

Correspondence.

FRANCIS MAKEMIE AND THE QUAKER KEITH.

BY REV. E. H. GILLET, D.D.

It is natural that all who take an interest in the history of the Presbyterian Church in this country, should welcome any new facts concerning its father and founder, Rev. Francis Makemie. His zeal and energy in crossing the ocean and in visiting New England, in order to secure fellow-laborers to assist him in his broad field, are well-known, and we have quite a full account of his arrest, imprisonment, and trial, for having preached a sermon in the city of New York. But little is known of his early history.

From a volume of his, in reply to the Quaker, George Keith, who had attacked a catechism, which he had drawn up for the instruction of the young, we have gathered some interesting facts. Keith had troubled the Quakers greatly. In Philadelphia (1691), he headed a party among them, which was opposed bitterly by Thomas Lloyd, President and Deputy Governor of the Colony, and twenty-seven other "pretended" Quaker preachers. He had urged them to publish "their fundamental truths and principles as a confession of their faith," a thing which had never yet been done. The project was vexatious and exasperating, and the opposing parties called each other hard names. Keith charged his opponents with partiality, ignorance, and unbelief. They styled him the Reviler and Accuser of the brethren out of Babylon, Father Confessor, Pope, and Primate of Pennsylvania. He complained of their loose discipline, and drew up a plan for rendering it more strict. It was in vain that a committee from London endeavored to promote peace. They condemned Keith for the separation, and pronounced woes upon him. He replied by calling the whole meeting "ignorant heathen," and saying, in answer to their teachings, that "if there is light sufficient to salvation in all men without the man Christ, then an honest heathen is a true Christian."

Keith now broke off from the Society, and set up a meeting of his own, first at his own house, and afterward at the "Barbadoes House," in Philadelphia. He issued several pamphlets, and succeeded in securing a decision of the New Jersey Quakers in his favor. The meeting in Maryland, however, decided against him. But he was not a man to submit quietly to an adverse judgment. He traveled abroad to defend himself and propagate his views. He extended his journeys northward into New England, to the disquiet of the Boston ministers, including the two Mather's, and southward to Maryland and Virginia, where he came in contact with Makemie. The very grounds upon which he differed from his Quaker brethren, and the plausibility with which he commended them to persons outside of his own sect, rendered him more dangerous as an aggressor. In Maryland he met with Makemie's catechism, and unhesitatingly arraigned it for errors and omissions, placing his strictures in the hands of one of Makemie's people. Makemie could not remain silent. He drew up his answer, which was published at Boston in 1694, by Benjamin Harris. It bore the "Imprimatur" of Increase Mather, and is commended as the "seasonable and profitable" work of its "Reverend and Judicious Author," by the Boston ministers, Increase Mather, James Allen, Samuel Millard, John Baily, and Cotton Mather.

Makemie says in this book—and the words were verified in his subsequent imprisonment in New York, at the instance of Lord Cornbury—"I have greater and better work than controversy to follow; but, in the strength of the Lord, shall not only defend my principles still by writing, but if called thereunto, shall readily seal them with my blood." Against Keith he defends his catechism with signal ability, and in doing so, gives us some important facts in his own life. Keith had charged that Makemie in his catechism had mentioned nothing "of his own experience of the work of God in his heart." To this Makemie replies—"I am constrained to justify my office from these uncharitable calumnies, and that grace might be magnified by giving this relation in the sight of an All-seeing and Omnipotent God, that ere I received the imposition of hands in scriptural and orderly separation unto my holy and ministerial calling, that I gave requiring (requisite?) satisfaction to godly, learned, judicious, discerning men of a work of grace and conversion wrought on my heart at fifteen years of age, by and from the pains of a godly school-master, who used no small diligence in giving souls to God's service and fear; since which time, to the glory of his free grace be it spoken, I have had the sure experiences of God's various dealings with me, according to his infinite and unerring wisdom, to my unspeakable comfort, whereby all may see how far grace is expected and desired, with gifts to qualify for the ministerial office; for not only was this required of me, but it is expected of all ordained by presbyters."

