ON MORAL EVIDENCE.

INTENDED AS INTRODUCTORY TO SOME REMARKS ON HINDUISM.

BY THE REV. J. GARRETT.

The human mind is liable to impressions of various kinds, all of which are conveyed to it through the medium of the senses. A sensation communicated by the eye is sufficient to suggest the notion of external existence, which is further confirmed by a sensation of obstruction or resistance communicated by the sense of touch. In these cases the senses are acted upon directly by the objects themselves, whose existence they testify, and the assent given by the mind to such existence is commonly said to be based upon the evidence of the senses. On the same evidence is founded our belief, of all events which come under our immediate observation.

But in the vast majority of cases this direct observation does not take place, and were it the only source of knowledge, our knowledge would be but a small fraction of what it actually is. Fortunately, however, knowledge is transmissive. Through the medium of language as presented to the eye or ear, one man's observations are presented to another, and the experience of a world is made available to an individual. The assent given by the mind to knowledge thus conveyed is said to rest on the evidence of testimony. These two, then, the senses and testimony, are the primary sources of all our knowledge. When the mind reasons, it reasons by means of facts, and the result of
its reasonings cannot be considered as derived from any independent source. The leading or initial truths of mathematical knowledge, indeed, are perceived by the mind unaided by the bodily senses; are independent of all existence, and bear the impress of eternal certainty.

What we intend at present is, to investigate the principle on which we assent to the evidence of the senses and of testimony.

Men have amused themselves very successfully with the arguments for the existence of an external world. Into this it is not our intention to enter largely. That mind must be of a very singular constitution in which there exist doubts of an external world: at the same time the proposition that such a world does exist is certainly not capable of demonstration. For it is not demonstrated until it be shown that we could not have an idea of externality through any other medium, and that another proposition, viz., that the Creator produces, by direct interposition, every impression that is ever made upon the mind—or in the words of the Atheist, that there is nothing in what we call mind but a succession of impressions, uncontrolled by volition and resulting from chance—involves an impossibility.

Although it be true that we are conversant only with the impressions produced by external objects, and cannot be said to hold actual converse with these objects themselves, yet we find it impossible to reproduce, at will, the impression which has been made; and we are therefore led to conclude that the cause of the impression was external to ourselves. Further, when any man touches or strikes his own body he is conscious of a certain sensation; if he touches or strikes another man he is not conscious of the same sensation; the difference between these sensations appears to be the test of externality. Leaving, then, the abstract question of externality, let us inquire how the case stands with regard to the modes of existence of objects, and the occurrence of facts under certain limitations and modifications.

Suppose for the sake of illustration, that a human being has been created in full possession of all his faculties, and perfect exercise of his senses. Some object,—suppose a stone—is presented to him. Immediately, through the medium of the eye, a certain impression is made upon his mind; the sense of touch
being exercised on the stone produces another and corresponding impression; when he looks at the stone and touches it, he constantly reproduces the same sensations. As often then as he sees an object he attempts to touch it, and by the sense of touch confirms his idea of its existence. An object we shall suppose is presented to him which is too distant for his touch, but by approaching it he again experiences the confirming power of that sense. After repeated trials it is no longer necessary to use the sense of touch as confirmatory to that of sight, for by their constant agreement in every case when the trial was made, the probability in favour of the accuracy of the sense of sight is beyond all computation. By thus at first confirming the testifying of one sense by those of another, each may be established as an independent and creditable witness; and will continue to be so, unless there should happen a case in which one sense contradicts the testimony of another.

Now what is all this, but the process of experiment, or the inductive method of reasoning? and what is the conclusion we have reached with regard to the evidence of sense? Is it that that principle is instinctive or intuitive? Is it that we believe in the evidence of sense in obedience to some innate occult principle, implanted in our nature, of the reasonableness of which we could make no assertion? Is it not rather that our belief in sense is based on that common foundation of all rational belief, the information of experience and the facts of an accurate and close induction.

We may now state as a general theorem that the testimony of any one sense is in general worthy of credit, and that the concurrent testimony of two or more senses, is the strongest ground for belief.

That this theorem should have failing cases may seem surprising: it is however, true, and gives additional confirmation to the views we have adopted. Fallacy in various forms enfeebles the evidence of sense, and as these can be detected only by induction, it is on that very induction we rely in our belief of the evidence under any given circumstances.

In the preceding observations we have considered man as the subject of impressions directly produced on his mind by external objects: we must remember that another and very expansive
field of knowledge lies before him, as the subject of communi-
cation. Small indeed would be the range of science if it were
bounded by the single-handed researches even of the longest
human life. But when we look upon each man as possessing
the power of communicating his impressions and inductions to
others;—and every age as capable of accumulating and trans-
mittting to futurity the inductions of all preceding duration;
its progressive character is unfolded to our view, and the induct-
ion of an individual is virtually the induction of every former
age. What at present concerns our argument is the principle,
or rather the question whether there be any rational principle,
on which the mind is justified in assenting to the truth of events
communicated through the medium of another mind. It mat-
ters not whether the manner of the communication be verbal or
written. In both cases such evidence is called the evidence of
testimony. As our belief in the evidence of testimony implies
results of the highest importance, and as objections of no ordi-
nary acuteness and subtlety have been raised against its validity
in some cases, it will not be out of place to examine with what
care we can the grounds of our assent.

It will be admitted generally with regard to the first testi-
mony of an entire stranger, presented to a man newly formed
with all his faculties, that independently of concomitant circum-
stances, he has no reason whatever either to believe or dis-
believe. Suppose the testimony respects some event of which
the truth is subsequently proved. Let the new formed being
have a second time an affirmation of some event made to him,
his mind bends to the side of belief; but should this second
testimony prove false, returns to its original indifference respect-
ing testimony, with a slight modification depending on circum-
stances. If the two affirmations were made by the same per-
son, he will then after the second, be in precisely the same
situation as at first. If they were made by different individuals,
then his bias with regard to these two persons will be in
favour of the first and against the second, but as to the tes-
timony of all other men he must be in a state of perfect
indifference. If in the progress of his connection with the
world he should find the first of these two, after many trials, to
testify the truth in all cases, he must at length feel the most per-
feet confidence in that man's testimony. If in addition to all this he had marked some very striking peculiarities of character in this man, such as that his testimony was given without the hope of reward, and not only so but with the certainty of loss, and not of loss merely, but at the peril of his life; and if, selecting these characteristics, and applying them to other cases, he has found that when they obtained, then the testimony was always true, then he has a rational ground for concluding that testimony given by such characters is never false.

Here as with regard to the senses, it is easy to see that induction is the ground of belief. While, however, the hypothetical case stated above is fully realised in the intercourse of man—for no man has ever in such circumstances persisted in false testimony,—we all know, that with many men various circumstances will effect a modification of testimony. Upon this view it would not be difficult to draw out a scheme of testimonies, and to affix to each class its leading characteristics;—we should see them range from that which was seldom true, through the intermediate shades of the sometimes true, the doubtful, the sometimes false, the rarely false, up to that highest of all which was never found to be untrue. Seeing this to be the case, it surely would be very unfair to take an argument applicable to one class of testimony, and by a sophistical generalization to apply it to the whole. The use of this observation will presently appear.

We have attempted to show that our assent to the evidence of the senses and of testimony, is given upon the ground of induction, we might have said of experience. As an illustration of the importance of this principle, we select the well-known argument of Mr. Hume, on the subject of miracles, which is as follows:—"No testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish: and even in that case there is a mutual destruction of arguments, and the superior only gives us an assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after deducting the inferior." (p. 182.) In another part of his essay, after supposing a well-attested account of a dead person being restored to life, he says, "All this might astonish me, but I would still reply, that the
knavery and folly of men are such common phenomena, that I should rather believe the most extraordinary events to arise from their concurrence, than admit so signal a violation of the laws of nature." (p. 204.) He thus sums up his argument, "Upon the whole, then, it appears that no testimony for any kind of miracle can ever possibly amount to a probability, much less to a proof; and that even supposing it amounted to a proof, it would be opposed by another proof, derived from the very nature of the fact which it endeavoured to establish. It is experience only which gives authority to human testimony; and it is the same experience which assures us of the laws of nature; when, therefore, these two kinds of experience are contrary, we have nothing to do but subtract the one from the other, and embrace an opinion either on the one side or the other, with that assurance which arises from the remainder. But according to the principle here explained, this substraction, with regard to all popular religions, amounts to an entire annihilation; and therefore we may establish it as a maxim, that no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle, and make it a just foundation for any such system of religion." (pp. 202–3.) Thus he affirms that no human testimony could render a miracle credible, because a miracle is contrary to our experience. We argue on the other hand, that it is quite as contrary to our experience that testimony, given in circumstances such as we have described above, should be false. If then there were but one such witness for the truth of the miracle, the improbabilities would balance each other: a second witness would double the probability in favour of the miracle; a third would make it as four to one; a fourth as eight to one; and so on to an inconceivable extent. Observe where the fallacy of Mr. Hume's argument lies; he frames his argument so as to apply to testimony in the mass; whereas, an argument applicable to testimony in the mass, is not therefore applicable to each particular sort of testimony.*

* It may aid some of our readers also to notice another fallacy, that of employing the word experience in two senses; and assuming that because a miracle is contrary to ordinary experience—which it must be to be a miracle—it is contrary to all experience—in other words that the "experience which assures us of the laws of nature" is the same in extent with that "which gives
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Nothing can be more certain than this; that the degree of confidence and satisfaction which we receive from the testimony of one man is very different from that which we receive from the testimony of another. Now the reasons of the difference are obvious: one man is invariably honest in his dealings—him we credit; another is otherwise—him we discredit: one man possesses tried good sense, and has often proved that he is not liable to be imposed upon—another has distinguished himself as a visionary and a fanatic. What could be more absurd than to say that because in our experience of the latter we had been often deceived, we should therefore extend our unbelief to the former. Thus in the first place we find a radical distinction as to testimony in the character of the witnesses—a distinction founded on experience. Again, if we take one of those whose testimony is of an inferior value, and place him in circumstances where adherence to that testimony puts in peril his honour, his property, his liberty, and his life; then adherence under such circumstances gives a reasonable credibility even to such testimony. How much more so if he be a witness of the first class—one who has never been known to deceive, and who for the truth of his testimony, sacrifices with unshrinking fortitude, not wealth merely, but liberty—not liberty merely, but honour—not honour merely, but life. And such sacrifices have been made. There was a man once who was reared in the wisdom of this world, and doubtless had in prospect many of its honours. He forsook that wisdom which he once admired, and in the very spot where its powers were concentrated fearlessly confronted its haughty professor; and the same eye which had been wont to brighten at the tribute of applause, met with unshrinking gaze the Epicurean smile of incredulity, and the Stoic's haughty and insulting contempt. Were this all, to such a mind the trial were severe; but life itself was not withheld to the strengthening of the testimony. There were many witnesses to the same fact, and their combined evidence places the matter on so secure a footing that it seems to me—resting on experience as the foundation of our belief in testimony, and pursuing the views explained above—that Mr. Hume's demand is answered; and that the authority to human testimony, whereas one is partial and the other universal.

—Ens. M. C. I.
evidence of miracles is shown to be such that its falsehood would be a greater miracle than they are themselves.

We have seen that there are two modifications on which depends our belief in testimony—the character of the witnesses and the circumstances in which they are placed. Another scale of testimonies may be obtained by combining them. Thus if a man of ordinary character be the witness of circumstances in which strong temptations to falsehood are before him—his evidence is doubtful. Again, if the witness be a man of indifferent character, and if the evidence he gives forfeits his life, a high degree of credibility is given to his evidence—how much more if his character be unimpeachable; how much more still if there be not one but many such witnesses. How opposed to all experience that such testimonies should be false.

Further, it appears that Mr. Hume's argument may be extended to the evidence of sense; for we have frequent experience of inaccurate indications given by sense—we have no experience of the occurrence of a miracle. Therefore it is more likely that our senses are deceived than that a miracle should be true. But if the evidence of sense be denied, then no evidence remains—truth is unattainable—and there can be no intelligence.

(To be continued.)

Note.—This extension of the argument, by the clear headed writer of this valuable article, should be noticed, as altogether legitimate; but it must be applied, as no doubt intended, only to the subject in hand—the evidence of sense in regard to a miracle; which Mr. Hume's doctrine would make an impossibility—and not to all "truth" and "intelligence."—Eds.

THE RENEGADE.

A FRAGMENT FROM A TRAVELLER'S NOTE-BOOK.

It is not probable that the following incident will make upon others the same impression it originally produced on the mind of the narrator. To events in which we have been personally concerned, we naturally attach an exaggerated importance. Some of the circumstances, however, connected with the pre-
sent occurrence are of such a character as to induce the writer to believe, that their narration will not be found either destitute of interest, or out of place, in the pages in which they now appear.

In order to avoid unnecessary circumlocution, and to insure greater distinctness, I must, in what follows, speak in the first person: the unavoidable egotism of the narrative will therefore be excused.

