PRESBYTERIAN BANNER & ADVOCATE.

Presbyterian Banner, Vol. VII, No. 45.
Presbyterian Advocate, Vol. XXI, No. 42

"ONE THING IS NEEDFUL:" "ONE THING HAVE I DESIRED OF THE LORD:" "THIS ONE THING I DO."

WHOLE NO. 359

DAVID McKINNEY and JAMES ALLISON, Editors.

PUBLICATION OFFICE, GAZETTE BUILDING, FIFTH STREET, ABOVE SMITHFIELD, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Philadelphia, South West Corner of Seventh and Chestnut Streets

TERMS.—IN ADVANCE.

FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1859.

By Mail, or at the Office, $1.50 per Year, } SEE PROSPECTUS
Delivered in the City, 2.00 }

Original Poetry.

The Good Shepherd.

BY REV. J. P. M'LAREN.

Not in the pulpit only is his voice
Upraised, to make the sorrowing hearts rejoice,
The laws and doctrines of "the Word" to teach,
And to a ruined world, good news to preach:
The truth he speaks, where, on the bed laid low,
Strong men to fell disease are forced to bow;
And where, with woeful cries and failing breath,
The young or old writhe in the grasp of death.
He speaks it at the stricken husband's side,
Whence God hath just displaced a blooming bride;
'Mid orphans, mourning parents, he appears,
And blends his words with sympathizing tears.
His office 'tis, with generous hand and heart,
Relief and prudent counsel to impart,
To sound a warning to the sons of vice
Along the paths where smiling sins entice;
The conscience smitten, to the Cross to guide,
And win the wanderers to the Saviour's side.
Such scenes and works demand his daily care,
And these his talents, time and labor share.
Happy the faithful man, his flock to feed
In pastures green, by quiet streams to lead.

But trials, too, as well as toil, his lot;
When duty is forsaken, grace forgot;
When love of brotherhood is reft of power
And sheep turn on each other to devour;
When some, he led and fed with gentle hand,
Colleagued in wrong, his loving words withstand;
When some he warned or wood from ways of death,
Requite his care with false and slanderous breath;
And some he taught the words of prayer and praise;
Assail his ear with coarse and vulgar phrase,
When poverty, elate with growing wealth,
And squalid misery, in recovered health,
From him and truth and duty turn away,
Forgetting favors of a former day.

I do not say such griefs as these to all
Who lead the faithful shepherd's life befall:
But if not these, then others hard to bear,
Privations, disappointments, fear and care—
To see his flock a light and thoughtless throng,
To see some sinking, who he thought were strong,
Some madly gay aneath their triple load—
Wrongs to themselves, to others, and to God.

Yet comforts, too, the man of God attend,
And to his heart, peace, joy, and hope, extend;
For heaven, approving conscience, and the good,
A three-fold fount, pour forth a generous flood
Of consolation; and their favor yield
To cheer him in his toilsome, troublous field.
Some rescued trophies of the Savior's blood,
Some, by the Spirit's witness, born of God,
Assiduous these in love around him stand,
To soothe his spirit and to nerve his hand.
The sons of peace, too, heavenly arts essay
To banish discords from the fold away;
Or, failing, they with him in grief retire
To mourn the fury of the gradeless fire;
His pious sorrows, they assuage or share,
And strength or succor beg for him in prayer.

Besides, upon his weary heart comes down
The gleam of stars and amaranthine crown,
Assured and sealed by the Chief Shepherd's blood,
And safely treasured for the man of God.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

"The True Psalmody."

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I send you for publication in the *Banner*, a few remarks upon the work with the above title. It was published in Philadelphia last Spring, by a Committee of several ministers and laymen of two or three denominations who sing "Rouse's Paraphrase" exclusively, and are much opposed to the use of "Hymns." The book has been highly recommended by the *Preacher*, and I perceive, has passed to a second edition. I have not noticed that you have, thus far, so much as mentioned its name.*

The paragraphs annexed, are extracted from "the Appendix" to a small volume about to issue from the publishing house of Martien & Son, Philadelphia. This work bears the title, "Letters on Psalmody—a Review of the leading Arguments, &c." The work, I may add, has received the cordial approval of a number of the most prominent brethren in this vicinity, including such names as Messrs. Paxton, Howard, Plumer, and Patterson, of these cities, who speak of it as "written in an *eminently Christian temper*."

EXTRACTS.

The materials which the Committee have thrown together in this "compilation," (the book entitled The True Psalmody) exhibit some curious examples of incoherence and discord. Nor is it easy to determine, of two or more conflicting sentiments set forth with equal zeal and authority, which they wish us to receive as their matured convictions. For example, in the "Introduction," they plead for, "The *Book of Psalms* in a literal translation," "to the exclusion of all uninspired songs," page 7. But when they reach page 217, their proposition is, "the *Psalms of Scripture* to the exclusion of all uninspired songs." But do the Committee really believe that "the Book of Psalms," and "the Psalms of Scripture," are identical in meaning? Are there no Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs in *Scripture*, except in the one book? Will they venture to maintain so absurd a proposition?

