

POETRY.

MRS. HEMANS' LAST POEM.

The Dublin University Magazine says of the following lines by Mrs. Hemans, that they are "the last verses ever dictated by her, which she sent to us a few days previous to her death."

"THE POETRY OF THE PSALMS."

Nobly thy song, O minstrel, rushed to meet
Th' Eternal on the pathway of the blast,
With darkness round him, as a mantle cast,
And cherubim to waft his flying east,
Amidst the hills that smoked beneath his feet;
With trumpet voice thy spirit called aloud,
And bade the trembling rocks his name repeat,
And the bent cedars, and the bursting cloud,
But far more gloriously to earth made known
By that high strain, than by the thunder's tone,
Than flashing torrents or the ocean roll;
Jehovah spoke through the imbreathing fire,
Nature's vast realms forever to inspire
With the deep worship of a living soul.
Dublin, April, 1835.

TELEGRAPH.

We intended to insert the following paper two or three weeks since—immediately after the Report of Mr. Barnes' trial which appeared in our columns on the 24th ult.—It has been delayed, with other articles, for want of space.—Ed.

DR. JUNKIN'S APPEAL.

Lafayette College, July 16th, 1835.

To Rev. John L. Grant, Moderator, and to the Rev. Second Presbyterian of Philadelphia.

Rev. and Dear Brethren,—You are hereby officially informed, that I intend to appeal to the Synod of Philadelphia at its next meeting to be held in the borough of York, on the last Wednesday of October next, against your recent decision in the case of the Rev. Albert Barnes. This appeal is from the "definitive sentence," its general ground is a "manifestation of prejudice in the case, and mistake" and consequent "injustice in the decision."

Allow me, before proceeding to specify the reasons which shut me up to the belief that the Court was prejudiced, and did err in judgment, to say, that I impeach no motives—I charge no corrupt prejudice no intentional mistakes or error upon any man. Men do often err under the purest motives, and are often powerfully prejudiced, whilst perfectly unconscious of it. With this single remark, proceed to the reasons, why I appeal on the above named general grounds viz.

1. Because the Presbytery, nearly three months after the charges had been received, and the day fixed for trial, attempted to constrain the prosecutor to change them, by prefixing the general charge of *heresy*; and did actually pass a resolution refusing to hear the parties, merely because this term was absent; and upon the prosecutor saying, in answer to a question put to him, that in his opinion the errors charged amounted to *heresy*, the Presbytery made a record which amounted virtually to a change of the indictment to a general charge of *heresy*. The prosecutor, now appellant, had stated his objections to the use of this term. First, it is a vague term, not defined in our books; no two, perhaps, of the Presbytery themselves would agree in what constitutes *heresy*. Its use therefore could only create confusion and throw a character of indefiniteness around charges of error, which he had laboured to make definite and precise. Secondly, this term is a bugbear and is often used to excite popular emotion of an unchristian character, and may therefore greatly prejudice the mind against the one who accuses another of error, and in favour of the accused.

Thus the Presbytery manifested favour toward Mr. Barnes, in giving him and his friends the opportunity of exciting odium against the accuser, by allusions and references to prosecution and to "the inquisitorial toils" of the prosecutor. Accordingly this last phraseology was actually used by one of the judges (Rev. John Smith) and not without effect.

Thus also the Presbytery changed substantially the ground and nature of the prosecution and led themselves into error. In their final verdict, they assume *heresy* as the general charge. And in giving their opinions, some members had their eye constantly on that fearful term, the meaning of which the court did not define. So the Rev. Mr. Barbour opened his remarks "I never can give my verdict," said he, "that brother Barnes has been guilty of *heresy*." And again, "The Confession was not made for a trap to catch *heretics*." And more of the same kind. So the Rev. John Smith and the Rev. N. S. Smith rung the changes on the word *heresy*, and evidently were expressed with the undefined idea. So Elder Hinckley said "the prosecutor has failed in establishing the charge of *heresy* against the defendant." So Elder Darrach, "I would not say Mr. Barnes was guilty of *heresy*." And thus the charge was carried of the ground of the charges and decided on a case not before them. *Heresy* with many is some horrible thing for which a man must be burnt. Thus lost in a term undefined and undefinable, the court, as appears to me, erred in judgment. They shuddered at the idea of burning Mr. Barnes.