—— I had been some time in Cairo, when, early one Sunday morning, I was proceeding from the place of my abode, to the Lutheran Mission Chapel, in order to officiate in part of the service. I had crossed the Birket Ezbekieh, or great square of the city, and was endeavouring to thread my way through the maze of narrow streets which lead, in this direction, to the Coptic quarter, the place of my destination. Little acquainted with the locality, and being naturally peculiarly deficient in the phrenological organ of that name, I was soon at a loss how to proceed, and ignorant almost entirely of the "speech of Egypt," looked around in vain for any one to whom I could hope to make my wants intelligible. At this moment a stranger rode up. Subsequent events induced me particularly to note his appearance. He was mounted on a powerful Arab horse, and dressed in the costume of the higher ranks of the country. A richly tasselled Fez cap was on his head, and his tall and commanding person was partially covered by a dark green caftan, heavily braided. He wore a military kind of girdle, from which depended a Damascus scymetar. His countenance, handsome, though rather strongly featured, was bronzed and sun-burnt; but it seemed to have been originally more fair, and did not strike me as altogether Arabic in its contour. I had set him down in my own mind as an European Turk, and consequently, though we mutually saluted in passing, I did not think of addressing him, with reference to my present dilemma. He seemed, however, to have conjectured what it was, for, after having ridden on a few paces, he turned round, and addressing me, to my surprise, in English, asked if he could be of use in directing me on my way. I thanked him for his civility, and stated my errand. "If you will walk alongside of me," he replied, "I will No. 7.
take you to the place, for my own road lies in the same direc-
tion." We naturally fell into further conversation, and the
stranger was not indisposed to be communicative. I found he
was an Englishman by birth, but for many years settled in
Egypt; and I conjectured from what he said, in the service of
the Pacha. What was his original, or present name, he did not
state, and courtesy forbade me to inquire. My dress indicated
my profession. "You are a missionary, I presume?" he inquired.
"No"—and I told him what I was. Our conversation turned
on religion, and the sentiments of my companion soon became
apparent. He spoke disparagingly of the missionaries, and the
fruitlessness of their labours; alluded, in the same strain, to the
divisions and schisms among Christians; and landed, in contrast
with them, the perfect uniformity, or as he termed it, unity of
Mohammedanism. I replied, of course, to his statements; and
after some further converse, observing his repeated eulogies of the
Mussulman creed, expressed my hope that he had not allowed
himself to imbibe any of its tenets. He was silent for a mo-
ment, and then suddenly pulling up his horse, said quickly, and
somewhat sharply—"I am not ashamed to tell you, I am a
Mussulman." Pained and grieved by his reply, I walked on for
some time, in sorrow and silence, by the side of the Renegade.
A sense of duty, however, compelled me again to address him;
and I was encouraged by his frankness of manner, and apparent
willingness to listen. Although partly noted down at the time,
I cannot now recall the verbal details of the conversation that
followed: but it was long and interesting, and often, on both
sides, sufficiently vehement and energetic, to have attracted a
group of listeners, had our language been intelligible. My com-
panion dwelt chiefly on what he had formerly stated—the unity
of Mohammedanism as a religious system: he did not, however,
say much in defence either of its evidences, or peculiar tenets;
at bottom, he was evidently sceptical in regard to modes of faith,
and often had recourse, as a dernier resort, to the common in-
fidel sophism, that all forms of religion were alike acceptable, or
rather, alike indifferent, to God; and, therefore, the one he had
chosen as good as any other. These views I endeavoured to
meet with the usual arguments. Had God really given a re-
velation from heaven? That was the first question. If so, it
must necessarily be the only true religion, exclusive of all others. Otherwise its revelation were needless, and unworthy of God. And which then was the true religion—Christianity or Mohammedanism? Had he examined the evidences of both, or either? Had he tested those of the Gospel, and found them wanting? Had he found those of Islam satisfactory and conclusive? Was not the latter utterly defective in proof—its one and only miracle an absurdity? Were not its most prominent tenets immoral and licentious, and such as a holy God could not have given? And though, in regard to external forms and observances, possessed of uniformity, was it not destitute of every attribute of spirituality—of that pure and spiritual worship, which He, who is a Spirit, can alone receive and approve? Especially what provision did Mohammedanism make for man as a sinner? Was he not himself conscious of having broken God's laws, and on what did he rest for forgiveness and acceptance? Did he not feel that he needed an expiation for his guilt, a surer ground of confidence than anything he possessed himself? And did his new creed give him aught on which he could thus rest his soul? Did it tell of an atonement—of any adequate ground of acceptance—of any way in which God could be just and yet a Saviour? On this last point I particularly dwelt—for it seemed in some degree to impress him. "Believe me," I added, "that it is easy to satisfy ourselves as to the future, while we are in all the consciousness of life and health, and the thoughts of eternity far distant. But think, I beseech you, whether it will be so always. Think whether the creed you profess will be able to sustain you in the hour of death—in the prospect of judgment—on the eve of meeting a holy and righteous God?"

He made no reply—but seemed thoughtful. Little did I imagine how unconsciously prophetic were these last words, or how near was the unwitting prediction to its fulfilment.

But we had now reached our point of separation. He resisted my solicitation that he would attend worship at the chapel. "That is impossible." As we parted, he held out his hand. "You will not refuse," said he, with a mingled expression of pride and sadness, "you will not refuse to take the hand of a—Renegade?" "Assuredly not. Would only it were as easy to
reach your heart." He saluted me cordially, and as we separ­
ed, turned round, and said, "Perhaps we shall meet again."

* * * * # #

— And we did meet again.—

—It was again a Sunday, some weeks later, and but a few days before my final departure from Cairo. Tempted by the beauty and coolness of the evening, I had gone forth, just before sun-set, to pay a farewell visit to what had always been with me a favourite place of resort—the Tombs of the Caliphs. This is a large cemetery, chiefly occupied with the once splendid, but now ruinous and dilapidated sepulchres of many of the for­mer Ottoman sovereigns of Egypt, and of some others of more modern date and lesser note. It lies outside the walls, to the south of the city, commencing nearly at the southern or Fai­oun Gate, and extending westward towards the Nile. Cir­cumstances cause me to remember its locality. The quiet seclusion of the spot, its remains of perished greatness, and the many associations connected with it, are calculated to invest it with a peculiar interest, and to render it a fitting scene for calm and thoughtful meditation. This evening it was more than usually attractive. The skies were clear and cloudless, the moon, nearly full, shone on the nearer objects of the picture with al­most noon-day brightness, and silvered with paler light the dis­tant summits of the Pyramids of Gizeh, and the still remoter wastes of the Lybian desert, stretching far westward. The si­lence was deep and almost undisturbed, befitting such a dwelling of the dead, broken only by the low hum of the distant city, and the dull and scarcely heard murmurs of the deep but sullen river. My stay must have been prolonged for some considerable time, for I was aroused from my reveries by the roll of the drums of the Arab Infantry, announcing that the guard was mounting at the gates for the night. Hastening back, I passed through the gateway, and pursued my way along the street, now light­ed up by the lamps of the bazaars. Independently of this, the moonlight was sufficient to exhibit a European's features, though, on the present occasion, my dress was concealed by an Arab juba, or hooded cloak, a disguise not unnecessary at night in some parts, at least, of Cairo. Suddenly, and ere I had proceed-
ed far, an unseen hand grasped my arm. I turned, and saw beside me a female figure covered with the long black silk veil, with its white frontlet, generally worn by women of the better classes in Egypt. Her manner was hasty and agitated, and she spoke quickly and volubly in what, I believe, was Arabic—to me of course unintelligible. A donkey-boy, however, who had accompanied me to the gateway, and was now returning with me, understood some English; and aided by his interpretation, I found that the object of my arrest, was to ascertain whether I was a "Hakeem Feringhee," a Frank physician. Somebody was sick, very sick—was I a Hakeem—would I visit him? "No—not a Hakeem—but one could soon be got." My reply was probably not understood, for the unknown female still continued her solicitations, and pulling me by the cloak, pointed anxiously down an adjoining street. I felt an inclination to comply, though scarcely knowing why. I had side-arms under my cloak, and there was light enough to guard against a surprise: after a few moments' hesitation, I turned and followed.

After a short but rapid walk, we reached the door of an ordinary looking dwelling. My guide entered, and following her, I found myself in a room on the ground floor. The light of a lamp suspended from the ceiling, fell on a couch in the middle of the room on which lay the form of a sick, and apparently dying man. His face was averted, and at first, I did not recognise him. But he turned on his restless bed, and changed as the features were, they could not be mistaken. The parting salutation had been fulfilled. We had "met again,"—I stood by the death-bed of the—Renegade!

There was no one else in the room but the female who had been my guide, and who was now no longer veiled. The peculiar circumstances of the moment had probably made her disregard, in this respect, the strict observance of Mohammedan etiquette. Clothed only in a white under-robe, she was now kneeling beside the couch, anxiously ministering to the wants of the sufferer. She was young, and comparatively fair for an Egyptian—and I should have deemed her possessed of beauty, but for the too obvious evidence which her general aspect gave of the ascendancy of unworthy passions. Her personal appearance, her present impassioned solicitude, the position
in which she so evidently stood towards her companion—told all too plainly the secret of the apostate's tale. There was the rock on which his soul had made shipwreck of its faith.

But the moments were precious. The seal of death was on that cold and clammy brow—but the sufferer was still possessed of consciousness, and his utterance was clear and articulate. He soon recognised, and addressed me. "Strange," he said, "most strange, that it should be you." "Strange, indeed," I replied, "yet not, I trust, unwelcome;" and I took hold of his hand. "No, not unwelcome," and he feebly, but cordially, returned the pressure. I sat down on the edge of the couch, and we spoke long in low and earnest whispers. The substance only I can now remember. What I state more minutely, was what most deeply impressed me at the time.

I had alluded to his abandonment of his faith, and looking towards the Mussulman girl, now seated on the other side of the couch, said, I no longer doubted the cause of his apostacy. He groaned inwardly. "True, too true," he muttered, "I have cast away all—and for a wanton's love. And now what can she do for me?" And looking bitterly at her, he drove away her outstretched hand, speaking in Arabic quickly and harshly. The hapless girl recoiled, and cowered down at his feet, weeping silently. I almost regretted my allusion, and interposed. "Nay—nay, do not yield to passion, you should have other thoughts. Think of yourself, and the God you are soon to meet. Are you at peace with Him?" "Peace!" he answered, "peace!—No peace for me. Have I not denied—blasphemed the name of Christ, and spit and trampled on His Cross? Away, get away, you have only come to mock me." "No, I will not away. God has sent me here, and I will not leave you. Be composed, and listen. You have sinned indeed—deeply and fearfully sinned—yet, I am warranted to say, that even for you there may yet be peace—mercy—forgiveness. You have not forgotten your Bible. Remember Paul. He was once a persecutor and blasphemer; yet he obtained mercy. Remember the thief on the Cross. He sought and found forgiveness even in the article of death. Oh, if you will but seek, you will yet find. God willeth not the death of a sinner. And the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." He was quiet, and seemed to listen. After a pause,
he said, "Is that in the Bible? Say it again." "Which?" "The last." I repeated the text. "All sin," he kept repeating, "all sin!" "Ay—all sin—every sin. Sin red as crimson—all may be blotted out in the blood of the Cross. If you will cast yourself upon Christ, he will in no wise cast you out. Pray for a believing—a penitent, contrite heart. 'Return unto me, and I will return unto you.' 'I will arise and go to my Father.' Were I dying myself, I could have no other hope but this." He remained silent, but continued to listen. I repeated such passages of Scripture as seemed most suited to his situation, and whatever else appeared most calculated, under God, to lead him, believing and penitent, to the Cross. He gave, indeed, scarcely any reply: but one thing was sufficiently evident—he had no reliance on Mohammedanism. As might have been expected, it was found worthless on a death-bed. But had he fled to the surer and better hope? Was he clinging to the Rock of Ages? I cannot presume to say. My fears, alas! were otherwise. For towards the close, he repelled sulkily and almost fiercely, the advances he had formerly received. "Be done—be done. The game is up—I must take my chance." These were his last words. He never spoke again; and from that moment sunk rapidly. I knelt by the bed, and prayed—Oh for one other hour of life and grace!

But the end was at hand. Ere the turn of the night he died—"died, and made no sign." Sullenly and sternly the soul of the Renegade had passed away.

___"Like scorpion girt with fire,
So do the dark in soul expire.
So writhes the mind remorse hath riven,
Unfit for earth, unmeet for heaven;
Darkness above, despair beneath,
Around it flame, within it death!"

And had such been the unhappy reality here? God alone can tell. With Him is the secret of the dead. Be the warning to those who are still the living: —

"Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth: and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment."

"My son, keep thy father's commandment, and forsake not
the law of thy mother. Bind them continually upon thine heart, and tie them about thy neck—to keep thee from the evil woman, from the flattery of the tongue of a strange woman. Let not thine heart decline to her ways; go not astray in her paths. For she hath cast down many wounded; yea, many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death."

—But she—that hapless and guilty one—what had become of her? In the confusion occasioned by the last sad catastrophe, and amid the bustle of the attendants entering the room, she had escaped my notice. She was now nowhere to be found. With some difficulty it was ascertained, that when all was over, she had suddenly quitted the house, and was last seen hurrying down the street, in the direction of the southern Gate. Nobody seemed to care for her. Her degrading position had made her an object of indifference even to the lowest menials. Endeavouring as far as possible to intimate that some one should go in search of her, I hastened from the house. My errand, whatever had been its issue, was at an end. But whither had she sped on her's?

Two days after, and the last before my final departure, I happened to be in conversation with a Persian dragoman, whose services I then required. Among other things, he mentioned the following—part of the current gup of the bazaars. The frequency of such events in Egypt, where life is held so cheap, was little likely to render the incident the subject of inquiry. On that same Sunday night—such was the dragoman's tale—on which the preceding events had taken place, or rather, early on the following morning, and just e'er the moon went down—a friend of his, returning to the city from the southward, was traversing the usual path-way leading from the Nile to the Tombs of the Caliphs. Suddenly, a female figure darted past him, making towards the river. Her wild and hurried manner, and the direction she was pursuing, made him suspicious of some evil purpose. He turned and followed, but she had already too far preceded him. A shelving bank hid her for a moment from his sight, and before he could reach the other side—there was a
heavy plunge. He hastened to the water's edge. Already far out in the eddying stream, something white, like a woman's robe, glimmered in the fading moonlight, and then slowly, and without a struggle, sunk in the dark waters. He watched, and waited long; but—it never rose again.

—"The end of these things is Death."—

Whether this event had any connection with the incidents of the preceding narrative, the writer presumes not to determine. The Nile tells no secrets; and if all be true, he has many such in keeping.

H.

THE VALLIES OF THE WALDENSES IN PIEDMONT.

Translated from the Notes of a German Visitor in 1842.

By an Officer of the Madras Army.