Keith had asserted that Makemie regarded ministerial maintenance as a main thing. "Let the reader," replies Makemie, "examine my catechism, and he shall not find ground for this malicious reflection; for it is expressed in as few words as any other duty, without insisting thereon, and this was the ex-

pression of an absolute stranger to me, and my practice in relation to a maintenance, to which I am bold to assert I have been ever denied as Keith, or any of his brethren. And whatever others have done, I dare affirm, I never bargained with any people about a maintenance, and have oft refused money when freely offered, and never enjoyed any maintenance but what was most freely offered to me, though I deny not to the magistrate a power of determining maintenance, when necessity requires it."

Makemie elsewhere insists on the propriety of a competent maintenance for ministers, that they may not be entangled or encumbered with secular affairs, or diverted from their holy calling. But from his language we may infer that he provided for his own support by the profits of the commercial transactions in which he is said to have been employed, and was thus enabled to preach the Gospel free of charge. He speaks of the deplorable ignorance of the people of Virginia, and refers to the language addressed to him by Daniel Acres, a Quaker preacher in North Carolina, who said that it bordered on blasphemy to call the Scriptures the Word of God. He refers also to his experience among the Quakers of Barbadoes, and to a preacher whom, he says, "I lately saw in London." His repeated mention of the slanders uttered by the Quakers against the New England ministers, manifests his strong sympathy with them; and the references he makes to the writings of the English Puritans, as Alleine, Coles, Burgess, &c., indicate plainly enough the theological treatises with which he was most familiar.

In the course of his reply to Keith, he sets forth quite distinctly and fully his doctrinal views. He vindicates the language of his catechism on the Trinity, on the sole and supreme authority of the Scriptures, on the offices of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King, on "the most unanimous and received doctrine of the Reformed churches, that whom Christ died for, he absolutely and completely redeemed, and that was, some select and chosen number, given Him of God the Father," on the perseverance of the Saints, the sanctity of the Sabbath, &c. The endorsement which the work received from the Boston ministers shows how fully they agreed with Makemie in the main points which he vindicated.

It is evident that Makemie's relations to the Dissenters in an around London, and to the ministers of Boston, were quite friendly and intimate. Through them he sought to obtain laborers for the destitute field around him in Maryland and North Carolina, and possibly in Virginia. His repeated visits to London, his extensive acquaintance in Old and New England, and the evident respect which his character and abilities commanded, indicate his peculiar fitness for the difficult part which, as pioneer of the Presbyterian Church in this country, he was called to fill, and which he filled so efficiently and so wisely.

THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL PERIODICALS OF GERMANY.

In this article, and two or more to follow, we propose to give a general view of the theological, and ecclesiastical periodicals of Germany. We shall follow, in the main, the classification and details of a series of articles published in the *Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* during the first three months of the present year.

The whole mass of such periodicals may obviously be divided into Protestant and Roman Catholic. And in each division we may make subdivisions into rationalistic or heterodox, positive and rigidly orthodox. In point of number, the advantage is slightly with the Roman Catholic periodicals, and they exhibit, moreover, greater unanimity than the Protestant, but the latter are far more influential, owing to the superior scientific and literary ability with which they are conducted.

The first thing to be noticed concerning the rationalistic portion of the Protestant periodical press, is the great change which fifty years have wrought, in its numbers and influence. At the opening of the present century it had well nigh an exclusive supremacy; now it is represented by only three principal publications, with a few others of inferior grade. And not one of the three first-class organs of this tendency is so exclusively rationalistic as to refuse the co-operation of a more positive school.

First under this subdivision may be mentioned Hilgenfeld's, "*Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*," an organ, as the name imports, of scientific theology of the rationalistic type. It appeared in 1858, as a continuation of Bau's and Zeller's "*Theologisches Jahrbuch*," but with important modifications for the better. It evidently is intended to pass over by slow stages to a more positive belief. Next, we have the "*Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*," the organ of that theological party, known as the Schleiermacher Left. It has been published at Berlin for eleven years. The editor is Dr. H. Krause, who has several assistants, the most prominent of whom is Dr. A. Schweizer, of Zurich; the most learned of all Schleiermacher's pupils of this party. Credner, of Geissen, and Jonas, of Berlin, have been among its contributors. Several of the more recent articles have shown a tendency towards the Schleiermacher Centre by admitting the reality of the Christian miracles; but in general, the tone is completely negative. It denies of Christianity all that is supernatural, and is unfavorable to all church forms of Christian life, thus reviving the vulgar rationalism of earlier

