

Our Saviour has shown us how to live, how to suffer, and how to die—leaving our bodies in the care of our surviving friends, and to commend our souls to the care and protection of the Almighty.

E. PLACE.

Stratford, N. H.

(From Evangelical Christendom.)

SARDINIA.

THE VAUDOIS CHURCH AND DR. DE SANCTIS.—CONSTITUTION OF HIS CHURCH.

LONDON, Sept. 15, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR AND BROTHER IN JESUS CHRIST,—For some time past the religious journals of England have been animadverting upon my difference with the *Waldensian Table*. Notwithstanding my persuasion that they have been publishing many things in reference to this affair quite at variance with the truth, I have resolutely refused to look at any paper, lest I should be tempted to reply. From the very commencement of the controversy I have desired to leave the judgment of the matter to God (1 Cor. iv. 3, 4); but during my recent sojourn in Paris, some of my Christian friends put into my hand the eighth number of *Evangelical Christendom*, entreating me to reply to the remarks made upon me in the Tuscan correspondence, page 262. After so long maintaining silence, I am at length induced to speak, in deference to their judgment.

I have no desire to enter upon a discussion which could be productive of little edification, but shall confine myself to correcting some errors made by your Tuscan correspondent, who, not being on the spot, and having heard only one side of the question, is incompetent to judge of its merits.

Your correspondent seems to intimate that my reconciliation with the *Waldensian Table*, was only apparent. I can, of course, only answer for myself; but as far as I am concerned, I can truly affirm the reconciliation is not only in appearance, but real.—I must, however, state that the reconciliation was not with the *Table*, but with its agent at Turin, Sig. Meille. Between him and myself friendly relations were unfortunately interrupted, but I thank God, they were soon re-established and continue still.

Your correspondent says that I refused the offer of the theological chair, which I had accepted *in principle*. Upon a slight examination, the apparent contradiction of my conduct will vanish. The theological professorship was never definitely offered to me.

The *Table* could not offer it to me, for the simple reason that according to the regulation it does not appertain to the *Table* to nominate the professors, but to the body of pastors. The offer made to me then by the *Table*, was simply to propose and recommend me to the body of pastors, as professor. Whether I should be elected or not would depend afterwards upon the body. As, therefore, the offer was not absolute; I could neither accept nor reject a proposition which was not a direct offer. The point about which so much has been said, namely, that I had accepted *in principle*, requires a word of explanation.

The evening before this proposition was made to me in Synod, I had a long conversation upon the subject with the *Table*, and upon my remarking that I should wish seriously to consider before I decided, they objected that I thus declined all offers of appointment. I then said that I accepted *in principle*; that is, that as a principle I would accept my appointment offered me by the *Table*, but that practically I reserved to myself the right of considering whether the employment offered me was suited to me.

The following morning, in full Synod, I spoke more explicitly. I then said that the theological chair was well suited to my inclination; that if I had nothing else to consult I should have proposed myself for election; but that I had a dear companion to consult; I had an interesting and numerous congregation, for whose direction I must provide. I said that I saw great difficulties in the way, but that with the help of God I hoped to overcome them all.

I found it impossible to overcome those difficulties, and gave this for a decided answer to the *Table*, who awaited it to propose me or not to the body of pastors; nor can I here see any contradiction on my part. All may be reduced to the simplest limits. The *Table* undertook to propose me to the body of pastors, that I might be formally invited to become Theological Professor. After mature deliberation, I declined their proposition; where was the contradiction?

Your correspondent says, in the same letter, that I have separated myself from the *Waldensian Church*. That is quite true, for circumstances had rendered such a separation necessary. It was necessary that I should clearly establish my ecclesiastical position. I have been called to evangelize where the *Table* is carrying on its work of evangelization. I could not labour under the direction of the *Table*, and was therefore compelled to declare myself independent of it.

Your correspondent remarks that after having declared my anxiety to be recognized as a *Waldensian* pastor, a few days after, I, of my own accord, separated myself from that Church. Thus stated, my conduct offers an inexplicable contradiction; but let us take the matter not in the abstract, but in the concrete. I would remind your Tuscan correspondent that he himself stated in your journal for February, that the *Table* had suspended my functions as minister, and that such procedure was essential. Well, I did not attend the Synod; but deeming it possible that my absence might be misinterpreted, I addressed a letter to the Synod and put it into the hands of one of the pastors, with instructions to present it only if he should judge it desirable to do so. At the opening of the Synod, the names of the ministers were read, and mine was cancelled. The *Table* has no power to suspend, and much less to exclude, a minister from the list. Some one asked why my name was cancelled; a discussion ensued, and it was decided that I should be called upon formally to take my place in the Synod. I received the Synodal Letter, and set out immediately for La Tour. After all this, it was natural I should declare before the Synod, as I should do now, that I loved the *Waldensian Church*, and it was equally natural that I should desire to be recognised as a *Waldensian* pastor. This declaration I could not obtain; and here I shall refrain from all allusion to a discussion which was anything but edifying.

I will proceed to notice another remark of your correspondent, who will, I doubt not, learn from myself with great satisfaction, that he has erred in believing me to be a member of the *Plymouth Brethren*. He says that he infers this from my letter. I cannot answer for the exactitude of the expressions contained in my letter, for I did not publish it myself, nor have I read it in any journal; but I can and do protest loudly against the accusation of belonging to the *Plymouth Brethren*; nor is my protestation destitute of proof. We have recently published at Turin the principles of faith and discipline of the *Evangelical Italian Church*. The simple fact of having a profession of faith and a discipline excludes all identity with the *Plymouth Brethren*; but further, the 17th Article of the Profession of Faith runs thus: "We believe