

the fact, that Dr. Balmer wrote a preface to a work on the atonement, by Polhill, published by a bookseller in Berwick. If this be the matter to which they allude, it is unnecessary to expose the unfairness of attributing to several influential persons, what was the act of one. Or of attributing to him the publication and industrious circulation of it, which were the work of a bookseller. But whether or not, it is certainly strange to make the proceedings of an individual or individuals in Scotland, for which even the United Presbyterian Church were not responsible, and with which the Presbyterian Church had as little to do as the Free Church, a reason for declining the union."

In reference to the fact referred to, which is not merely, as the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod find it convenient to presume, that Dr. Balmer wrote a preface to a work on the atonement, by Polhill, it is enough for the present object to state that it is a matter of notoriety in Scotland; and no one can doubt that such a fact was well calculated still further to weaken confidence in the soundness of the United Secession Synod. The United Presbyterian Church in Scotland just consists of the United Secession in union with the Relief, in the proportion of about three fourths of the former to one fourth of the latter.—As the Free Synod, by uniting, upon the proposed terms, with the Presbyterian Synod, would have been brought into a state of union with the United Presbyterian Church, composed as it is of such materials; the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod must, in charity, be supposed to have forgotten what they were writing about when they say, "it is certainly strange to make the proceedings of an individual or individuals in Scotland, for which even the United Presbyterian Church were not responsible, and with which the Presbyterian Church had as little to do as the Free Church, a reason for declining the union." The United Secession, in their "Summary of Principles," agreed to in 1820, could, in stating "the chief reasons of Secession" from the Church of Scotland, mention as the very first, "The sufferance of error without adequate censure." In 1827, in the Testimony which they then agreed to, they could vindicate their continuance in a state of Secession by a reference to various evils of which they complained, one of which is thus stated:

"1. If errors which deeply affect the

foundations of the faith and hope of Christians, are publicly taught in a church, and if the majority of its rulers, instead of employing fit means to reclaim false teachers, shall resist the application of such means, and not only tolerate, but support the erroneous, and identify themselves with them, how can the faithful friends of the truth continue in that church with a safe conscience? Must they not recognise the corrupters of the Gospel as brethren, and give them the right hand of fellowship, as members of the same courts and of the same body? This is inconsistent with the apostolic exhortations: 'If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.' Paul, writing to the churches of Galatia, concerning the Judaizing teachers, says, 'I would they were even cut off which trouble you.' Nor ought the idea of breaking the unity of the church to deter any one from withdrawing. The unity is already broken. The church is in a state of schism. Its pastors, instead of teaching the same, teach opposite things on the most important subjects.—Their unity is merely nominal. The formularies which they subscribe in common, no longer indicate the real belief of the body, and have ceased to be the bond of ministerial and church communion." &c. They could, as a sufficient justification of the statements which they thus made in the text of their Testimony, append in a note what they call "a few, and only a few, specimens of doctrines inconsistent with the standards of the Church of Scotland, published by ministers in her communion." It may well appear strange that the body from whom this Testimony emanated, could manifest but little sympathy with those who, having as a minority struggled for the removal of the evils against which they here testify, became at length the reforming majority of the Church of Scotland; and that, after the Disruption, they could show as much disposition to fraternise with the ministers of the degraded Establishment as with those of the Free Church. But are the men who adhered to such a Testimony to be held as understanding, or as honestly meaning what they say, when they exclaim, "it is certainly strange to make the proceeding of an individual or individuals in Scotland, for which even the United Presbyterian Church were not responsible, and with which the Presbyterian Church had as little to do as the Free