate; Mr. Plumer to give the charge to the pastor, and Mr. Neill be his alternate. Mr. Matthews to preach the sermon, and Mr. Pollock to be his alternate.

Rev. Sol. J. Lacy, a member of the Presbytery of Armagh, was introduced to Presbytery, and having exhibited the necessary credentials, and undergone the examinations required of foreign ministers, was received upon his subscribed the standards of our church, the Moderator declared him at liberty to preach and administer the sealing ordinances within the bounds of this Presbytery, whenever duty called, either as a stated or occasional supply for twelve months, at which time, if the way shall be clear, Mr. Lacy will be received into full connection with this Presbytery in the manner prescribed in the Digest.

The next meeting of Presbytery will be held in the First Church, Richmond, on the third Thursday of April next.

The petition of certain members of the church in Petersburg, to be set apart as the Second Presbyterian Church of Petersburg, was taken up, and on motion, Mr. Wherry, the commissioner from said petitioners, was heard at length in their behalf; whereupon it was

Resolved, That the prayer of the petitioners be not granted.

And the following minute was unanimously ordered to be addressed to the petitioners, expressive of the views of Presbytery in the case.

To Messrs. John Tuliaferro, B. C. Wherry, and others, petitioners for the erection of a new church in Petersburg.

DEAR BRETHREN—The Presbytery of East Hanover, in session at Nottoway Court House, Sept. 21st, received your petition, which, over your commissioner at length—they weighed all the reasons assigned—they looked at the nature and extent of the field proposed to be occupied by the new church, and remembered, what you must have existing—and in view of the whole circumstances of the case, determined that the erection of a Second Presbyterian church in the town of Petersburg, would not be proper.

In making known this decision to the petitioners, the Presbytery feel called upon to say a few words by way of pastoral suggestion, hoping that all they may say will be received, as we believe it will, in a proper spirit. 1st. Presbytery do not feel disposed to put any harsh or unchariable construction on the proceedings of the petitioners thus far, but they would respectfully and solemnly suggest that any withdrawal from the ordinances of the church of which the petitioners are members, especially of long continuance, or any attempt to organize or maintain a party in the church in Petersburg, by establishing a separate place of worship, or in general, any thing violative of the principles of our Form of Government ought to be carefully avoided, and thus occasions of subsequent estrangement of feeling carefully kept out of the way. 2d. Presbytery earnestly recommends to all concerned the spirit of forbearance and gentleness,—the forgiving of any supposed wrong which may have been felt, the remembrance of the humbleness of all needless contentions, and the importance of abstaining from all unprofitable, and especially all irritating conversation on the subject.

3d. Lastly. Presbytery entertain and express the expectation that the petitioners will now return, in the spirit and according to the practice of good and sound Presbyterians, to the communion of the church towards which they have suffered a slight, and, as we hope, but temporary alienation; and we earnestly pray that grace, mercy and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, through the Eternal Spirit, may be multiplied to all the petitioners, and they and all the members of the church to which they belong, be abundantly prepared unto every good word and work, and for every event however trying, even death and judgment.

Resolved, That a copy of this minute be furnished to the delegate of the petitioners, and that the senior member of the Session of the Church in Petersburg, who may be present, be requested to read this minute from the pulpit with the first that was cut off, it would be the height of absurdity, if supposing the legs could talk as in the days of Æsop and Menenius Agrippa, they should talk about declaring that *they* were the body!!! Whatever credit they might claim as possessors of all the *wisdom and knowledge* of the body, their claim to be the body, would hardly be admitted, while the trunk and head were still alive, and performing the functions of a living body—almost as well without the amputated parts as with them—perhaps better, if the legs were unsound before. As justly might an excommunicated church member, (whether legally excommunicated or not) claim that the church which had excommunicated him, had done an unconstitutional thing, and thereby destroyed its organization. And having gathered a party for the purpose, he might adopt Mr. Cleaveland's specimen of reviving a defunct organization. Assembling in one corner of the church, one of them might say, that "Whereas a number of the members of this church have been aggrieved by proceedings had in the law, that a constitutional organization must be secured at this time and in this place, we trust it will not be considered an act of discourtesy, but rather of duty and necessity, if we now proceed to organize this church," &c. Then, after going through the motions, they may, or may not, adjourn; but inviting the whole church, to meet in the place and on this plea declare that they are the church!!—and as for those who refused their polite invitation—they—were not the church!!!

3. The proceeding of the *minority* was inconsistent with all their own previous positions. In the Assembly of 1837, they alleged indeed that the excision of the four Synods was unconstitutional and illegal, but that the body had destroyed itself by that act. But they did not then make the discovery that the Moderator refused to do his duty, which was a so obvious certainly, in his putting the motions whereby the excision was effected, as in his declining to put Dr. Wilson's motion this year,) —nor did they then, upon the discovery, learned in the law," consider it necessary to "proceed to organize the General Assembly," which they might have done the moment the exscinding act was passed, but, for no reasonably as this year, upon the ground that a portion of the commissioners was excluded, and the body was therefore disorganized. If their argument is good now, it would have been good then. But they continued them to sit and vote in the Assembly of 1837, till its dissolution—and in obedience to its closing vote, they came up to the Assembly of 1838;—which "WE" they proceeded to organize, at the appointed time and place, in opposition to, and in the presence of the organized Assembly. That which they did now, they might as lawfully have done then. But they had not then been "advised by counsel learned in the law." What a pity! That the author of "Presbyterianism, or a Review of the leading measures of the Assembly of 1837, by a member of the New York Bar," only let his light shine some eleven months before Chancellor Kent, and Messrs. Wirt and Hopkins, might have spared their opinions;—the Auburn Convention need not have met;—the minority would not have resolved, as they did at that time, that they were not the secession over and over again, in every form, and through all their "*organs*," their determination to come up to the *Assembly*, year after year, for twenty years if necessary, and claim admission for the exscinded commissioners. What a pity, that such wisdom, such law, such sound Presbyterianism, should have escaped the minds of all the *legal gentlemen* constituted last year, and the minds of all the ecclesiastical lawyers, or ecclesiastics "learned in the law;" —that all this light should have been hid under a bushel so long, and that the New-school so long left in darkness, "in wandering mazes lost"—were compelled to invent so many, various, and contradictory expedients to justify the acts of *the Assembly* of 1837, and to get into *the Assembly* of 1838.

The "new light" which has guided them in their course for the last few weeks, deserves commemoration.

But what now, are the precise character and bearings of the exscinding acts of 1837? That, in consequence of the abrogation of the Plan of Union of 1801, certain Synods formed under that plan, are out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. In other words, the Presbyteries and Synods concerned having been erected unconstitutionally,—organized illegally, in the judgment of the Assembly of 1837,—embracing, unconstitutional or improper elements,—were no longer recognised as portions of the Presbyterian Church. The object of this act, as explained by the Assembly itself, was to make the Church homogeneous, as the constitution, which had been so far infringed by the erection of Synods, &c. on the principles of the Plan of Union, intended it to be. And the Assembly moreover declared, in reference to these Synods, that so far as related to the Presbyterians,—churches and ministers,—in those Synods, their disownment was but temporary.

