D. M'KINNEY.....J. ALLISON.....S. LITTLE

DAVID M'KINNEY & CO.,
Editors and Proprietors.

TERMS IN ADVANCE.

SINGLE SUBSCRIPTIONS.....$1.50
IN CLUBS.....1.25
DELIVERED IN EITHER OF THE CITIES.....2.00

For Two Dollars, we will send by mail seventy numbers, and for One Dollar, thirty-three numbers.

Pastors sending us TWENTY subscribers and upwards, will be thereby entitled to a paper without charge.

A RED PENCIL MARK on the paper, signifies that the term is nearly out and that we desire a renewal.

Renewals should be prompt, a little before the year expires.

Send payments by safe hands, or by mail.

Direct all letters to DAVID M'KINNEY & CO., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Presbyterian Banner.

VOL. VIII., NO. 40. PITTSBURGH, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1860. WHOLE NO. 404.

THE PRESBYTERIAN BANNER.

Publication Office:
GAZETTE BUILDINGS, 84 FIFTH ST., PITTSBURGH, PA.
PHILADELPHIA, SOUTH-WEST COR. OF 7TH AND CHESTNUT

ADVERTISEMENTS.
TERMS IN ADVANCE.

A Square, (8 lines or less,) one insertion, 60 cents; each subsequent insertion, 40 cents; each line beyond eight, 5 cts.
A Square per quarter, $4.00; each line additional, 33 cents.
A REDUCTION made to advertisers by the year.
BUSINESS NOTICES of Ten lines or less, $1.00; each additional line, 10 cents.

DAVID M'KINNEY & CO.,
PROPRIETORS AND PUBLISHERS.

[Selected.]

The Sabbath.

With silent awe I hail the sacred morn,
Which slowly wakes while all the fields are still;
A soothing calm on every breeze is borne,
A graver murmur gurgles from the rill.
An echo answers softer from the hill,
And softer sings the linnet from the thorn—
The skylark warbles in a tone less shrill.
Hail! light serene: Hail! sacred Sabbath morn.
The rooks float silent by in airy droves;
The sun a placid yellow lustre shows;
The gales that lately sighed along the groves
Have hushed their downy wings in sweet repose;
The hovering rack of clouds forget to move;
So smiled the day when the first morn arose.

For the Presbyterian Banner.

The Men and Doings of the Late General Assembly.

Another General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has met, deliberated, voted, and dispersed, and delivered its proceedings over to the critics and historians of the Church. I do not propose to perform the part either of a critic or an historian; but having jotted a few sketches of prominent actors, and a few reflections on certain important proceedings, I hand them over to the *Banner*, hoping they may not be devoid of interest to its readers.

It was an oft repeated remark, during the sessions of the Assembly, by those who claimed to know, that since the beginning of General Assemblies in the United States, the Rochester Assembly was the largest in numbers, and the strongest in talent, that had ever convened. Perhaps they knew! Perhaps they didn't know! It was certainly large enough for convenience; and perchance wise enough to do no serious mischief; while there is room for a division of opinion as to how much good it accomplished. There were in this Assembly some men of mark; some working men; and some talking men. In speaking of the men, I shall select a few who may be taken as types of their classes. I shall begin with the Moderator, Rev. J. W. Yeomans, D.D., whose position on a platform of conspicuous dimensions certainly made him a man of mark. The ability with which he presided over so large a body—composed of men of diverse temperaments—his gentlemanly bearing, and the impartiality of his decisions, commanded the unqualified respect of the Commissioners, and secured him the distinguished honor of conducting the Assembly through its deliberations without an appeal from any of his decisions, or a single complaint of partial dealing.

Dr. Yeomans is a man of medium stature, of symmetrical form, and may be close to sixty years of age—he has a finely developed head, and his countenance beams with intelligence; when you look him in the face, you cannot resist the impression that you are gazing on a man who thinks profoundly; and when you hear him, either on the platform or in the pulpit, you are constrained to admire the beauty and force with which he expresses his thoughts. His profile strikingly resembles that of Dr. Duff, the distinguished Scotch missionary at Calcutta. There are few men in the Church superior to Dr. Yeomans in intellectual endowments and attainments.