No traveller towards Italy via Turin should neglect to visit the Vallies of the Waldenses, which are only six German miles from that capital, and easy of access, as a diligence leaves Turin daily for Pignerdo, from whence another carriage proceeds to La Tour, the principal place of these interesting people. At least the writer of these lines reckons the day he recently spent amongst them, as amongst the loveliest and most enjoyable reminiscences which he took back with him to Germany. He has noted down a short account of what he heard and saw, solely because Protestantism is in these villages, by strong laws and ancient descent, somewhat secured and historically acknowledged. But the other evangelical churches, which, within the last twenty years have been formed in almost all the principal towns of Italy, especially under the protection of the British and Prussian governments, are, on the contrary, in a much more insecure state, and as churches the most are not even tolerated much less known. If, therefore, circumspection and prudent reserve be any where requisite, they are unquestionably here, that the work of the Lord, which is openly and gradually preparing a way for itself even in this benighted land, might not be disturbed in its tranquil and unobserved progress. By hasty and public reports, which must natural—No. 7.
ly meet the eye of the Papists, and with their active and well known intolerance, cannot but produce a dangerous reaction, the good cause is often much injured contrary to the wishes or intentions of the author; as for example in France. How necessary moderation and prudence are in this empire, I will endeavour to prove by an example. A French reformed minister was established for some years in a small but much frequented town in Italy. He allowed himself to be induced by his well meant and praiseworthy zeal into mingling with Romanists also, and distributing the Bible among them more openly than prudence warranted. The consequence was the actual conversion of a Popish family, and the almost as immediate command that he should quit the country within four and twenty hours. His numerous flock is now left without a shepherd, and will not easily obtain permission to invite another. "Be ye wise as serpents, but harmless as doves."

The Waldensian vallies lie to the S. W. of Turin, in the so-called Cottish Alps which separate Piedmont from Dauphiné. The first step into these tranquil vallies is surprising and recommendatory, and if I recollect aright, Hase, in his Church History, calls them the home of pious simplicity of manners. The moment one leaves Popish ground, he imagines himself transported into an entirely different region—feels himself within a Protestant atmosphere—breathes more freely, and believes himself surrounded by a fresher air. The cultivation of the land is excellent; above all the eye meets, industry, order and cleanliness, virtues which are rarely met with in Italy. The inhabitants are in the highest degree friendly and courteous, simple and modest. All speak French, which language is used in preaching and instruction. Among themselves, however, their old Patois is spoken, besides Piedmontese, a dialect of the Italian, which is the judicial language. Beggars are very rarely seen, while in Italy they attack a person in crowds. I have observed none in these vallies. The scenery has an Idyllian, cheerful, Swiss character. The tranquillity which reigns here, interrupted only by the roar of a few forest streams, is extremely salutary to the mind.

There are altogether four vallies, of which only three are at present Protestant, viz. that of Suscrue, through which the Pelici flows—with the valley beside it of Angrogne, through which a mountain stream of the same name flows and unites with the Pelici below at La Tour—the valley of St. Martin, through which the German sea takes its course and flows into the Cluson by Perouse, afterwards into the Pelici, and then empties itself into the Po—and lastly the valley of Perouse with the capital of the same name. Even these vallies are not entirely Protestant, the Papists having settled themselves and built churches in all. In La Tour, the Protestant capital of Lucerne
(the town of Lucerne itself is entirely Popish,) an immense Cathedral is at present building, although there are but few Papists there. The Papists, however, are characterized by endeavours to make a great show externally, in the hope, by such precautions, of gradually overwhelming the evangelical Waldenses. In La Tour, is the Latin school of the Waldenses, which prepares students for the higher classes of the college. By means of moderate contributions a stately and palatial edifice was erected for it in 1836. There is also a Protestant hospital, and an establishment for the education of females. The principal founder of these beneficial institutions is an English Colonel, Charles Beckwith, who appears to have made it the object of his life, to spend his property in the support of these evangelical churches, and therefore resides the greater part of the year among them. The establishment for female education is under his immediate direction. What a source of comfort must his beneficence be to this noble philanthropist. The Sardinian government contributes not a farthing towards the Protestant churches or schools, although the Waldenses have to pay as many taxes as the Papists, and labour under many oppressions. All the expenses are borne partly by the congregation and partly by small contributions made in England, Holland, France, Switzerland and Prussia. The theologians study partly in Geneva, no longer in the national university, but in the oratoire of the evangelical society, partly in Lausanne, and partly in Berlin. In the last city Frederick William III., who interests himself much in these vallies, has instituted two scholarships for the Waldenses studying theology. Two who were educated there, and were, as far as I know, particularly attached to Neander, are already established in their own country. Two others are now enjoying the advantages of this useful institution. When students have passed and received ordination, they are obliged to undergo another ordeal before the principal ecclesiastical authorities of their own country, and to make a solemn confession of their faith in the symbolical books of their church.

The doctrine of the Waldenses, who number about 21,000, has the nearest relation to the French Reformed Church. The Waldenses consider the Old and New Testaments as the only rule of faith, and as the best summary of them, they receive the confession published in their vallies in 1655. This is Calvinistic as regards the Lord's Supper, but it does not exceed the simple Scriptural definition of predestination. For divine worship, the Bible, the Psalms of David versified and set to music, the Hymns of Benedict, Pictet, and the Catechisms or Meditations of Osterwald are used.

The constitution of the church approaches the nearest to the French reformed. The 21,000 Protestants are divided into 15
parishes, each of which has an ecclesiastic, of whom there are therefore 15, but at present five more are added, who have a part obtained, and a part are not appointed to parishes. The parishes are divided into two classes, of which Parly, Rodoret, and Massel form the first, and the remainder the second. The Waldensian churches are one—all the parishes are subject to the same discipline and have no authority over each other. The ministers mentioned, with double the number of laymen, (who, however, together have not more votes than the ministers) form the Synod, which assembles regularly every fifth year, but oftener if required by extraordinary circumstances. The king of Sardinia always deputes a delegate to it, who is the Intendant of the city and province of Pignerdo. The Synod dare not, however, at any time deliberate on matters relating to the faith, but solely to the institutions of the church. The interior as well as extraordinary interior affairs are conducted by the consistory. Each parish has a so-called consistory, composed of the minister of the parish, who is the president; of the elders, and the deacon who is charged with the care of the poor. Above these fifteen consistories there is a higher one which is called the table. It is composed of three ecclesiastics and two laymen, and has to bring all the statutes and regulations of the Waldensian church into operation, to watch over the external and internal administration of the parishes, and over the moral conduct of the chief men; to take care of the hospital, to carry on the correspondence with the foreign friends and benefactors of their congregations, and to determine the outlay of the contributions received. With regard to church discipline the Waldenses, in particular, were formerly exemplarily rigid. Among them no matrimonial separations were allowed, except in cases declared by our Lord himself. “Marriage,” say their books on Marriage, “is an indissoluble tie, which cannot be dissevened before death, if it be not as Jesus Christ has said, on account of adultery; and St. Paul declares that no wife can separate from her husband, and no husband from his wife.” Adulterers were excluded from participation in the sacrament, which deprived them of all other religious and civil rights, par exemple, of the right to be witnesses at baptisms, or in a court of justice, and even to marry. When in the course of time they gave evidence of improvement, they were received into the fellowship of the church, after three times undergoing the penance the church imposed. This was effected by the guilty one attending divine service, seated on an isolated seat opposite the pulpit, in the presence of the whole congregation. On the first Sunday the minister, before he pronounced the Benediction, informed the congregation of the facts; and turning to the criminal, who was now on his knees, reproved him earnestly, and displayed to him the fearfulness of his sin, and of
the Divine Justice he had provoked. On the second Sunday, he pointed out to him the necessity, and the fruits of sincere repentance. On the third Sunday, the criminal prayed with a loud voice for Divine pardon, and entreated the congregation to forgive him, promising by his future conduct to retrieve his error if possible. Upon which, the minister announced the Divine pardon to the criminal, and his reunion to the church. The whole concluded with a warning to the people and a prayer.

Church penance was once imposed upon smaller sins; dances were entirely prohibited as "processions of the devil, who was the leader of balls at their commencement, middle and end, and made as many springs in hell as the dancers did on the dancing floor." Leger, the celebrated writer of the history of the Waldenses, could write of this even in the year 1669. "All dances are not only absolutely forbidden, and are not allowed to pass without censure, or at least bending the knees before the consistory, but even those who are present at the dances of the Papists, do not escape reproof. All kinds of games of hazard are banished. Neither cards nor dice are seen amongst them, unless introduced by strangers; and if any one is persuaded to join them, he must make reparation more or less ample, according to the circumstances of time, place and person." Oaths are not unconditionally rejected, as is often maintained, but are allowed in affairs of great importance. "There are," says Perrin, in his Spiritual Almanac, Part 1st, page 20, "Oaths which are lawful, tending to the honour of God, and the edification of our neighbours." Legal processes were formerly a thing unheard of among the Waldenses. Towards the end of the last century, however, a change took place even in these retired valleys, certainly not French infidelity, but partly a dead orthodoxy, which in many cases is much worse than open rationalism, when it is, for instance, only a reclining cushion for licentiousness of thought, and laxity of manners. It is as if that disease had infected the atmosphere, and spread itself like cholera. Jacob Bretz writes in his history of the Vaudois, 1798:—"We ought, however, to confess frankly, that the Vaudois appear to have degenerated since the time of Leger. They have allowed themselves to have recourse to cards, which were formerly unknown to them, and which have proved the misery of many families. Lawsuits are becoming common in some communities—luxury and games are insensibly introducing themselves amongst them; and there are even (a thing unheard of before) families who live in idleness, and thereby set a pernicious example. The zeal for religion is also becoming colder."

The French Government placed the Waldenses on the same footing as its Catholic subjects; not, however, from any high principle, but simply from religious indifference. This political advantage could
therefore bring no great religious or moral benefit. On the contrary it was prejudicial to the Waldenses, who were from ancient times accustomed, in oppression and persecution, to develop their internal life and that power of faith, which made combat and death indifferent to them. They are anything but favoured by the present government. The king has even, within the last year, allowed the tyrannical law to be enforced, which compels them to withdraw to the limits of their original boundaries; and consequently to dispose of all the lands they had gradually purchased beyond them. A greater portion of these Protestants are therefore subjected to considerable temporal injury—to live henceforward under great pressure, or else to emigrate, for which very few have the means. The punishment of death is in this country inflicted on the convert from Popery to Protestantism; while the convert to Popery is rewarded with a life pension of five French francs per mensem, by a society recently established.

Of the present religious spirit of these valleys, I may say that in them, as well as in the whole evangelical church throughout Christendom within the last twenty years, a new zeal, a more decided life has been awakened, both among the clergy and the laity. There are no rationalists among the clergy. The youngest of them distinguishes himself in every respect most advantageously.

Every one should, when an opportunity offers, visit the head teachers of the college at La Tour, Messrs. Malan, Revil, and Meille; excellent and amiable Christians, and well instructed theologians and teachers. Even the Papists cannot deny the spirit of order and morality which reigns in these valleys. A Popish ecclesiastic and a highly distinguished officer whom I met in the post coach, told me in Italian, “The Waldenses are a noble people, they have all possible good qualities, but their religion is an abominable heresy.” What a contradiction! How can religion distinguish itself otherwise than in the life of the professor, and can there be a real morality without religion? The Waldenses are also particularly valued as true and faithful servants. May the Lord upbraid and increase the pure faith in these remote and tranquil valleys, and when the battle breaks out afresh, arouse powerful witnesses of pure Gospel truth as in the days of the fathers, witnesses who shall not endeavour to gain the victory by external means, or rude or inhuman fanaticism—but who shall know no other weapons than the Word of God—than faith, love, prayer and patience.
Our readers will find subjoined to this a paper from three of our brethren, announcing their intention to withdraw their superintendence and support from this work. The intention was announced to the Missionary Conference at the usual monthly meeting on the 9th ultimo. It took the majority of the meeting altogether by surprise. It had indeed been intimated that a proposition respecting the management of the Instructor would be brought forward, but no intimation was given of the nature of the proposition till it was formally made at the meeting. The meeting consisted of thirteen members. One left before the discussion commenced. Two declined voting. The proposition of the three brethren was supported only by themselves—and seven declared for the amendment. In case the withdrawal of the brethren should occasion disappointment to any of our readers, we must distinctly avow that we are in no degree responsible for this. The three brethren had voluntarily bound themselves by written engagement to support this work, on the principles agreed to by the Conference, and announced in the Prospectus; and nothing could have been less contemplated than their finding in the neutrality studiously observed by the Editors a reason for withdrawing.

The Instructor is based upon neutrality. Its history and design will show this. It arose out of the Missionary Conference, a monthly meeting of some years' standing, composed of members and missionaries of all the different Protestant bodies in Madras; being open to, and at different times attended by Episcopalians, Independents, Wesleyans, Presbyterians and Baptists. The want of a periodical to represent the sentiments of this meeting, and the different societies to which its members are attached, had been long felt and regretted. The difficulty was to find an Editor. Each member had his own pe-
cular work in hand, which he found to be enough, and more than enough. Who would undertake the difficult task of representing such various shades of opinion? and who, though willing, possessed sufficiently the confidence of the meeting to make him competent? Yet this difficulty had been overcome in Calcutta, and why might it not be in Madras? At last the expedient was adopted of agreeing upon a Prospectus embodying the principles upon which the work should be conducted, and two of the members, recommended by their seniority, were selected for the management of the work, which, at the urgent request of the brethren, they consented for a time to undertake. They commenced the work in the spirit in which it was committed to them, under the deep impression that their first duty in their new office, was impartiality—a strict adherence in all they might say, and in all they might select, to the principles of neutrality laid down in their Prospectus. Judge then of their surprise, when they learned that a motion was to be brought forward, complaining of their neutrality, and virtually binding them to the active support and defence of the principles of the Free Church of Scotland.

The obligation to convert this work into a Free Church organ does not necessarily follow from the bare words of the motion, but the reasons by which the motion is supported, show that this is its direct object and design—an object which brings us at once into collision with the Church of England; a church whose principles we expressly bind ourselves in our Prospectus not to assail or controvert—a church which pleads for the supremacy of the Chief Magistrate over all causes civil and ecclesiastical, as the only Scriptural constitution of a church of Christ. Vide Article 37, and Canons 1st and 2nd—also Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Book 8th.

