

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THE MISSIONARY RECORD

OF THE

Free Church of Nova Scotia.

VOL. I. HALIFAX, N. S., FEBRUARY, 1852. No. 14.

THE LAW, OBLIGATIONS, AND PRIVILEGES OF THE SABBATH

ISAIAH 58TH. 13TH. 14TH.—*“If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight the Holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord: and I will cause thee to ride on the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob, thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”*

In these words we have the authority of the Sabbath plainly recognised; for Jehovah would not speak of an ordinary day in this manner: it is as an ordinance of God that it is thus to be hallowed and observed; while God expressly calls it *“my holy day.”* As an authoritative institution of God, and as *his* day, we are not to do our own ways, nor find our own pleasure, nor speak our own words, but are to honour him. We have the objects or duties of the day set forth; and we have the privilege, and advantage of the Sabbath represented: *“then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride on the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob, thy father.”*

Let us confine ourselves in our present remarks to the authority of the Sabbath.

It has been made a question when the Sabbath was instituted. It has been contended that it was not instituted till the giving of the law to Moses, that it was unknown before that time;

and the conclusion has been drawn from this, that the Sabbath was binding only upon the Jews, and that, since the types and ceremonies of the legal dispensation have found their end in Christ, the Sabbath is no longer to be observed as a sacred day, or as an ordinance of God.—The words in Genesis: *“And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it,”* &c., have been got rid of by saying that they were inserted by the historian, as the reason why God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it—viz., because that in it he had rested from all his work, although he had not yet instituted the Sabbath. But it is altogether improbable that the sacred historian would speak of the seventh day as one on which God rested, and which he blessed and sanctified, if he did not do so except by anticipation. This would be an unwarrantable perversion of historical narrative, and in this way we could not say what was history and what not. Moreover, the day was not so ceremonial and typical in its character as to belong only to a typical dispensation, and to be unnecessary ere yet the full typical dispensation was developed or appointed. It was useful for the same purposes of rest and devotion from the first ages of the world as afterwards, and was no doubt a sacred day with the Patriarchs, as well as with their descendants. It is no argument against this, that we have no mention made of the Sabbath between the creation of the world and the time of Moses, for we have no mention of it between the time of Moses, and that of David, a period of above four hundred years, and yet we know the Sabbath had been instituted, and must have been observed all that time. In ad-

dition to this, we have the Sabbath spoken of as an existing ordinance or institute previous to the command given from Mount Sinai. In Ex. 16. 23., we read: "And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said," &c. If the Sabbath had not been instituted before, how could this language be justified? It is obvious that it existed previously, and God makes provision to preserve its sanctity by working a miracle for the purpose, when the people must have either gathered the manna as usual, or suffered from the want of food. It is worthy of remark, too, that the words of the commandment which applies to the Sabbath are: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," &c., from which the inference is very fair and legitimate that the day existed, as a sacred day, before; and the holy observance of it was made one of the injunctions of the decalogue, in order to guard its sanctity, and secure its observance. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy"—the Sabbath, a day not unknown, a day familiar to their minds: "Remember that day with which you are familiar, and keep it holy." But more than this, we cannot see how the command respecting the Sabbath could be inserted in the moral law, if the Sabbath belonged only to a typical dispensation, and was not an ordinance proper to all ages of the world, to the time previous to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, and to all time succeeding. How should it be inserted in the moral law, and why was it not enjoined with the other commandments which were of a ceremonial or typical character merely?—It is true that the Apostle reckons the Sabbaths amongst other days of a ceremonial character, in regard to which he admonishes the Colossians: "let no man judge you;" for they were a shadow of things to come, but the body was of Christ. But while it is to be admitted that the Sabbath possessed a ceremonial and typical nature, and in its character as such was no longer to be observed, it undoubtedly possessed a moral character, which appears both from the place which it occupies in the decalogue (or moral law) and from the language respecting it in many a page of Scripture. No day is called God's day in the sense that the Sabbath is: "If thou wilt turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thine own pleasure, on my holy day," &c. He calls it *his* Sabbath: "thou hast profaned my Sabbaths:" "they shall keep my laws and hallow my Sab-