Another man of mark was Dr. Charles Hodge, of Princeton, New-Jersey. He is also a man of weight, both bodily and mentally. Age and professional toil seem to set lightly upon him. He looks no older than he did fifteen years ago, and has, within that time, increased considerably in physical dimensions. He, as all who read his writings must know, is a man of vigorous powers of mind and great intellectual attainments. He wields a powerful pen; but is not an impressive or finished speaker. His writings are remarkable, both for their philosophical clearness and logical conclusiveness; he is a master in dogmatics, and seems to regard what the Church has always believed as paramount in settling a Theological controversy. He is not what is now-a-days called a progressive man, and, on that account, is made a mark for the shafts of those who think the Church might, with safety, remove some of her ancient land-marks, and set up new ones. Dr. Hodge is a man of few words; but every word he speaks has a meaning applicable to the subject which occupies his attention. What he said in the Assembly, he was compelled to say in defence of the theory of the Church, which he is known to hold and to teach from his Chair in the Seminary at Princeton. His speech was published in the *Banner*, and its readers may therefore be supposed to know what his theory is. It is, perhaps, the prevailing theory of our Church at the present time; but to some intelligent and thinking ministers and laymen it is not satisfactory. They think it is too meagre—that it reduces the Church to too simple a form; that, while it makes the presence of the Holy Spirit the essential idea and life of the Church, it, in a great measure, ignores the organizing tendency of the Spirit, and compels the Church to be a debtor to the world for the mode and means of accomplishing her mission.

The opposite of Dr. Hodge is J. H. Thornwell, D.D., of South Carolina. He was a talking member of the Assembly. He is above the medium stature, of thin habit, and dark complexion; and may be about forty-five years of age. He is fluent of speech, and maintains a manly bearing toward those who differ from him. He is a man of theories, and has an abundance of zeal and earnestness in maintaining a cherished idea; but he has not that philosophical clearness of conception which leads captive the judgment of an audience. The logical development of his mind greatly exceeds the philosophical; his powers are not nicely balanced; his logical knives often clash and cut into each other, because of the absence of the guiding power of philosophy. We thought he explained the cause of his misfortune in the respect of which we are now speaking, when he stated, in a very appropriate connexion, that he had in his library, and has carefully perused almost all the books on logic that have ever been published. He has taken in too much of other men's logic; it has disturbed the natural logical equanimity of his mental powers; men will listen to him when he addresses them, but they will not be convinced.

Dr. Thornwell's speech before the Assembly was long, though not tedious. It was listened to respectfully; but it failed to gain him adherents. His theory of the Church is more than the extreme of Dr. Hodge's theory. He holds that the mode and rules of Church organization and government are as plainly laid down in Scripture as are the articles of faith, and that the Church has no more right to adopt an organism such as a Board of Missions, by which to accomplish a portion of her work in the world, for all the details of which she cannot point to a "Thus saith the Lord," than she has to believe a doctrine for which she cannot point to a "Thus saith the Lord." With Dr. Thornwell were associated others in maintaining this strange theory, all of them from the South, who, although they did not individually occupy so much time, were distinguished as talking members. It is obvious, at first glance, that this theory is impracticable and visionary; even those who were not satisfied with Dr. Hodge's theory, could not adopt it; and it was rejected by a large vote.

The report of a Committee appointed by the Assembly of last year, to inquire what changes it might be expedient to make in the Board of Domestic Missions, was made the occasion for discussing theories of the Church, subjects quite foreign, indeed, to the purposes for which that Committee was appointed; but which served to occupy the time and exhaust the patience of the Assembly, and thus to prevent the accomplishment of the changes in that Board which a large number of our churches demand, and without which they will not be satisfied. Nothing was done to improve the condition of the Board of Domestic Missions; our talking brethren prevented all efforts to accomplish such changes as would be satisfactory to the churches, by discussing points *ad nauseam*, about which the churches care nothing. The two Secretaryships still remain, and with less occasion for them than ever, since another Advisory Committee was ordered to be constituted, similar to that at New-Orleans, for the Pacific Coast, having its centre of operations at San Francisco. It is greatly to be regretted that the Board was not restricted to one Secretary at Philadelphia; which would probably have been done, had it been possible for those who were anxious for such a change, to get the subject before the Assembly at the proper time. After the long speeches on the different theories of the Church were heard, there was no temper in the Assembly to do anything but the ordinary routine business, so that not one of the agitated subjects, which it had been hoped would be wisely disposed of, was definitely determined. The Revised Book of Discipline, like the Board of Domestic Missions, remains where it was, and must agitate the Church another year.

The working members who were prepared to do something with respect to the Board of Domestic Missions, satisfactory to the large number of contributing churches which demand a more economical administration of its affairs, were prevented from accomplishing their laudable purpose by the talking members. It will be found before the expiration of another fiscal year, that the churches are not satisfied with the present administration of the Board of Domestic Missions.