* "We," says Mr. Cleveland, "We proceed now to organize the Assembly for 1838." Who are WE!—The *minority*.

As *they were organized*, the disowning was absolute. But the effect on individuals, and perhaps on some Presbyteries, was but temporary. For the Assembly, in so many words, expressly declared, that as soon as these Presbyteries or individuals, should separate themselves from their mixed or Congregational connexions, order would be taken, either to continue or modify their respective organizations, as should appear expedient, and to restore them to the Presbyterian Church. The Assembly having the right of disolving, dividing, and uniting Synods, acted on this right, in the case in question; and because of the peculiar nature of the case, the Assembly, in the disowning act, and in the explanations with which that act was accompanied, may be regarded as having acted *provisionally*, and pointed out the course to be pursued by all *bona-fide* Presbyterians concerned, in order to their regular and orderly connexion with the Church. If it could have succeeded the men or the churches, and the Presbyteries, it might have taken in hand to separate the unconstitutional elements, and as the case might require, modify or continue the present organization of the Presbyteries and Synods. But the Assembly acting on the knowledge it possessed, and upon all the fair presumptions of the case, and in view of the fact that the Plan of Union provided for a state of things in those Synods, which was utterly unconstitutional,—which gave to those Synods, and to the Presbyteries composing them, privileges not possessed by other Presbyteries, and never contemplated for any Presbytery,—preferred to settle the matter decisively and accurately. The Assembly said in effect, "You who are Presbyterians are connected with a mass of materials which have no right to be in this denomination. We are not able to say to what extent. But the evil is felt sorely every year. We leave it to you to get rid of it,—to investigate, and purge yourselves of it. For ourselves we are determined to be connected with it no longer. But as long as you are in the body with us, this foreign admixture which is connected with you is in the body to the detriment of its health and symmetry." Separate yourselves therefore from this thing. And as soon as you have done so, and made the fact manifest, your connexion with us shall be restored." The Synods and Presbyteries, had but to comply with this reasonable injunction,—and they could have done so most completely, within the year 1837,—and they might have come up to the Assembly of 1838, with a view of being confirmed as to their former organization, or to have it modified according to circumstances, within the control of the Assembly, and they could not have been refused with any show of decency. Their connexion with the Church would have been restored.

The effect then of the disowning would have been but temporary. In reality their exclusion, as to all important purposes, would have been but for the few days that intervened between the disowning act of 1837 and the dissolution of the Assembly, and for the few hours intervening between the opening of the Assembly of 1838, and the proper adjustment of their claims. For the only evil, which it can be pretended that they have suffered, is the brief suspension or exclusion of their commissioners for the brief period just indicated, for what other privilege, or right, of these "500 ministers and 60,000 church members" has been even touched.

But this course they refused to adopt, with the exception of a very few; (among whom was one minister who by separating himself from a mixed Presbytery and subjecting himself to a constitutional Presbytery, instantly recovered from all the evil of the disowning act, and was moreover a member of the Assembly of 1838.) And so long as their refusal to do so evince that they prefer their unconstitutional connexions, and relinquish their connexion with the Presbyterian Church.

As to hopes of their ever regaining a connexion with the Presbyterian Church, after this brief suspension of it, the acts of the Assembly of 1837, provided the only just and reasonable method. As appearing at the Assembly of 1838, they needed but to make it manifest that they were Presbyterians,—and they would have been constituted into Presbyteries or Synods,—(the proper order being taken to organize them,) and their commissioners would have been recognized. This of course would have been done, after the organization of the Assembly of 1838. That is to say, such bodies as they would compose would require to be recognized by act of the Assembly,—and could not be counted, nor their commissioners enrolled at the opening of the Assembly. For no body but the Assembly,—the acts of 1837 standing unrepealed,—could give them a being and organization that would entitle them to be formally connected with the Church and their commissioners to seats in the Assembly.

Their admission would be effected, not by the mere recognition of the clerks,—for they had not the power to recognize them. That power was taken away from the clerks, by the Assembly of 1837, under Dr. Alexander's resolutions. Their commissioners, therefore, would be classed, in the first instance, with the commissioners from Presbyteries whose names had been changed, or from newly erected Presbyteries, (of this class is the Presbytery of Greenbrier recognized by the Assembly of 1838,) whose commissioners—(those commissions are defective—all of which cases the Assembly reserves for its own judgment and does not confide to the clerks. The powers of the clerks as a committee of commissions are defined by the Assembly itself, and may be altered or abolished at pleasure. And accordingly, the Assembly of 1837, abridged this power, as it had before limited the power by denying to the committee of commissions authority to decide in the case of defective commissions. It is but asserting its own power to judge of the claims to membership in this body, instead of transferring that power to its standing officers. And since so great an outcry has been made about Dr. Alexander's resolutions, we have taken pains to find out, not generally known, that these resolutions are but a copy of a former act of the Assembly,—which so far as I know was repealed only by the opening of the act appointing the clerks a standing committee of commissions, in the year 1826-29. By the general powers of the committee of commissions, they were authorized, on being satisfied of the regular formation of new Presbyteries, to enrol their commissioners. In other words, the clerks recognized the Presbytery and enrolled its commissioners. By the present law, the Assembly recognizes the newly formed Presbytery and orders the enrolment of its commissioners.

In the printed minutes of the Assembly, for 1822, (page 20,) is found the following record:

The committee to which was referred an overture on the subject of admitting commissioners from newly formed Presbyteries, to seats in this house, reported the following resolutions, which were adopted, viz:

1. *Resolved*, That it be adopted as a standing rule of this house, that commissioners from newly formed Presbyteries, shall, before taking their seats as members of this body, produce satisfactory evidence that the Presbyteries to which they belong have been regularly organized according to the constitution of the church and are in connexion with the General Assembly.

2. *Resolved, also*, That such commissioners shall be entitled to furnish the evidence required in the foregoing resolution, before the House shall proceed to the choice of a Moderator.

Beside the object for which I have adduced this record, it establishes several important facts, relating to this whole business.

1. That a commission of itself does not entitle the bearer to a seat in the General Assembly. The Assembly must first know that the Presbytery to be represented is in the "denomination." Its commissions must first be recognized by the Assembly. This is a part of the proper evidence of appointment.

2. That the Assembly judges concerning the organization of Presbyteries, whether they be "according to the constitution of the church." And the Assembly of 1837, in correspondence with this right of judging, decided that the Presbyteries to which were made up of the materials furnished by the Plan of Union, (or the four Synods composed by those Presbyteries,) were not regularly organized according to the constitution of the church," and therefore disowned them as organized bodies.