baths." Its chief character indeed was as a day commemorative of the work of creation: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: *wherefore* the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." And does not that stamp the institution with a moral character, applying to one age equally with another? But the allusion of the Apostle may be, and most likely was, to the Sabbaths of weeks, which were entirely of a ceremonial character, and were in no manner binding after the time of Christ: they were but the shadow, the body was of Christ; so that no argument can be drawn from the words of the Apostle against the permanent obligation of the Sabbath day. The same argument which would prove the fourth commandment to be the first institution and promulgation of the Sabbath, would prove the other commandments to have been instituted on Sinai for the first time, an absurdity not to be entertained for a moment. The commandments of the moral law were binding from the first, and are given in the shape of the Decalogue, or ten commandments, to invest them with greater solemnity to man, and to present them in a condensed and authoritative form. The "thou shalt" was written before on the hear, and when in the progress of ignorance and sin it became so defaced as to be hardly traceable, it was then put on the tables of stone, and copied into the revealed word of God, where it stands an unerring guide to duty, and an awful testimony against all who break God's law. It cannot be doubted, then, that the Sabbath was instituted immediately after the creation of the world. It was authoritative before the moral law was publicly promulgated: it had an authority independent of that, and in virtue of a prior appointment; and it must be binding *since* the ritual dispensation, as it was before it. It is a commandment or ordinance of permanent obligation. Those who would make it out as of a temporary character are put to the most awkward and unsatisfactory shifts; and the evidence of its permanent character is so abundant and so solid that the wonder is, that a question could be at all raised on the subject. It is a bad cause which needs so much and such ill expended ingenuity to defend it. The matter is too plain to allow even an apology for those who would destroy the permanent character of the Sabbath. It is by escaping argument,

not by adducing it, that the authority of the Sabbath is attempted to be weakened, or set aside. The fourth commandment is too plain and palpable an evidence to be eluded: it meets the anti-sabbatarian at every turn: it must stare him in the face at every attempt to break away from the Sabbath law: it is evidence against his own attempt to convert the very commandment into an argument against itself, and in favour of a Jewish obligation. The argument for the authority of the Sabbath stands thus: it was instituted by God at the creation, and in commemoration of it, as well as for other beneficial purposes: that there is no mention made of it between the time of its first recognition, or appointment, and the time of Moses, is no argument against its existence during that interval, for a similar omission may be adduced after the time of Moses: it is inserted in the moral law, and everywhere it is represented in Scripture as bearing a moral character, and therefore of permanent obligation; so that it is as binding now as in the time of the Jews, and as binding as an *entire ordinance*, or as, *a whole day*, appropriated and set apart to the service of God. No ingenuity can destroy this argument, or weaken the conclusion, that the Sabbath is the Lord's, and is to be devoted to his service. And let it be remarked that it has all the authority of the other commandments and ordinances of God. Any infringement of the Sabbath is an outrage on God's law as much as the transgression of any other of the precepts of that law, and must have the wrath of God lying against it as much as any other transgression whatever. Accordingly, it is guarded by as weighty sanctions as any other of the commandments: nay, if possible, by more weighty sanctions than any of the rest. God appears as if he were peculiarly jealous of this day.—“When he means to intimate,” says the illustrious Calvin, “*that religion is to be subverted, he complains that his Sabbaths are polluted, violated, neglected and profaned: as though in case of that duty being neglected, there remained no other way in which he could be honoured.*” And it might well seem to God, if his day was neglected and dishonoured, that nothing else would be observed or hallowed; and accordingly, the way in which the Sabbath was observed might then, as the manner of its observance may still, be the criterion of the state of every other duty, or a symptom of the degree in

which God himself was, or is, esteemed. And just according to the degree of piety any where existing will be the degree of estimation in which God's Sabbaths will be held, and the sacredness with which they will be kept—We see in the words from Isaiah above quoted, in what manner God views the Sabbath day, how tenderly, if we may use the expression, he regards it, and what blessings he attaches to its faithful observance.

The change of the day from the seventh to the first does not affect the principle of the day itself, the authority of the Sabbath, as the day of God. That remains the same, and we find an adequate reason for the change in the event of which the day is now especially commemorative. All the reasons for the Sabbath remain as before, except what was purely ceremonial or typical, and we have the additional one that on the day on which it is now observed, the first day of the week, Christ rose from the dead, and triumphed over our spiritual enemies. If creation was worthy of being commemorated, much more surely that work in which the peculiar glory of God is displayed, his mercy in harmony with his justice! We have no express injunction for the change, but we have the most instructive reasons and significant examples in favour of it. Christ not only rose from the dead, but he repeatedly showed himself to his disciples on that day. The early christians met on that day for their religious exercises. We are expressly told, Acts xx. 7.—“And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.” And in 1st Cor. xvi. 1.-2., we read,—“Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.” It is called the Lord's day,* just as the sacrament of the supper is called the Lord's supper,† both expressions referring to Christ, the one to his death, the other to his resurrection. It has been thought, therefore, that ample warrant is thus obtained for the change from the seventh to the first day of the week. But

* Rev. i. 10.