This church we are called upon to testify against, after having publicly professed our respect for its creed, and gained subscribers to our work among its members, and literary contributions from its ministers and missionaries, upon the good faith of this profession! But we will be no parties to such conduct. We believe that Christ is the sole King and Head of his church, and that, as such, He hath appointed a government in the "hand of Church-officers distinct from the civil magistrate." We as Presbyterians, in common with our three brethren,
believe also that He is the Prince of the kings of the earth, and that Christian magistrates have authority immediately from Him in matters concerning His church;—that in the words of the Confession of Faith, which they have professed to be the confession of their faith, it is the duty of magistrates "to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruption and abuses in discipline and worship prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered and observed."* These two powers are not intended by God to destroy "but mutually to uphold and preserve one another"—and the best mode of regulating them so as practically to effect this, is one of those difficulties in Christian ethics concerning which great and good men—"the Reformers of the 13th, and the Puritans of the 17th century"—have widely differed; and concerning which therefore we are bound by our Prospectus not to dogmatize. One thing, however, we will not cease to maintain that no incense of loyalty can be acceptable to Christ, no sacrifice however noble can be pleasing to Him, without a sacred regard to what He himself has termed the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and fidelity.

The indefinite nature of the charge made against us by our friends will not escape the notice of our readers. Two numbers of the Instructor are referred to, consisting severally of 64 and 56 pages, and the complaint is that in each of these numbers something is not done, or not done in a worthy manner. The sin then of the Editors is one entirely of omission; but we would ask, does this sin, if sin there be, lie only or chiefly at the door of the Editors—does it not lie also at the door of those who are conjunct with them in the management of the work? Does it not lie at the door of the dissatisfied brethren themselves, who are as much pledged to the public for the "support and superintendence" of the work as are the Editors? But perhaps they have exerted themselves to supply the observed defect. Perhaps they have written articles most "worthy of the deep importance of the principles involved." Perhaps they have contended most ably for that one great principle of Protestantism, "the Headship
of Christ over his church," and have pressed their contributions upon the Editors—but the Editors have modified or rejected them. This is a natural inference, and indeed the only one that can properly be drawn from such a complaint coming from parties so pledged; especially as by a rule of the Conference enacted for the guidance of the Editors, a latitude is given to others in handling matters of controversy which is denied to them.*

But what are the facts of the case as to communications. Of the three seceding brethren, only one has ever offered anything to the Instructor. His communication was inserted as sent—and it does not contain a word about the "great present truth" or "the fundamental doctrine that has been kept in abeyance," or the principles of the Free Church of Scotland!—But what have the Editors said or done in the two obnoxious numbers, with which our brethren have "good reason to feel aggrieved." In No. 3 they published the account of the first General Assembly of the Free Church, as taken verbatim from the organ of the Free Church, the Edinburgh Witness; and in No. 5 they published the Pastoral Address of the Free Church as it appeared in that and in the Native Herald; and in both cases without note or comment. The same in both cases as to the other Church. The head then and front of their offending is this, and nothing more. They have allowed the Free Church to tell its own tale in their pages, and in its own manner and language; and if the tale has not been properly told,—if the "great principles involved have not been treated in a worthy matter," the blame of this omission surely lies with the Free Church and its friends, and not with the Editors.

We feel that some apology may be due to our readers for

* The rule is as follows:—

"That no article, either editorial or communicated, or appearing in the form of an extract or extracts, the main design of which is to advocate the peculiarities of a particular denomination, shall be admitted into the work."

"That the Editors, however, shall have liberty to give insertion to communications on such subjects from correspondents, provided that such communications in the judgment of the Editors, are not otherwise inconsistent with the general principles of the work."
having opened our pages to the matter at all, and that perhaps
the strict line of duty would have led us to resist the "respect­
ful claim of right" on the part of our brethren to lay their
reasons for withdrawing, before the friends and supporters of the
work. But our doing so might have seemed harsh towards
parties with whom we had hoped long to co-operate, and whom
"we esteem very highly in love for their works sake." Trusting
that our readers will make allowances for our circumstances, and
excuse what may seem to them a deviation from our princi­
bles. We have allowed our friends to speak this once in their
own cause; and having spoken ourselves in reply, we now
announce that here the matter must end, as far as the pages of
the Madras Christian Instructor are concerned.

LETTER FROM THE REV. MESSRS. ANDERSON, JOHNSTON, AND BRAID­
WOOD—WITHDRAWING "FROM THE SUPERINTENDENCE AND SUPPORT
OF THE PERIODICAL."

TO THE EDITORS OF THE MADRAS CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTOR
AND MISSIONARY RECORD.

GENTLEMEN,—In consequence of the decision come to at the Monthly
Conference of Missionaries and Ministers on the evening of the 9th
current, we now, according to notice then given, beg to withdraw
our names from the "superintendence" and "support" of the Madras
Christian Instructor, and respectfully claim the right of laying
before its friends and supporters our reasons for so doing.

The discussion, as you are aware, was spontaneously brought up
by a member of Conference, belonging to one of the Bodies of which
it is composed. He stated that he felt that the manner in which
the Disruption of the Church of Scotland had been treated in the 3d
and 5th numbers of the Instructor was unworthy of the deep im­
portance of the principles involved,—was calculated to confound all
moral distinctions, in as much as what was asserted to be "godliness"
by the one party in Scotland was declared to be "rebellion" by the
other,—that of course both could not be in the right, one of them
must be in the wrong,—and that those members of the Conference
who belonged to the Free Church had, according to his judgment,
reason to feel aggrieved.
This afforded us an opportunity to express the dissatisfaction, which we had all for some time felt, with the manner in which one of the great principles of Protestantism, as now contended and suffered for in Scotland, seemed to us to be kept in abeyance, and practically set aside in the Periodical, contrary to its principles, as announced in the Prospectus to which our names are attached.

The Conference seemed unwilling at all to entertain the subject. A motion was demanded, before we were allowed to state our views; and, to save the time of the meeting, we put the following motion:

"That the great and vital question of Christ's sole and supreme Headship over His church be hereafter testified to in this Periodical, in conformity with its principles as expressed in the Prospectus, and especially in opposition to existing errors and corruptions as at present exhibited in the remaining Establishment of the Church of Scotland."

This called forth a counter motion, which was carried by a majority. It was as follows:

"That the course hitherto pursued by the Editors of the Madras Christian Instructor, in reference to the Disruption of the Church of Scotland, meets with the approval of the Conference, and that no change take place in the neutrality which has been hitherto maintained on this subject."

The member, who started the discussion, gave in the following protest, viz.—"That in such a Periodical, and on such a question as the Disruption in the Church of Scotland, the notice taken of it in the 3d and 5th numbers of the Instructor is not a practical neutrality."

It will hardly be denied, we think, by any one who knows the state of this country, how important it is to uphold, to vindicate, and to defend the leading doctrines and principles of Protestantism, as the only sound basis of a Scriptural union among all "who hold the Head." In framing the Prospectus of the Periodical this was primarily kept in view, because it was conceived to be essential to its usefulness and value. The following paragraph in the Prospectus makes this sufficiently evident:—"Based upon the great principle of Protestantism, That the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Christians—adhering to the doctrines in which the Reformers of the sixteenth, and the Puritans of the seventeenth century, were substantially agreed, and which are embodied in the creeds of the Established Churches of Great Britain, and held by the other Orthodox Churches of that country and of Protestant Christendom; avoiding, as far as possible, all controversy on those topics on which Protestant Christians may consistently and conscientiously disagree; while at the same time, stedfastly maintaining the purity of Evangelical truth in oppo-
sition to existing errors and corruptions, from whatever source they may arise, and by whatever professedly Christian community they may be advocated; it will be the great object of the Instructor, so far as its influence may extend, to vindicate the principles, to preserve the unity, and to promote the interests of that one only true and Catholic Church, which, though consisting of different members and distinguished by different names, is yet "One Body in Christ," "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all." (2.)

Few Christians, we believe, would be unwilling to co-operate on so Catholic a basis, provided the principles announced were fully carried out.

One of these great principles, we conscientiously believe, and are now prepared to prove, has not been testified to and "vindicated,"—a principle which is at this moment shaking Scotland to its centre, and making itself be felt throughout Christendom and the world.

If the Madras Christian Instructor, as stated in the Prospectus, is based upon the great principle of Protestantism, "That the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Christians, then the decrees of Rome and the mandates of Civil Courts must, in all matters plainly affecting Christ's kingly office and prerogative as the sole and Supreme Head of His Church, and the liberty wherewith He hath made His ministers and people free, as declared and taught in His Word,—bend and be subject to its divine infallible dictates. The Protestantism of the Bible must of necessity uphold the supremacy of Him, who is its great subject and centre. (3.)

If the Bible explicitly teaches His Supremacy over His Church, which, as a spiritual community governed by His laws, holds directly from Himself certain rights and privileges in her Statute-Book and Charter, the Bible—then she dares not, and cannot surrender even the least of these privileges, because they are not hers to surrender; and no earthly power whatever may justly deprive her of them. Rather than surrender these, a large majority of the Evangelical Ministers in the Church of Scotland have foregone all the advantages of an Establishment; and all who now adhere to, or remain in the Establishment, stand chargeable with having surrendered them.

At such a crisis, and in a controversy now shaking and sifting the Christian world, is it not the bounden duty of every man of whom Christ is the Head, of every church collectively, and especially of the Ministers and Missionaries who have put their names to the above Prospectus, earnestly to contend for this doctrine at present so violently assailed in Scotland, to sympathize with those who are suffering for it, and to "vindicate" it from the misrepresentations to which it has been exposed? (4.)

That it has been so assailed by the Erastian and unconstitutional
encroachments of the Civil Courts on the Church of Scotland's spiritual jurisdiction, is now a matter of history. And the demonstration of the fact, best fitted to convince an unbelieving world of the reality and power of this doctrine as an influential commanding principle, and to draw forth the sympathies of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, is afforded, on the scale of a church and nation, by the noble and Christian spectacle of nearly five hundred ministers and two hundred licentiates, beyond all question the best and most devoted in Scotland, and a million of faithful people, sacrificing all the worldly advantages of an Establishment, rather than violate its integrity.

Under such circumstances, on what principle, we ask, can Christian Ministers and Missionaries, unless they adopt as their own the principles of the remaining Establishment, think of maintaining a cold neutrality? Are our Brethren of the "Free Church" at home to receive the hearty sympathy and influential support of nearly all the Evangelical Bodies in Britain and the world, and are we the Missionaries of the "Free Church" in India to be left unsupported by our Brother Missionaries in this land of strangers and idolaters, in testifying to principles that ought to be equally dear to us all?

At the sacrifice of much that is dear to nature, and at great worldly loss, our single-minded Brethren at home are now maintaining the doctrine of Christ's Supreme Headship, by the argument of deeds rather than of words, beyond the pale of the Establishment,—an Establishment which they loved and prized, and which they never would have quitted, could they on this vital question have preserved a good conscience within it. For Evangelical Christians to be silent or indifferent in such a controversy, is to betray a woful want of sympathy with Christ's suffering Church and Members,—suffering too to uphold the prerogatives of His crown, and their own dearest rights and privileges. If when one of the least members of His mystical body suffers, all the members are bound to suffer with it; much more are they bound to sympathize with a whole Church cast into the furnace, and to suffer for their Head and King walking with them in the midst of it.

"But in what respects," it will be asked, "has the Supreme Headship of Christ been invaded in the Church of Scotland?"

The proceedings in that Church during the last five years supply a full and satisfactory answer. From her General Assembly down through all her inferior Judicatories, her spiritual jurisdiction has been outraged and laid waste by the invasions of the Civil Courts. Nearly all her functions, as a Church of Christ, by her Constitution and Standards spiritually free and independent, in all matters affecting her doctrine, worship, government and discipline, and acknowledging
His Word as the only supreme and ultimate standard of appeal,—have once and again been invaded.

First, her Courts, convened in Christ's name and by His authority, are become liable to be coerced, by the Civil Courts and by heavy penalties, to intrude unacceptable Ministers on reclaiming or resisting Congregations, that is, Ministers unable to edify the body of Christ, because destitute, in many instances, of piety.

Second, her Ministers have been interfered with and interdicted from preaching the Gospel and administering the ordinances, in parishes where the people were destroyed for lack of sound doctrine.

Third, her spiritual censures, righteously pronounced against Ministers and Probationers, who violated her laws on the plea that they were bound to obey the law of the land, have been suspended and set aside, not merely in regard to civil consequences, but with reference to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

Fourth, Ministers, solemnly deposed by a large majority of her General Assembly, in particular the seven Ministers of the Strathbogie Presbytery,—deposed in the name and by the authority of the Great Head of the Church, and Probationers deprived of their license to preach the Gospel,—for rebelling against her authority,—have been restored to their spiritual office and status, and her whole proceedings with reference to them been declared ab initio null and void.

In all these respects, and more that might be enumerated, has the spiritual province of the Church of Scotland been encroached upon by the Civil Courts, in a way and to an extent quite unprecedented and unknown since the Revolution of 1688. And all hope of redress has been completely cut off by the Legislature of Great Britain and Ireland declaring that the law, as thus interpreted and enforced by the Civil Courts, is henceforth to be the law that is to regulate the proceedings of the remaining Establishment.

To all these acts of encroachment upon Christ's sole and supreme Headship the late Residuary Assembly has tamely bowed the neck; and affixed to them the seal of her approbation and sanction.

The Ministers and Elders, who, on the 18th of May last, read the solemn Protest against these unconstitutional proceedings; and who, in concert with many Brethren like-minded with themselves, in the atmosphere of a "Free Assembly," signed the Deed of Demission and Act of Separation, have shown to all the world, that this doctrine of Christ's Headship is not, as some represent it, a cold and lifeless abstraction, a mere matter of church government, a thing of secondary importance,—that may be admitted and protested for in words, but, at the bidding of the State, be violated in practice.

This doctrine has proved itself, at every crisis of the Church's history and period of reformation, to be a vital commanding principle.
In the apostolic age, it proved itself to be so. The Apostles and first Martyrs obeyed God rather than man, because “under law to Christ.” The usurpations of the Emperors and Popes undermined and set aside this doctrine; and when the Popes blasphemously “exalted themselves above all that is called God, or that is worshipped,” and “sat in the temple of God” as Christ’s vicegerents on earth,—it was the darkest night of the Church’s history.