3. That the Assembly is properly organized, and competently to do business, even to the decision upon the qualification of its own members, before the election of the Moderator of the year. A "House" exists, i. e. a quorum of members of unquestioned right, sitting with the Moderator of the previous year, judges of the right of persons claiming to sit.

But this was in old times, and before "council learned in the law" had made the notable discovery promulged by Mr. Cleaveland, that "a constitutional organization must be secured at the time and place" appointed,—which nobody doubted, and that no Assembly could be lawfully constituted, unless all sorts of commissioners, tainted and untainted were included in the very first instance.

To return. The membership and representation, thus suspended or lost, by these Synods is not of the nature of a civil right,—as of a partnership in funds for the advantage of the partners. 1. The funds are for a public purpose. And as long as they are faithfully applied to that purpose by those whose authority to apply them is undisputed, the control of the Assembly over them cannot be disputed, notwithstanding a portion of the Assembly is ejected from such control. It is not pretended, that the disowned Synods have incurred any money damages, properly so called, or liability. All that they have lost, is a part control of certain funds, which are abundantly guarded from perversion, without their interposition. To say that the Secessions are the Assembly, could not exclude us, who hold to the true Assembly, from a share in the control, because the very decision that would preclude them the Assembly, would authorize us to be represented in their body. 2. When these Synods entered the church, they entered a *solidarity* risk, and by the same act they risked their expulsion, ejection, or exclusion through the force of these laws. That ejection deprives of no civil rights,—involves no fine, or loss of any kind. The property which, as a part of the body, they controlled for public purposes, is still controlled by the body. Their rights were as *members* of the body; and when their membership ceased, no matter how,—their rights ceased. One man, or a Presbytery (as the Cumberland Presbytery,) becomes irregular, or disorderly, or heretical, as the case may be,—and is excluded. Another withdraws himself to join some other denomination. But while this process is going on, the body still maintains its vitality and integrity, *quoad hoc*. Neither the admission nor the separation of members has any effect on the right of the body as such to govern their and to manage its affairs for the public good, and, according to the constitution, the law and the usages in the case.

So much for the question of civil rights and of charters,—which is all that can come under the cognizance of the civil courts. The grand question of communion and denominational connection, the civil courts cannot touch.

2. The organization of the minority was in opposition to that fundamental principle, upon which they relied to justify their renunciation of the Assembly as organized in view of the acts of 1837.

They alleged that the General Assembly could not be ORGANIZED *unless it included every commissioner who might be present from any Presbytery, or any portion of any Presbytery, all the Presbyteries.* If we admit this position, still it is a question whether the Presbyteries composing the four Synods are necessary to be reckoned,—because the Presbyteries to be represented must be in the denomination—whereas these Presbyteries had been declared out of the connexion, by the highest authority known in our body. There must obviously be a limit somewhere. But, (waiving this for the present,)—the commissioners from the Presbyteries composing the four Synods, were *not* included in that organization which proceeded upon Mr. Cleaveland's motion; and the organization under Dr. Beman and Dr. Fisher was therefore as void as that under Dr. Elliott—For (1) The commissioners from the Dr. Beman, on their right as *enrolled* members of the Assembly,—no one but enrolled persons having a right to deliberate and vote;—and that time not a commissioner from the four Synods was enrolled—and of course could not have been included in the organization.

They stood on the same relation to the organization of Dr. Beman's Assembly, and to the Assembly of which Dr. Elliot was Moderator. The former did not include them any more than the latter. The former could not include them because they were not enrolled; and the latter could not enrol them, because, notwithstanding they were commissioners from "Presbyteries," their Presbyteries were not acknowledged to be in the connexion. But (2.) by the published minutes of the Assembly, it appears that they rescinded the acts of 1837, and recognized the commissions from the four Synods, *after their organization.* They were therefore included originally in the organization of neither body. And if such inclusion was necessary, their Assembly was not an own showing and according to their own argument, are no more the Assembly than is the body which, on the very ground here commentplated, they repudiate. That which they did *after* organizing, the Assembly *might* have done after organizing. The *trial was never made in the Assembly to rescind the acts of* 1837. And the Assembly and the Secession differ in this respect, only on the single point, that whereas both bodies organized originally without the commissioners from the four Synods, the former had no regular motion for their admission to consider, and the latter had. The Assembly never voted on this question—for the minority instead of giving a principle by before the house, withdrew from the body. And till such motion, made and passed, the commissions of the four Synods could not be over the state of the case is just this,—that, whereas neither the Secession nor the Assembly, at their respective organizations originally included the commissioners,—(which is not the *Assembly*, as such, *exclude* them. The *Clerks*, acting under their impressions of duty; in view of the acts of 1837, declined to enter the commissions on the roll. These not being were enrolled were the Assembly; and the commissioners refused by the clerks might have complained and appealed to the Assembly, to compel the enrolment of them. But the Assembly were bound by the error of the clerks, if it was an error—and it was no more than an error,—for which the Assembly of 1838 never could have held itself responsible. Before it proceeded to admit the excluded commissioners, could be made in an orderly manner, they and the minority were off; and no body else chose to make the motion for them. The *Assembly* of 1838 did not act in case at all.