2. Because the accused was not called upon by the court to put in a plea to each charge specifically. Dis. 10. The charges shall be read to him, and he shall be called upon to say whether he is guilty or not." Now cases may occur wherein an accused person may plead guilty to one and not to another of the charges and unless the question be distinctly put, do you admit the truth of this first charge or not? And so of the rest, it cannot be known what the plea is; and if no special plea be put for each count of the indictment the prosecutor and the court are put to unnecessary trouble and kept in ignorance of what they are called upon to do; whether to prove the truth, or only the relevancy of the charge. This violation of rule is the more culpable, because a Presbytery is a court constituted, and every person arraigned ought to have it put to his conscience to say whether the things charged are true or not. But the 12th section settles this question, "If the minister, when he appears, will not confess, but denies the facts alleged against him, &c." Clearly this contemplates an explicit acknowledgment or denial of the things charged. Now Mr. B., in the plea he put in, admitted some of the charges and denied others; but the Presbytery did not require him to specify which he admitted and which he denied; so that the plea amounted to nothing. He says, "I neither have taught nor do I teach, any thing according to my best judgment, contrary to the Word of God; nor do I deny any truths taught in the Word of God, as it is alleged that I do in the indictment now before the Presbytery." Can any candid man read this plea against charges of holding doctrines contrary to the Word of God and the Confession of Faith, without feeling, that the accused admits teaching doctrines contrary to the Word of God and the Confession of Faith? And is this plea any thing more than evasions in every age have put in? Who does not know that all errorists that have troubled the Church and do trouble her, always profess to feed their doctrines on the Bible. In reference to the Confession of Faith there is absolutely no plea at all. The prosecutor has always been of opinion, and by the admissions of Mr. B., now more than ever, that had he been put to a special plea he would have acknowledged the truth of at least a majority of the charges, as he has done of the principal ones, so far as the standards are concerned; and would have justified himself on the ground of Scripture. Thus it is believed, prejudice was manifested in favour of the accused. For by this course he was left to all the benefit of a denial, where he could do it with a clear conscience; whilst he had all the advantage of silence, where he could not have denied. By this too, the trial was greatly prejudiced.

Thus also, the appellant and the court are left still in doubt whether Mr. B. admits or denies certain points. Dr. Ely in his paper said Mr. B. included Christ's active obedience in the matter of the believer's justification, and did not teach that justification, is simply pardon. On the contrary Rev. Mr. Patterson said he believed Mr. B. held the common doctrine of the New England divines and the doctrine of Dr. Dwight, which is that justification is simply and only pardon. Thus justice in this state of the case could not be expected. This incipient error led on to others.

3. Another reason for thinking that there was some little bias in the court, is the high estimate in which, deservedly, some at least of the members held Mr. B. as to talents and his congregation as to respectability and influence. It will be remembered that the Presbytery held its meetings in the lecture room where the accused had usually met his people, and many of them were present during the trial. It is hardly conceivable that the good brethren should not be especially influenced. "Never let me be found condemning a man to whom God has given such mighty powers of mind, and a congregation so dignified and influential."

4. My fourth reason for appealing on the ground of prejudice leading to error, is, that the Presbytery have in their decision, endorsed some of Mr. B.'s alleged errors, and having made them their own, could not be presumed altogether impartial in their judgment. Ex. gr. "This exercise of mind and heart" (Abraham's) say they, "the Apostle says was imparted to Abraham for righteousness." See 4th reason. And again, under 5th reason, "It (the Confession of Faith) does not intimate that independent of and subsequent to the enactment of the moral law God entered into a special compact with man about his obedience; but that he was pleased to promise eternal life, not only for himself, but for his posterity on condition of Adam's obedience to that law, to be proved by his observance of the prohibition from the fruit of the tree of knowledge."

Now, on the contrary, the very doctrine of the Confession and Catechism, is that man was created having the law of God written in his heart, and "when God had created man he entered into a covenant of life with him." The covenant was subsequent to the enactment of the law. Thus the Presbytery sanctions the error charged, and therefore may well be supposed favourable to the accused.

5. Because on the 5th, 6th, and 7th charges, it is very difficult to say whether the Presbytery admit, as Mr. B. did, that he denied the doctrine of the Standards. It is painfully difficult to know what their decision is under these heads; and particularly on the 7th, they certainly do not seem to have denied or acknowledged the doctrine that Adam's posterity are guilty, i. e. liable to punishment on account of Adam's sin.