Again: On page 7 of the "Introduction," they plead for "the Book of Psalms to the exclusion of all *uninspired* songs." But when they reach page 65, they quote a leading author as follows: "It would appear to be the Divine will that this (Book of Psalms) should be used to *the exclusion of all others*." This of course *excludes* not only "uninspired songs," but "all others" except the Psalms of David, both *inspired* and uninspired! Which side does the Committee maintain, or wish us to adopt in this conflict of sentiment? And what is most extraordinary, on page 133, the Committee themselves say—"The issue before us is, have we liberty to make and sing * * songs *other than those of the Bible!*" On page 7, it was "the Book of Psalms to the exclusion of all uninspired songs," but when they arrive at page 133, they forsake their first position, "the Book of Psalms," and are found arguing against "songs *other* than those of the Bible"—where of course they take under their protection not only "the Book of Psalms," but "the songs of the Bible" generally, as well as those of the book of Psalms! The leading author whom they quote with so much approbation, says it appears to be "*the Divine will*" to exclude "all others" but "the Psalms;" but not so the Committee when they arrive at page 133. They then say, it is "songs *other* than those of the Bible," against which they contend! At one time, it is "the Book of Psalms" exclusively for which they are valiant, but at another "the songs of the Bible," including, of course, all *songs in the Bible*, in defense of which they have unsheathed the sword of controversy! And still more to confound this confusion, the Committee tell us near the close of the book (p. 217,) "We have kept but *one definite proposition* before us—*the Psalms of Scripture*, the Church's sufficient and appointed manual of praise." So that this oracle of "True Psalmody" greatly needs an interpreter to expound its responses

This "True Psalmody" is largely employed with objections to "uninspired hymns" "They have led," the Committee tell us, "to the abandonment of congregational singing;" and "in domestic worship," they strongly intimate, "there is comparatively little use of sacred songs." These are unquestionably great evils; and so far as they exist among the advocates of hymns, deserve to be condemned. But have the Committee traced these evils to the true cause, viz., the use of hymns? In a foot note they admit *a fact* which entirely spoils their argument. "The Methodist denominations" not only "retain congregational singing," as the Committee concede, but as every one knows, make more use of *song* in Divine worship than all the other denominations put together! Yet these same Methodists do not sing "the Psalms" at all, but only hymns! The logic of "The True Psalmody" is sadly at fault here. Again, "the use of hymns endangers the Church's purity: they have been used in diffusing error and heresy." But has not the pulpit been often used for the same purposes? Do not men *wrest* Scripture to their own destruction? Are the Scriptures and public preaching therefore to be discarded as dangerous to the purity of the Church? Has not "the grace of God" often been abused to licentiousness? What, then, becomes of the Committee's argument? Do not the Arians of Ulster sing and *explain* "Rouse's paraphrase" so as "to diffuse error and heresy?" Of course the use and explanation of "Rouse's paraphrase" should be abandoned as *endangering the purity of the Church!*

From page 73 to page 96, we have a labored attempt from the pen of Dr. Cooper, to prove that Paul's "Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs," (Ephesians v: 19,) must mean the Psalms of David exclusively. Dr. C. is no bad special pleader, but we merely refer him to the decision of Ralph Erskine, quoted in one of our letters. He will there find the unbiassed judgment of a prince among the original fathers of Dr. C.'s division of the United Presbyterian Church, viz: that Ephesians v: 19, Colossians iii: 16, contain *a Divine precept* for singing such human paraphrases as Erskine composed on "Solomon's Song." As Ralph Erskine had no peculiar dogma to defend, it is quite probable he was right, and Dr. C. altogether wrong.

In the same connexion it is argued that "the sayings of Mary and the prophecy of Zacharias" (Luke i,) are no "precedents" in favor of New Testament songs; "for," they tell us, "of Mary it is merely stated that she *said*; her utterances are not styled *a song*; not is there any evidence that she *sang* them."

Now as this argument has been employed in Pittsburgh,* as well as Philadelphia, it is worth a moment's attention. "Mary did not sing—she only *said*." But in Revelation v: 9, we read—"they *sung* a new song, *saying*, Thou art worthy," &c. Hence it follows, that the four living creatures, and the four and twenty elders, did not *sing at all*—they only *said!* For other examples see Revelation iv: 10, v: 12, vii: 10, 12. Try the same argument with some of the Psalms. "David *spake* unto the Lord the words of this *song*." Psalm xviii. Did David *say* or sing? Or is Psalm xviii a *song?* Again: "*I said*, I will take heed to my ways." Psalm xxxix. Of course this Psalm is not to be sung, for David only *said* it! Again: Psalm lv—"Sing forth the honor of his name—make his praise glorious. Say unto God, how terrible art thou." The Committee can perhaps decide whether this Psalm, like the eighteenth, is to be *said* or *sung*, since both terms are used!

