

more than might naturally be expected, but which they do not sufficiently consider in their customary allusions to those who do not come within the pale of what is conventionally styled orthodoxy. We have faith in the spirit of Christianity that it will make them more candid, and moderate, and forbearing, in their references to Unitarians than they have yet shown themselves, and that before they venture, at any time, to reproach liberal Christians on account of their differences of opinion, and the want of a settled standard of faith, they will take a scrutinising glance at their own condition. As a rule, it is always most fitting and seemly to take the beam out of our own eyes first.

We now present a notice of Dr. Bushnell and his discourse, from the Boston Reporter, an Orthodox paper, together with some remarks on the Reporter's notice by the Editor of the Boston Christian World:—

In addressing a class of Unitarian students in divinity, on the subject of the atonement, (says the Reporter,) Dr. Bushnell would be expected to be explicit, and to make his views understood. Probably he was understood, for he has been reported essentially alike in different papers.—All agree that he rejected the common Orthodox view of the atonement, viz: a vicarious sacrifice for sin. If Christ did not suffer in our stead, if he did not shed his blood for the remission of sins, if his death was not necessary to the safe and just exercise of pardon on the part of God, then has the whole of Orthodox Christendom read the Bible in vain. Dr. Bushnell occupies a singular position. He teaches that Christ is God, and yet adopts the Unitarian view of the atonement, making it to consist in the power of example, or a subduing manifestation of the Divine goodness. According to this theory, God could pardon as well without the atonement as with, but he needed it to bring the sinner to repentance.

We have hitherto inclined to the side of charity respecting Dr. Bushnell's theology. We have admired his talents and believed him honest. But now that he has assailed the great central fact of the gospel—now that he has aimed a blow at the corner stone of Christianity, at the Rock on which every hope of Heaven rests, we lose our admiration of genius in grief for the error into which a great mind has speculated itself.

It has happened to Dr. Bushnell as to Professor Bush. The latter was admired, loved, fellowshipped to the last, and given up only when he shot off into a darkness at which piety shuddered. Dr. Bushnell's mind is of a like cast, there is ground to fear; it has shown a passion for what is fanciful, it has reached the outer circle of gospel truth, and will go quite beyond it, if left to its own apparent bent and determination. Other hopes are cherished, we know, by many, and God grant that they may be realized.

Dr. Bushnell has yet other discourses to deliver publicly on the subject of the Divinity and atonement, and a book to publish. Perhaps he will profit by criticism and counsel, and prove himself not to have subverted the foundations of the Christian faith. The church and the ministry are disposed to hope all things, and not to pronounce a hasty judgment.

We regret that our friend of the Boston Reporter, (says the Christian World,) should have published such paragraphs as the above; because it exposes him to censure for spending his time in beating the air; and in attempts to lessen the influence of one whose potency is only the more substantiated by all such squibs.

Is there anything so marvellous in Dr. Bushnell's repudiating the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, when nobody of any intelligence believes it? It is read about in books and in creeds, but it is not to be found in the Bible, no, not in a single passage; and the editor of the Reporter would be very unwilling to print in his paper or to preach from the desk, that the infinitely good and holy God was so angry and wrathful that it became necessary that He, the same infinitely good Being, should be made to suffer a cruel death, to appease the anger and wrath of that same infinitely good Being. Or if this is too severe a representation of the dogma, then we will substitute the more common mode of illustrating it, and which is generally thought equally exceptionable, namely: that in consequence of the unappeasable wrath of God towards wicked men, Christ, a perfectly innocent and spotless being, is made to take all the re-

proach and punishment on himself. We should like to see an application of this rule in an Orthodox family. Let it be once known that such an one, a parent, has seen fit, in consequence of the recreancy of one of his sons, by which his dignity and authority have been impugned, to visit upon an innocent child his malediction, rather than upon the real culprit; what would be thought, even in a heathen community, of such a violation of common justice?

Now, Dr. Bushnell, and thousands of Orthodox who are as much interested in the great truths of our religion, and of the infinite value, importance, and indispensableness of the death of Christ in the work of redemption, as those of the strictest sect of Pharisees, are not to be troubled or put down because the traditional influence of the fathers is felt in the bosom of some of the children, and who on that account say foolish things of their betters.

We have become acquainted with quite a number of pious and intelligent Orthodox laymen, and not one have we found who has been ready to maintain the doctrine of a vicarious atonement. We care not how much importance is ascribed to the death of Christ. God forbid that any should forget what they owe to the rock of their salvation, or loosely esteem the crown of thorns or cross of suffering; but O, let it never be said that we can ascribe an act to God, that would shock us if applied to a human being.

With respect to the propriety of including the heresy of Professor Bush in the same category with Dr. Bushnell, we care but little about. We believe that Professor Bush is a very pious and learned man; that in the adoption of his present views he has been governed by the purest motives; and that his aim is to bring men to Christ—to save souls. If on the score of holding a mystical or dubious faith, he is to be set aside, then no good reason remains why the whole of Orthodoxy should not be, for the same reason, set aside.