Why did not the Presbytery give an unequivocal sentence here? On these three charges, where every attentive hearer of his defence must know that Mr. B. admitted his denial and rejection of the doctrine of our Standards, and where he set up his defence on the ground of Scripture and his own metaphysics, in opposition to them. I am constrained to think, the main efforts of the Presbytery have been expended in throwing darkness and obscurity around the subject, and "so they will put it up."

This reason I may extend to each one of the charges, and the Presbytery's action on them. Three questions naturally arose on each. 1. Is the thing charged proved by the testimony? 2. Is it contrary to the Standards? 3. Is it contrary to the Bible? Now the prosecutor humbly concedes he had a right to a decision on each of them. This he respectfully requested in a letter addressed to the Presbytery, but was refused.

6. Because an inaccurate statement in the 8th reason of this decision, was, perhaps, partly the ground of this decision, viz. "Because the prosecutor did not attempt to show in what the proper penalty of the law consisted." Now the prosecutor did show, from the Confession and the Bible, that the proper penalty of the law consisted in death. "Thou shalt surely die"—that it consisted in the curse—the wrath of God—which things include sorrows, anguish and woes intolerably inflicted upon the Saviour by the righteous judgment of God the Father, because his own Son bore the sin of his people, (by legal imputation) in his own body on the tree.

7. Because of a similar inaccuracy in the 10th reason, viz. that "the evidence submitted on the part of the prosecution—was that of inferences drawn from Mr. B.'s language." Now the appellant, humbly concedes that he submitted the language itself of Mr. B., as the testimony and the evidence in the case. He submitted all the passages read, and their adjoining contexts respectively. These were the evidence, and it is believed they contain proof.

8. Because one member of the court at least, distinctly rejected the Standards of the church, as a rule of judgment in the case. He said the Confession had been twice in wrong places. It was not a trap to catch heretics. He said as good a right to bring charges against a man for holding doctrines contrary to Ridgley's Body of Divinity, and the Bible, or contrary to the Christian Alliance, and the Bible, as the present prosecutor had to charge Mr. B. with holding doctrines contrary to the Confession of Faith and the Bible. It is true, he next day apologized, by saying he did not mean to disparage the Confession of Faith. But then his speech was at least partly written. It was deliberately and strongly expressed, whereas the apology was obviously a mere effort, for popular effect. Now, the more of the judges were of this sentiment, I cannot say. I believe, however, there be some even never Presbyterians, than this anti-confession brother. But one thing is obvious, viz. that such doctrine effectually precludes a fair and impartial trial.

9. Because the Presbytery took Mr. B.'s present declarations as expository of the meaning of his language adduced in proof. "I think this will be evident upon a simple reading of the passages of his book quoted as testimony, and the decision of the court." During the whole trial, it appeared plain to me, that he was in a state of confusion, and the only legitimate exponent of his own printed words; and in support of this, it was alleged, that he knew best what was his own meaning.

Now the appellant believes that the court itself was the only authorized expositor. They had no right to take the present views of the party at the bar; nor his present gloss upon his own words, formerly uttered, as their correct meaning. They were bound simply to weigh the words according to their obvious meaning in their connection, and according to the usages of the language. The question left to them was not (forgotten not to have been) what does Mr. B. now say, or deny? Not, what does he now say he taught then? But simply, what has he taught here in this book?

Every candid mind must perceive, that if a man shall be permitted to give his own explanation to his own words, no man can ever be convicted of holding error, unless he be stupid as to be unable to distinguish between truth and error, and to suffer down and explain away his own terms. A very small portion of talent for mystification can gloss over the most obvious terms. For example: An action of slander is brought against me, for uttering the words—"I saw O. P. Q. in a state of intoxication, at a public dinner on the 4th of July." It is proved that I pronounced these words, and that I am not on friendly terms with O. P. Q. I put in a plea of justification, and claim the privilege of explaining. I show both from my habits of speaking and writing, that I have used the term intoxication, in application to high mental excitement. The man was intoxicated with joy. This is all I meant. It was a compliment. I was simply representing the strong patriotic feeling of O. P. Q.; he was intoxicated with joy upon a reminiscence of the glorious transactions this day commemorates. Or, I show that I have been in the habit of abusing Pennsylvania as a drunken State, and I mean nothing more than that I saw O. P. Q. in Pennsylvania that day. What the court and jury take my explanation, and find

me a verdict or will they judge for themselves, what my language means? Will they receive as authority, my present testimony, in my own defence; or will they ascertain by other scales, the weight of the words proved?