While the talking members occupied the time of the Assembly in discussing theories of the Church, the working members prepared and carried through the items of business which were done. These items were numerous, but all of the ordinary routine. More would have been done by this class of members, if they could have possessed themselves of a reasonable share of the Assembly's time. They were industrious men; they came from their Presbyteries to do the business of the Church, and neither cared to make speeches, nor allowed themselves to be influenced by the speeches that were made. I cannot, perhaps, select a better type of this class of members than Wm. A. Scott, D.D., of California, the Chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures. He is a man of few words, and those are always well chosen; a man of action, and his actions are guided by sound judgment. The business which passed through his hands, as Chairman of the above-mentioned Committee, was immense; and it was, for the most part, reported to the Assembly with admirable judiciousness. Dr. Scott is the representative of a goodly number of men in the late Assembly—men less conspicuous than himself, but equally industrious and energetic. Had it not been for this class of members, the Assembly might have continued its sessions to the present time; for there was a burthen of speeches yet undelivered, which would have occupied many days, to the exclusion of the business required to be done. It is fortunate for the world, and especially for the General Assembly of our Church, that God has not constituted all men alike—that while there are some naturally loquacious ones, there are also some whose natural propensity is to act without much speaking. If the Revised Book of Discipline had been patiently entertained by the Assembly, and opened for discussion, it would require a prophet to predict when the subject would have been disposed of. There were those who had objections to every change made in that Book, and who were prepared to support their objections by long speeches. By the way, would not the Church be better off with the old than with that Revised Book of Discipline, or any other that could be produced? There ought to be no real difficulty in conducting business according to the old Book; the method of proceeding in all ordinary judicial cases is sufficiently determined by decisions to be found in the Digests of the Assembly, to relieve Church Courts of all embarrassments, and the Book, as a whole, is founded upon sound Presbyterian principles.

OBSERVER.

For the Presbyterian Banner.

Thoughts Upon Sextons.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—If you should deem the following observations suitable for, and insert them in your columns, I shall feel honored thereby; but if otherwise, I shall feel satisfied that you know best your own business, and how to act in such cases.

I am a Sexton, and have profited by a perusal of your short but valuable sermon* to us; and I hope that its suggestions will reach many of those to whom they are particularly addressed.

When you say that the Sexton should be a model of politeness, you say nothing but what is true; yet, who is there who does not know that in this respect, as a class, we are very defective. That there are some who are all that can reasonably be desired in politeness, and also in other characteristics which make up a model Sexton, cannot be denied; but the majority need, and it is to be hoped that they would be benefited by an occasional sermon such as furnished in your paper of the 7th of April.

I need not inform you that there are persons who visit some churches in preference to others; this is perhaps the case in all large cities, particularly. They visit these churches, chiefly because they are kindly and politely invited to a seat, and assured of no intrusion on their part. The visits of this class of persons are more likely to be repeated, by such a reception, on the part of the Sexton, or some one else, than if treated coolly. The fact is, they do repeat their visits, again and again, and in the end become, many of them, fixed and settled as useful members of said churches.

There is also another class of persons, who loiter about our church doors, outside. They want to come in, but so modest are they that often, unless invited in by the Sexton or some one else, they will walk away. To such a class of casual or occasional hearers, a Sexton can, evidently, if he feels as he should, be of considerable service; and in serving them, would also serve the Church. Every Sexton may have his own way in seating strangers and others, but he can, if he will, temper his peculiar way with a smile, so as to assure the visitor, in repeating his or her visit, they can do so without a risk of rudeness on his part. When confidence is thus inspired, there is encouragement to hope that the result will be a good one. Better have a Sexton who is not over tidy in his habits, than a rude one; both are bad enough, but of the two evils the former is the lesser one. Nevertheless, it is true that dusty pews and a slovenly Sexton, which always go together, are evils of some consequence, inasmuch as they tend amongst other things, to deter persons, particularly ladies, from church and the lecture-room. They cannot be atoned for or covered up by politeness, but will always stand as obstacles in the way of his acceptableness with any church of taste and nicety in this respect. One thing is certain, he never would be esteemed as a model Sexton. Politeness is a jewel, but it would add to its lustre if its possessor was orderly, clean, and neat. Every one can see that to possess these qualities, with a good share of intelligence, is to possess not only what are in themselves good, but what should be esteemed by all churches as indispensable to a model Sexton.

The Sexton should, however, no more than the preacher, be expected to please everybody; this it is presumed would not be expected; and as he should know what his duties are, he should know also who it is that are authorized to enforce those duties. Ignorance upon these points have sometimes brought parties into a collision; hence it would be wise for those who are appointed by the church to employ a Sexton, to define his duties, and employ him as they would any other officer of the church, with reference to his fitness for his work. Churches are apt to think that any ignoramus will make a Sexton, and that for a small salary they can secure all that they require in this respect. Perhaps it would suffice for those who have but little to do, and less ambition to present a pleasant and inviting house, but it would be a suicidal policy to pursue by a respectable congregation, or one that desired to be so considered.

If, to the other duties of a Sexton be added that of collecting the pew-rents, he must not only be polite, but patient and persevering. These are very necessary qualities in any kind of a collector, but essentially so in a church one. As I have devoted ten years to general collecting, and for several years past never had less than three or four churches to collect for, it may be presumed that I have had some experience in this kind of business, and as a result I venture the assertion, that a church-collector should be wide-awake, courteous, and respectful, and never discouraged. But enough upon this point, and now a few thoughts upon Ventilation.