times. The tone of its criticism is bitterly destructive. It is an oracle for "liberals," and "friends of progress," and exerts throughout the Austrian empire an unwholesome influence which no German organ has been able to counteract. The third leading periodical of this class is Dr. Schenkel's "*Allgemeine Kirchliche Zeitschrift*." Through its columns, Dr. Schenkel advocates the reconstruction of the whole Christian Church on the basis of the Parish. It is to be recommended for its full and ingenious notices of new works, and for its quarterly chronicle of events in both Church and state. It is now in the sixth year of its existence. Besides these three leading periodicals, there are others of secondary and purely local significance; the "*Süddeutsche evangelisch-protestantische Wochenblätter*," which espouses Schenkel's church democracy, and gives the latest results of the negative criticism to the sympathizers in Baden and Pfalz; the "*Prophet der Gegenwart*," conducted by an association of the clergy of Weimar, Turingen and Hesse; and the "*Zeitstimmen*," which reflects the pantheistic naturalism of the theological faculty of Zurich.

Passing now to the periodicals of the positive Protestant type, it is to be noticed that they are more than three times as numerous as the heterodox. For the "*Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*," there are three corresponding positive organs; for Schenkel's and Hilgenfeld's publications, there are at least six or eight of no less scientific importance; for the local press, there are five or six times as many. The term "positive" is necessarily used with considerable latitude, so that we may group the periodicals of this type according to the degree in which they are positive.

In the first group we embrace four leading periodicals, which are not so decidedly positive, but represent the party known as the Schleiermacher Right. These are (1.) "*Gelzer's Protestantische Monatsblätter*," published since 1852, by Dr. H. Gelzer, Professor of History and Literature, assisted by Dörner, J. P. Lange, Hagenbach, Schlottmann, and others. It is devoted to the inner history of the times, opposing, on the one hand, Romish superstition and hierarchical assumption, and giving, on the other hand, information as to the task and labors of the Christian present in the foreign and inner missions. If sometimes, in opposing the strongly conservative tendencies of the Lutheran Church, it displays a bitterness like that seen in the publications of Krause and Schenkel, the well-known names of the editors are sufficient guaranty for its general Christian spirit. (2.) The "*Theologischen Studien und Kritiken*," which is the oldest and most honorable of all German periodicals devoted to theological science. For thirty-seven years it has maintained its standpoint, answering to the Schleiermacher positive school, or the so-called accommodation theology, without, however, in later years, excluding the co-operation of many strongly orthodox theologians. Dr. C. Ullmann was, until the present year, the principal editor. Umbreit, then Rothe, afterwards Hundesbagen and Richur, and at present Nitzsch, J. Müller and W. Beyschlag, appear as assistants. The last prospectus gives us assurance that it will continue to espouse the Gospel of the Scriptures without abridgment. (3.) "*Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*," first published in 1832, and since 1846 conducted by Christian W. Niedner, Professor of Christian History in Berlin. It is designed to enrich the domain of historical investigation by authentic statements of the component facts of the development of Church History, and by giving original records from both ancient and modern times. Ehrhard's sketch of the Culdee Church first appeared in this periodical. (4.) "*Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung*," a repository for the latest historical information and statistics of the Christian Church. It was founded in 1822, by G. Simmermann, at Darmstadt. Since then it has undergone many changes. Originally, it was the organ of pure rationalism; then of rational supra-naturalism; then of the unionistic accommodations, theology of a believing type; and now under the editorship of K. Zimmermann, is more positive, while not supporting the Confession. It leans towards the Gustav Adolph Verein, and is somewhat latitudinarian from employing writers of different schools. The "*Theologische Literaturblatt*," under the same management, is a weekly publication, devoted to book notices and criticism. After existing forty years, it is suffering from a falling off in the subscription list; a fact which points to a decline of interest in such subjects among the working clergy. Affiliated with the above are certain organs of an essentially practical tendency, as "*Botte des Gustav-Adolph Vereins*," by Zimmermann; also, "*Sonntagsfeier*," a monthly, devoted to pulpit eloquence and edification; and sundry other homiletical periodicals, as "*Homiletische Vierteljahrsschrift*," "*Pastoralblatt für die Evangelische Kirche*," by Pastor Oley, and others.