† 1 Cor. xi. 20.

whatever day is observed, that a Sabbath is to be observed, is abundantly obvious.

REMARKS

ON THE

"*Reply of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, to the Letter of the Free Church Synod declining the Union.*"

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR KING.

EIGHTH ARTICLE

It says little for the principles of the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod that, with a case before them such as has been described in the preceding Articles, they seem incapable of observing any thing but mere feeling to account for the separation that was effected at the Disruption. According to them, the grand manifestation in the Disruption, and in the continuance of the separation which was then accomplished, is that of a hearty dislike to the Established Church; and they seem willing to take some credit to themselves or not sympathising in the feeling. Referring to what they would wish the public to believe to be the real differences between the Free Synod and themselves, they say, "when cleared of extraneous matter, the amount of them is, that we do not dislike the Established Church of Scotland so heartily as they do, and that we are more favourably disposed toward the United Presbyterian Church. They do not object to our faith or practice, but only to our *feelings* toward third parties, with whom we are not connected, and for whose acts we are not responsible." The case of the United Presbyterian Church will be considered in its own place. In the meantime, with respect to the Established Church of Scotland, the principle of the above extract seems entirely to correspond with the sentiment embodied in the following sentence extracted from Mr. Trotter's Letter which appeared in the "*Guardian*" of September 7th, 1849, "Our own separation from the Church of Scotland having been a distant event, time had closed the wound it had occasioned, and permitted the return of a kinder feeling, than at first existed between the two bodies; and we perhaps did not make sufficient allowance in our calculation on the subject, for the influence on your minds, of the severe contest in which you had been so recently engaged." And do these brethren really wish it to be

understood that it was a matter not of principle but of feeling which induced their "fathers of the Secession" to withdraw from the moderate majorities of their day? Do they wish it to be understood that it was a matter not of principle but of feeling that kept themselves and their predecessors in this Province aloof from a connexion with the Established Church of Scotland, but that now when these *feelings* have had time to cool, now when certain wounds have been closed up—and simply through lapse of time—they have no objection to an incorporation? If this is not the import of the language just quoted, it is difficult to see what can be its meaning; and, if it is, then, whether it represents themselves in a correct light or not, it is most unquestionably a grievous misrepresentation of their "fathers of the Secession." They did indeed contemplate, and hope for, and pray for, a return to the Establishment. That return, however, they regarded as a thing that would be either practicable or lawful not when time might have closed their wounds or soothed their irritated feelings, but when, and only when, the grievances which had driven them from the Establishment might have been redressed.

In as far as the Free Church is concerned, there is no need to maintain that her supporters were altogether raised above the ordinary workings of human feeling. There was much to call forth the expression of feeling, and of strong feeling too: and as, on the one hand, it may not be very easy even for the most advanced christian, when contending earnestly for the truth in opposition to mean trickery, or base treachery, or ruthless oppression, to guard against the exhibition of some emotion which he might afterwards wish had been suppressed; so neither, on the other hand, is it greatly to be desired that, in such a struggle, his movements and feelings should be adjusted to suit the taste of those who have no sympathy for the cause in which he is engaged. The noble spirits, however, who really bore the heat and the burden of the day, whatever confessions their own ingenuous minds may have prompted them occasionally to make, were not the parties who expended their strength in the mere expression of feeling. An investigation of the facts of the case may show that the strongest expressions of feeling, on the side of the Free Church, came from some who, when the decisive step was to be taken, found it convenient