Again: To account for the fact, asserted but not proved, "that singing praise has been dropped so extensively in connexion with the use of hymns," the Committee say "the idea of worship has ceased to no inconsiderable extent to be attached to the singing of hymns." To prove this extraordinary assertion, they quote "S. D." in the *Presbyterian*, thus: "Protestants and Papists alike sing to creatures." "We sing to all sorts of inferior creatures, especially to sinners." But if this is sound argument, we wonder the Committee have not long since "dropped the use of the Psalms!" Take this example from Psalm lvii:

> Why dost thou boast, O mighty man,
> Of mischief and of ill.
> Thy tongue mischievous calumnies
> Deviseth subtilely.

If any *worse* example of "singing to creatures, especially to sinners," can be found in our hymns, we have never discovered it. Again, Psalm xciv: 8:

> Ye brutish people, understand!
> Fools! when wise will ye grow?

For more of this dreadful evil of "singing to creatures and to sinners," see Psalms xlix, lviii, lxii, lxvi, lxvii, ii, iv, ix, x, and many others. If Dr. Cooper and his brethren will practice the doctrine they preach, and drop all such Psalms as these, we will begin to think they feel the force of their own argument. By their own showing, the Psalms of David "contribute influences to mislead the minds and corrupt the hearts of sinful men," equally in this particular with our hymns! When our Assembly shall issue an expurgated edition of our hymns, Dr. C. and his brethren of course will be found expurgating David! Our system, they tell us, "needs amending and purging," p. 155. We reply, by your own showing, so does David!

On page 69, adopting the words of a leading author, the Committee say—"One thing is certain, that neither our Lord nor his apostles have furnished any Psalms and songs for the use of the Church." The Committee surely do not think that saying "it is certain," is the same as proving their proposition. But no man who carefully reads the New Testament, can for a moment doubt that there are many *songs* of praise in that volume; such for example, as those of Mary, and Simeon, and Zacharias, as well as those recorded in the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation. Scores of passages can be readily adduced, having much more of the attributes of sacred *song*, viz.: sublime devotion and poetical excellence, than many of the more *prosaic* parts of the book of Psalms. This is so obvious, the wonder is that it has ever been called in question. All that is necessary is to have some poet, such as *Rouse* or *Watts*, to paraphrase these beautiful passages in verse and metre—and we have a volume of New Testament *songs*. How strange that good men should venture to affirm that "our Lord and his apostles have furnished *no songs* for the Church!" And this rash assertion includes "the new song," Rev. v: 9—14, recorded by the Apostle John. It will not do to say "*it is certain* this 'new song' was not furnished for the use of the Church." That is the very point to be proved; and which never was and never will be proved. The Commentators teach a very different lesson.

To make this reasoning still more obvious, look at a few examples. Can any one doubt that there are many passages in the New Testament, at least, as worthy to be called "songs," and versified for purposes of praise, as are the following:

> At evening they go to and fro:
> They make great noise and sound,
> Like to a dog, and often walk
> About the city round.
>
> And let them wander up and down
> In seeking food to eat;
> And let them grudge when they shall not
> Be satisfied with meat.

Or these:

> Whose belly with thy treasure hid
> Thou fill'st—they children have
> In plenty. Of their goods the rest,
> They to their children leave.
>
> When they me saw, they from me fled;
> E'en so I am forgot
> As men are out of mind when dead:
> I'm like a broken pot.

These and scores of similar stanzas, are parts of songs of "*Divine institution*;" but the songs of the New Testament—"*None are furnished!*" But, say the Committee, Prof. Alexander, of Princeton, affirms that all "the Psalms" are "songs, poems intended to be sung, and with a musical accompaniment;" and that "they are intended to be permanently used in the worship of God." But in what manner are they to be "permanently used?" What did Prof. A. mean by this language? "The learned and highly esteemed Professor" constantly uses our "Psalms and hymns," and in all probability never sung five stanzas of Rouse in his life! Yet the Committee venture to quote him as favoring their notions of "a correct and *literal* translation!" The "permanent use" advocated by Prof. A. does not help the cause of "True Psalmody!" And then as to "the musical accompaniment," which the Professor says was also "intended"—the Committee shrink from it with horror.

Not to make my article too long, Messrs. Editors, I close with the following:

The Committee endeavor to make a little capital out of the fact, that some hymns in frequent use were the productions of men who gave no evidence of being regenerated; and that Tom Moore's hymn beginning, "Come ye disconsolate, where'er ye languish," is found in our collection. It can not be denied that our hymns in general are from Christian pens, from such eminent authors as Watts, Newton, Toplady, Cowper, Heber, Montgomery, &c. But one of these songs is the production of Tom Moore—that is "the dead fly in the ointment." Let us inquire whether nothing can be said in palliation of so great an enormity.