In the second group there are two leading periodicals. Many of the former class lean to this side, and it is hard to draw a line with precision. Yet a fundamental distinction is, that the organs of this second group hold to a firmer dogmatic basis, and are more energetic and lively in defending it against theological innovations. Their advocacy of union is also more intensely Christian in its character. While those of the former class advocate an undue or absorptive unionism on the footing of an accommodation theology, these

hold a union without absorption—a confederation or brotherhood of Christians, without merging minor differences in the great Christian life, namely, the foreign and inner missions. They are, (1.) "*Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie*," dating from 1856, edited by Dörner, Palmer, Weizsäcker, and others. This periodical reflects the Schleiermacher emotional theology as deepened and enriched by mystical speculative elements of Schelling's philosophy, and Veting's and Baader's theosophy. It is characterized by a careful elaboration of the christological dogma, and by a system of purely scientific apologetics. These features chiefly distinguish it from the "*Studien u. Kritiken*." The principal editors of "*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft und Christliches Leben*," have been associated with the above. The "*Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Evangelisch-theologische Forschung*," is a kind of appendage to the *Jahrbuch*. (2.) The "*Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*," is the organ of the Evangelical Alliance.

As such, it labors to promote a more intimate intercourse and more wholesome exchange between English and German theology, not in a specifically theological view, but taking in the whole range of ecclesiastical manifestations and interests. To this same group belong several homiletical publications, as "*Gesetz und Zeugnis*," by Pastors Leonardi and Zimmermann. Also several organs of the foreign and inner missions, as "*Evangelische Missions-Magazin*," published at Basel. "*Calwer Missionsblatt*," "*Friedensbote für Israel*," and the organ of the Gossner's mission, "*Biene auf dem Missionsfelde*."

A sketch of the Lutheran periodicals of rigidly confessional tendencies must be reserved for a future communication.

NAMES AND THINGS.

Disputes about words may seem to many but as "idle words"; but words are themselves things, and have a power of their own. "The word was with God," not only, but "was God."

Trench, in his "Study of Words" says, "When, at the beginning of our civil wars, the parliamentary party styled themselves 'The Godly,' and the royalists, 'The Malignants,' it is very certain that, wherever they could procure entrance for these words, the question upon whose side the right lay was already decided."

Now a great deal of the vacillating policy, and many of the mistakes made in the war against the great rebellion have arisen from the misuse of words. (2.) It was a long time before the people, and the Government, and the army, and especially officers of the regular army, whose profession and business was war, could realize that secession was rebellion. Almost necessarily, from their education, the latter looked upon the two armies as having equal rights and entitled to equal privileges, standing on an equal footing, and engaged merely in a trial of strength and skill; the right to be decided by the issue of the game which the two armies were playing.

When, early in the war, while a chaplain in the army, I advocated a more thorough policy, as against rebels who had forfeited every right by rebellion, a policy similar to that which was partially carried out by Sheridan in the Valley, it was a very common reply to me, "How would you like to have the Confederate army carry out that policy in Pennsylvania?" as though it was right for the rebel army to fight us if they would keep within the established usages of what is termed "honorable warfare." The question seemed to me like asking a sheriff who has just hung a condemned criminal, "How would you like a murderer to treat you in this way?" That which would be perfectly right for the officer of the law to do, would be but an additional crime in the other; so, that which would be perfectly right for the National army to do, would be an additional crime in the rebel forces who had already committed the all-embracing crime of rebellion.

The power of words and names is seen in the readiness with which the soldiers of the National army adopted the nick-name of "Yankees," so persistently applied to them by their enemies; and I have no question that, if Beauregard's order to call ours the "Abolition" army, and our soldiers, "Abolitionists," had been carried out, it would very speedily have made them abolitionists, which they certainly have never been. I have heard Germans who could scarcely speak English at all, and Irishmen with the most marked brogue, speak of themselves as Yankees with as much satisfaction as any New England man.

It is for this reason that I have never allowed myself to say "Federal army" and "Confederate army," but always, "National army" and "Rebel forces;" and while a prisoner in their hands, in conversation with rebel officers, I have said to them, "We are the national police, quelling a riot and putting down a mob." When you have said "Federal" and "Confederate," you have already given up so much by these "question-begging appellations," that there is nothing left worth fighting for; as when a man calling himself a "Baptist" offers to discuss the question of baptism with me, what is there left to discuss, if he is a Baptist and I am not?