5. How does it appear that, (as is alleged,) every commissioner who presents the proper evidence of his appointment, was in the place in the organization of the Assembly, or else the body cannot be organized at all? (1) It has been generally supposed that "any fourteen or more ministers constituting a quorum, being met on the day, and at the place appointed, are a quorum for the transaction of business;"—certainly then it will be allowed that the Assembly are constituted with the lawful Moderator, are a quorum, i e a lawful General Assembly, although there should be present some commissioners, whose right to sit may be questioned, who are excluded from the body, for a time or altogether. The case has often occurred of persons being elected commissioners to the Assembly, who were not ruling elders; and although their commissions certified them to be elders, yet when proof was exhibited to the contrary, they were rejected by the Assembly. Did this destroy the organization of the Assembly; and did it authorize the *minority* in such cases to unite with the excluded commissioners, the *ejected quasi* elders in "proceeding then to organize the Assembly?" And yet these commissioners came from Presbyteries acknowledged to belong to the Presbyterian church. (2.) But the four Synods are denied by the great majority of the body to belong to our connexion. And, in order to give validity to the argument that no organization can be effected, while any part of the commissioners is excluded,—or to speak more to the point,—in order to prove that the organization of the General Assembly of 1838 was invalid, because the commissions from the four Synods were excluded,—it must be shown that they were in the connexion. Chap. 12, sec. 1, of the constitution says, "The General Assembly shall represent all the churches of particular churches of this [Presbyterian,] denomination." The Presbyteries of "this denomination" shall each be represented. But to *all Presbyteries* belong "*this denomination!* If so, then the Associate Reformed, and the Covenanter Presbyteries, &c. may be represented. "This denomination" includes those churches which have been organized into Presbyteries in our connexion, and those Presbyteries and Synods which have been declared to be in our connexion by the General Assembly. That body is the highest judicatory in the Church. And the Form of Government and Rules of Discipline, constitutionally show the powers are intrusted to it. (See chap 12, secs. 4 and 5.) In the exercise of its authority, the General Assembly of 1837, for cause, declared that the four Synods were out of the connexion. Who is competent to say that they are? Is the *dictum* of the minority, *evasion and lawless* of Dr. Beman and other than the Assemblies of 1837 and 1838? (3.) A similar case has once before occurred. In the year 1807, the Synod of Kentucky, for cause, *dissolved* the Presbytery of Cumberland and suspended, *without process*, a portion of their ministers who had been irregularly ordained.—These acts were approved by the General Assembly of 1808 or 1809. The Cumberland Presbytery by its dissolution, was *upso facto* declared to be out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian Church. (This case is similar to the dissolution of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, by the Assembly of 1837. The Presbytery refusing to dissolve not only was the Presbytery as such unknown to the Church, but the members were out of the connexion, by contumacy. At all events, they were not in the connexion as a *Presbytery*. In this position,—equally unknown as *bodies* in the connexion,—the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia Presbytery, and the Cumberland Presbytery.) But suppose the Cumberland Presbytery and their friends, had made a great outcry about the unconstitutionality of the ministers and church members without trial, (as has been the case in regard to 500 other ministers and 60,000 church members;)—and suppose that they had gone through form of unconstitutionality of their dissolution, alleging that the General Assembly could not be lawfully constituted unless commissioners from the Cumberland Presbytery were admitted, and suppose yet further that a minority of the Assembly agreeing with them, should take Mr. Cleaveland's position, and in combination with the Cumberland commissioners set up as the General Assembly!! "*Risum teneatis amici*" Who does not see the absurdity of such a claim! and yet these Cumberland Presbyteries had something more to complain of than the four Synods,—for their ministers were actually suspended without process,—but where was such a thing been done, in relation to the four Synods? It is evident that if the Cumberland Presbytery and its friends had proceeded as has been done in the case of the four Synods, they would have been laughed to scorn. Yet they had as much right to do it as those have contended, that the constitution requires every Presbytery to be represented; and when their commissions appeared and were refused seats, their friends would have rescued them and joined them, and together formed, or to use Mr. Cleveland's words, "proceeded now to organize the Assembly with the commissions from the Synods, *after their organization.* They were therefore included originally in the organization of neither body. And if such inclusion was necessary, their Assembly was not an own showing and according to their own argument, are no more the Assembly than is the body which, on the very ground here commentplated, they repudiate. That which they did *after* organizing, the Assembly *might* have done after organizing. The *trial was never made in the Assembly to rescind the acts of* 1837. And the Assembly and the Secession act? Moreover, what is the name and nature of those regulations concerning the reception of Foreign Ministers? These rules were enacted by the Assembly; and they are in force all over the Church to this day. They are familiarly known in some places, by the name of the "Quarantine Laws of the Presbyterian Church." It is a very new doctrine, that the Assembly cannot make laws of any sort. It cannot make laws or terms of salvation. Its power is very limited, it like that of all ministers, and of all councils and synods, is only ministerial and declarative. The power of making laws is but the conscience, *i. e.* to guide and humble sin, in Popery. This power the constitution of the Presbyterian Church expressly disclaims. Nor can the Assembly make constitutional rules *i. e.* rules additional to those now forming what is called the constitution of the Presbyterian Church—or rules that abrogate, alter, or infringe constitutional provisions;—nor are its acts valid if they contravene the express rules of the constitution. And *for this reason*, the Plan of Union, and the formation of Presbyteries and Synods of a character unconstitutional, were disowned, abrogated and made null and void by the Assembly of 1837. Nor can the Assembly give such force and perpetuity to its acts, that they may be binding on its successors, or on the church, whereas constitutional rules can be abrogated only by the Presbyteries in a way provided for amendments of the constitution. But as long as they are in force they must be regarded as the law of God, so may the Assembly expound and apply the constitution of the Church, and make it the fundamental law of the Church; and in so doing it may do what it has done as any that are adopted by any other Presbytery. These expositions and acts are in force till altered by the Assembly. It is its only authority from which there is no appeal. Its acts can be repealed only by the Presbyteries electing an Assembly that will repeal. The power of repeal must be placed by the Assembly, and by no other body; and till such repealing, the law is in full force. Hence, the Plan of Union, and all the abuses that sprung the object in this case, have been in full force for thirty-six years. Unconstitutional as was the whole business, there was no remedy, until the Presbyteries elected such an Assembly as would abrogate, alter and destroy, the effects of it. And hence the acts of abrogating and exscinding, adopted by the Assembly of 1837, were perfectly in force, until a *succeeding Assembly* shall formally repeal them. A majority of the Presbyteries willed the existence of the Plan of Union, till 1837. A majority of the Presbyteries willed its abrogation in 1837; and in 1838, a majority of the Presbyteries willed that the abrogation should not be repealed, nor its progeny revived. The will of the Presbyteries in all these cases, has been manifested in the complexion and acts of the different Assemblies, which in all this time they have elected.

7. Our record, with respect to the will of the Presbyteries as manifested through the Assemblies of 1837 and 1838.

It has been said that the majority in 1837 was unconstitutional. In what respect was it unconstitutional, or more so than other Assemblies? It was a very decided, and a very overwhelming majority. It was no more *accidental* than that it was an *accident* that a majority of the Presbyteries determined to make the Assembly just what it was. Affairs were drawing to a crisis, and the crisis came at the meeting of the Assembly in 1836. Thereafter, the Presbyteries took care what sort of commissioners were sent to the Assembly. In 1837, the Presbyteries were largely and faithfully represented; and an unprecedented majority was given to the election of Mr. Wilson, as Permanent Clerk,—(the test question at the opening of the Assembly,)—and that majority continued till the end of the session. The acts of 1837 were deliberately passed, after they were discussed in the Presbyteries; and the result was, that whereas the parties were as about 135 to 115, in 1837; they were as 159 to 121 in 1838. The majority was more now, if they did not know it before, that the *accident* which made them a minority was not a freak of chance or fate. There needs no inspiration to convince us, that the Presbyteries, and the *Presbyteries* produced this result; the Church so willed it; and the consequence of the whole is—the accession of the *minority*.

They choose their own course. Hazarding all the results,—and knowing that the majority would not follow their leader,—they went out. But they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us. But they went out from us that it might be made manifest that they were not of us.

And yet in the face of all these facts, it is gravely contended that the minority of the General Assembly may do such things as the Assembly of the 17th of May, and thereby make themselves the General Assembly! If they are the Assembly, what is the majority?

NOTICES.