What had Luther to stand on, when battling with the Pope and the Emperor, but this doctrine of Christ’s Headship? And what was it but the fear of violating his allegiance to Him as his Head, that constrained him to resist and triumph over them both? Taking his life in his hand, like the Apostles and early Martyrs, he was enabled to obey God rather than man, because he kept the eye of his faith, in spite of the frowns of power and in defiance of all the potentates of darkness, steadfastly fixed on his invisible Head and King.

It was the same commanding principle that made the other “Reformers of the sixteenth” and the best of “the Puritans of the seventeenth century” so strong in opposing every encroachment on the province of Christ and of conscience. What was it but this, that enabled them so joyfully to take the spoiling of their goods, and so unshrinkingly to endure the horrors of exile, of the dungeon, and the stake?

From its very nature the doctrine of Christ’s sole and supreme Headship affects every one of the laws, arrangements, and doctrines of His Church; because it involves in it what shall be the character of every Gospel Minister, the relation in which he and his flock shall stand to one another, and the quality and character of the doctrines that he preaches.

So manifestly indeed does this doctrine lie on the face of Scripture, that every Church in the world, in some sense or other, acknowledges it. The Pope of Rome, by a blasphemous figment, usurps Christ’s seat on earth as universal Bishop, but not without pleading divine authority for it. Emperors, kings, and civil rulers in other lands, assuming that the Church must have a visible Head, have, in opposition to God’s Word, made the spiritual bend to the secular, and intruded themselves into the place which belongs exclusively to Christ.

Following in their train, the Residuary Establishment of Scotland have, in their Pastoral Address, also professed their belief in Christ’s sole and supreme Headship. It is no breach of either charity or truth to say, after their recent proceedings, that they hold the doctrine in word, while their acts as a Church emphatically deny it, and violate whatever is peculiar in its character.

This course which they have chosen to pursue is well understood in
Britain, and is regarded by nearly all the Evangelical Christians and Churches throughout Christendom as manifestly unscriptural. Moved by one kindred impulse, these Churches have lifted up their voice to sympathize with and encourage the “Free Church” in her maintenance of this great principle, which the Residuaries have assisted the Civil Courts to trample on. It is a significant indication on which side the preponderance of principle and integrity lies, that while the warm hand of brotherly affection has been extended to the “Free Church” from all the ends of the earth, not a single word of approval, as far as we have yet heard, has been given to the adherents of the Remaining Establishment by any Evangelical Body of Christians in the world.

Evangelical Episcopalians at great public meetings; the Presbyterian Churches in Ireland and in England; the Wesleyan Methodists of England and the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales; many Associations of Independents and of Baptists in England; the Congregational Union of Ireland; American Presbyterians; Protestant Evangelical Churches in France, Holland, Prussia, and Geneva; and the Waldensian Church in the valleys of Piedmont; have, some by letter, some by addresses and deputations, and many of them also by pecuniary support, expressed their warm approbation and sympathy with the “Free Protesting Church.” The American Missionaries at Bombay have given the use of their Church and the weight of their influence to the Free Churchmen there; and those at Constantinople have paused in their arduous labours among the Mohammedans and the Jews to send to the “Free Church” their sympathetic congratulations. “Is it,” we ask again, “to be otherwise at Madras?” If so, it is right that the public should be made aware of the unique and singular fact.

If the voice of so many Churches, disagreeing on many lesser points, proclaims the “Free Church” to be right in the noble stand she has made, and in the position which she has taken; and if the foregoing statements possess any weight whatever;—then the doctrine of Christ’s sole and supreme Headship is not a point, “on which Protestant Christians may consistently and conscientiously disagree, but the great “present truth,” which this Periodical, according to its Prospectus, ought “stedfastly to maintain” and “vindicate” in opposition to the errors and corruptions” into which, as we have proved, the remaining Establishment of the Church of Scotland has fallen. (5.)

For Missionaries to be silent or neutral, who have put their names to such a Prospectus—so explicit on the point at issue,—and at such an eventful crisis, were to manifest, as we think, an indifference to the honour of our Head, to the testimony of our suffering Brethren, and to the spread among our countrymen here of sound Evangelical views on the subject,—which it will be difficult to defend, and in which we,
with our views, can take neither part nor lot. Neutrality in Residuaries, it is easy to understand. Herein lies the strength of their policy, especially in India. But how Missionaries, who are in profession substantially one with Free Churchmen, should bind themselves to neutrality, in opposition to the Prospectus, and to the example of the Churches in Britain and America that sent them forth, we do not, we confess, understand.

The Prospectus plainly demonstrates that it never could be intended that the Periodical should be neutral in such a matter. We at least, when we gave our names to support it, never so understood its object. "It will be the great object of the Instructor," to use the words of the Prospectus, "to vindicate the principles, to preserve the unity, and to promote the interests of that one only true and Catholic Church, which, though consisting of different members and distinguished by different names, is yet "one body in Christ," "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all."

Such is plainly declared to be the great object of the Instructor, and to this we affixed our names. But we never once supposed, nor indeed was it ever contemplated that the Headship of Him who is King of "that one only true and Catholic Church" was to be "vindicated" by "neutrality!" The very idea is monstrous, and involves a contradiction. (6.)

The whole question between us and the majority of the Conference resolves itself into this, "Is it, or is it not, the doctrine of the 'one only true and Catholic Church' that the Lord Jesus Christ is its sole and supreme Head; and that its office-bearers and people in all matters spiritual—when acting according to His Word as read in the light of their own consciences—are to obey Him or the Civil Magistrate, when the two jurisdictions—the Secular and the Spiritual—clash and come into collision?" (7.)

If Christ's ministers and people are to obey Him in such circumstances, "notwithstanding of whatsoever difficulties or troubles may arise," and if a Branch of His Church in Scotland is now suffering for obeying Him rather than Caesar, are we, as a Conference of Ministers and Missionaries pledged to "vindicate" in the pages of the Instructor a principle that ought to be as precious to us as to them, to shrink from doing so under the plea of neutrality? Caesar must yield to Christ, if the Bible is to be heard, and Protestantism to be advocated. These are not the times for men to muzzle their testimony to great principles, either in Europe or in India. The pressure of events is forcing men to take their sides, whether they will or not. And it is fortunate that it is so, for the sake of truth and consistency.

We recur to the Prospectus. Therein it is declared that the Periodical will "steadfastly maintain the purity of Evangelical truth in
opposition to existing errors and corruptions, from whatever source they may arise, and by whatever professedly Christian community they may be advocated. We leave it with a discerning Christian public to determine whether this has been done or not, in the matter of Christ's Headship.

Neutrality or silence is not the way to preserve "unity," when vital principles are at stake. Solid and abiding "unity" in the "one true and only Catholic Church" cannot be preserved, according to God's Word, unless the principles be vindicated and stedfastly adhered to, on which that unity rests. (8.)

The majority of the Conference having, by a formal motion, declared it to be their purpose to abide by that neutrality which they have hitherto exemplified with reference to the Disruption of the Church of Scotland (though it would not be difficult to prove that neutrality has not been maintained,) the only honourable alternative left us, is to withdraw our names from the "superintendence" and "support" of the Periodical; which we now accordingly do, after thus laying before its friends and supporters our reasons for so doing.

We have the honour to remain,

Gentlemen,
Respectfully yours,

John Anderson,
Robert Johnston,
John Braidwood,

Missionaries of the Free Church of Scotland,
and Members of the Madras Missionary Conference.

Madras, 20th October, 1843.

We append a few running notes as the most convenient way of replying to some of the leading statements in the paper; and the better to show our real position.

Note (1.) It is to be noticed that the fault charged—whether truly or not, our readers may judge for themselves by reference to the numbers mentioned—is, that "practical neutrality has not been maintained;" and it is urged from the same quarter, that "entire silence" should have been observed. On the other hand, those who brought in the resolution argue, that "for missionaries to be silent, or neutral, who have put their names to such a Prospectus, were to manifest an indifference to the honour of our Head, &c. It is evident that both parties cannot be suited. The principal breach of neutrality alleged is, the publishing of the Pastoral Address, both of the General Assembly and the Free Church, without note or comment!
If there be a breach of neutrality in this, we would ask on which side is the favour shown?

Note (2.) It is here that we join issue with the seceding brethren; and let it be remembered that the question is not whether the Free Church of Scotland is right or wrong; or whether the missionaries or others at Madras, in their individual capacity, ought or ought not to sympathize with it, however deeply; but whether the Prospectus put forth to the Christian public, on the faith of which members of the English Church, Scotch Establishment, Dissenters, Independents, Wesleyans and Baptists have subscribed, and paid for the Journal in advance, requires, or even allows, those who conduct it, to make it an organ of that church; or to testify to Christ's sole and supreme Headship over the church, in the language of the resolution, "in opposition to existing errors and corruptions, as at present exhibited in the remaining Establishment of the Church of Scotland." The subject, therefore, is in a nutshell, and can be grasped by each of our readers for himself. It is quite independent of the merits of the Protesting church; and consequently the eloquent special pleading of the communication in favour of that, with the appeal to the missionaries of Madras to follow the example, so widely set, of expressing their sympathy with the "five hundred ministers and two hundred licentiates," "beyond all question the best and most devoted in Scotland, and a million of faithful people, sacrificing all the worldly advantages of an establishment, rather than violate its integrity"—may be allowed to have its full weight, without at all affecting the question whether this sympathy is to be expressed through the pages of the Instructor. They may give in their adherence to the Free Church, or they may aid it by their contributions; they may if necessary, as in Calcutta, commence a Free Church Journal to advocate its cause; but can they as honourable men, can they in common honesty, take advantage of their position, and attack the Church of Scotland, through the Instructor supported in part by its members? The editors think they cannot, and a large majority of the Conference think they cannot. It remains for a discerning Christian public to decide.

Note (3.) The Instructor certainly stands on the great principle, "that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Christians;" and it adheres to the "doctrines in which the Reformers of the sixteenth and the Puritans of the seventeenth century were substantially agreed, and which are embodied in the Creeds of the Established Churches of Great Britain," &c. and so standing, its editors do not feel themselves at liberty to attack those creeds; because, in the coalition formed, they agreed not to do so; and taking "the Bible and the Bible only" as containing their creed, they are united against "the decrees of Rome," which does not take the Bible alone for its rule; but they do not see how it follows that they must in this capacity unite against those Established Churches which do take the Bible as the only rule of faith. "Against errors and corruptions, from whatever source they may arise," they may testify, and intend to testify; and their pages will be open to
any temperate discussion regarding the existence of such errors and corruptions in the established or other churches, concerning which correspondents may have a much wider range than the editors would allow themselves; but they cannot admit that because they take "the Bible and the Bible only," for their rule, that they as editors may press their views of Bible truth against Baptists, or Armenians, as to doctrine; or English or Scotch Churchmen, or Lutherans, or Wesleyans, or Independents, as to church government.

Note (4.) There is no doubt that every truth should be "testified to," in proportion to its importance; but it must be at the proper time and place. Those who have come from a distant land to "testify the Gospel of the grace of God" to the heathen, or even to their destitute countrymen, may be thankful if they can unite in this testimony, and show that they are one in regard to the essentials of salvation, though they may have, as it is known they have, different views as to the manner in which the "sole and supreme Headship of Christ" is to be "testified to," in connexion with any subordinate power given to any class of men, ecclesiastical or civil; and as to the extent to which they are called upon for this testimony, in this land of idolatry, especially through a publication in which they agreed to adhere to the doctrines, "in which the Reformers of the sixteenth and the Puritans of the seventeenth century were substantially agreed;" not those in which they differed, as they did concerning church government.

Note (5.) "It is said, the doctrine of Christ's sole and supreme Headship is not a point on which Protestant Christians may consistently and conscientiously disagree." If it be meant as to the fact of His headship, it has been already stated that not only Protestants but Romanists profess to believe it, and of course thus far Protestant Christians cannot disagree; but if the manner of Christ's Headship be intended, Protestant Christians do most widely, and yet no doubt conscientiously differ. All except those who deny any power in the church, either by its ministers or members, to exercise spiritual control and discipline, believe that this "sole and supreme Headship" is consistent with some church order and government by men, which implies some delegated authority; and this, as to its nature and extent, and how far it can be consistent with any regulating power by a civil magistrate—who, as many suppose, is bound to aid in spiritual things—is a subject of general dispute between all Churchmen and Dissenters; the former taking their authority from the mixed rule of the Jewish theocracy, of which Christ was the Head, and the High Priest and King his representatives; and the latter confining themselves to the New Testament dispensation, and objecting to all interference of the civil power, and all connexion of church and state, from danger of corruption, and on the ground that Christ's kingdom is not of this world. These are subjects on which, important though they be, the conductors of the Instructor have agreed to differ;—and consequently the doctrine of Christ's Headship, as held by the Free Church, or by Episcopalians, or by Independents, is not "the great present truth which this periodical ought
steadfastly to maintain and vindicate," but as it is held by all these. Those of the conductors who wish to join in "the voice of so many churches," have other organs of communication, so that they are not shut up to silence.

Note (6.) As to "neutrality," we must abide by the Prospectus as quoted—"to vindicate the principles, to preserve the unity, and to promote the interest"—not of one branch of the church as the Free Church of Scotland, or any other—but of "that one only true and Catholic church, which though consisting of different members, and distinguished by different names, is yet one body in Christ." This is the neutrality—a real union with all who are in Christ, and opposition only to those who oppose Christ—on which the Instructor was based; and the basis is broad enough to sustain it. It was not intended to vindicate the peculiar views of any part of this "one body," but those in which the body is agreed, so that the "monstrous" idea of a doctrine "vindicated by neutrality," may be quietly let alone, without any "contradiction."