So in the matter of constitutional rights, how much confusion there has been alike among loyal men and rebels, as though rebels had any rights left but the right to the gallows and the halter. I have met with rebels at their own

homes, where, with wonderful simplicity and forgetfulness of their position, they would speak of their rights under the Constitution, and what Mr. Lincoln had a right to do with them under that Constitution, as though their repudiation of that document had left them with the same rights and privileges as before.

The same want of a proper sense of the criminality of rebellion is seen in the greater indignation with which special acts of cruelty, as at Andersonville, or the murder of negro soldiers and their officers, or Champ Ferguson's crimes, are visited than the great crime which includes them all, and in the special hatred of these minor officials and tools of the great leaders, with perhaps a half unconscious admiration of those greater criminals, Lee and Davis.

And is not the Government itself beset by some such false estimate of crime, when it hastens to hang the would-be murderers of individual men, but hesitates to punish those who aimed at the nation's life, and waded in the blood of thousands that they might reach, if possible, the throat of the nation? And will the Government still seek to hide its punishment of him who has been the chief criminal of all, under the charge of complicity in the minor, though possibly more disgusting, crime of assassination?

What are these minor crimes of individual murder, starvation and mutilation, when once you are a rebel? What- ever is necessary to the success of the rebellion, is all easy when once the Rubicon is crossed.

Let things be called by their right names, and crimes be judged according to their heinousness, and let the immorality of wrong names be understood, and there will be less of crime. He who is proud to be a "partisan ranger" would be ashamed to be a "guerilla." D. G. M.

CIRCULAR LETTER OF HOLSTON PRESBYTERY.

Circular Letter addressed by Holston Presbytery to Presbyterian Ministers and Churches within its bounds.

Inasmuch as our action is very liable to be misconstrued, we deem it proper to lay before the churches and the public a more formal statement of the principles that govern our present movement.

We believe that no government has ever yet been in the world, that more clearly than ours recognized the great principles of liberty, justice, and equality. Our constitution is more thoroughly based upon the great principles of the Bible, than the fundamental law of any nation upon the globe. Hence the injunction, "to be subject to principalities and powers;" to make "supplication, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks for kings and for all that are in authority;" "to be subject unto the higher powers" as to "an ordinance of God." These injunctions fall with more force upon a subject of our government than they did upon those to whom they were originally addressed, dwelling as they did under the reign of the Roman Nero.

While the great Founder of the Heavenly Kingdom has prescribed no form of civil government to be adopted by the members of his kingdom; while mere political principles as such, are not made a test of discipleship; he does require obedience to the civil ruler. At the call of duty, the disciple of Christ can go into any kingdom and live under any government, but obedience to that government is required. And if obedience were required, when one of royal blood, and tyrant too, was upon the throne, much more do the Scriptures require obedience to a government recognizing the great principles of liberty, justice, and equality.

Hence we believe that men who have sought the overthrow of our Government, have committed a real sin, and that the Bible expressly condemns of sin; and that the ministers of religion, who helped to form the public sentiment which ripened into rebellion, and who gave that rebellion their sanction and their prayers, have committed a great wrong; a wrong so great as to require a full acknowledgment, and untiring effort to repair the mischief done.

Now, as a matter of fact, how few ministers of Southern sympathies do not claim to have been right in all they have done, and refuse to make any atonement for the evil of their course? Indeed, they claim their full rights under a government, which, for four long years, they have sought to destroy, and for whose destruction they have earnestly prayed. At the hands which they have wished might be paralyzed, they claim protection and freedom.

Accordingly, we urge these, our mistaken brethren, to confess the wrong they have done, and to "surrender unconditionally." We think that it would be in much better taste for them to come back, like the prodigal son, and ask to live under our Government upon any terms that might reasonably be prescribed, than to demand rights which they have forfeited.

It is alleged, that this would be moral suicide; that ministers pursuing such a course would annihilate themselves. Not, certainly, if they are dead already. If their ability to do good with the predominant part of the population of this land is gone; if they have lost their influence with the men who have borne the nation's flag above the dust and smoke of battle, nothing that they can do can more completely slay them.