(1.) Do these brethren never *worship God* by reading or otherwise uttering the prayer of Baalam: "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his?"—Numbers xxiii: 10. Have they never worshipped God by reading from the pulpit his prophecies—"There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel," &c? Are these prophecies and this prayer *the worse*, because their author was not a regenerate man?

(2.) Is not a large part of the book of Job the utterance of error? Does not the Lord tell Eliphaz—"My wrath is kindled against thee and against thy two friends; for ye have not spoken of me the thing *which is right as my servant Job hath?*" Chap. xlii: 7. But do not these brethren worship God by reading publicly these erroneous sentiments?

(3.) When "the devils," in various instances, acknowledged Jesus to be the true Messiah, "the Holy One of God," he did not command them to be silent—he did not refuse a recognition of his Divine character and mission even from "devils." And our brethren *worship God* by reading from their pulpits these just and true ascriptions of honor to Christ, though their authors were *the devils!* Is not this almost as bad as singing a hymn of Tom Moore? If the Committee feel no "compunctious visitings" while worshiping God in the language of "Baalam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness," (2 Peter ii: 15,) with the utterances of Job's friends, against whom God's "wrath was kindled"—and even in the language of "the devils" of the New Testament, then what becomes of their argument? Doubtless even wicked men are sometimes deeply impressed with Divine things, as Baalam was, and are so under the teaching of the Holy Spirit as to utter many most valuable and interesting truths. And if, after the manner of Baalam, they possess the most elevated poetic talents, we think the Scriptural examples do not condemn the occasional use of their utterances in public worship. Certainly the Committee are not in a position "to cast the first stone" at us Presbyterians.

The "True Psalmody" has much to say against "uninspired songs," "human composition," &c. And the Committee say they "are certainly at liberty to pronounce *very decidedly* the Scottish version (Rouse's paraphrase) to be an *accurate rendering* of the original." Not to repeat what has already been said in our Letters, take these specimens from Psalm cii: 6:

> Like pelican in wilderness
> Forsaken I have been
> I like an owl in desert am
> That nightly there doth moan.

Will these brethren inform us where they find in "the original," the second and fourth of these lines? And the same is true of hundreds of similar stanzas. They are specimens of *Rouse's composition*. Yet Dr. P speaks of Rouse as "the *Divine songs* in this version," including, of course, all the sentiment and verbiage which he has added to the inspired text! The Committee must not be surprised to hear from every intelligent Presbyterian, in reply to such argument—"Physician heal thyself." And are they certain that Rouse was "a regenerate person?" If not, "how dare they sing his effusions?"

W. A.

*Because we were not favored by the publishers with a copy for notice.—EDS.

* Pressly on Psalmody, p. 44.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

Trust in God.

Trust is different from submission. Submission has to do with *facts*. Trust has to do with *possibilities*. The one has reference to the *present*; the other to the *future*. Submission bows to the stroke, now. Trust puts its hand into the Smiter's, and follows, whither he will. It is hard to say which is the more beautiful, or which leaves in the soul the more profound peace. Manifestly they are the two angels which guard closest our happiness. He who has learned to submit and learned to trust, is safe, whatever may come. "His life is insured."

Let us glance a moment at the importance of Trust in God. We are walking on a path where a thick vail touches our toes. It advances a step as we advance. That step is the present. All behind is past. All before is future. Through that vail we can hear the sound of coming events. Looking up, we can sometimes even see the shadow of the tallest of them; and by the shadow, judge something of their character. But that is the most we can do. Now, before that thick vail, trust is certainly the grace most essential. Without it, we duplicate our miseries. We fill up the horn of actualities out of the horn of possibilities. On the book of each day we make a "double entry"—ills that are, and ills that may be. We cannot think of mercies which are, for the miseries which are to be. We cannot sit down in the sunshine, for watching the storm brewing in the sky. And so it comes to pass, the majority of people never have a sunny memory, or a peaceful hour. They are always in some affliction, actual or possible. Trust in God is the specific for all these possible ills; and they are, by far, the most numerous. What a burden is removed when the care of the future is given to God, and present duty is our only concern. Well may he be solicitous who takes this burden on himself. There are momentous interests in the future. Resolutions are born there. The actors in the coming drama are harnessed and trained there. And when we hear the muttering of coming storms, the mustering of coming forces, the clang of their heavy mail, and see the shadow of their crested helmets, right here across our path, what feverish anxiety we have to lift the vail and get a glimpse behind the scenes! But it may not be. And before such an impossibility, I can well conceive how the man who has never learned to trust God, will stand trembling. The calamity that lies right there, not an inch behind that vail, may be the one that shall blast his reputation or his fortune, and besides that, he has nothing. But he who has learned to trust God, rests well assured that nothing can come which will affect his standing with him, and that safe, nothing that can befall him will be of very grave importance. How happy should we all be, were we only content to grasp firmly the reins that are in our hands, and leave God to manage the reins of great coming events. "Trust in the Lord to do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed."