Note (7.) This question is very cleverly intended as a dilemma; and though we might object to it, as assuming that every doctrine of the "one only true and Catholic church," however differently held by different members, as this obviously is, must be discussed in the pages of the Instructor, contrary to its intention; yet, to avoid controversy, we will even take it as it stands. To prepare the way let it be known that there is no question at all between the "majority of the Conference" and the seceding brethren, as to what they could wish were the doctrine of the "one true and Catholic church" concerning Christ's headship, as nearly all of them go further on this subject than these brethren. The point of inquiry is merely whether the doctrine is held by the one true church or not. As a general fact this must undoubtedly be affirmed. It is held that "the Lord Jesus is sole and supreme Head." But the latter part of the question contains a sophism, though we doubt not it was unintentional. "Is it or is it not the doctrine of the one true church,"—"that its office-bearers, and people in all matters spiritual—when acting according to His word, as read in the light of their own consciences,—are to obey Him or [rather than?] the civil magistrate, when the two jurisdictions—the secular and the spiritual—clash or come into collision?"

We do not criticise the wording of the sentence "is it or is it not the doctrine"—"to obey Him or the civil magistrate," (it being of course one or the other) as this is a mere inadvertence; but to the substitution of "Him" as equivalent to "His word as read in the light of their own consciences," and thus shifting the question. The fair and straightforward inquiry would be, whether it is held that they, "when acting according to His word, as read in the light of their own consciences," are to obey, that word, as they understand it, rather than "the civil magistrate, when the two jurisdictions clash," &c.; for if the "two jurisdictions," which "clash and come into collision," are those of Christ and the Civil power, there can be no ques-
tion. The "one true church" holds the doctrine, every Christian holds it, that they are to obey Him—to obey God rather than man; and this not in "matters spiritual" only, but in all matters. But if the "two jurisdictions, the secular and the spiritual" are the ecclesiastical and the civil, as may possibly be intended; or on one side the word as read in the light of their own consciences, and on the other the law of the land (as the shape of the question properly implies) the "one true church" does not hold, with the same unanimity and certainty that the "office-bearers," or others, are to obey the word, in the sense in which they, or some branch of the church may understand it, in opposition to the civil magistrates. The fallacy lies in the supposition that in every case where "the two jurisdictions clash," there will be found an express declaration of the will of God in his word equivalent to a direct communication from Him, leaving nothing to be learned by inference, and no room for doubt as to His will, and consequently no doubt as to duty. But this is not the case, and the "one true church," agreeing as it does in the principle of private interpretation differs as to its application—that is whether any, and if any, what checks to the licentiousness of individual opinion, may be allowed, either to the church or state. The Romish church alone claims infallibility in its spiritual functions, and not only freedom from all interference of the civil power, but control over it. But the churches of the Reformation differ essentially from Rome, and really among themselves on this question. We are not therefore driven to the alternative of denying that the headship of Christ is held by the one true church, or of advocating in the Instructor that view of the doctrine which is pressed upon us by the seceding brethren!

Let it be distinctly kept in mind, that the only point necessary to be made out in justification of the course pursued is, that there is a real difference in the manner in which this doctrine of "sole and supreme Headship" is held by different Evangelical churches, and that these churches may differ somewhat in their views from the Free Church of Scotland, and yet be true churches of Christ, whose creeds we are bound not to attack.

Note (8.) We quite agree with our brethren as to unity, "that the principles should be vindicated and stedfastly adhered to, on which that unity rests"—and this being, as regards the union for conducting the Instructor, adherence to the great "vital principles" in which we are agreed, and not any peculiar views in which we differ, we must abide by our neutrality as editors—though thinking and acting for ourselves as individuals. The question in fact is, whether the views of such as sympathize with the Free Protestant Church of Scotland—as most do in our Conference, are to be intruded on those who think differently; contrary to an express stipulation, and through a medium supported by those whose conscientious principles we should thus attack. There can be but one answer to such a question. We must fulfil our pledge to the public. We must "keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace," among ourselves. "Let there be no strife betwixt us, for we are brethren." We regret, we mourn, that there should be the appearance of any. We would "cut off occasion from those that desire occa-
sion, "to speak reproachfully, for "there are many adversaries." On the platform of our common Christianity we intend to stand, while the public will support us, assuring all that in regard to the denominational views of every class of Evangelical Christians who "hold the Head," we are, as respects their distinct and separate inclosures, non-intrusionists.

We only add an extract or two from Presbyterian Standards, to show that the question in reference to the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion is still sub judice with those who hold these standards; and therefore should be an open question, if mooted at all, in this work.

"Because the powers which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve one another; they who upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God—and may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the Church, and the power of the Civil Magistrate." Confession of Faith, Chap. 20, Sect. 4.

"The Civil Magistrate hath power to call Syneds, to be present at them, and to provide that whatever is transacted in them, be according to the mind of God." Chap. 23.

And in the older Confession by John Knox, which was ratified by the Parliament of Scotland, in 1567, as the public and avowed Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland, the following passages occur.

"We confess and avow that such persons, i.e. Emperors in their empires, Kings in their realms, Dukes and Princes in their dominions, and Magistrates in the cities, are placed in authority, and to be holden in most reverent estimation, because they are the lieutenants of God in whose sessions God himself doth sit and judge. Moreover to Kings, Princes, Rulers and Magistrates, we affirm that chiefly, and most principally, the conservation and purgation of the religion appertain,—So that not only are they appointed for civil policy, but also for the maintenance of the true religion as in David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah." Art. 24.
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LETTER FROM THE REV. D. POOR, AMERICAN MISSIONARY, CEYLON.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE MADRAS CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTOR.

GENTLEMEN,—I have read with deep interest the article in the September number of the Instructor, on "Missionary Success in India." The subject is evidently one of common interest to all labouring in the missionary field; and as the pages of the Instructor furnish an appropriate channel for the communication of thought and feeling on the subject, I cannot but hope that missionaries, stationed in different parts of Southern India, and in a great variety of circumstances, will avail themselves of the opportunity of comparing notes with each other, and that such a comparison will be to their mutual advantage.

The question of "Missionary Success" is one attended with great difficulties. It is difficult, even for a man, who has been long in the field, to satisfy his own mind, as to what has or has not been accomplished. It is still more difficult to speak, or to write on the subject, in a manner not to be misunderstood,—whether by spectators on the spot, or by our friends at a distance. Both of these classes are liable to opposite extremes in their judgment, according to their different temperaments, habits of thought and feeling on missionary subjects, and their different degrees of knowledge of the actual state of things in heathen countries. It is difficult to define, satisfactorily, what missionary success is, or in what it consists. It is equally difficult to gauge the amount of success that has actually been attained. At different periods of my missionary life, I have had great reasonings with myself on this subject, and have sometimes been sorely tried, on not being permitted to witness anticipated results of particular forms of labour. I am, however, happy to be able to say, that for the most part, I have been "without carefulness," as to what might be the results;—being in a good degree satisfied to pursue that course of labour which I believe to be dictated by the word, and providence, and spirit of God. When the heart has been well nigh sick, because its fondest hopes and expectations were long deferred, my mind, in the multitude of thoughts within me, has often been chastened by No. 7.
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such inquiries as the following. Why should the provisions of redemption have been restricted to the race of man, to the exclusion of devils, seeing that the efficacy of the blood of Christ is sufficient, for ought that appears, to meet their case also? As the Son of God was set up from everlasting,—“slain from the foundation of the world,” why must four thousand years elapse, before He appeared “to destroy the works of the devil,” “to abolish death, and to bring life and immortality to light by the Gospel?” Seeing that He came in “the fulness of time,” and finished the work which His Father gave him to do, why must two thousand years elapse before “the mystery of God should be finished?” But—which is more immediately to the point in hand—if the spiritual watchmen in Christendom, in Protestant Christendom, and in the most highly favoured parts of it, were in any degree faithful to their God and Saviour, and to the people of their charge, how, with the array of means at their disposal, how has it happened, that in the judgment of charity, not a tithe of any state or nation are found “in Him” who hath tasted death for every man? And should not this inquiry have its appointed place in the discussions of those who are formally debating the question, of “the want of Missionary Success in India?” But it may be said, that I am evading the question, and taking refuge in the mysteriousness of Divine sovereignty. Nevertheless, we may not deny nor overlook the sovereignty of God,—even though missionaries may pervert it to the purposes of sloth and unfaithfulness. For it is reasonable to suppose, that in the interesting and exciting point of visible success, as well as in every other part of the wondrous plan, it may with truth be said, that “as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are the thoughts and ways of God higher than the thoughts and ways of man.” Such considerations, however, can be no legitimate ground for consolation and support, any farther than our consciences bear witness that we are working out our own salvation with fear and trembling, watching for souls as those who must give account, and doing with our might whatsoever our hands find to do. To me, it is amazing and soul-inspiring, that God should have vouchsafed so great a measure of success to the comparatively feeble efforts of His servants in India, for the last forty years. This is emphatically the case, if we take into the account the state of the European population, and their present attitude and influence in relation to the Native inhabitants of the country.

The success has been such that the reports of it have well nigh produced disastrous effects upon the churches in Christian countries, through whose instrumentality, mission operations have been carried forward. From publications recently received from England and America, it would seem that our friends are expecting soon to be
informed of "the downfall of idolatry in India!" With such expectations how can they be kept from fainting, before the mighty work is achieved?

A similar evil also is to be apprehended in regard to missionaries newly arrived in the mission field. In view of what they had learnt of the success of missions in the East, they are not prepared, on their arrival for what they must witness with their own eyes,—that success has been of such a nature as in some important respects to increase the difficulties of mission labours,—that the paucity of genuine conversions and the great number of abortive conversions that have been witnessed, the feebleness and heathenish state of the Native church, the nature and power of idolatry to resist the truth,—all conspire, to the eye of sense, to defer the greatly desired event, "the downfall of idolatry," to a far greater period from the present time than was assigned it, in the hopes and feelings of those who entered the field a quarter of a century ago.

But I am losing sight of the object I had in view, in addressing you, which was not to write an essay on the subject of missionary success, but to give in my testimony as the result of my own experience on the subject of Mission Schools in connexion with preaching the Gospel to the heathen.

I have this month entered upon my twenty-eighth year of mission service among the Tamil people, and my labours have been almost exclusively confined to those who now are, or who once were, idolaters. During my whole term of service, I have had much to do with mission schools, and under very different circumstances at different periods. In October, 1816, I commenced missionary operations at this station, Tillipally, where I continued to labour in word and doctrine nearly seven years. On leaving this place for Batticotta, in 1823, I delivered over to my successor, the Rev. H. Woodward, six hundred children, principally boys, who were connected with the schools at this station, and which were established within three miles of the mission premises.

I was stationed at Batticotta in connexion with a Mission Seminary, for the space of nearly thirteen years. While at that station, though I had not the immediate superintendence of Tamil schools, I had the privilege of preaching at the village school bungalows, more particularly in the evening, having the assistance of some of the elder students in the Seminary. The main body of the inhabitants, both in Tillipally and Batticotta, are agriculturists, living in small villages of from fifty to one hundred houses, and having from one, to three or four heathen temples. Having a predilection for preaching the Gospel to the heathen, I sought and obtained a release from my employment as a teacher in the seminary, that I might give myself wholly
to the ministry of the word. With reference to this object, I joined the American Mission in Madura, and was stationed in the city, as a preacher of the Gospel, for nearly five years. While there, I had opportunity of pursuing a variety of methods both in the city and in the country. I made attempts to preach the Gospel in the street, in the bazaars, in choultries, at heathen temples, from house to house, in school bungalows, and on my own premises. During my residence at Madura, the schools under my superintendence contained, on an average, upwards of one thousand children. A large majority of these children were in the Fort of Madura, and nearly all of them were the children of bigoted idolaters. Two years ago I removed from Madura to Tillipally, where I commenced my mission labours in 1816.

For the purpose of giving the results of my experience and observation on the subject of preaching the Gospel in connexion with schools, I beg leave to send you copies of two communications on this subject, addressed to the Secretary of the American Board. The one from Madura in 1840, and the other from Tillipally, containing a statistical view of our mission schools in Jaffna, for the half year ending June 30th, 1843. If in your judgment these communications would contribute in any good degree to the general stock of information on the important subject of Mission Schools, you are at liberty to make such use of them as you may think proper.

Yours very truly,

Tillipally, Jaffna; }
24th October, 1843. }

D. Poor.

Note.—We regret being obliged to defer the interesting communications on the subject of Mission Schools, from our valued correspondent, to our next number. They throw the light of experience on that important branch of mission labour.—Eds.

Bicentenary of the Westminster Assembly.

(Continued from page 331.)

And then, still looking round on the Presbyterians in the Assembly, we find a Thomas Gataker, whose writings gave ample attestation to the character he received during life of a perfect helius librorum,—a devourer of books; who showed a learning as multifarious as it was profound; and who could write as learnedly on the subject of Lots as on Transubstantiation, and the Tetragrammaton. While among those more distinguished for minis-
terial gifts, "workmen that needed not to be ashamed," we find such names as those of Dr. William Gouge, of Blackfriars, London, one of the annotators on the Bible, and President of Zion College; and Mr. Simeon Ashe, of St. Austin's, "good old Mr. Simeon Ashe," as Calamy describes him, "a Christian of the primitive simplicity, and a Nonconformist of the old stamp. He was eminent for a holy life, a cheerful mind, and a fluent elegance in prayer. He had a good estate, and was much inclined to entertainments and liberality. His house was much frequented, and he was universally beloved." We think from this description we should know good old Mr. Simeon Ashe.

Time, however, would fail us to speak of Oliver Bowels, Thomas Case, Anthony Burgess, Francis Cheynel, Jeremiah Whittaker, Joseph Caryl, Obadiah Sedgwick, and others, whose names are associated with works that have contributed to form the religious character of our nation, and that impart to this day instruction and consolation to many thousands.