I agree with you that pure air is an essential, and that it is next in importance to the Spirit of God and his truth, in the sanctuary. There may be various ways of obtaining it, in different churches, according to arrangements for this purpose; and perhaps no church is so badly constructed but that, by a little judgment on the part of the Sexton, it could be tolerably ventilated. But, unless he knows and feels the importance of pure air, as a sustaining principal of life, it is not likely that he will supply a congregation with more than they need, except to turn it in upon them in such a way as to endanger their health. This will be oftener done than may prove desirable, unless prevented by some one; and, unquestionably, with innocence on his part. The fact is, the church should be well ventilated before meeting, always; and care taken to prevent the lighting of matches, and the throwing of cigars and other refuse of tobacco, or anything else that would tend to make the atmosphere of the house unpleasant, down upon a hot furnace, as is sometimes done. And when the windows are closed, except, perhaps, one or two at the top, a few inches, on the off-side from where the wind would enter the church, it will soon resume its former temperature, but with a purer air. When we consider how disagreeable a smoky, a cold, or a badly ventilated church is, it will undoubtedly be conceded that a pleasant one, filled with pure, warm air, but not oppressive, is an important attraction to an intelligent audience, on a cold Sabbath day; equally so is a polite and inviting Sexton, who has made it his endeavor to bring about so desirable a result.

In the sermon, early fires are recommended, and, I think, with great propriety. It seems to me that too much cannot be said in favor of this practice; while late fires are the cause of many great evils, of which even some Sextons are not conscious. In the first place, the Sexton often fails to secure a comfortable temperature, and consequently puts it out of his power to ventilate after he has warmed the house well, at least so far as ventilating before morning service is concerned, which should always be done thoroughly. A room thus freshened not only lets off the smoky smell which often follows the warming of a church, but makes it much easier to keep the house comfortable during service.

Another consequence of late fires, is the cold air currents which we sometimes feel in churches, and, resulting from this, not unfrequently, cold feet. Also, by late fires, we are often compelled to force them, in order to get up a tolerable temperature, and in doing this, as a regular thing, a furnace will not last long; hence it is that some Sextons will use up a furnace in half the time that others will. But the greatest evil of all, in forcing fires, is, endangering the church. Many fine edifices have been destroyed by this means. I care not how safe a building may be regarded, in this respect, none are fire-proof against a lazy and careless sexton. Early, but steady fires, with a good supply of pure air, to the hot air chamber, is best, because always safest, and because it affords time for ventilation.

INQUIRER.

* The reference is to an extract published by us some time ago. The above has been laid over several weeks, on account of the press of other matter.—EDS.

Family Prayer.

The patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, wherever in their pilgrimages they fixed on a place of residence, erected an altar to God for family devotion, and called on the name of the Lord.

Joshua resolved that, as for him and his family, they would serve the Lord; that is, worship him.

Job practised family worship. "He sent and sanctified his children, and rose early in the morning and offered burnt-offerings, according to the number of them all. Thus did Job continually."

David, having spent one day in bringing the ark from the house of Obed-edom to the place he had prepared for it, and in presenting peace-offerings before the Lord, returned at night to bless his household—that is, to pray for blessings upon his family, or to attend upon family devotion.

Cornelius, the centurion, it is said, "feared God with all his house"—meaning worshipped him with his family.

In the Lord's Prayer we have a command for family devotion. "After this manner, therefore, pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven." The form of prayer is plural. It must, therefore, mean social prayer, and if social, then family prayer; for a family is the most proper place to engage in this devotion.

Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, having pointed out the duty of husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants, adds: "Continue in prayer; watch in the same with thanksgiving." The subject upon which he was speaking leads us to conlude he meant family prayer.

In his Epistle to the Ephesians, he enjoins it as duty to "pray always with all prayer;"—that is to offer prayer of every kind; and in every form, and at every proper season. Family prayer must, therefore, be included in the injunction.

EUROPEAN CORRESPONDENCE.

GARIBALDI'S EXPEDITION AND ITS SUCCESS—DESIGNS OF FRANCE AND RUSSIA IN THE EAST—A COUNTERCHECK—PERSECUTION OF FRENCH PROTESTANTS—THE SCOTTISH GENERAL ASSEMBLIES—DR. CUNNINGHAM'S SERMON—THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD—ITS COMMEMORATION OF THE TRI-CENTENARY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION—ANALYSIS OF DR. ANDERSON'S SPEECH ON THE "DEFECTS" OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION—ITS OWN DEFECTS—A GREAT PARTY DEBATE—THE LORDS VS. THE COMMONS—THE PEERS' VICTORY—REASONS FOR THE VOTE—THE CABINET—WILL IT IN OFFICE—POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, May 23, 1860.