D. H.

From our London Correspondent.

A Great Surprise—A Fortnight and its Incidents—The Change and its Author—The Conditions of Peace—Criticism of the Press Thereon—The Sack of Perugia—An American's Testimony—What Next?—The Future of Europe—Invasion Alarms and the House of Lords—Dangers in the Mediterranean—Malta, the Duke, and the Emperor—Pauses in the Storm—The Advantage to Trade and Commerce—Harvest Prospects—Irish General Assembly—Discussion on Sabbath Question, and Professor Reichell—Home Mission—Missions to Roman Catholics—Scattered Protestants and Scott Immigrants—Funds Needed—The Colonial Mission and its Field—Continental Missions—Letter from the Moderator of the Waldensian Synod—Report on Revivals in Ulster—Special Features—Recommendations and Resolutions.

LONDON, July 14th, 1859.

A STUPENDOUS SURPRISE came upon the world on the afternoon of Friday last. Exactly a fortnight before, on the same day of the week, two mighty hosts were fiercely engaged in the very heat of the bloodiest battle of modern times. Solferino won—the Austrians sullenly retreating—tremendous slaughter on both sides—multitudes of "wounded," to say nothing of "the missing"—the crossing, by the French, of the Mincio—the investment of Peschiera—all these—with the imminence of another battle—with a succession of sieges—with all the dread results of sorties from the beleagured, shot and shells from those death-dealing, far-reaching French rifled cannon, which had smitten the Austrians at Solferino like the Destroying Angel—and the last and crowning storm of each fortress in succession, involving frightful destruction of human life—occupied the minds of men and nations. We heard, too, of a Tuscan and French army arriving at the Camp of Louis Napoleon, of a strong force about to be thrown on the Venetian coast, and of Venice itself, once "the Queen of the Adriatic," to be bombarded. More than this; Hungary was to be revolutionized, Kossuth was in high favor, Germany was menacing, and although diplomacy was busy, nothing but war to the knife, seemed to be the *role* for months to come.

Now, what a change! Napoleon *has done it all*. Without consulting Victor Emmanuel—without asking the advice of any of his generals, he acts as usual, on his own secret resolves, and like himself, he does so with the decision of an indomitable purpose and will.

The armistice that took Europe by surprise, that sent up the money market, and made July skies brighter than ever, was the result of various causes and considerations It is believed that the Emperor of the French found his army disorganized and shattered to a greater extent than to us, at a distance, hearing of victory, seemed possible. The Austrians had fought fiercely, and had their *leading* been equal to their obstinate courage, and reserves been brought up at the crisis of Solferino, and so their central position been held fast, the day would have been their own. But they inflicted terrible losses on the French army, and especially on its officers. The Sardinians, too, suffered terribly. In addition to this, ten thousand French troops were prostrated with typhus fever, and the marshes of the Mincio were becoming more deadly every day. Then there was the prospect of long sieges, and if not of doubtful results, yet of such a time consumed as to involve a tremendous waste of blood and treasure. Further, the *revolutionary* element was becoming too rapidly developed for the astute Napoleon's liking, and even for his ultimate safety. Russia was beginning to draw back, or to become cool—the Pope, the Cardinals and the French priests were murmuring and menacing—and so, tempting fortune no longer, in the hour of his triumph he sends back the shattered body of the young Prince Windisgratch (as asked for) to the young Emperor of Austria, deploring the horrors of war, and adroitly taking advantage of a second message sent by an officer bearing a flag of truce, to ask Francis Joseph whether he would not consent to a conference with a view to the suspension of arms.

Venice, he has told, was about to be bombarded; but, said Napoleon, "I would fain spare its beautiful buildings," &c., &c. And so there is a door opened to one too proud, even in defeat, to *ask* for terms, and still strong enough to fight obstinately. And thus, on Monday morning last, the two Emperors met at Cavirana; and on Tuesday afternoon the telegram flashes over the Continent and across the Channel, the news that an armistice was agreed on, and next that a treaty of peace was actually signed!

A Congress it was supposed would follow the meeting of the Emperors; and as the armistice was to continue till the 15th of August, it was expected that peace somehow or other would be agreed upon ere that period of time expired. In prospect of such a Congress, the *Times* strongly deprecated the idea of sending English plenipotentiaries to take part in it.

The conditions of peace are: 1st. The surrender by Austria to France, of Lombardy, and the handing it over by France to Sardinia. Austria's humiliation was less bitter in surrendering Lombardy to France as her conqueror, rather than to the hated Sardinia. 2d, Austria retains Venetia, including, I believe, her possession of the four famous fortresses, two of which are in Lombardy. 3d. There is to be an Italian Confederation, of which the Pope is to be "*Honorary* President." When this was read out from the telegram in the House of Peers, Lord Lyndhurst was evidently tickled by the word "honorary," and asked was the word really used It *is* a significant word. The poor Pope is becoming a *shadow* as to temporal sovereignty. What kind of presidency can he exercise over Victor Emmanuel and Count Cavour—the one, according to the *Tablet*, the "Henry Eighth" of the day, and the other, "Cromwell?" 4th. There is to be a general amnesty. Mazzini will not be included in it, I presume. It is a significant condition that Venice, although retained by Austria, is to form a part of the Italian Confederation.