It is not meant to be asserted that the men we have now described were faultless. So far from this, their characters were, in some instances disfigured, and their good exposed to be evil spoken of, by no small blemishes, rendered more observable from the neighbourhood of very praiseworthy qualities in the same individuals. In some cases, as already hinted, they were driven by the violence of the times, to plunge more deeply into the political agitations of the day, than became the ministers of peace. Nor can even the very great provocations and persecutions they had suffered, or the dangers with which they were encompassed, altogether excuse the ungracious violence with which, in their sermons before Parliament, some of the warmer spirits among them urged the "execution of judgment upon delinquents,"—meaning those who had been guilty of public crimes. Of their want of liberality to those who differed from them in matters of religion, we may afterwards speak. But among their minor failings, which, though leaning to virtue's side, have exposed them more than any other to the shafts of ridicule, we may notice the extreme length to which they drew out their religious services,—the fault certainly of the age. What, for example, could be thought now-a-days, of such a fast as that in which the Assembly engaged, at the request of my Lord Essex, thus given by Baillie J:

"After Dr. Twisse had begun with a brief prayer, Mr. Marshall prayed large two hours, most divinely, confessing the sins of the members of Assembly, in a wonderfully pathetic and prudent way. After, Dr. Arrowsmith preached one hour; then a psalm; thereafter Mr. Vines prayed two hours, and Mr. Palmer preached one hour, and Mr. Seaman prayed near two hours; then a psalm. After Mr. Henderson brought them to a short sweet conference of the heart-confessed and other seen faults, to be remedied. Dr. Twisse closed with a short prayer and blessing." "And yet," says Baillie, "this day was the sweetest that I have seen in England." This reminds me of an anecdote told of Dr. Chadderton, one of the translators of the Bible in James I.'s time, who, after having preached on one occasion full two hours, paused and said, "I will no longer trespass upon your patience." Upon which, all the congregation cried out, "For God's sake go on, go on!" when he proceeded much longer in his discourse, to their great contentment.
and admiration. Perhaps to these failings, or rather excesses, I might be expected to add a certain unnatural tone of austere sanctity which is supposed to have characterized this age. But there is no reason to think that this was justly chargeable on the early Puritans or Presbyterians as a body; it belonged rather to the Sectaries in the later days of the Commonwealth, whose enthusiasm, degenerating into the gloom of fanaticism, became at last the very caricature of religion, and prepared the way for the opposite extreme of profligacy into which the nation sunk at the Restoration. The religion of Puritanism was not necessarily nor in fact identified with melancholy, though Butler, in his Hudibras, has ingeniously contrived to associate it with the grotesque exhibition of Sectarianism. Addison tells an amusing story in the Spectator, of a youth who was nearly frightened out of his wits on being introduced to be examined by Dr. Goodwin, the Independent, then head of a college in Oxford, in a dark gallery hung with black, and enlightened by a single taper, when the Doctor, who appeared “with half-a-dozen night caps on his head, and religious horror in his countenance,” asked him the fearful question, Whether he was prepared for death? The moral is good, but the illustration does not apply to the Presbyterian Puritans of that time, who were far from being morose or inimical to innocent mirth.

But let us not overlook the other members of the Assembly who were opposed to the Presbyterians. Of these, one party was formed by the Erastians, who dissented from the grand proposition of the Assembly,—That the Lord Jesus, as King and Head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the Civil Magistrate; and whose leading principle was, that all Church government ought to be in the hand of the civil rulers. There were only two Erastian divines in the Assembly, namely, Dr. Lightfoot and Mr. Coleman, who was a learned and pious, but somewhat violent tempered divine, and whom Baillie describes, perhaps in too strong colours, as “a man reasonably learned, but stupid and inconsiderate, half a pleasant [half a buffoon], and of small estimation.” But as Coleman died during the very heat of debate on the proposition already mentioned, Lightfoot was left to enter his solitary dissent against it. Insignificant as this party was in point of numbers, it derived importance from the character for learning enjoyed by the persons composing it, and still more so from the powerful support they received from the House of Commons’ Parliament, the most of whom, according to Baillie, were “downright Erastians.” “The Pope and the King,” says this lively chronicler, “were never more earnest for the headship of the Church than the plurality of this Parliament.” The learning of Lightfoot is beyond all question, and he certainly made abundant use of it in the Assembly, and if we may judge from his own Diary of the proceedings, with no small eclat. In these disputations he was ably backed by another man of prodigious erudition, the celebrated John Selden, who had a seat in the Assembly as one of the lay-assessors, deputed by the House of Commons. The grand point maintained by these men was, that the Jewish Church and State were all one,—that in the Jewish commonwealth there was no Church
government distinct from the civil government,—and that therefore there should be no such distinction in Christian states. "This man," says Baillie, speaking of Selden, "is the head of the Erastians; his glory is most in the Jewish learning; he avows everywhere that the Jewish State and Church were all one; and that so in England it must be, that the Parliament is the Church." The Presbyterians, on the contrary, maintained that such a distinction did exist under the Old Testament,—that the two kinds of government are, in their very nature, distinct from, and independent of each other,—and that God never did confound them, nor intend that they should be ever confounded together. Without entering into this controversy, which was maintained at great length, and with much learning and ingenuity, on both sides, it may be remarked, as in some degree accounting for the line of thought and argument adopted by the three Erastians in this Assembly, that all of them were distinguished by a particular fondness for Oriental and Rabbinical learning. Coleman was so complete a master of the Hebrew, that he was commonly called Rabbi Coleman. And it is well known that the fame of Selden and Lightfoot rests chiefly on the same foundation. Superior as they may have been, it will not be considered a breach of charity to suppose that a consciousness of this tempted them to make a somewhat needless display of it in the Assembly. Certain it is, that though highly applauded by some, it made but a small impression on the members, who were learned enough to appreciate, but too shrewd to be misled by the ingenuity of their objections. There is much force in the remark of honest Fuller, when speaking of Selden. "This great scholar, not overloving of any (and least of these) clergymen, delighted himself in raising of scruples for the vexing of others; and some stick not to say, that those who will not feed on the flesh of God's Word cast most bones to others, to break their teeth therewith." We confess that we do not admire the vain-glorious tone in which he would say to the members, when they cited a text to prove their assertion, "Perhaps in your little pocket bibles with gilt leaves, (which they would pull out and read) the translation may be thus, but the Greek or Hebrew signifies thus and thus." And we cannot help recalling, in beautiful contrast to this, his own dying declaration, that "out of the numberless volumes he had read, nothing stuck so close to his heart, or gave him such solid satisfaction, as that single passage in Paul's writings, beginning with; "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men," &c.

But who are these five divines who sit apart from all the rest in solemn and anxious consultation, evidently displeased with the whole proceedings of the Assembly, and ever and anon disturbing the good harmony that otherwise prevailed? These are the Independents, or, as they were called, the dissenting brethren. There might be about ten or eleven divines in the Assembly who advocated, more or less, the congregational mode of Church government; but five of these, more zealous than the rest, formally dissented from the decisions of the Assembly, and, afraid that toleration would not be extended to them, appealed to Parliament, as "the most sacred refuge and asylum for mistaken and misjudged innocence." This appeal was styled, "An Apologetical Narrative to the Parliament," and was signed by
Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughs, and William Bridge. These were afterwards joined by William Greenhill, and William Carter, who with them signed reasons of dissent against the Assembly, on the conclusion of the “Grand Debate,” as it was called, between the Presbyterians and Independents, and these seven were hence called “The Dissenting Brethren.” Most of these divines had been compelled, by the persecution of the Prelates, to retire to Holland, where they became acquainted and enamoured with the congregational scheme of Government. The most celebrated among them were the two first mentioned, Dr. Thomas Goodwin and Mr. Philip Nye, whom Wood styles “the atlasses and patriarchs of Independency.” Both of these were eminent for piety and ability. Dr. Goodwin, in particular, is well known by his works. He was the favourite minister of Cromwell, through whose influence he was appointed President of Magdalen College in Oxford. Thomas Goodwin we must be careful to distinguish from John Goodwin, whom Toplady, with his usual freedom, characterizes as “that low and virulent Arminian, John Goodwin, the Fifth-monarchy man,” and of whom Calamy observes, “he was a man by himself; was against every man, and had every man almost against him.” Dr. Goodwin was a very different character, orthodox in doctrine, eloquent in preaching, and exemplary in life. His piety was of the most ardent and enthusiastic cast, tinctured, however, with that shade of gloom and austerity which, as we have seen, was the prevailing vice of the latter days of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Philip Nye of Kimbolton, was, in many respects, a different character from his friend Goodwin. A keen, sharp-witted man, “of uncommon depth, and seldom, if ever, outreached.” Active from the commencement in urging the Covenant, and getting up the Assembly, in the selection of which he is said to have had a principal share, there was none more pertinacious in opposing their progress. He kept them upwards of three weeks debating on one point of the Directory alone, where the communicants were recommended to come up to partake of the Supper at a table, insisting on the superior propriety of having the elements handed to them in their own seats. Though one of the Commissioners sent by Parliament to solicit the assistance of the Scots, he seems to have taken up a strong prejudice against the government and order of the Church of Scotland; and certainly there was no love lost between him and our Scot Commissioners.

The last group in the Assembly to which I invite your attention are seated on the lowest form, at the right hand of the Prolocutor. They may be easily distinguished from the rest of the Assembly by their care-worn countenances, and the feverishly intense interest which they show in the proceedings of the Assembly. With them it was no common cause. Not the credit of their own discipline only is at stake,—the salvation of their beloved Church and country is involved. They have come out of a fearful struggle with lordly bishops, Popish ceremonies, royal mandates and battles,—they have cast down the walls of Jericho; but well do they know that the liberties of their country still hang trembling in the scale, and that nothing will save them but a successful issue to their present mission.
Which of all the members of this Assembly wrote home such letters to his friends as those of Baillie? What teeming anxiety, what anxious prayers, about "these poor distressed Churches!" How lifted up at one time,—"O, if it please God to perfyte this work, it will be the sweetest and most happy business that ever in this isle was enterprysed! All our company, thanks to God, feel the fruit of Scotland's prayers!" How cast down at another time about the opposition of the Independents!—"these, however, very good, yet very dangerous and unhappy men, who have been the great and mighty instruments to keep all things here loose both in Church and State, for the increasing of their party;" and these still more unhappy Erastian lawyers in the Parliament, who "make it their work to spoil our Presbytery, not so much upon conscience, as upon fears that the Presbytery spoil their market, and take up most of the country pleas without law!" And yet how hopeful, amidst all their difficulties, that they would "wrestle through, by the help of the prayers of God's people! The humour of this people is very various, and inclinable to singularities. No people had so much need of a Presbytery!"

(To be continued.)


According to the intimation in our last, we now give from Mr. Winslow's Sermon on the death of our late beloved associate, some further description of his estimable character; not, as is said in the Sermon—by way of "attempt at eulogy" but for "edification."

"He was zealous. Of a naturally ardent temperament, he seemed to have thrown all his amour into religion. To a good degree, he was uniformly fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; and never seemed to count anything too much to do for Christ and his cause; but when he found any special encouragement, when there was a religious revival among his people, as the speaker well recollects, then his very soul seemed to take fire; and he was incessant in his exertions. He might at such a time almost adopt the words of David, speaking as a type of Christ,—'The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.' It being once said to him that a certain minister at home had objected to becoming a missionary, because he thought there would not be sufficient excitement; he said very earnestly, while his eyes glistened, 'excitement, excitement, I am eaten up by excitement!'

"He was active. Not only was he abundant in labour when specially excited, but his zeal was of that kind, which prompts to constant efforts, and his habits of body and mind were all active. This is evident from the amount of his labours. As pastor of an English church and congregation he had duties to perform which in this climate are generally considered suffi-
cient to occupy the whole time of a minister. But while there was no marked neglect of any of them, though there must have been less attention to some than could be desired, he studied the Tamil language, so as to preach in it with a good degree of acceptance and intelligibility, and did, latterly at least, preach in it once or twice a week; besides superintending schools, distributing tracts in the bazaars, and performing other missionary labour in that language.

"In addition to these stated labours as an English pastor and a missionary to the Natives, he had a variety of other work thrown upon him. He was not only for some time Secretary of the Madras District Committee of the London Missionary Society, but for several years one of the Secretaries of the Bible Society, and at two different periods, for a short time, the principal Secretary. His efforts in this department, even after his return, will not soon be forgotten. The last report of the Society is their monument. For some years he was also Secretary of the Religious Tract Society, devoting much strength to it; and for a still longer period he was Secretary of the Tamil Revision Committee of that Society, and Conductor of the Tamil Magazine, as well as a Member of the Revision Committee in Tamil for the Bible Society, when the New Testament, translated by Mr. Rhenius, was undergoing revision. He was also for two or three years the principal conductor of a small quarterly Magazine, called the 'Missionary Register;' the author of a small volume, entitled, Letters on Mental and Moral Improvement, designed for the benefit of East Indian Youth, in whose welfare he felt a deep interest, and for whose improvement, at one time, he delivered a series of lectures on various important subjects; and the compiler of Memoirs of Mrs. Smith, his second wife. At the same time, he was acting as tutor to a class, sometimes consisting of only one or two, and sometimes of six or more, young men in his family, preparing for the missionary work; of whom, besides some still pursuing their studies, five at least—the Reverend Messrs. Bilderbeck, Nimmo, Bower, Johnson, and Dawson, are now ordained missionaries. Assisting in the ordination of two of these was the last public act of his life, and his excellent charge to them at the time, if preserved, should be printed; that in this also, it may be said, 'being dead, he yet speaketh.'

"He was enterprising. His mind was fertile in expedients for doing good, as are the minds of many in devising ways and means for worldly gain. If some of his various schemes failed, as in so many some must fail, more were carried to perfection than a slower mind, or one less bent on good devices would have even conceived. Of these—besides his efforts already mentioned, for bringing forward labourers and training up missionaries—the Native Education Society School, which owed its origin principally to him, is a prominent instance. He also, to promote Native education, reprinted, in a more convenient form than before, Sadur Agaradi, a Tamil Dictionary in four parts; and printed the Abridgment of Rhenius's Tamil and English Grammar.