Upon every essential doctrine, declared so by Christ, and laid down by him in the Bible, there are no differences of opinion amongst Christians. It will not be disputed, we suppose, that any other qualification than the love of God, of Christ, and of humanity, is necessary to constitute a disciple on earth, and an heir with Christ of a heavenly inheritance. Will our Brother of the Reporter say that Dr. Bushnell and Professor Bush, on account of their peculiar views of Christian doctrine—only peculiar because they differ from his own—will he say that for such reason, they are at a greater distance from the kingdom of heaven than himself, and those dear friends who think with him upon the dogmas of the Church? We venture to answer the question for him in the negative.

DR. CHANNING'S OPINION OF GREAT PARTIES.

We recommend the following paragraph to the thoughtful perusal of our readers, and of the good people of this city generally. Flowing as it does from the deep, earnest, generous soul of Channing in a friendly letter written a little more than ten years ago, we would have it read and re-read, "marked and inwardly digested." It has a larger significance than that which appears on the surface. "Are we not, indeed, cultivated enough for Society?" Must our social gatherings still be strongly marked by frivolousness and ostentation? If such things could be said or supposed of Boston in 1837, we confess our fears for Montreal in 1848. "If such things are done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

"The passion for lectures continues, and these and other pleasures have shut up our theatres almost entirely. I hope the next triumphs of reason and civilization will be over great parties. Are we not cultivated enough for society? Now we congregate; but ought it to satisfy our ambition to take the first rank among gregarious animals?—The sight of young girls, decked for balls, &c. brings this evil strongly before me. I respect people too much to make spectacles of them. I like good taste in dress; but I can hardly remember the time when the sight of people dressed richly and elaborately did not give me a feeling approaching contempt."

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION AND THE MONTREAL UNITARIAN CHURCH.

We are gratified in being able to state that the last British Mail brought out a donation of fifty pounds sterling from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association to the Unitarian Society in this city. The design of this grant is to aid the society in the effort, so well commenced here last winter, to finish the exterior of the Church, and liquidate the debt remaining on the building. It was obtained, we believe, on the application, and through the instrumentality of our friend, Rev. E. Tagart of London. Personally, we thank him for the timely attention he gave to our communication. And on the part of the Montreal Society, we thank him, and the Association, for their promptness in placing the money at our disposal.

Some other letters were written to various Ministers in Great Britain and Ireland at the same time as Mr. Tagart's. We rely on hearing from them in due season. We trust the reasons set forth in those communications will be sufficient to induce them to make a little exertion on behalf of liberal Christianity in this part of the world. Our fraternal demand on them was not, we think, extravagant. 'Having confidence in them, we wrote unto them, knowing that some, at least, would do even more than we said.'

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

Several ecclesiastics, both Catholic and Protestant, have been elected to the National Assembly of France, nearly all of whom are pledged in favor of a separation of Church and State. Among those who are doubtful is the eloquent and well known Protestant, M. Coquerel; but his sentiments are not known. Nearly all the Catholics are strongly in favor of the separation. M. Boisner, in addressing the electors of Aricge, said: "The Church asks nothing of the State but liberty; I repudiate all endowments, all payments for religion." All parties, perceiving that the present is a favorable opportunity for solving the great question of the relation of the Church to the State, are eager to make known and to advance their views.

The Society for Promoting the General Interests of French Protestantism, has demanded of the Provisional Government complete religious liberty, and urged all pastors in France to interpose in the elections by voting for men who will inspire the Church with confidence. The papers are divided on the subject. The *Archives du Christianisme*, which is the organ of the more enlightened classes of the National Protestant Church, calls for a General Reformed Synod, and betrays an inclination towards separation, without, however, venturing to express any very strong desire for it. The *Esperance* allows the main subject to be fully discussed in its columns, and resigns itself to the course of events. The *Lien*, the organ of the masses of the Protestant Church, will not have separation on any terms. The *Echo de la Reforme* thinks it would compromise the existence of the Reformed Church. The *Semeur*, the evangelical paper, is strongly in favor of separation. A Jewish journal, the *Archives Israelites*, calls for separation; also, one Catholic organ, the *Memorial*, appears to see the necessity for it. The Society for the application of Christianity to Social Questions has avowed in favor of separation.

It would seem as if the Catholics were becoming the most ardent friends of freedom. One of the most remarkable features of the late revolutions is the position which the shrewder and more cultivated Catholics have taken. A remarkable article appeared lately in the *London Tablet*, one of the most influential Catholic papers in England, which is worthy of notice:

"In these days," observes the writer, "when a sternly democratic spirit is breaking up the frame work of old societies, what the church needs is that her ministers should enter frankly into the spirit of this new social state, sympathize with it, act with it, use it for the glory of God, and the salvation of human souls. But what would be worse for the fortunes of the church than while the mass of society was becoming, or had become, democratic, for the clergy to be thrown in complete dependence on monarchies or aristocratic influences, against which the inmost nature of the people revolted and rebelled?"