What next? will be the question, incessantly put, until the Emperor Napoleon is pleased to step forth once more as a champion and a challenger. He it is, that shapes European politics, and has done so for years. But for him, peace would not have been made so soon and suddenly in the Crimea; England's army was at last what it ought to be; the French were exhausted, and had got "glory," and it was not the policy of Napoleon—far seeing as he is—to make Russia his eternal enemy. On the contrary, ever since the Crimean war there has been an ever increasing cordiality between the two powers, until at last an "understanding" is announced, which accounts for the humbling of Austria, and the alarms and armings of agitated Germany.

Now, Austria is likely to become France's fast ally, and both together may seek to humble Prussia, against whom strong resentment is felt for her recent menacing conduct. Shall there be, *after a pause*, a war on the Rhine? Shall Germany, South and North, Austria looking on with grim satisfaction, and Russia not lifting a hand to save her, be the next object of French assault? "Yes," say multitudes; and then, "what *next?* Why—England's turn shall come next. Austria will be only too glad to see *her* humbled; and if Russia please, she can join her fleet with that of France, and above all, an invasion may be attempted. All this is constantly on men's minds and lips It is a firm conviction in Germany. You will find it among very sober-thinking men in Germany. He is playing a *deep* game—such is the sentiment—indicative of a conviction that Napoleon's plans are vast, his ambition gigantic.

The Mediterranean, henceforth, if it become not "a French lake," must be vigilantly watched by England. She has Gibraltar, and the sentinel island and stronghold of Malta, and these are being strengthened. Parliament has been discussing perils, and providing for them.

The veteran Lord Lyndhurst last week delivered a powerful speech as to the dangers to be apprehended from France, in reference to invasion. He dwelt on the insufficiency of our fleet and defences. He is the Nestor of the House of Lords, and is always listened to with the profoundest respect and attention. Lord Ellenborough warmly seconded his views, and Lord Stratford de Redcliffe was especially emphatic in the same strain. As an old diplomatist, he has evidently no confidence in Napoleon. Lord Granville and the Duke of Argyle, on the part of the Ministry, deprecated the use of exciting and provoking language, and made light of the peril. Lord Derby *said nothing*. The French government papers ridicule the House of Lords for their suspicions.

THE NAVY is still the subject of attention, and old Sir C. Napier considers it very insufficiently manned. It is clear that we must submit to a largely increased expenditure for our fleet, and that taxation will increase in proportion, even though to Europe there may be granted a period and parenthesis of tranquility. Few there are who believe in permanent peace. I heard an anecdote this week which I am assured is authentic. The Duke of New Castle, the present Secretary for the Colonies, was formerly an acquaintance and associate of Louis Napoleon, when residing here as an exile. One day when shooting together in the country, Napoleon said that *Malta ought to belong to France. Recently*, the Duke of New Castle was in Paris, and asked the Emperor did he recollect that conversation. "Yes!" "Are you still of the same opinion as to Malta?" "Yes!" was the grave reply. The "opinion" Napoleon—if opportunity offer—may try to turn into an accomplished fact.

But after all, by these pauses TRADE AND COMMERCE speedily recovered themselves. The buoyancy of the money market, and the general cheerfulness and hopefulness that prevail, are most refreshing, even for those who are only lookers on, and have no stake in shipping, merchandize, banks, stocks, mines, railways, or other securities. *Millions* of money have been added to the capital of nations within the last few days. The United States will be enriched and gladdened, too, by the news of peace; and all good men will bless God that "the days of vengeance" in Italy have been shortened.

Nevertheless *disgust* is the general feeling here at Bonaparte's conduct.

The *Times* thinks that the two alleged causes of the war, and the real grounds of the complaints made, namely, "Austrian oppression and Papal misgovernment," do not find a solution in this peace. "France desired to leave Rome, if Austria would withdraw from the Legations. The Sardinian Manifesto, and many similar documents from Paris and Turin, were directed to the expulsion of Austria beyond the Alps. France has spent £50,000,000, and fifty-thousand men, only to give Milan a Piedmontese, instead of an Austrian Master, and to establish the Pope in a temporal dignity even beyond his imagining, and capable of any extension. Is all this real?"

In the same article, the *Times* says of the *facts* of the case: "Austria is somewhat humbled, but relieved of a difficulty. Sardinia is aggrandized with a province that mistrusts her, and a neighbor that has earned an imperishable and inexhaustible claim to her gratitude. The Grand Dukes once more are supposed to be shaken into their thrones. The Papal States are left as they were, but with a master somewhat greater than before. He is Honorary President of the Italian Federation, and Gen. Goyon holds the sword by his side. The King of Naples is made a member of that Italian Federation, and has to learn the worth of that honor, and its true import."