The Synod of North Carolina will meet at Third Creek, Rowan county, on the 17th October.

The Presbytery of Orange will meet in Greensboro', on the 8th October.

The Presbytery of Concord will meet at Mocksville, the 12th October.

OBITUARY.

Departed this life, on Friday, the 14th of September, Miss Mary Jane, daughter of Mr. John Cryzzer, of Nelson county, at the residence of her father, after a protracted and decessive illness. She died of pulmonary consumption. She bore up under her sickness with great fortitude and Christian patience. She was ready and prepared to depart. Her end was peaceful. She had been a consistent member of the Presbyterian Church for about two years before her death and continued steadfast to the end.

I visited her during her confinement several times, and she would always say, as to her death, she was willing to go; that she was willing to die and suffer the will of her heavenly Father. And the last words that she was heard to speak with her very feeble and faltering voice, "Praise God, praise him, praise him." Her end was peaceful. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord." Oh! may the friends of the deceased improve this dispensation, and prepare to meet God before it will be forever too late—may the Lord grant it for Jesus' sake.

S. J. R.

Departed this life, on Monday, the 9th September, in the county of Nottoway, at the residence of her father, Dr. A. A. Campbell, Mrs. CATHARINE C. EVERGERAD, consort of Dr. Geo. Fitzgerald. Mrs. Fitzgerald was a pious, and exemplary member of the Presbyterian Church. It was the privilege of the writer to be with Mrs. F. several times during her illness. The prominent idea she was joyfully sustained by the grace of God, and to a degree unusually great, was her entire resignation to the gospel. She felt, and declared the Saviour to be exceedingly precious to her soul, and relying upon him, she was not only not afraid of death but was almost impatiently anxious to depart and be with Christ. Mrs. F. has left with her bereaved husband one child, a dear little boy, rather more than twelve months old. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints;" "Death is swallow up death in victory." These scriptures were abundantly fulfilled in the experience of Mrs. Fitzgerald. Her last well days were spent in the service of her God, and now she sweetly rests in the bosom of her Saviour.

P.

EDUCATION.

MISS ANN ELIZABETH POOLE will resume the duties of her Schoolroom, Monday, 1st October.

☞ A few Pupils will be taken in Music and French. oct 1—3t.

MISS MACKENZIE, with sincere thanks for that very liberal share of patronage by which her School has always been favored, and with an address wish to merit its continuance, respectfully announces to the public that it will be re-opened for the reception of boarders and day pupils, on the 1st October. sept 27

PORTER, KEEN & CO.,

OPPOSITE F. & J. S. JAMES & CO.,

Main street, Richmond.

OFFER for sale, very low for cash, by the piece or package, the following styles of Goods:

Plaid Shawls; Jaconet, Cambric, Mull, Cross Bar, and Book Muslins; Bishop's Lawn; Bobinett; Lace; White Cambric Cravats; Ging. and American Prints; Bleached and Brown Cottons; Twilled Jeans; Wool and Red Flannels; Cotton do.; Colored Linsey; Ticking; Osnaburg; Satinets; Fustians; Hosiery; Gentlemen's Gloves, of different kinds; Silk Pocket Hdkfs; and Black Silk Cravats.

READY MADE CLOTHING,

of every description, made in the very best manner; all of which we will sell as low as can be purchased at any other place in the city. Please call and examine. sept 27.

NEW GOODS.

THE subscriber informs his friends and the public, that he is in receipt of his fall supply of HATS, CAPS, and HATTERS' MATERIALS, (for manufacturing) comprising the largest and best selected assortment of Goods he has ever had to offer to the public, consisting in part as follows

400 doz black and dark Wool Hats

400 do. silk, fur, Russia, hair and Beaver Hats, from low price to the finest qualities, and from the most approved manufacturers of Philadelphia and New York.

CAPS.

600 doz. Men's and Boys' black, brown and gray hair seal Caps;

300 doz. cotton, muskrat, seal and otter fur Caps;

100 do. sedes and plush do;

50 do. Gentlemen's, Youth's and Children's Cloth, all of modern patterns.

HATTERS' MATERIALS.

Spanish and Saxony Hat Felts;

Silk Hat Bodies;

Canonical and raw Russia Hair Fur;

Iron Shallows;

Skins of all colors;

Polongs and Hat Tips;

Cotton Tips and Sides;

Black and drab Bindings and Bindings;

Silk Plushes, Raw Silks;

Cards, Stopping Brushes;

Hat Blocks, Hat Boards;

Extract of Logwood, and various other articles too numerous to mention.

ALSO,

A general assortment of Stocks and Collars, from an approved manufacturer.

I have spent several weeks in the Northern Cities, and have personally selected my Goods, I invite purchasers to examine my assortment feeling confident that I shall be able to offer my Goods to them at satisfactory prices. JOHN THOMPSON.

sept 20

PURE PREPARED COCOA—Fresh Mustard and incanisters, just received by

O. A. STRECKER.

aug 9

VIRGINIA TRACT SOCIETY.

Receipts for August and September.

From Union Theol. Seminary Tract Society, per R. W. Bell, $16 00

From two female members of Goshen, N. C., for foreign distribution, per Rev. W. S. Plumer, 2 25

From Amherstdale Pres. church and congregation, per Rev. J. S. Armstead, 50 60

From Samuel Robinson, Amelia, per. S. P. Hawes, 1 00

From John Smith, Washington co., for books sold, per Rev. S. Taylor, 3 57

$113 42

oct 1 GEO. STEEL, *Treasurer.*

☞ The Chatham and Conference Journal will please copy.

☞ With a view of more easily meeting the expenses attendant upon the publication of this paper, there is connected with it

A JOB OFFICE,

Which is prepared to execute

Books, Pamphlets and Job work generally,

WITH NEATNESS AND ACCURACY.

The patronage of the members of the Presbyterian Church, and of the public generally, is respectfully solicited for this department.

Respecting all Job Printing address either the Editor at his office, or

B. R. WREN, PRINTER,

Rear of RANDOLPH & Co.'s Bookstore, Main Street.

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 bills, 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 Editors friendly to the paper are authorised to act as agents. Promptness is confidently expected in all agents.

All letters and communications should be sent to WM. S. PLUMER, *Editor, Richmond, Va.*, post paid. Any information this will impose a tribute on any kind 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 encouraging, except on orders for the paper or remittances of money.

ADVERTISEMENTS not inconsistent with the character of the paper will be inserted at $1 00 per square for the first, and 50 cents per square for each subsequent insertion.

No advertisements will be received for less than twelve 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.

PAYMENTS

TO THE

WATCHMAN OF THE SOUTH,

Made during the week ending September 29th, 1838. All payments are to No. 104, unless otherwise noticed.

Charlotte C. H., Va.—Ann M. Read.

Point Hills, N. C.—Sarah Young, to 113, John M. Cannon, to 112.