GARIBALDI'S EXPEDITION has continued to absorb the attention of the whole of Europe, almost exclusively. From Naples, on the 19th inst., came a telegram, marked "official"—indicating that it was of Royal manufacture—announcing that Garibaldi's volunteers had been attacked at the point of the bayonet, by the King's troops, and had been routed, after severe loss, including one of their leaders. The *Patrie*, a Paris paper, favorable to liberty, substantially confirmed the truth of this statement, adding, however, that the volunteers had effected their retreat in good order, and that by the last accounts the insurrection was being organized and extended in a great many directions. Another statement appeared in the *Times*, to the same effect, adding that the action with the King's troops was by no means of a decisive character. Other ("emigrants") volunteers were landing on the coast of Sicily, and when all were assembled there would be twelve thousand men, well armed and well provisioned. It further appeared that several thousands of the native Sicilians had joined the liberators, and that the Neapolitan troops found themselves much embarrassed, and virtually shut up in the large towns, where doubtless the mass of the population hate them with intensest hatred. Probably ere these lines appear in print, Sicily will have been wrested from the King of Naples, and its virtual independence secured. It remains to be seen whether the Bourbon dynasty, as represented by young Bomba, may not entirely be swept away. The sooner this is the case the better, for the sake of humanity, liberty, and truth. Such a Government is an outrage on mankind, and an insult to high Heaven.

THE DESIGNS OF FRANCE AND RUSSIA, on Turkey, are now beginning to come to light. Russia complains, hypocritically, of "the unbearable" wrongs done to the Greek Christians, because of the non-execution of that famous edict of toleration and protection, which was secured by the never-to-be-forgotten exertions of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, when Ambassador at Constantinople. Its tendency was emphatically Protestant, and therefore inimical to the secret designs of the Greek and Latin Churches in the East. Had Nicholas succeeded in the Crimean war, religious liberty would have perished, Bible circulation would have ceased, and the American missionaries would have been driven away. And as to the present Czar, he has prohibited—notwithstanding hopes to the contrary—the Bible to be printed and circulated in the Russ language, he has so persecuted a body of his subjects who had adopted a simple Bible faith, as to compel them to emigrate from his dominions, and he has also banished and exiled the Jewish population of the Crimea. And yet this is the Power which cries out on the Sultan, because of "unbearable" persecution, through connivance or negligence. No doubt there are fanatical Pashas in distant Provinces, and Christians do suffer at times. No doubt the Porte is oftimes powerless to carry out its own law of religious toleration. But for the Russian Ambassador to convene the Diplomatic Corps, and make a great outcry, and then propose joint action, is a piece of glaring hypocrisy, masking designs which have long been cherished, and which Muscovite tenacity, in spite of checks, will continue to prosecute, if possible, to a successful conclusion.

What shall we say of France, in this business? France, each of whose monarchs is "the eldest son of the Church," has always affected the championship of the interests of the Latin Church in the East. On Maundy-Thursday, at Rome, there is an annual "cursing" performance, in which not only "heretics" are duly denounced, but "schismatics," i. e., the adherents of the Greek Church, are consigned to perdition. And once a year, too, at the Easter Festival, in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, at Jerusalem, Greek and Latin monks have been wont to come into such fierce collision that Turkish soldiers have been obliged to interpose. Nevertheless here we find the two Powers which, *representatively*, are *Greek* and *Romish*, in their protectorate and sympathies, joining hands. Each is a propagandist, and the priests of the respective Churches uses each to do *their* work. France makes her Consuls missionaries for Rome, and she has thus succeeded, by promises of protection, in bringing over to the Latin Church a goodly number recently. But one of these Powers is insufficient—it cannot carry out its political designs alone—and so "the secret understanding" between France and Russia, which has been in existence for more than a year, is now beginning to bear fruit. The result would be, if successful, either the entire dominance of Russia in Turkey, or the sharing of the spoils of empire with France, and thus the Crimean war would have been waged in vain, and the Mediterranean would become a joint lake for the French and Russian, or for one of these Powers. France persecutes Protestants—the Turkish Government never persecutes. Russia, as we have seen, is intolerant, and yet both are now in accord, and, under professed zeal for Christianity, are developing their political and dangerous designs.

That French Protestants are still persecuted, let the following recent case testify:

A widow, born in the Catholic faith, but since converted to Protestantism, and one of the most steadfast and respectable members of the Evangelical Church at Macon, recently met with an accident. Her clothes took fire; she was severely burnt, and taken to the hospital. Her wounds, though severe, were not mortal; nevertheless she summoned her pastor to her bedside. Being absent, his wife Mdme. D——, immediately responded to the call of her husband's parshioner. The sick woman no sooner saw her than she implored her assistance to try and get her out of the hospital, that she might breathe her last among her friends. She asked Mdme. D. to raise the blanket and see how she was treated. Mdme. D. did so, and to her horror found that the patient's arms and legs were so tightly strapped to the bedstead as to prevent her from making any motion. Mdme. D. immediately withdrew, and returned soon after with a litter and four men to take the poor woman away, but the Catholic Sisters of Charity prevented her entrance, and since then neither herself, her husband, the pastor, nor any member of the Protestant community were allowed to enter the hospital. A few days after, the poor woman died, and was buried in the Catholic cemetery with the rites and ceremonies of the Romish Church.