These sentiments as to the aggrandizement of power and influence given to the Pope by the Treaty, seem modified in another article in the *Times*, where it is said, "The Romans must hope that the Italian Confederacy under the honorary presidency of the Pope, shall be nothing like any government they have hitherto known under these too infallible auspices." "Hope is also suggested to Kossuth and Hungary, that 'the restoration of the kingdom' is on the programme, to the Lombards that 'Constitutional government will be extended' to them, and to Venice 'that her independence will not be a mere name.'"

AN AMERICAN GENTLEMAN writing to the *Times*, signing himself "Boston, U S A," describes the cruelties of the Swiss Papal troops at Perugia, the plunder of himself and his family, and their almost miraculous deliverance from massacre. It appears that the destination of the troops was concealed from them till they approached near the town; they then mutinied, were punished, and next promised the plunder of the place.

HARVEST PROSPECTS are most cheering. No blight or frost has fallen on our fields, while drought, extending over May and June, injured the crops in Scotland and Ireland, so as to make the straw of the cereals short, and to cause the flax crops to be inferior. Recent rains, however, falling in Ireland and Scotland, have produced a great change for the better, and the harvest of the United Kingdom, as a whole, will be excellent. With this, and peace, we may expect, God willing, the closing part of this year to prove very prosperous and enriching to the country The heat of the weather this week has been intense.

THE IRISH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, after four or five days sittings in Dublin, has adjourned till the month of September, and will then reassemble in Belfast. There were some matters brought up, which involved differences of opinion. One of these was a notice taken, in the Report of the Sabbath Observance Committee, of the pamphlet published last year, by the Rev. Professor Reichell, of Queen's College, Belfast, being the substance of a sermon on the Sabbath question, delivered by that gentleman. I referred to it in my correspondence, at the time of its publication. It was a somewhat plausible and certainly daring defence of the *low* views of the Sabbath, adopted by the late Dr. Arnold of Rugby, and by the present Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whately. It also contained sneering allusions to "Puritans" and Dissenters. Mr. McNaughton, of Belfast, Mr. S. M. Dill, of Ballymena, and other ministers, published able replies, and there is reason to believe that *one* of the antecedents of the revival, namely, an increasing veneration for the Sabbath, and the more practical and thorough recognition of the Divine authority and perpetual obligation of the Lord's day, was, by reason of the discussion, largely promoted.

The question before the Assembly was, the propriety of alluding in the report at all to Dr. Reichell's pamphlet, and on the back of this came up the further consideration (although not formally put,) whether the students of the Irish Presbyterian Church could be safely allowed to attend, while at Queen's College, the prelections of a Professor who *held* (it was not said taught,) such heterodox views. It was urged successfully that it was beneath the dignity of the Church, and unnecessary also to open these questions, and views to this effect were virtually endorsed by a majority in favor of "the previous question."

The Home Mission of the Irish Assembly embraces as its field, the South and West of Ireland, with express reference to Romanism and Romanists in Dublin, Biro, Kerry, and Connaught. The priests are very vigilant. Thus in Kerry, "every report published finds its way to the priests of the district, and when they find so many of their people attend Protestant worship, they take pains to wile them away, and in too many cases succeed." In the province of Connaught, only a few years ago, the Presbyterian Church had five small and feeble congregations; now it has nineteen, with twenty three preaching stations, having a regular attendance of about two thousand worshippers. These are chiefly Protestants, Scattered Protestants, fast degenerating into Popery, or heathenism, have thus been saved from spiritual ruin. Scottish settlers on the lands in Connaught, find faithful pastors for themselves and their children. The number of Roman Catholic hearers and scholars, is smaller than in former years. But conversions occur, and America generally receives the converts. "Three converts from Popery," says a missionary, "left my district this year, and many others before them. From some who were rescued from Popery, by means of our schools, I have had letters, telling of the delight they feel in working in American revivals. One young man took part in the grand enterprise of erecting the union revival tent in Philadelphia."

Besides missions in the West and South, the Irish Assembly supplements from its home friends, the stipends of twenty one congregations, or assists them in outlying missionary work in their respective districts. Of the five hundred and ten congregations of the Irish Assembly, four hundred and fifty are in Ulster, and the other sixty in the other provinces. The Southern Presbytery of Munster, which a few years ago had only four or five congregations, has now twenty three. The total collections for the Home Mission last year, were £1,568, and this as distinct from that for "Roman Catholic Missions," which was £2,251, including contributions from Scotland. But the field is extending, and more aid is urgently required. The fund is in debt, and if a Deputation goes over this year to the United States, I have no doubt from the *prelibation* presented to Professor Gibson and Mr. McClure, last year, at Philadelphia, that a *full* cup of American sympathy for old Ireland and her *best* interests, will be forthcoming.