"Take Prussia for an example. How had religion gone into decay in those famous Rhenish provinces? How had a universal indifference swallowed up both priests and people? How had the seeds of a devouring heresy been widely spread and deeply planted? And what rescued the Church from this great danger? What but

the spirit of democracy? The great Archbishop boldly placing himself in opposition to the crown and the bureaucracy, and, from his prison, striking the chords of a popular sentiment before which the monarch was forced to yield."

The letter of M. Lucquet, Ambassador of the Pope to the Swiss Diet, admits that the separation of Church and State is the great question of the age; that it is likely to be decided in France, and in other countries nearer Rome; and that the Pontiff has pretty nearly made up his mind to the divorce.

"Of all persons, of all corporations, of all social exigencies," says this letter, "the Church of God has the greatest need to be made acquainted with the fact; to discern the signs of the times; to penetrate below the surface and understand what lies throbbing but unspoken in the inmost soul of the human race."—*N. Y. Evening Post*.

MINUTES OF CANADA. CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE.

[From the Christian Luminary.]

Conference met at Newmarket, June the 12th, agreeable to appointment. Organized by calling Elder McMillan to the chair, appointed Edward Kermot, Clerk, and Jehiel Churchel and J. W. Collins, Assistants. Prayer by the Chairman.—Address by Elder J. Earl.

The following churches were reported as in good standing, viz., East Gwillingsbury, Mariposa, Whitby, Pickering, Haldimand, Darlington, Georgiana, Esquesing, North Gwillingsbury, Murray, 2d Haldimand, King, Markham, Newmarket, Whitechurch. The following Elders were reported as good, viz: H. H. Willson, Geo. W. Colston, John Prosser, Anson Plumb, J. W. Sharrard, T. Henry, Robert Barry, John W. Noble, Wm. Noble, Charles McMillan, Squire Morton, Thomas McIntyre, John Earl, Thomas Pickard, George Sherman, Jesse Vancamp, F. B. Rolf, John Macklem, J. L. Russ. Licentiate—Jehiel Churchel.

A committee of five were appointed to bring business before Conference, consisting of Elder Prosser, Brs. Moses Knight, William Hilburn, Leander Spooner and J. Henry, 2d.

Resolved, That subscriptions be circulated throughout the churches, for the support of Elder Charles McMillan, as an Evangelist.

Resolved, That as the Conference of the Canada Christian Church is composed of Ministers and a lay delegation, is recognized the Church in her collective body, and is therefore (considered) the most capable of giving counsel, and deciding questions.

Resolved, That each church within the bounds of Conference raise a fund for the benefit of the Church.

Resolved, That we recommend each member of Conference to bring a letter of recommendation.

Resolved, That a vote of thanks be tendered to the Hon. Robert Baldwin for the copy of a draft of deeds.

Resolved, That a vote of thanks be tendered to the committee who have labored and obtained similar rights from Parliament as other Christian bodies.

Resolved, That a vote of thanks be given to Elder H. H. Willson for his services as Clerk of Conference; also to Elder G. W. Colston, for his while Assistant.

Resolved, That each Minister belonging to this Conference forward to the Clerk of Conference a copy of his certificate of ordination, so that he may record it on the Journal of Conference.

Moved, that the delegates of each church circulate a subscription paper in favor of Elder Thos. McIntyre, to consist of money or any necessary article, for the benefit of his family.

Moved, that two General Meetings be appointed as follows: One on the Governor's Road, in Burford, on the third Saturday and Sunday in August next, where Br. Robert Wilkins shall appoint.—The other in the Big Creek Settlement, Burford, on the fourth Saturday and Sunday in the same month, where Elder John Earl may appoint.

Moved, that a meeting take place in Oshawa, on the first Wednesday in October next, to take into consideration the propriety of forming a Book Association.

Moved, that a vote of thanks be given to the friends of Newmarket, for their kindness to the members of this Conference.

Moved, that this Conference adjourn till the 2d Monday in June, 1849, then to meet in Oshawa.

CHARLES McMILLAN, Moderator.  
EDWARD KERMOT, Clerk.  
JEHIEL CHURCHEL,  
J. W. COLLINS, } Assistants.

BOOKS FOR SALE,

AT C. BRYSON'S BOOK STORE,  
ST. FRANCOIS XAVIER STREET.

THE entire Works of WM. ELLERY CHANNING, D. D., in two volumes.

The entire Works of the Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Messiah, New-York, one volume, 8vo pp. 887.

A COMMENTARY ON THE FOUR GOSPELS. By the Rev. A. A. Livermore.