Hall's Store, Va.—Wm. W. Fleming, to 105, James Woods, to 113, Mary Dinwiddie, to 98.

New Store, Va.—Thomas J. Perkinson, to 99.

Wampanoie, N. Y.—Rev. Wm. H. Cooper, to 88, Alex. Stewart, to 96.

Oneida Castle, N. Y.—James Stewart, to 96.

New York—Peter D. Dean, to 104.

Newberry C. H., S. C.—Rev. R. C. Ketchum, to 79, Sarah K. P. Johnston, Wm. Welch.

Cheraw, S. C.—Sarah Messer.

Cassenhurg, Pa.—P. B. Wilson, to 80, James E. Curson, John E. Alexander, to 90, Wm. W. Stickley, to 80.

Farmville, Va.—Samuel Lyle, Mrs. Mary T. Ridley, Andrew Millspaugh, C. C. Read.

Williamsburg, N. J.—James Anderson, John Ballard, Mrs. Agnes F. E. Hershman.

Roanoke Bridge, Va.—Wm. W. Spencer.

Manchester, Va.—Jacob Freeland.

New Orleans, La.—John Freeland.

Dinwiddie, Va.—John McAllister, Dect. Thomas P. Atkinson, Miss Ann Benedict, Mrs. Rebecca Jordan, to 70, John W. Faxton, Robert Ross.

Hampton, Va.—John McAllister, Dect. Thomas P.

Petersburg, Va.—Mrs. Margaret Wilson, Miss Isabella Green.

Jonesville, Miss.—Charles McNair.

McLean's Office, Miss.—Norman McLeod.

Brandon, Miss.—John Sisebite, to 98.

Stony Point Mills, Va.—Dect. Edward Hughes.

The River Warehouse, Va.—Mrs. Margaret McClelland, to 52.

Oak Hill, N. C.—Mrs. Amy W. Smith.

Waynesborough, Va.—Wm. W. King, to 112.

From the Western Presbyterian Herald.

Editor of the Cincinnati Journal:

Sir—In the Journal of the 19th ult., you have published our first letter, which you follow with a number of "REMARKS," which "remarks" we suppose you intend to be understood as answers to the statements contained in the letter. Some of these remarks we now propose to notice. You propose, "What is it to organize a deliberative body? Nothing more nor less than to ascertain who are the proper members of the body, and to elect the officers necessary for the transaction of business." We are always pleased when we can agree with you, and in this we do cordially agree. This is precisely what we mean by organizing the General Assembly; and when thus organized they are prepared to act; and one of their first acts usually is, to elect their officers. You then proceed, "To whom does the power of fixing this, ordinarily and properly belong? Surely to no others than the body itself." The term *body* is used in two senses; sometimes it means a number or multitude of men; sometimes it means a number of men organized or united together under certain laws and regulations, for the accomplishment of certain specified purposes. In this latter sense alone we understand, or ought to understand the word in this discussion. What then is the meaning of your statement that the body organizes itself? A body, as such, cannot act before it exists. And yet if we can understand your language, it means that the body does act before it exists, because it organizes itself. When we use the phrase, "to constitute the General Assembly, we mean the commissioners from the different presbyteries, organized according to the constitution into a body with the power of acting, not individually, but collectively.

We notice again the following remark: "It is contended that these officers," the Moderator and clerks, "not one of them, perhaps, a member, have an arbitrary and uncontrollable power over the body." It is trying to the patience to meet with frequent and positive assertions without the shadow of proof, and even in the very face of proof to the contrary. We never have and never will contend for arbitrary power in any man, or any body of men, or even in an editor. The only power for which we contend, and for which we do most earnestly contend, in the Moderator and Clerks, is that prescribed and enjoined by the plain letter of the constitution and the rules of the church. We will presently find an instance of arbitrary power in one of the arguments which you allege in support of your cause.

Again, you remark regarding the Clerks that they are the "mere servants of the body for which they are acting, holding their office during its pleasure—they have no more power over the organization," that is, of the Assembly, "than the merest stranger." We cannot conceive how such a statement as this can be made by one who professes to be engaged in the defence of Presbyterianism. The Assembly of 1829 appointed the permanent and stated clerks "a standing committee of commissions, and required all commissions to be submitted to them, that instead of being read in the house, they should be examined by said committee and reported to the Assembly." This appointment has never been repealed, and it is therefore still the duty of the clerks, a duty which no other person has a right to discharge, to examine all commissions, and report accordingly. It will remain their exclusive duty from year to year, until this appointment is repealed by the Assembly, to use your own language, "to ascertain who are the proper members of the body." If they are, as you say, the mere servants of the body, they ought of course faithfully discharge the duties prescribed by that body... How then can you say that the clerks have no more power over the organization than the merest stranger? Does the cause which you advocate need the support of such positive, unqualified assertions?

Again, you assert that "no Assembly has no power over the organization of a subsequent Assembly." If this is true, there has been no 6th General Assembly for 20 years past. The last act of each Assembly is to appoint the time and place for the organization of the next Assembly. Each Assembly also, elects the Moderator who is to preside until a subsequent Assembly is completely organized. The permanent and stated clerks are to hold their office during the pleasure of the Assembly, and are to discharge their duty in organizing each subsequent Assembly, until they are removed from office. All this is according to the plain letter of the constitution and the rules of the church. (See chapter xii. section 8.) The Presbyteries require their commissioners to attend on the day and at the place mentioned by the preceding Assembly. How then can we understand the positive assertion that "one Assembly has no power over the organization of a subsequent Assembly?" You go further and affirm that "it is indeed the wildest of absurdities to claim such a power over the organization of a future Assembly which is in no respect dependant on that which preceded it." If this be true the Assembly for forty years past is chargeable with this "wildest of absurdities;" for they have appointed the time and place for the meeting of the Assembly of '39, and also, the Moderator who is to fill the chair until a successor is appointed. If you can be gratified by striking, as you suppose, your opponents, you care not if the blow falls with equal severity on your friends.

"The clerks," you observe, "may have decided, as may be out of the way or refuse to enrol a single name." Let us take another hypothetical step the commissioners may have deceased, or be out of the way, or refuse to submit their commissions for examination. Either of these suppositions would create a necessity for acting differently from what the constitution has prescribed. But that necessity does not exist. The Moderator and clerks *are present*, and actively engaged in the discharge of their respective duties. Let us first settle, if we can, the real case before us, and then we will go with you into the discussion of as many hypothetical cases as you please. But when no necessity exists, let us not act as though it was pressing on us with irresistible force. Your physician pays you a visit and finds you in perfect health; but he supposes you to be very sick, and insists on your taking medicine. No, doctor, you would rather wait till I am sick, and then I will take your medicine. In the coldness of winter we put on warm clothing and draw near the fire. Must we therefore put on the same clothing and draw near the fire in the heat of summer, when the mercury is up to 90? If a meeting of the commissioners should ever occur, and no person should be present who had been Moderator for ten or twenty years past; whether he is a commissioner or not, it does not alter the case, he is, according to the 2nd General Rule, the true Moderator, if both the clerks should be absent, then it would be necessary to organize the Assembly in some other way. But why should we anticipate or suppose this necessity until it actually exists?