M. Schmidt adds that a complaint was made to M. le Prefet, but it is too probable that, but for his boldly publishing this scandalous instance of religious freedom in France, nothing would have been allowed to transpire. It is impossible to say how many cases of the same kind occur in every establishment of the kind under Catholic or Government control. The matter is quietly hushed up, and as *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*, the French Government piques itself on the amount of religious liberty which its subjects enjoy.

A countercheck is now being presented to the designs of Russia, by a joint declaration by Austria, England, and Prussia, that all three insist on the integrity of the Turkish Empire being recognized as a basis for any possible negotiations, and have refused to take the assertions of Russia about the sufferings of the Christians in Turkey, into consideration, or even to recognize their truth, unless they are placed side by side with the reports of their own representatives.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES of the Established and Free Churches, are now sitting in Edinburgh. Dr. James Moncrieff was elected Moderator of the Established Assembly. The Lord High Commissioner, the Earl of Belhaven, came to the Assembly Hall in procession from Holyrood Palace, made the usual announcement of the Queen's determination to protect the privileges of the Church, and of the usual Royal grant of £2,000 for religious purposes in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. There is very little interest taken by the public of Edinburgh, or by visitors from other countries, in the Established Assembly. The Hall in which it meets is a noble one, but there is a formalism about the proceedings which proves that Moderatism is *not* dead, and the popular heart gravitates toward the *real* representative of evangelic life—the Free Church Assembly.

Dr. Cunningham opened the Free Church proceedings with a sermon from Gal. iv: 6. As the subjects discussed were Scriptural views of the Atonement, as contrasted with the new or insidious opposition to them now current, the discourse was preëminently a word in season, and that from the lips of a Master in Israel. He remarked that "the Rationalism which prevails so extensively in the present day, the setting up of man himself as the great standard, tends powerfully to discountenance such views of the Divine character and moral government, and of the conditions and capacities of man, as the doctrine of the Atonement assumes."

"The love of mystic vagueness and obscurity," he added, "which is also a peculiar characteristic of the present day, is adverse to the formation and expression of distinct and definite conceptions upon this, or upon any other great doctrine of revelation."

These remarks are as just as they are suggestive and weighty. I see proofs of their necessity increasingly every day; specially in connexion with a book recently published by an Independent minister in London, Mr. Brown, entitled "The Divine Life of Man," in which the *judicial* character of God is swallowed up in his *paternal* character; and yet the author maintains, and others at the press and in *pulpits* hold precisely with him, that this is not a real departure from the old landmarks. Add to this the influence of Professor Jowett, at Oxford, and "Essays" lately published by Oxford men, and the danger is most imminent. Satan having failed in Romanizing us through Tractarianism, is now bringing in upon us a flood of Rationalistic heresy, although I believe and expect that here also the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him.

The following is the remaining outline of Dr. Cunningham's discourse—I. The connexion between the person and the work of Christ; his proper Divinity and his vicarious atonement. II. The necessity of atonement, and satisfaction for forgiveness of sin. III. The reality and true nature of an atonement or satisfaction as effected by the sufferings and death of Christ. IV. The extent of the atonement.

He concluded by urging on the fathers and brethren the necessity of definite and clear views on the subject, and warned the young men, especially to beware of two things. "First, beware of attempting to make the cross of Christ more attractive to men—to make your representation of the scheme of redemption better fitted, as you may fancy, to encourage and persuade men to come to Christ, by *keeping back or explaining away* any thing God has revealed to us, by failing to bring out in due place and order, and in its right relation, every part of the scheme of revealed truth.

"Second, beware of underrating the value and efficacy of Christ's blood, as if fitted and intended only to remove legal obstacles, and open a door of salvation for all," [This is, I fear, the general theology even of Evangelical Dissenters here, always excepting the Baptists.] "and not to effect and secure the salvation of an innumerable multitude, as if it did not contain certain *provisions and effectual security*, that Christ should see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

Dr. Robert Buchanan, of Glasgow, author of "The Ten Years' Conflict," was unanimously and by acclamation, elected as the new Moderator, and delivered a lengthened and appropriate address. As usual, the crowd at the opening of the Free Church Assembly was very great.—including many strangers, and no doubt the American friends, whose presence and doings in London I have recently indicated. In Glasgow, Dr. Murray has been preaching, and Mr. G. H. Stuart, has been giving an account of the American Revival.

