

cloud his meaning. He speaks to his brethren as a man fully and deeply impressed with the magnitude of his subject, and he speaks consequently with a weight and an authority which mere literary qualifications would scarcely command. The consistent and lofty principle, the strong patriotism, the pure and fervid eloquence of the man, and the divine, shine in every sentence. The style of the discourse is animated and impressive, the reasoning, cogent and persuasive, and the position taken, firm and unswerving. Yet there is none of the narrowness of the mere sectary—or the blind zeal of the bigot. Every view enunciated is broad, liberal, and full of charity. The most ardent Unionist, if he is a Christian man, cannot rise from a perusal of this sermon without a genuine love and respect for its author. But as our space is limited and we wish to allow our readers to judge of the merits of the discourse by a few short extracts, we will let the Dr. speak for himself. In the introduction, he briefly describes the character of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and exhibits the influence of that character upon the primitive Church. He deduces certain lessons from the conduct of the Apostles—and making their principles his text, applies them with great power and fervor to the subject in hand. His leading object is to show that they never allowed principle to yield to expediency. What is right, is right under every possible circumstance and condition. We cannot barter or compromise the truth—or win one part of it by sacrificing another. To trim or compromise is no portion of Christian ethics, and but a poor foundation on which to found a united Church. The preacher well says,

“The Utopian Reformer, forgetful that the only union which the word of God sanctions, and declares fitted for the condition of the church on earth, is a union that is entirely spiritual—not political and external—is the fusion into fellowship of faith and love, by the Spirit of God, of all human hearts, the whole Christian community “being of one heart and of one soul,”—in his heart-hatred of sects and schisms, and with an exuberance of liberality, that would compromise truth, and sacrifice every conscientious conviction at the shrine of a wide catholicity, would agglutinate the incoherent particles of religious opinion,—would attempt, but attempt in vain, to fuse into one homogeneous mass, the repellant elements of earth and heaven.”

This is a great truth well expressed, and in a subsequent passage he explains some what fully what Union is—a thing spiritual, not political and external.

“Union is a blessed thing, and the great object and aim of the Christian Church is to bring all ‘to the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God,’ and unity is the distinguishing quality of the glorified church in heaven. There they all see eye to

eye, all are ‘of one heart and of one soul,’ all are devoted to the same thing. We should therefore shun everything like division in the church as a very great sin. We should avoid even the appearance of this evil, as repugnant to the distinguishing qualities of the heavenly worshippers. But perfect unity of sentiment and action, is not to be expected in the church in the present imperfect state of humanity. The diversity of mental endowments, and of intellectual vigor and perspicacity, that exists in the human family; the varied influences of education, of national habits, and of early associations, render it impossible to find any two men, who, in the exercise of free inquiry, hold precisely the same views of the same subject. But this permitted evil may, in the providence of God, lead to the most desirable results.”

We wish we could make room for the author’s description of the evils which dissension and sectarian jealousy have brought upon the Christian Church, but we must forbear, in order to make room for the following fine apostrophe which every lover of our venerable Zion will read with warmly responsive feelings. In the following passage there is something better than mere eloquence, let our readers peruse it till they have got it by heart.

“What, then!—to put out of view this unseemly spectacle, and to give length and verge enough for the manifestation of the spirit of universal catholicity, would we sink all distinction of parties?—would we break up the present frame-work of the visible church, and remove these partition-walls by which it is now divided, as things of indifference, and injurious to the free play of our Christian sympathies?—Would we sacrifice, at the shrine of expediency, our honest predilections for our own modes of discipline, and forms of worship, that all sects and parties may be amalgamated into one community—being called by one name—observing the same forms and religious rites,—alas! that we cannot say, in the present condition of human nature, ‘all being of one heart and of one soul.’—Would we surrender, for the sake of external unity, our conscientious preference for the church of our Fathers, and forgetful of her past history—forgetful of what Scotland, of what the world, owes to her, as the noblest champion of civil and religious liberty,—forgetful of her being the most honored instrument in the hands of her Divine Master, for the successful accomplishment of his work—forgetful of the many benefits we have individually received from her hand, and ungrateful for her fostering care and kindness in our infantile weakness; and unthankful for her Christian counsels, now, that we are rising into manhood; are we to repudiate her? Are we to deny all connection with her, and yet continue to batten on her bounty? Are we to renounce every peculiarity in her principles and constitution can