One of your most extraordinary remarks is the following: "According to the notion of a literal construction of the phrase, 'no commissioner shall have a right to deliberate or vote in the Assembly, until his name shall have been enrolled and his commission examined and filed among the papers of the Assembly' no vote of any kind, or for any purpose, can be given—no Moderator or clerk can be elected—no examination of commissioners be had—nothing can be done." The term *literal* is sometimes contrasted with what is spiritual, but more frequently with what is figurative. We will not presume that this part of the constitution has a spiritual meaning; you therefore mean to contrast it with something that is figurative. If it be figurative, what figure is employed? Is it metonymy? metaphor or hyperbole? Is the whole or only certain parts of it to be turned into figure? Are the commissioners only figurative commissioners? Are the sessions only figurative commissions? The reading, examining, and filing these commissions, are these only figurative actions? This is a plain admission on your part that this article of the constitution, understood literally, is inconsistent with the cause which you advocate. For we do not believe that there can be found in the English language a sentence more obviously literal in its meaning. If you turn this article into figure, you may, on the same principle, turn the whole constitution into figure; and thus we may have but a figurative constitution, a figurative assembly, a figurative church, and we may be but figurative christians.

Again, you remark, "There was no *deposition*, technically speaking." Was then a deposition of the Moderator speaking in any other manner, especially was there a deposition constitutionally speaking? We have formerly seen that the Moderator was deposed, according to any form, nor in any manner.—"It was not necessary, you further remark, "that the body should have any cause of complaint against the old Moderator—there needed no dereliction of duty to give them the power to put their own officer in place of an officer elected by another body. It was a matter dependent on their own pleasure, for the exercise of which they were under no necessity to give reasons to any man." We suppose you intend this to apply to the action Mr. Cleaveland and those who united with him in organizing the New School Assembly. It is as complete an instance of arbitrary power as ever occurred. In disposing of the Moderator it was not necessary that they should have "any cause of complaint" against him, or that they should charge him with any "dereliction of duty," but merely because it was their pleasure to do so, for the exercise of which they considered themselves responsible to no man. Here are all the essentials of arbitrary power, and on the justification of the exercise of this power depends, in your estimation, the constitutionality of the New School Assembly.

We quote another of your remarks, which is this: "We defy Dr. Alexander to find a precedent for it in any deliberative body having the shadow of independence. Indeed amidst all the records of arbitrary power, we have never before met with such an assumption, necessary that they should have "any cause of complaint" against him, or that they should charge him with any "dereliction of duty," but merely because it was their pleasure to do so, for the exercise of which they considered themselves responsible to no man. Here are all the essentials of arbitrary power, and on the justification of the exercise of this power depends, in your estimation, the constitutionality of the New School Assembly.

We quote another of your remarks, which is this: "We defy Dr. Alexander to find a precedent for it in any deliberative body having the shadow of independence. Indeed amidst all the records of arbitrary power, we have never before met with such an assumption, and until Dr. M. can find one, he ought not to undertake the defence of this in a country like America." To what does all this solemn thing, this earnest language of defiance, this positive assertion relate? Simply and solely to this plain question, has the Moderator of the Assembly the right and the power to decide a motion out of order, and an appeal from his decision equally out of order, when he firmly believes it to be so? The constitution answers this question in language too plain to be misunderstood: (Chap. xix. sec. 2.) "The Moderator is to be considered as possessing, by delegation from the whole body, all authority necessary for the preservation of order." [illegible] refer in your preceding remarks to the case of the Moderator and Dr. Patton. Dr. Patton's motion was as evidently out of order as if it had been made when the Moderator ascended the pulpit, before he had commenced the sermon. According to your own opinion there was no organized body to vote on the motion or the appeal; because it was not yet "ascertained who were the proper members of the body," that is, who had a right to vote. Not a single commission had been read or examined, and until this is done no commissioner has a right either to deliberate or to vote. The Moderator, as he could not do otherwise, declared this motion and the appeal out of order. You may, as you do, call this "arbitrary power," or "assumption of power." But it is a power which we do undertake to defend as belonging to the Moderator according to the constitution and rules of the church, not only "in a country like America," but in America itself. It is a power which the Moderator of the Assembly frequently exercises, and it is exercised by the presiding officers of all deliberative bodies.

Quoting your own words, we have said that "the body has a right to preside over its own officer," and that the Assembly of '37 elected Dr. Elliott as their Moderator, and prescribed for him a plain rule of duty as long as he remained in office, and that the constitution decides that he is to remain in office till a new Moderator is chosen. You call this a "kind of legerdemain." This is a word we never use, and of course do not pretend to understand its meaning. But as you doubtless will not use it without understanding both its meaning and its use, we therefore ascertain what you mean by the word by the case to which you apply it. To state that the General Assembly has a right to direct its Moderator is, in your sense of the term, legerdemain. We, in next sentence, "A dignitary of the church" completed, would have been one of crushing power, which we could not possibly have survived. But forbearance was exercised "even over the love of victory, and you say—"but let it pass." We too will "let it pass" with this remark: there are various substitutes for argument; of these, according to taste or fancy, some choose one and some another; you have a perfect right to your choice. You proceed, "The readers of the Journal, the Dr. ought to understand, are ordinary intelligent people." So far as you have submitted any thing from us to your readers, they will be witnesses that they are considered and treated as having ordinary understandings. We have presented arguments are therefore accompanied with the chapter, and section, and generally the words of the constitution, that by comparing the statement and the proof together they may clearly perceive the conclusion. Does the editor himself of the Journal, consider and treat his readers as having ordinary understandings? If he does, will he point out to them the argument contained in this sentence. For if they have ordinary understandings, we presume they can hardly perceive it without this additional aid. At one time you state that Dr. Beman was sworn into office by a civil magistrate, at another time you admit, though with apparent reluctance, that possibly "this may be a mistake." In frankness you should have said it is a mistake. At one time you state, "it is competent to the body the moment the chair is taken to choose a new Moderator," and "the first act which the commissioners do upon assembling is to appoint a Moderator."—That is, before a single commission is read and examined, or even before the introductory prayer is offered, a Moderator may be elected. Again you state that the commissions at least must be "called to order," and again you more correctly decide that it must be "ascertained who are the proper members of the body," and then, and not till then, the Moderator may be elected. In reference to the election of Dr. Beman, you state positively that "this election was in accordance with the constitution," and yet without quoting the words, however, to chapter xix. and 5th General Rule in support of your statement. And yet when these passages are examined they are the commons only figurative commissions? The reading, examining, and filing these commissions, are these only figurative actions? This is a plain admission on your part that this article of the constitution, understood literally, is inconsistent with the cause which you advocate. For we do not believe that there can be found in the English language a sentence more obviously literal in its meaning. If you turn this article into figure, you may, on the same principle, turn the whole constitution into figure; and thus we may have but a figurative constitution, a figurative assembly, a figurative church, and we may be but figurative christians.