"He was Catholic. Not that he had any tendency to Romanism, or Puseyism, or Liberalism; but that he possessed in an uncommon degree
Christian liberality. He was naturally generous. No single word perhaps better expresses his native disposition, whether as regards his feelings or his purse. The same general trait was manifest in his religious character. Being from another country, and from another, though not widely different communion, I can certify to his Catholic spirit: for he received me and subsequently my colleague, on our first arrival here, with the cordiality of a brother; and always manifested the same kindliness. Indeed it was owing to his advice and almost intreaty, that the American Mission was commenced at Madras; and had the same number of missionaries come from his own society, he could not apparently have been more gratified. The same feeling was manifested towards the German Missionaries, as I have had opportunity to know; and I may add, as being myself from a land where party spirit, on account of denominational differences in religion, seldom runs high, and is unattended with the bitterness which is sometimes found in countries where religion is mixed up with politics, that although noticing these things the more, from not being accustomed to them, I have sometimes been grieved at the ungenerous and harsh remarks of even good men, upon those of other denominations, Dissenters against Churchmen, and Churchmen against Dissenters, yet I do not remember anything of the kind in our departed friend. I never that I recollect heard him speak slightingly of Wesleyans, or harshly of Churchmen. No doubt he had strong preferences for his own denomination, but his maxim seemed to be, to hold with all who hold the Head, and to 'keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.'

"He was prayerful. This is the last characteristic which time will allow me to mention. While, on account of various and pressing occupations, he could not command his hours for close study, so much as he could wish, he seemed to realize the truth of Luther's maxim

'Bene orasse est bene studuisse.'

To pray well is to study well.

"One who knew used to say that he frequently got his text for a sermon when on his knees, just before going to the chapel; referring of course to his more strictly extemporaneous efforts, when pressed for time.

"In course of the principal religious revival which blessed his ministry in this place, he seemed to get new views of what is meant by wrestling with God in prayer.' Of this I was not only aware at the time, but in our delightful intercourse on the way to Vizagapatam, he spake freely of it, as also of his general religious experience.

"Referring to a remark made at that time, by a dear missionary brother now absent, which had given offence to some—viz. that in the intercession of Moses with God for the Israelites, he so prevailed that the Almighty (with reverence be it said) appeared unable to resist, even as a little child;—he added, yes, and it was said with reverence, by that dear brother, as the big tears rolled down his cheeks; and however faulty may have been the form of the expression, he knew the blessed truth it contained, and I learned it. There was then certainly wrestling and prevailing prayer. He men-
mentioned a sermon which he preached in this place, and also at Poonamullee or Tripasore, or perhaps both, and afterwards frequently in England.—Oh! that sermon, said he, was *prayed out*, that was a revival sermon; and I never preached it without some evidence of the presence of God with me, as when it was first composed.

"It was this spirit of prayer which caused his labours to be blessed to the conversion of many souls in his English congregation, and some among the Natives, who will be 'his crown of rejoicing' before the Lord, 'when he shall come to be glorified in his Saints, and admired in all them that believe.'

"But I need not dwell on this theme. Ye are his witnesses. Yea there are those here who were begotten by him in the Spirit;—to whom he once could say, 'my little children of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you.'

"There are many here also who can testify, in what manner he was 'with you at all seasons,' 'serving the Lord with all humility of mind,' and how he kept 'back nothing that was profitable unto you,' but 'taught you publicly and from house to house.'

"Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing.'

We take the liberty of adding, from the body of the Sermon, one paragraph relating to the manner in which our lamented brother may be supposed to have met his summons, and the spirit with which his friends should submit to the afflictive Providence.

"But again, there is, in the trying circumstances of this death, the most affecting one of all, our uncertainty as to its manner. Here imagination has full scope, and may paint to us the most harrowing scenes;—but if they were real, the voice to us would continue the same, 'be still.' Mourning widow charge your breaking heart, 'be still'—weeping children, 'be still'—trembling aged father 'be still'—all ye friends, 'be still'; 'what ye know not now ye shall know hereafter.' And as it would be sinful for us to murmur, however frightful were the consummation, so is it much more sinful to murmur at what may be only the framing of our own fancy. Rather should we look upon the brighter side, and thanking God that there was at least one praying soul in that doomed barque, we should imagine, that like the pious minister of whom we have all lately read, the Rev. Morell McKenzie, who was lost with many others, in a Steamer, on the coast of England, and who, as their wrecked vessel was sinking, gathered the passengers around him and lifted the voice of prayer while they went down together into the mighty waters; so our beloved brother, prayed for, and with, his fellow sufferers; and having time perhaps, from previous warning of danger, that he directed some of them successfully, in that eleventh hour, to the Saviour; and prevailed with one poor soul, or more, in the last extremity, to cry in faith, with the thief on the cross, 'Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.' Who would not be almost willing to die, if he could thus conduct, and attend, even one soul to glory, snatched from the very jaws of 'the Dragon that old serpent which is the devil.'
"May we not imagine, that as the storm increases and hope abates, the frail barque, dismasted and water-logged, straining in every timber and opening in many a joint, as it is tossed at the mercy of the tempest, and about to founder, staggers, trembles and groans, like a thing of life, before it takes its last plunge, from the top of some mountain wave; that then the passengers and crew, seeing that all has been done that men could do, and there is no longer the least hope, gather themselves together in the most sheltered place, and unitedly commend their souls to that God into whose immediate presence they are about to be ushered; and that as the voice of prayer, perhaps even of praise from some newly redeemed soul, ascends from them amidst the howling of the tempest, the blessed Saviour comes to receive their departing spirits, while their bodies coffined in their barque, with their sea-clothes and the sea-weed for a winding sheet, go down for their long rest among the pearls and corals of the ocean. And is there in this much at which nature shrinks? Be it so; only let grace prevail; while the voice of unceasing love and wisdom continues to proclaim, 'Be still and know that I am God.'"

TAHITI.—Most of our readers are probably aware that last year, in consequence of a document signed by four chiefs of Tahiti and the neighbouring islands, addressed to the King of the French, requesting that a French Protectorate Government should be formed at the islands, the French Admiral Thouars, in a Ship of War, visited Tahiti and took formal possession; uniting the French flag with the old Tahitian flag received from England. It appears that the Queen, Pomare, was not apprised of the proceedings of her chiefs in claiming French protection, nor was she at Tahiti when the French Admiral was there. The document, transferring the supreme sovereignty, having been prepared by the French Admiral and Consul, and signed by the chiefs who had sought French protection, was submitted to the Queen at Moorea, and signed by her to avoid hostilities.

A letter, certainly plaintive and touching, has recently appeared in the newspapers, from Queen Pomare to the Queen of Great Britain, stating that the whole transaction was a conspiracy of the chiefs to supplant her in the Government of Tahiti—that she signed the French treaty under the threat of a fine of 10,000 Dollars, or the immediate commencement of hostilities, in which she feared all the English and American residents would be massacred—and calling upon the English Government, whose friendship alone she wanted, for aid in supporting her lawful sovereignty. This letter was dated January 23d, of the present year, when H. B. M. Frigate the Talbot was at Tahiti.

Later accounts state that at the request of Sir Thomas Thomon, Captain of the Talbot, the Queen having for the first time, after the French took possession, visited Tahiti, and assembled the chiefs and people to confer on the state of the country; there was manifested a general feeling against the French alliance. On the 9th February a public meeting was held, at which were pre-
sent, the Queen, Sir Thomas, the British, American and French Consuls, the Purser of the Talbot, the Missionaries, most of the foreign residents, the principal chiefs, and about 5,000 people in regular divisions and neatly dressed. After prayer, at the Queen's request, by the Senior Missionary, the Queen's speaker introduced the business of the day, urging that all should listen attentively and patiently to every speaker, and saying, "should any hard words be spoken, pray to God that as they enter your hearts they may become soft, that they may not produce anger." He afterwards read the Queen's speech, in which she described herself as banished from the kingdom; and then a letter from the British Admiral expressing the sympathy of the Queen of England. The principal chief of each district was asked, "what is your desire in reference to the new state of things? and each replied in the most unqualified terms, that Queen Pomare was their only sovereign—that they desired to retain the flag given to them by Great Britain—that they had their own laws and teachers—and with emphasis, that they had the Bible sent them from Great Britain, and needed and wished no more. Even the four chiefs who had signed the request for French protection, after making different excuses for doing so—two of them because the other two had signed—when asked, "Do you wish the aid of France?" all replied that they had no such wish, and only signed the request because they were teased to do so.

The Queen's speaker then declared that it was her wish to be on friendly terms with all foreign nations, but that her great ally was Britain; from thence she had her teachers, her civilization, laws and religion, and she was resolved to have no other. "All the chiefs responded to these statements in the most animated manner, and the whole body of the people expressed their cordial assent by a show of hands, many putting up both hands. The meeting was concluded with prayer, and the people separated in the most orderly manner."

These transactions encourage the hope that this interesting people may yet be saved from the unwished-for intrusion upon them of Popery and foreign rule.

INDIAN INTELLIGENCE.

BAPTISM OF FOUR NATIVES AT AHMEDNUGGUR.—We perceive by the last number of the Dnyanodaya, a notice of the baptism of four Natives of the Mahar caste, on the 13th August, by the American Missionaries at Ahmednuggar.

BOMBAY—BAPTISMS AT SREROOR, AMERICAN MISSION.

The Missionary at this station writes—"On Sabbath the second instant (July) I was permitted the long desired privilege of receiving into the visible Church of Christ the first convert from heathenism at this station. He belonged to the brahmin cast, and is about forty years of age. His parents died when he was young, and at the age of eighteen he commenced his
labours as school teacher at Sattara. He soon obtained service in this capacity in one of the Native Regiments, with which he remained eight or nine years. He then spent a year and a half in the Elphinstone College at Bombay, preparing himself better for his professional labours. Having in the mean time lost his former situation, he came to Seroor, and for ten years was the principal schoolmaster of the place. On my occupying this station I took his school under my care, and he has ever since remained in my employment. When my village school was suspended some time since, I put him into the boarding school, with which he is still connected. From his first connection with the mission, he has regularly attended our public services on the Sabbath, and daily taught our Christian books in school. The influence of the truth thus brought before his mind, had doubtless an important bearing on his subsequent history, though his inquiries were not awakened till about four months since. From that time light began to dawn upon his dark mind; he lost all confidence in Hinduism, threw away the little pebble (Shalegram) he had formerly worshipped, and began to seek in earnest for a better way. He soon became convinced that Christianity is the only true religion, and that Jesus Christ is the only Saviour of sinners. Still he feared the consequences of openly renouncing Hinduism, as in that case he would be deserted and abused by his old companions; while he had some misgivings as to what awaited him, should he become a Christian. In this state of mind he accompanied Dajeba to Ahmednuggur. There he witnessed the baptism of some converts, became acquainted with the Native Christians, and obtained some idea of the constitution and privileges of the household of Christ. On his return he expressed his determination to cast in his lot with the people of God, and meet the consequences. About this time he brought his family to live on my premises, that he might have more religious privileges, and be in better circumstances for prosecuting his inquiries. This was about five weeks since. As his inquiries advanced, his difficulties disappeared, his mind became settled, and he entered upon the practice of Christian duties—at first with much diffidence, but soon with great delight. Among other things over which he mourned in view of his past life was the fact that he had never been legally married to the woman with whom he had lived for many years. The marriage ceremony was performed on Saturday, after he had given satisfactory evidence that he had become a member of the body of Christ, and was worthy of a standing in his visible Church. He was baptized at our little chapel on Sabbath morning in the presence of more people than could get into the house, among whom were some of the principal Natives of the place. In the afternoon, the three children of the convert, a boy aged eleven years, and two girls, aged nine and six—received the seal of the covenant at my house, and then we gathered around the table of our Lord. It was a precious time, long to be remembered. In view of what our eyes beheld on that occasion we feel ourselves called upon to be thankful and rejoice in the Lord who has remembered us in our feebleness and visited us with his mercy.”—Oriental Christian Spectator for September.

Temperance, Madras.—The Annual Meeting of the South India Temperance Society took place on the 27th October, at the Temperance Hall; when, as the public are informed through the newspapers, the Hall was crowded, and much interest manifested in the proceedings of the evening. We take this as a token for good, and beg leave to refer to the Journal of the Society
for a full account of the meeting, and for the luminous report of the proceedings of the year. The progress of temperance in different parts of India, as well as elsewhere, is represented as on the whole very encouraging.

ECCLESIASTICAL MOVEMENTS.

The Rev. H. Cotterill, M.A., returned from the Neilgherries in good health on the 28th October, and resumed his official duties, as Chaplain at Vepery, and of the Military Male Asylum.

Obituary.

REV. W. BOWLEY OF CHUNAR.

We have the melancholy task of recording the death of the Rev. W. Bowley of Chunar. Mr. Bowley has been for the last thirty years and upwards, one of the most laborious and faithful missionaries of the cross in India; possessed of a robust constitution and buoyant mind, intimately acquainted with the habits and language of the people, capable of sustaining almost any amount of labour without injury, of simple habits and devoted heart, possessed of considerable preaching talent and full of love to souls—he was one of the most useful missionaries in the country. For the translation of the Bible into Hindi, together with several of the most useful Christian books and tracts in that language, the Church of Christ is indebted to Mr. Bowley.

The cheerfulness and promptitude with which he undertook and executed works for the Bible, Tract and Book Societies, rendered him, at all times, peculiarly valuable to these institutions. He loved them all, and ever most willingly and indefatigably aided them with his advice and his pen. He was the early associate of the beloved Corrie at Agra, and belonged in spirit and action to the Christians of that early stage in the history of missions and Christianity in this land. He loved all practically who loved the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

This excellent servant of Christ had written to a friend the day before his death, stating that he was about to go on his usual missionary tour in the cold season; he was then in his apparently usual health. The next day in almost an instant, while preparing to go to the bazaar to preach, he fell a prey to death, it is supposed from an affection of the heart. Thus in the midst of his labours did he enter into his reward.

"Oh happy servant he, in such a posture found."

May we also be found ready when the Son of Man cometh, for in such an hour as we think not He cometh to many and he may so come to us.

Mr. Bowley was about fifty-six years of age.—Calcutta Christian Advocate.

MONTHLY PRAYER MEETING.

The address at the last meeting, as announced, was by the Rev. R. Johnston, "On the Obstacles which Idolatry presents to the Progress of the Gospel in Madras." It was a very able exposition of those obstacles; as our readers may be convinced by referring to it as printed in the Native Herald.

The meeting on the 4th instant, is to be held at the Wcstcyn Chapel.