And when we ask them to restrain from the functions of their office, so long

as their brethren might think necessary for the honor of religion, we only ask them to take one step towards reinstating themselves in the confidence of the community. And when we refuse the right hand of fellowship, we do not presume to bar the gates of life against them. We only say that we cannot sanction their unscriptural conduct. God is their judge, and not we. If they can find others that are like minded, and that will fellowship with them, we have no disposition to interfere with their enjoyments, should the rulers of the land see fit to grant them the privilege of performing the functions of their office.

With a view of palliating the wrong that they have done, it is alleged that they have only preached the Gospel, and acted as subjects of Him who said that his kingdom was not of this world. Would that we could thus regard their conduct! Was it as members of Christ's spiritual kingdom that they so earnestly prayed for the President and Cabinet of these Confederate States, that all of their enemies, vandal hordes who were invading their homes, might be driven back—be put to shame—be smitten with confusion and blindness—bite the dust in death—and be utterly wasted? Was it as members of Christ's spiritual kingdom that they gave such eloquent exposition of prophecy, and brought Isaiah, David, and Daniel to the stand to foretell the great things of the Confederacy, and showed its success to be as certain as the existence of God? Was it as members of Christ's spiritual kingdom that they spoke words of approval to the enemies of our Government on the street, at the market, in the counting-room, in the parlor, in short, in every place where men talked over the news of the day? Did they, as members of Christ's spiritual kingdom, act as chaplains in the Southern cause, not confining themselves to the temporal and spiritual wants of the sick, the wounded, and the distressed, but oftentimes, with a chivalrous bravado, rushing forward into the fierce engagement, not afraid to send men into eternity unprepared?

No it is not against abstract opinions that we protest; but against action—decided action. We may be charged with producing schism in the church, and causing derision among brethren. This certainly does not come with a good grace from men who have encouraged brother to stand in fiery battle against brother, and son against father, and have wished that the chasm separating the friends and the enemies of South might open as wide and as deep as that between heaven and hell.

The former divisions in the Presbyterian Church we deplore, and we have seen and felt enough of their sad effects; but we cannot purchase harmony even among those with whom we have shared delightful labors and sacrifices, at the price of principle. It would not be the true way to build up the Church of Christ.

We hold and teach the grand old doctrines of the Confession of Faith, and we believe that system of truth to be scriptural, and the source of life and strength to the Church. The Assembly's Catechism we desire to have imprinted upon the mind of every child of our Sabbath-schools and congregations.

But sympathy with rebellion against our Government is no part of our creed, and we, with our feelings, are with the loyal portion of our population, who intend that this generation, and coming generations, shall understand that treason is a crime, and that it is no trifling matter to uphold and encourage the men who have occasioned the death of thousands and tens of thousands of brave men on the battle-field, in the hospitals, and in the Southern dungeons and stockade prisons. The land is filled with mourning, and the moan of the widow and the wail of the orphan are heard on high. And we cannot give the right hand of fellowship to the ministers of Christ who have wished and prayed for this woe upon the land, and express no regret for their course.

It is evident to all that much strife and many divisions prevail. We that have stood by our nation's flag, do not claim that we are faultless in this matter. This would be to claim to be more than human. Even in the trying times we have passed through, we have not exhibited as perfectly as we should the spirit of our Master. We feel it; we know it; and we have our part to do in the great work of reconciliation.

But we doubt whether any one thing would do more to restore harmony, than for each follower of Christ, and each minister who has gone off with the rebellion, to acknowledge the wrong, and to seek to repair the great wrong done.

KNOXVILLE, E. TENN., Aug. 25, 1865.

DISLOYAL MINISTERS IN MISSOURI.—A letter from St. Louis, in a New York daily, says:—"The class more immediately affected by the new Constitution, and now in great distress about its adoption, are the secession clergymen, who are required to take an oath that they have neither borne arms, nor aided nor sympathized with the rebellion. Of course hundreds of them cannot do it without palpable perjury, and here is where the shoe pinches. They would gladly, a majority of them, take an oath of allegiance to Jeff. Davis; but as they haven't the opportunity, they must, perforce, commit perjury or quit preaching in Missouri."

REV. JEREMIAH ASHER, chaplain of the Sixth Regiment United States colored troops, died at Wilmington, July 27th, aged 62. He was ordained in Providence, Rhode Island, about twenty-five years ago, and after a brief ministry in that city, came to Philadelphia, and was pastor of the Shiloh Church for fourteen years.