Again, you remark, "There was no *deposition*, technically speaking." Was then a deposition of the Moderator speaking in any other manner, especially was there a deposition constitutionally speaking? We have formerly seen that the Moderator was deposed, according to any form, nor in any manner.—"It was not necessary, you further remark, "that the body should have any cause of complaint against the old Moderator—there needed no dereliction of duty to give them the power to put their own officer in place of an officer elected by another body. It was a matter dependent on their own pleasure, for the exercise of which they were under no necessity to give reasons to any man." We suppose you intend this to apply to the action Mr. Cleaveland and those who united with him in organizing the New School Assembly. It is as complete an instance of arbitrary power as ever occurred. In disposing of the Moderator it was not necessary that they should have "any cause of complaint" against him, or that they should charge him with any "dereliction of duty," but merely because it was their pleasure to do so, for the exercise of which they considered themselves responsible to no man. Here are all the essentials of arbitrary power, and on the justification of the exercise of this power depends, in your estimation, the constitutionality of the New School Assembly.

We quote another of your remarks, which is this: "We defy Dr. Alexander to find a precedent for it in any deliberative body having the shadow of independence. Indeed amidst all the records of arbitrary power, we have never before met with such an assumption, and until Dr. M. can find one, he ought not to undertake the defence of this in a country like America." To what does all this solemn thing, this earnest language of defiance, this positive assertion relate? Simply and solely to this plain question, has the Moderator of the Assembly the right and the power to decide a motion out of order, and an appeal from his decision equally out of order, when he firmly believes it to be so? The constitution answers this question in language too plain to be misunderstood: (Chap. xix. sec. 2.) "The Moderator is to be considered as possessing, by delegation from the whole body, all authority necessary for the preservation of order." [illegible] refer in your preceding remarks to the case of the Moderator and Dr. Patton. Dr. Patton's motion was as evidently out of order as if it had been made when the Moderator ascended the pulpit, before he had commenced the sermon. According to your own opinion there was no organized body to vote on the motion or the appeal; because it was not yet "ascertained who were the proper members of the body," that is, who had a right to vote. Not a single commission had been read or examined, and until this is done no commissioner has a right either to deliberate or to vote. The Moderator, as he could not do otherwise, declared this motion and the appeal out of order. You may, as you do, call this "arbitrary power," or "assumption of power." But it is a power which we do undertake to defend as belonging to the Moderator according to the constitution and rules of the church, not only "in a country like America," but in America itself. It is a power which the Moderator of the Assembly frequently exercises, and it is exercised by the presiding officers of all deliberative bodies.

Quoting your own words, we have said that "the body has a right to preside over its own officer," and that the Assembly of '37 elected Dr. Elliott as their Moderator, and prescribed for him a plain rule of duty as long as he remained in office, and that the constitution decides that he is to remain in office till a new Moderator is chosen. You call this a "kind of legerdemain." This is a word we never use, and of course do not pretend to understand its meaning. But as you doubtless will not use it without understanding both its meaning and its use, we therefore ascertain what you mean by the word by the case to which you apply it. To state that the General Assembly has a right to direct its Moderator is, in your sense of the term, legerdemain. We, in next sentence, "A dignitary of the church"—completed, would have been one of crushing power, which we could not possibly have survived. But forbearance was exercised "even over the love of victory, and you say—"but let it pass." We too will "let it pass" with this remark: there are various substitutes for argument; of these, according to taste or fancy, some choose one and some another; you have a perfect right to your choice. You proceed, "The readers of the Journal, the Dr. ought to understand, are ordinary intelligent people." So far as you have submitted any thing from us to your readers, they will be witnesses that they are considered and treated as having ordinary understandings. We have presented arguments are therefore accompanied with the chapter, and section, and generally the words of the constitution, that by comparing the statement and the proof together they may clearly perceive the conclusion. Does the editor himself of the Journal, consider and treat his readers as having ordinary understandings? If he does, will he point out to them the argument contained in this sentence. For if they have ordinary understandings, we presume they can hardly perceive it without this additional aid.

"Tempora mutantur," &c.

To act thus in accordance with the decisions of a former Assembly is both rational and honest;—actions, which, if we understand is thus organized in the best manner, the manner prescribed by the constitution;—honest, because it is acting in accordance with a rule publicly and solemnly adopted.

With sincerity
Your friend,
JOHN MATTHEWS.

EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE.

Thomas Hownham, the subject of the following providence, was a very poor man, who lived in a humble cottage, situated upon a moor, called Barmour Moor, about a mile from Lowick, and two miles from Doddington, in the county of Northumberland. He had no means to support a wife and two young children, save the scanty earnings obtained by keeping an ass, on which he used to carry coals from Barmour coal hill to Doddington and Wooler, or by making brooms on the heath, and selling them round the country. Yet poor, and despised as he was in consequence of his poverty, in my forty years' acquaintance with the peasantry around, I have scarce met with a people as a man that lived near to God, or one who was favored with more evident answers to prayer. My parents then living at a village called Ingram Hall, about one mile and a half from his hut, I had frequent interviews with him, in one of which he was very solicitous to know whether my father or mother had sent him a pound of tobacco, which they had before. I answered him in the negative, so far as I knew; at which he seemed to be uneasy. I then pressed to know what relief he had met with, and how? After requesting secrecy, unless I should hear it from some other quarter, (and if so, he begged I would acquaint him,) he proceeded to inform me that being disappointed in receiving money for his coals the day before, he returned home in the evening, and to his pain and distress, found that there was neither bread nor meal, nor any thing to supply their place, in his house; that his wife wept sore for the poor children, who were both crying for hunger—that they continued crying till they both fell asleep; that he had got them to bed, and their mother with them, who through sore sorrow and weeping—being worn out with the sufferings of the children, and her own tender feelings.

Being a fine moonlight night, he went out of the house to pray unobserved. He then proceeded to meditate on these remarkable expressions in Hab. iii. 17, 18: "Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labor of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat—the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stall—yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation." He then continued, as he thought, about an hour and a half: and in a sweet, serene, and composed frame of mind he returned into the house; when, he informed me, he looked through the window, he perceived something upon a stool or form (for chairs they had none) before the bed; and after viewing it with astonishment, and feeling it, he found it to be a joint of meat roasted, and a loaf of bread, about the size of our half-peck loaves. He then went to the door to look if he could see any body; and after using his voice as well as his reason, and hearing no reply, he returned to his house, and there, without quitting the house, he received