There is an Assistant Minister's Fund in connexion with the Irish Assembly, which distributed £508 among twenty ministers, last year, some receiving larger sums than others, under special circumstances, of position or income from other sources. Some Assistants have, from the ordinary stipend, only £30, and many do not receive more than £50 per annum.

The Colonial Mission of the Irish Presbyterian Church, embraces the fields of Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. It is suggested that a missionary shall be sent to British Columbia, the great majority of the eighty thousand or one hundred thousand settlers there, being Presbyterians. The report referred to the contemplated union of Presbyterians in Canada, which would make its ministers and congregations upwards of two hundred. A union has been effected between the three Synods of Australia; the New General Assembly now comprising sixty ministers, with prospects of rapid increase.

The Continental Mission of the Irish Assembly, makes annual grants to the work of evangelization in France, Belgium, and Northern Italy. A very interesting letter was read by the Moderator, from Rev. F. P. Revel, President of the Waldensian Synod. Referring to the results of the war, he says: "Soon, we trust, called, by the new fields open to its enterprise, will we be obliged to send them new laborers to proclaim the good news to souls hitherto bowed down under the yoke of Rome."

The Waldensian Church's special mission seems to be the provision of Evangelists for Italy. Shall the fields be *open* under the new regime? Shall Florence receive the Gospel without a re-established and bigoted Grand Duke daring to hinder? Since the occupation of Milan by the Allies, *religious liberty* has been recognised Is this to be lost? How can "the honorary president" tolerate such a thing?

THE REVIVALS IN ULSTER occupied the special attention of the Assembly. In the report on the subject, by Dr Kirkpatrick, it was stated that when an answer was given to long continued prayer, it came as "an actual surprise." The special characteristics of the revival have been such as I have repeatedly intimated to you in recent letters. 1. Persons of both sexes, of all ages, of various ranks in society, of all denominations, including Unitarians and Romanists, have been at once convinced of sin, and apparently converted to God. 2. These spiritual emotions have, in numerous cases, been accompanied by physical impressions, producing bodily infirmity, and continuing, in some cases, for hours, and in others for days, and usually terminating in peace of conscience, and joy unspeakable and full of glory. 3. The two great truths on which the converts, prominently and almost exclusively dwell, are the sinfulness and utter helplessness of man, and the all sufficiency of Christ, as a living and personal Redeemer. 4. No heresy has been started in this state of new and unusual excitement. The whole movement gives vivid illustration of the vital doctrines contained in the Standards of the Church. 5 The effect produced on the life and conversation of the converts, has been decidedly evangelical—in a deep sense of sin, especially in neglecting Christ; in simple reliance on him; in ardent love to him; in brotherly kindness; in earnest zeal for the conversion of sinners; habitual communion with God; delight in his Word, worship, and service. As to moral and social results, they have been most striking and decided. 6 The work has been carried on largely by converts themselves; the fear of man being taken away, uneducated persons are heard to offer prayer to God with fluency and fervor, in the presence of multitudes; and without embarrassment or trepidation, call on sinners to repent and believe the Gospel.

Recommendations were made, that increased attention be given to the observance of family worship, to the catechising of the young, and to the formation of Bible classes—that the private members of the Church be encouraged to exercise their gifts for its edification and enlargement; that Sessions meet more frequently for prayer, conference, and mutual encouragement; that ministers hold meetings for the special end of personal edification to those assembled; that religious intelligence be more widely circulated; that the people be instructed to become well acquainted with the Confession of Faith; that circulating libraries of standard Theological works be established for the benefit of ministers; that notes should be taken of the operations of the Holy Ghost, in cases of special awakening; and that classes should be formed among the converts, to build them up in the faith, love, and hope of the Gospel.

The Assembly then passed a series of resolutions, acknowledging the marvellous work of God, confessing their need of Divine counsel and wisdom, cautioning the ministers against undue suspicions of the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit on the one hand, or of doing any thing whereby physical agitations, or even convictions of sin, might be supposed to be genuine conversion to God; also, entreating all ministers to watch against the introduction of any erroneous doctrine or practice, "lest Satan should get an advantage, and the Spirit of truth be provoked to withdraw."

J. W.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

The Name of Jesus.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I was gratified in reading, just now, in a late paper of the United Presbyterian Church, to find the Editor uttering arguments, sentiments and expressions, on a certain subject, very similar to what we Presbyterians use on the subject of their restrictive doctrine of Psalmody. It seems that an inquiry was made of the editor of a Masonic paper, whether it is in accordance with the nature of Masonry, that prayer, in the Lodges, should be made in the name of Christ; the answer was in substance a negative one. On this, the U. P. editor makes the expressions alluded to above, which I present below, with our views in juxtaposition:

"It would be a gross violation of the funda mental principles of this order, even for Christian ministers, when praying in a lodge, to put up their petitions in the name of Christ."	It would be a violation of the "distinctive principles" of the U. Presbyterian Church, even for Christian ministers, when *praising*