LORD BROUGHAM'S ADDRESS at his inauguration as Chancellor of the University of Edinburgh, was delivered a few days ago, under the most interesting circumstances. The Moderators of the Assemblies, and of the U. P. Synod, the Professors, Lord Provost, and a brilliant audience, were present. The address occupied two hours in the delivery, and was a truly marvellous and felicitous display of intellect and power. It also contained beautiful tributes to the memory of Washington and other patriot heroes, as contrasted with ambitious conquerors. It set forth great and important lessons as to patient study, as to the value of classical literature, as to the study of Greek rather than the Roman models of oratory, and pointed out that while in oratory, nature, under strong emotion, was always eloquent, that the orator must be a student of his best passages, taking care, as is quite possible, to *conceal* the art, and to give to his most powerful passages an air of unprompted and impassioned power. No orator has given greater illustrations of this than Lord B. himself, in his great career. His oration also paid homage to revealed religion, and maintained that natural theology must be studied too.

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD held its annual meeting on the week preceding the General Assemblies. Dr. Harper, one of the theological Professors, was chosen Moderator. A separate commemoration of the Tricentenary of the Scottish Reformation, was held by this body in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, on Wednesday, the 16th instant, in connexion with which, together with devotional exercises, addresses were delivered by leading ministers, on "The Causes of the Reformation," "The Scottish Reformation," "The Influence of the Reformation," "Its Defects," and on "Our Present Duties in Relation to It."

The speech on "The Defects" was by Dr. Anderson, of Glasgow, an eccentric and gifted man, and was eminently characteristic of him. He instanced matters as "defects," doubtless therein overdoing his theme, and misrepresenting unintentionally the Reformers of Scotland, as well as Free Church men now. For example, while he held ordination and the imposition of hands to be thoroughly Scriptural, he said "our Reformers prostituted to ends of great clerical assumption," and "especially so in limiting the liberty of prophesying." That taint, he said, was found even in their own Synod to a certain extent.

Again. "Our Reformers imported from Rome, not a little of the doctrine of the mysterious, as to the sacraments," and very rashly ventured to say of "the deliverance of the Westminster Divines," on the subject of Baptism, that he had "never seen or heard a satisfactory attempt to vindicate that deliverance from the charge of teaching Baptismal Regeneration." The best answer to such a statement, is, first an *argumentum ad hominem*—why sign a Confession embodying a dogma you do not believe; and, secondly, that as Dr. Cunningham pointed out to a querulous Baptist minister at Sunderland, who had left the Established Church on account of its teaching baptismal regeneration, that our Catechism and Confession, in their definitions of Baptism, are not dealing with the case of infants at all, or teaching aught like an *opus operatum*, but are speaking of the baptism of adult believers.

There was better reason in Dr. A.'s affirmation that the Scottish Reformers went too far as to minute conformity on a great number of topics as necessary for ministerial and Christian communion; though even here he spoke with rashness, and threw obloquy on the "opinionativeness" of Luther, Calvin, and Knox, as well as on "creeds" composed by "dead men," as requiring "frequent review."

Dr. Anderson had more reason for complaint as to "defects" as to the power asserted by the Scottish Reformers on behalf of the civil magistrate, which in its development must necessarily destroy toleration itself. The eccentric speaker maintained that the U. P. Synod was the *only* Church in Scotland that could or would protest against "defects" like these, in the Scottish Reformation. He also put forward the extreme, "voluntary" views of modern Seceders, and went so far as to find fault with the Evangelical Alliance, as having "had a most deadening influence on their witness-bearing," attacking the memory of Chalmers for an "opinionativeness" (kindred to that of Luther and Calvin,) as to the Establishment principle, deploring the defection of his own Synod from its old ground, and that they were now "a feeble, faithless, un-Protestantized generation." Had they been "faithful," they would have "gained over three-fourths of the Free Church to protest against the endowment of Irish Presbyterians, and so have tumbled down the Maynooth grant." All this is mere rhapsody, enthusiasm, folly, and marvellous self-conceit. These are the kind of speeches which are sure to keep asunder the Free Church and the United Presbyterians, and also to damage our hopes of a union of Presbyterians in England. The audience cheered this speech loudly; and this indicates the awakening of old antipathies. No doubt the Synod as a body did not endorse these views. Dr. Anderson said he knew that it would bring odium upon him, and he wished the reporters for the press to send it forth that he alone was responsible—"I fecht for my own hand."

A GREAT PARTY STRUGGLE has just ended, and its issue is a victory for the House of Peers. In my last I referred to the prospect of a collision between the Peers and Commoners, and to the speech of Mr. Bright on behalf of the Paper Duty Bill, and against the proposed action of Lord Derby and his friends. His Lordship received a deputation on Saturday last, from the meeting at St. Martin's Hall, and assured its members that he intended only to treat the question as one of revenue, while yet affirming that even as a money question, the Peers had a right to stop a measure passed by the Commons. In the great debate of Monday night, Lord Lyndhurst (the son of Copley, an American artist,) speaking on his eighty-eighth birthday, made a brilliant legal oration in support of Lord Derby's views. When the division came, many of the Whig Peers voted against the Cabinet policy, and the bill was rejected by the very large majority of eighty-nine. Thus in the prospect of a deficient revenue next year, with feelings of antipathy to Mr. Bright and his plans of increased direct taxation, to gratify, and doubtless in the main, with a conviction that the dangers of a European war, as well as the *certainty* (for it is such now,) of another with China, demanded the husbanding of our resources, the Lord's have delivered their verdict. The Cabinet, however, keeps in office. They will not resign; neither will they, by a dissolution, appeal to the country. This in the present state of Europe, to say nothing of the interests of trade and commerce, would be madness. The accession, too, of a Derby Cabinet to power, would be a calamity; as it would give heart and hope to the despotisms of the Continent, and the Pope and all his myrmidons would be ready to sing a *Te Deum*.