"[This, I take it, is the grand error of the Presbytery, as to the ground of their decision. They made Mr. B. both witness and judge in his own case, by a gratuitous assumption of his present views, and his present exposition of his language formerly uttered, and now adduced in proof, as being undoubtedly the true and proper sense of that language; and of his doctrines then published. Accordingly, notwithstanding he had said in his defence, 'the doctrine of all sinning in Adam, and falling with him, I mean to reject,' the Presbytery acquitted him on the ground of his oft-repeated declaration, that he agreed with his accuser in the substantial facts of the case.]

All these considerations, and some others, conspire to sustain me in the conviction, that my tenth and last, and principal reason of appeal is just and true, viz:

10. Because the decision of the Presbytery is not in accordance with the facts of the case, as exhibited in the charges and the testimony and the Law of God, and a righteous decision.

All which is respectfully submitted, by Your unworthy brother in the Lord,
GEO. JUNKIN.

For the Southern Religious Telegraph.

THE USE OF WINE IN THE BIBLE.

[The following remarks were suggested by an article which appeared in the N. Y. Evangelist, a few weeks since, and for circumstances beyond the writer's control, would have been forwarded to that paper. It is hoped therefore that the Editor of the Evangelist will still consider them as written for his periodical and insert them accordingly.]

A writer in the Evangelist of June 27th on "the duty of the churches in relation to the use of fermented wines in the Eucharist," has, I apprehend, fallen into a mistake respecting among the Jews, of the O. T. Now, that this subject is attracting so much attention, and especially, since this particular view is creating some little excitement among the friends of Temperance, every argument drawn from the Bible, should be based on correct interpretations of scripture. The writer in the Evangelist, if I correctly understand him, presents this view: It is wrong to use in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper any alcoholic wine. The Bible however clearly recognizes an innocent use of wine. But, he would reply, the Hebrew Bible makes a distinction as to the wine.

One kind, there designated by the word *tiros*, is not only innocent, but is recommended among the blessings of God's people and is allowed to the children of Israel. See Deut. 7: 13. 11: 14. 14: 23. It was prayed for by Isaac, as a blessing to be bestowed on Jacob. Gen. 27: 25, 27. The other, on the contrary, called *yayin*, to which the reader will perceive a similarity in the Greek *oinos*, the Latin *vinum*, or the English *wine*, is represented as a prohibited article—toxicating, demoralizing, and deleterious, in the highest degree. Now if such a distinction exists, it is worthy of our attention. If *tiros* or *must*, a mere syrup, may be used with impunity, while *yayin*, a fermented oil, should not be touched, and it be clearly established that our Saviour used the former, then the case is to my mind a clear one. It will be at least the safe side, to abandon fermented liquors and procure even for the communion service, an article of a more innocent character. But these things have not been established by the writer, for.

1. *Yayin* is used in Deut. 14: 26, as synonymous with *tiros* in v. 23. God commands (or permits, if this term is preferred) the Israelites to eat, in the place which He should choose to put his name there, the tithe of corn and of wine (*tiros*) and oil, and so on. But should they distance from the temple, prevent them from carrying these things to it, then were they to convert the tithe into money, and buy whatsoever they loved for, (desired) oxen or sheep, or wine (*yayin*) or strong drink, and should eat there and so on.

2. In Judges 9: 13. Wine (*tiros*) is said to cheer God and man. Now, without staying to explain this passage, or even to show, that it constitutes a part of Gotham's Fable, it is not necessary a Bible truth, any more than any other sentiment of ungodly men related in the Bible.—3. Because of a similar inaccuracy in the 10th reason, viz. that "the evidence submitted on the part of the prosecution—was that of inferences drawn from Mr. B.'s language." Now the appellant, humbly concedes that he submitted the language itself of Mr. B., as the testimony and the evidence in the case. He submitted all the passages read, and their adjoining contexts respectively. These were the evidence, and it is believed they contain proof.

8. Because one member of the court at least, distinctly rejected the Standards of the church, as a rule of judgment in the case. He said the Confession had been twice in wrong places. It was not a trap to catch heretics. He said as good a right to bring charges against a man for holding doctrines contrary to Ridgley's Body of Divinity, and the Bible, or contrary to the Christian Alliance, and the Bible, as the present prosecutor had to charge Mr. B. with holding doctrines contrary to the Confession of Faith and the Bible. It is true, he next day apologized, by saying he did not mean to disparage the Confession of Faith. But then his speech was at least partly written. It was deliberately and strongly expressed, whereas the apology was obviously a mere effort, for popular effect. Now, the more of the judges were of this sentiment, I cannot say. I believe, however, there be some even never Presbyterians, than this anti-confession brother. But one thing is obvious, viz. that such doctrine effectually precludes a fair and impartial trial.

9. Because the Presbytery took Mr. B.'s present declarations as expository of the meaning of his language adduced in proof. "I think this will be evident upon a simple reading of the passages of his book quoted as testimony, and the decision of the court." During the whole trial, it appeared plain to me, that he was in a state of confusion, and the only legitimate exponent of his own printed words; and in support of this, it was alleged, that he knew best what was his own meaning.

Now the appellant believes that the court itself was the only authorized expositor. They had no right to take the present views of the party at the bar; nor his present gloss upon his own words, formerly uttered, as their correct meaning. They were bound simply to weigh the words according to their obvious meaning in their connection, and according to the usages of the language. The question left to them was not (forgotten not to have been) what does Mr. B. now say, or deny? Not, what does he now say he taught then? But simply, what has he taught here in this book?

Every candid mind must perceive, that if a man shall be permitted to give his own explanation to his own words, no man can ever be convicted of holding error, unless he be stupid as to be unable to distinguish between truth and error, and to suffer down and explain away his own terms. A very small portion of talent for mystification can gloss over the most obvious terms. For example: An action of slander is brought against me, for uttering the words—"I saw O. P. Q. in a state of intoxication, at a public dinner on the 4th of July." It is proved that I pronounced these words, and that I am not on friendly terms with O. P. Q. I put in a plea of justification, and claim the privilege of explaining. I show both from my habits of speaking and writing, that I have used the term intoxication, in application to high mental excitement. The man was intoxicated with joy. This is all I meant. It was a compliment. I was simply representing the strong patriotic feeling of O. P. Q.; he was intoxicated with joy upon a reminiscence of the glorious transactions this day commemorates. Or, I show that I have been in the habit of abusing Pennsylvania as a drunken State, and I mean nothing more than that I saw O. P. Q. in Pennsylvania that day. What the court and jury take my explanation, and find

me a verdict or will they judge for themselves, what my language means? Will they receive as authority, my present testimony, in my own defence; or will they ascertain by other scales, the weight of the words proved?

"[This, I take it, is the grand error of the Presbytery, as to the ground of their decision. They made Mr. B. both witness and judge in his own case, by a gratuitous assumption of his present views, and his present exposition of his language formerly uttered, and now adduced in proof, as being undoubtedly the true and proper sense of that language; and of his doctrines then published. Accordingly, notwithstanding he had said in his defence, 'the doctrine of all sinning in Adam, and falling with him, I mean to reject,' the Presbytery acquitted him on the ground of his oft-repeated declaration, that he agreed with his accuser in the substantial facts of the case.]

previously used with his disciples in the paschal supper. Read Deut. 14: 23, 26, with Matt. 26: 26, 7 and 50, in which last place we find it said, "And he took the cup." What cup? What did it contain? On what occasion had they assembled? These questions I merely throw out in connection with the passage in Deut. respecting the paschal supper. But wine was evidently on the table, and the inference is, that it had been used.

I did not intend to write so much. I would like to examine some remarks of the writer more fully, especially those relating to the Rechabites and Nazarenes. If he will read Jer. 35th, attentively, he may find himself mistaken with reference to God's approval of them for not using wine. I should say from the use the prophet makes of the circumstance, as an illustration, that he referred to their *constancy*, and that only.