J. W.

The two prize fighters have made up their disputes. Each is to have a belt of honor. Sayers retires from the ring. Great evil has arisen from the boxing mania. Lord Palmerston *half* defends it, and he needed and deserved a rebuke, such as has now been administered.

Weak Christians.

A writer in the *Missouri Baptist* groups five classes under this title:

"1. There are some brethren so physically weak, that they cannot raise their hand as high up as their pockets, and some not quite so weak but that they could do that, who are not able to lift it out again.

"2. There are some brethren so weak from the labors of business, that they have not strength to walk to church on the Sabbath, and some not quite so weak, who can get there only once that day.

"3. There are some so weak after the toils of the day, that they are not able to walk to prayer-meeting; and then, again, others who can get there, who are too weak to speak or pray.

"4. There are some brethren so weak, as to be unable to rise early enough to have family worship before business hours; then there are others who do rise early, but are too weak to reach down the old family Bible.

"5. There are some brethren so weak in talents, that they are not able to teach a class in Sabbath School, but who are not quite so weak when a political meeting is on hand."

Laughing Ministers.

LETTER FROM A SISTER.

MY DEAR EDWARD:—You solicit criticism from the whole family circle, "the girls included." Is it that you really desire to profit by our sagacious hints, or are you merely curious to know what people are likely to think of you when you shall have arrived at the full dignity of a minister? Upon the first supposition, I am quite at your service, and engage to furnish my quota of admonition with all sisterly fidelity. You do well to include your sisters in the list of your mentors, for we can make some suggestions which your theological teachers may not deem within their province; and representing, as we do, a no inconsiderable class of the subjects of ministerial influence, our views may be of as much consequence as those of far wiser people. Moreover, as the daughters of a minister, we have some bits of experience to whisper in your ear.

Leaving the things of theology to those more skilled in that department, I shall confine myself mainly to matters pertaining to the outer man, believing as I do, that among the items which constitute what is denominated the *success* of a preacher, his personal manners, both in the pulpit and out of it, are of no small importance.

In the first place, my dear Edward, I do pray you not to come into the class with those who may be denominated *par excellence*, "laughing ministers." Let seriousness be your prevailing mood, and laugh only in the proper time, place, and way. Laugh only when you are really amused, and not for the sake of being a "good fellow," or for fear of being thought unappreciative of the ludicrous. Clergymen have as good a right to laugh as other men if they will be governed by propriety in their merry-making, as, I am sorry to say, is not always the case. A *gentleman* will not throw back his head, and stretch his mouth from ear to ear, and stamp his foot, like a bar-room roisterer, let him be where he will, or have what he will to laugh at. Neither will a person who means to take life in serious earnest, and lives for high and exalted purposes, however mirthful his temperament, be always peering about, like an idle school boy, for something to laugh at, or given to uproarious demonstrations of his appreciative ability when cause for laughter shall chance to present itself. Of all men, I would have my minister dignified, manly, and gentlemanly. I would wish him social, cheerful, genial, but not one of your habitual laughers. You know me too well, Edward, to suppose me an advocate of long faces, of an owl-like gravity, or least of all, of anything which savors of the sanctimonious. I would never condemn wit or pleasantry when spontaneously and properly timed, nor the laughter which it excites; but it is "this eternal guffaw about everything," as Douglas Jerrold has it, which heartily disgusts me, in a minister. If I were a Professor in a theological institution, I should be disposed to treat this species of bad manners as a barrier to "ministerial success," in the best sense of that term, quite as serious as wrong views of the origin of evil, or of natural and moral ability.

Do you ask if I think you especially in need of counsel on this point? No, not from the natural bent of your mind and feelings, but I fear the contagious influence of a prevailing style of manners. In ministerial gatherings, laughing would seem to be the order of the day. Recently, at a minister's meeting held at our house, the peals of laughter which occasionally reached the kitchen, led Bridget to declare with one of her Catholic asseverations, that "our Yankee ministers were the greatest cases for laughing that ever *she* saw." Of course, I reproved her freedom of speech, and repelled the uncharitable suggestion, but I felt, nevertheless, that she had spoken the truth.

It does seem, even on great and important public occasions, as religious anniversaries and the like, that the grand element of a successful achievement in the speech-making line, is its special adaptedness to raise a laugh. Mr. A makes, it may be, a brilliant speech