I have not made these remarks from any disposition to hold on to wine. I abhor and advocate abstinence, because I wish, like Paul, to be willing "to eat no meat while the world stands, if so doing I cause my brother to offend." And so long as my using wine may lead others astray, I am willing to give it up. It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother is offended. Ro. 14: 21. But I fear extremes, and the bold stand some are taking in refusing to use it in celebrating the Lord's Supper, admonishes us to be careful. My sole design in these remarks, has been to correct a mistake which I find has been copied without remark into two of our leading Temperance papers, and which if uncorrected, must do mischief among those who have no opportunities to investigate the subject. I believe the Bible ground respecting wine is, that its moderate use is safe; its excessive, sinful and dangerous. I believe, moreover, that many of the wines manufactured in America, and also many that are imported, contain as much alcohol as rum today or mint julep, and are equally to be deprecated. But I will not, for this reason, say that all fermented liquors, because they contain alcohol or the intoxicating principle, carry with their use, moral turpitude.

BENJ'N M. SMITH.
Union Theol. Sem. Aug. 1835.

WANT OF MINISTERS IN THE CANADAS.

The following deplorable picture of the religious condition of the Canadas, is from Dr. Reed's and Matheson's forthcoming Journal.

From Montreal, Dr. Matheson descended the mighty St. Lawrence to Quebec, with a view to obtain information respecting the state of religion in the Lower Province. The report which he gives is truly deplorable. The population of Lower Canada is now estimated at 600,000 of whom 400,000 are Roman Catholics, having 150 priests and 140,000 Protestants having about 65 ministers. The above enumeration gives less than one minister to every two thousand souls.

"But this calculation," says Dr. Matheson, "by no means affords a correct view of the real state of the colony. More than one half of the whole number of preachers is to be found in the cities and towns. In such places, the proportion may be more than one minister for two thousand Protestants, but this leaves a still smaller number for the townships newly settled. When it is also considered that the population of these districts is widely scattered, and that, in addition to this, the roads are exceedingly imperfect, we cannot but perceive that, with such a small number of preachers, the religious destitution of the people must be very great."

"Indeed, there is one township which has been settled five years, where no sermon has yet been preached; and in another, which has been settled a much longer time, there has been no preaching for seven years! In short, there is hardly one-sixth of the supply of ministers provided for the religious instruction of the whole of the Protestant population, to say nothing of the non-efficient instruction among the Protestants, the state of things among the Roman Catholic, who form the bulk of the population, is still worse."

"The great object of their priests is, to retain them in the errors and superstitions of Popery. The peasantry are, in general, a quiet and contented race; but grossly ignorant, not only of the great doctrines of Christianity, but even of the first rudiments of knowledge, very few of them being able to read. They are entirely under the spiritual domination of many blindly attached to the worst corruptions of Christianity. No ray of scriptural light has yet penetrated the thick darkness that surrounds that part of the population. The Scriptures are excluded, and Protestant teachers are not allowed to instruct the ignorant, if the priests can prevent it; and their power over the minds of the people is almost omnipotent. Some years ago a French Protestant, acting as a missionary under the patronage of the Methodist denomination, made an attempt to instruct them, but he was repulsed in such a manner, by the efforts of the priests, that he did not remain long among them."

"Upper Canada contains about 320,000 inhabitants, of whom very few are Roman Catholics. There are about 160 ministers of different denominations, viz: forty Episcopalians, fifty Methodists, thirty-four Presbyterians, thirty Baptists, and six Congregationalists. This would give, on the average, one minister to 2000 souls; but, as in the Lower Province, they are very unequally distributed, at least one-half being fixed in the towns. The population is rapidly increasing by emigration, and no steps have been taken to provide the requisite supply of additional teachers. Dr. Matheson says that the duty of furnishing the colonies with suitable religious instruction must be regarded as one of the most important of the Christian Church in this country; and he eloquently pleads the strong claim which their spiritual necessities have upon all the evangelical denominations of Britain."

"Persons from all these communities of Christians have settled in these provinces. They have gone from the congregations of Episcopalians, the societies of Methodists, the churches of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists. A necessity was laid upon them to seek support for their families; they would gladly have remained at home, no discontent with the civil institutions of their country drove them away. It appeared to be the path of duty, and trying as it was to leave the loved associations of early life and of matured affection, yet they submitted to the providential arrangement, and went. They have left behind them relatives, friends, and neighbors. They have forsaken external privileges, and religious enjoyments, and they and their children are in danger of suffering for lack of knowledge. Look at these claims of country and kindred, of family and friends, of Christian duty, and say if the present condition of the Canadas is not a reproach to the Christians of Great Britain."

"There is a touching account of an interview which Dr. Matheson had with a family of settlers whom he had known in England; the aged mother, a minister's daughter, vented her feelings of deep maternal solicitude on account of her children, growing up without religious ordinances, without a sanctuary. Fixing her streaming eyes on the welcomed visitor, she exclaimed with the most moving earnestness: 'Oh! if the Christians of England only knew our situation, and that of thousands around us, they would not rest satisfied till they sent men out to preach the Gospel to us. If they only knew a mother's grief at seeing her children growing up without the means of grace, would they not feel for us? Would they not send us help? Do tell them of our case, and of that many around us, who would willingly attend the preaching of good men of any denomination.' Her parting words were: 'Do not forget us; do tell the good people at home, how much we need their sympathy and their prayers. Such an appeal speaks more loudly than any argument. It is a voice crying across the ocean, 'Come over and help us,' to disregard which were disobedience to Heaven."

Death of a Missionary.—Mrs. Matilda C. Dean, wife of the Rev. William Dean, Baptist Missionary to Siam, died at Singapore, on the 5th of March, 1835, aged 21 years, leaving an infant daughter of about three weeks old. Mr. and Mrs. Dean, it will be recollected, sailed in the ship Cashmere from the port of Boston, with Mr and Mrs. Wade and others, on the 2d of July, 1834.

A correspondent of the Boston Recorder writes from France as follows:

RELIGION IN FRANCE.

Rejection of Voltaire—acknowledgments of Providence—the Duc de Broglie—Guizot—death of the Revue Encyclopedique—respect for the Bible, and ignorance of its contents.

May 29.—Another of the favorable signs is, that the enlightened men of the nation so generally acknowledge what is called here "the religious sentiment." This means differently, according to the character of the person who uses it. It should suppose that those who have a considerable idea of what they do mean by it, wish to acknowledge the existence of a God, with certain general attributes, and that one ought to cultivate a certain degree of worship towards him. And this admission is a great change compared with twenty-five years since. A writer who had said in one line, "I well organized society there is no want of religion. I do not wish the natural sentiment of religion to be done away, but let every man keep it to himself,"—in the next, expressly reproaches what he calls the "irreligious sallies of Voltaire, and the satires of Diderot." Now, comparatively, would wish to have themselves to be his disciples. The materialist, even, would wish to go elsewhere for authority. The mechanical philosophy finds no defenders at the Sorbonne, whatever other errors may be found there. A work founded on the Voltairean philosophy was lately offered at the Institute of France, by a candidate for the prize of Monthyon. Many members arose and declared against such a perversion. Among them were Royer Collard, Cousin, Villain and Jay. Cousin said, "It is impossible to establish society upon the basis of the philosophy of the eighteenth century. There is for us, no other base, and that is Catholicism." Royer Collard said, between me and the man who would look for liberty in revolution, there is a vast abyss." Mr. Thiers, one of the king's ministers, while defending the claim of the United States, said that "a kind providence" had brought to light such a document. Many were uttered at hearing such unusual language in the Chamber, uttered with freedom and honesty of heart. He repeated it again, then and since, and defended his use of the word. A few days after, came the birth day of the king, when all the authorities came to him, to present him their congratulations. One half at least of the addresses to him, as well as the bulk of the providence. It is plain that those were not every day phrases that indicate nothing, for the opposition journals mocked the government for its alleged hypocrisy.

The men now at the head of the government are men to whom the philanthropist can look with more confidence than to any preceding administration. The President of the Council, the Duc de Broglie, a Protestant,—is the advocate of liberal opinions, of general education, of the abolition of slavery. Guizot, the minister of public instruction, is the author of the History of France, designed to inculcate from history the importance of free institutions, Editor of the French Edition of Gibbon's works, which contains notes by way of antidote to its infidelity. He also is a Protestant, & before he was in office, devoted part of his time to the direct support of the church. The books for primary instruction, circulated through his instrumentality, emanate from sources determined at least to exclude all that can be pernicious. The "book of moral and religious instruction," so extensively used throughout France, is the work of an evangelical Christian. In their co-operation with Mr. Thiers, Dupin, and Maitton, there is every prospect of stability and order, and in the meantime, of the progress of knowledge and ameliorating institutions.

Another encouraging sign is in the death of the "Revue Encyclopedique." This journal was conducted on a more magnificent scale than any journal in Paris—four or five large volumes a year. But the presiding spirits opposed Christianity, and had the foolishness to pronounce Christianity dead. The community of educated men would not support them. It dwindled away to few subscribers, gave its last gasp against the form before it, that it had pronounced dead, and ceased for always. Several periodicals were found ready to attack the spirit and matter of its last attack against Christianity. It is indeed a striking fact, to see how extensively, in all these monthly periodicals, questions are agitated relating to Christianity. Innumerable are the articles on the bearing of the Reformation, on German Rationalism, on the Prospects of the religion in France, on their various forms of Spiritual Philosophy. But after you have read a few, it becomes painful to see the same continued pride, that urges them to reject every thing that is positive in Christianity, and to see the same restlessness of mind, that after all cannot be satisfied without something positive. They are looking forward to a glorious future of earthly felicity, arising from a prevalence of religion. They may not see it, but their posterity will. And each one, with a taper or a torch is groping about, looking for truth on the earth, instead of above, where Christ is. They stand at all degrees of distance from Christianity. One admits one truth, one another; one worships in his closet, another in church; one is desperately Orthodox, another is all for interior faith (mysticism). But few know what it is, to simply love and obey the Lord Jesus. A Catholic Priest told a Protestant a short time since, "you have thrown more light in my mind in this short conversation upon what are the real requirements of God, than I have learnt before in all my life. I never before knew that there were any persons on earth, who had a kind of faith like yours and that of those Christians whom you have described to me."

It is much the same with twenty modern writers whom I could name, who seem to be searching for truth with as much sincerity and honesty as does even the proud human heart, unrenewed by the gospel. They are in a land called Christianity, where are churches and preachers; but after all, they seem to have no true notion of what Christianity is. They need to be enlightened on what are the first principles of the oracles of God, as much, almost, as do those who have the gospel brought to them by the foreign missionary.

There is a great profession of respect among many for the Bible. They are not prepared to acknowledge it as the word of God, or as a rule of faith. It is a sort of enthusiastic admiration for it, like that of an artist for a picture, or of a poet for Homer or Milton. The same man will fall into raptures about the wisdom of Confucius and the wisdom of Moses and Solomon. But even this is a great change. Formerly nobody read the Bible, comparatively. Twenty years ago, three commissioners from England searched in all the book stores of Paris, and found not a single copy of the Bible in the language of the people. It is not so very common on a book of sale even now. Hence there is an ignorance of the contents of the Bible, incredible to one who does not reflect on the circumstances. I remember a young man who had completed his studies in the university here, who knew not if there was an Apocrypha, or the Book of Isaiah. The same man quoted passages in Latin from the Bible. But this signifies nothing; for even the most ignorant peasant can sometimes repeat by rote the Lord's prayer in Latin, not knowing what it means. They have so often heard it in church, that they cannot help learning it.

I have not room to speak on this sheet of modern French philosophy, and fear I shall not find time to speak of it as carefully as I could wish. There is a sort of distinguished men, who show their confidence in Christianity as the only remedy for existing evils, who yet would not confess that they believed in the fundamental truths of themselves, men who would that all might govern themselves by Christianity, but they themselves never assist at mass. It was reported to me by a credible authority concerning Cousin, that after he had been discoursing before an audience on enthusiasm, he, according to custom, requested those who had any questions to ask to send them up in writing. On one was written by a hearer, "Was Christ, then, an Enthusiast?" M. Cousin declined to answer, and requested the writer to give him a private conversation.

NEW BOOKS.

THE Origin and History of Missions; containing faithful accounts of the voyages, travels, labors and successes of the various Missionaries, who have been sent forth to evangelize the heathen; compiled from authentic documents; forming a complete Missionary Repository—illustrated by numerous engravings, from original drawings made expressly for this work. By the Rev. Thomas Smith, minister of Trinity Chapel, London, and Rev. John O. Choules, A. M. Newport, R. I.—2 vols. 8vo.

History of the Reformed Religion in France. By the Rev. Edward Smalley, A. M.—3 vols., with a portrait of Theodore Beza.

On the Extent of the Atonement, in its relation to God and the Universe. By Thomas W. Jenkens—with an introduction, by Rev. Daniel L. Carroll, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. From the London edition.

Christian Union; or, an argument for the abolition of sects. By Abraham Van Dyck, counsellor at law.—To which is prefixed, a sketch of the life of the author.

Daily Duties, incalculable in a series of letters, addressed to the wife of a clergyman. By Mrs. Adams, author of Parlor Lectures, &c. &c.