to remain in the Establishment. And although it has been the fashion with some to resolve the whole matter into the angry passions of the human heart, and to raise an outcry particularly against the Free Church for what they have been pleased to call the bitterness of feeling with which she conducted the controversy, it would not be easy to point out a case in which principles so important were contended for, in which the contest was spread over such a length of time, and in the progress of which so much unjust and injurious treatment was met with; in which, nevertheless, there was less of improper feeling manifested, than was by the Free Church in the "ten years' conflict." The detail, short as it is, which has been given in some of the preceding Articles, shows that it was indeed a contest for principle: and the more fully the principles for which the Free Church contends are examined and tried by the standard of God's word, the more clearly will it be seen that they are principles which should be maintained by the Church Universal, and which no length of time can ever render obsolete. It may suit the views of some to say that they think the Free Church of Scotland was right in the cause which she maintained, and that if they were in Scotland it is with her rather than with the Establishment that they would join; but that still, in this country, there is no occasion for keeping up the difference. If these principles, however, are Bible principles in Scotland, they are not less Bible principles in Nova Scotia. The breadth of the Atlantic cannot alter their character; and if there are those in this country who think it right to keep up a connexion with the Scottish Establishment as it now is, and to attempt to give an appearance of respectability as a Church to that abject "creature of the State" which consents to be "laid prostrate," as Dr. McCulloch of Greenock expressed it, "at the feet of the civil magistrate;" then there is a duty laid upon all who would faithfully maintain the Bible principles for which the Church of Scotland has struggled from the days of the Reformation, to protest against any such connexion—to maintain all the more strenuously the interests of the truth, and, like the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, as formerly noticed, to show by their adherence to the Free Church, where it is that they find the body that truly represents the Church of their fathers. Those who profess to be Seceders, should not

need to be reminded that God's word denounces judgments against every corrupt ecclesiastical system. While christian charity may rejoice to recognise the workings of divine grace in those who may be the members of a Church which they may feel themselves bound to protest against as corrupt—and Free Churchmen may think with warm emotion of those whom they still regard as christian friends whom they have left behind in the Establishment; yet enlightened christian friendship would remonstrate with those who are unhappily entangled in such a connexion, would point out to them the danger of their position, and would press upon them the call of God's word, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." God's people though they are, they occupy a dangerous position, and it will be their wisdom to leave it without delay.

The Synod of the Free Church, in their Answer to the communication which they had received from the Presbyterian Synod, refer to the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland as presenting a third obstacle to the proposed Union. They say, "The United Presbyterian Church in Scotland, which was formed lately by the union of the United Secession and the Relief Churches, is now regarded by you as your parent Church. We have no wish to refer unnecessarily to that body, but since union with you would involve us in communion with them, we must state in all plainness that this forms another obstacle which we cannot overcome, to the contemplated union." The brethren of the Pre-byterian Synod, in their Reply, seem now to be unable to understand why any reference should have been made to the United Presbyterian Church. In a passage already quoted in this Article, they say of the differences between the Free Synod and themselves, "the amount of them is, that we do not dislike the Established Church of Scotland so heartily as they do, and that we are more favourably disposed toward the United Presbyterian Church. They do not object to our faith or practice, but only to our feelings toward third parties, *with whom we are not connected*, and for whose acts we are not responsible." Again they say, "But supposing all their objections to the United Presbyterian Church to be well-founded, we repeat that in her proceedings *we are not at all implicated*, nor did we ever ask from our Free Church brethren any ap-

proval of them. We are descended from her, and under many obligations to her, but we are still independent of her, and in no respect under her control." The Presbyterian Church in Ireland is an independent Church; she is not under the control of any other portion of the visible Church; and her commissioners, in that step of which the Church subsequently approved, exercised their own independent judgment when, having witnessed the Disruption, and having considered the position in which the Ecclesiastical Establishment and the Free Church of Scotland then respectively stood, they presented their Commission to the General Assembly of the Free Church, declaring that it was in that body that they found the proper representation of the Church of their fathers. In acknowledging the Free Church as their parent Church, they did not place themselves under her control, nor did they in the slightest degree compromise their independence; but they certainly thereby declared that they regarded the Free Church as maintaining the principles of the Church of Scotland from which they were an offshoot, they declared that they held by the same principles for which the Free Church had been contending, that they fully sympathized with her as suffering in defence of their common faith, and that they desired to maintain with her the communion which they had hitherto held with the Church of Scotland. Nothing less than this can be understood as implied in acknowledging the Free Church as their parent Church; and assuredly all this is implied in the relation in which the Free Church of this Province stands to the Free Church of Scotland. Now, Mr. Trotter, the Convener of the Committee on the Union, in forwarding the communication from the Presbyterian Synod to the Free Synod, in June 1849, accompanied it with a letter in which he says expressly, "that in case of uniting, our correspondence with our respective mother Churches, must be placed on the same footing." It is true, the bodies are not named who are here spoken of as mother Churches; but as it is well enough known that the Free Synod is in correspondence with the Free Church of Scotland as its parent church, so it is presumed that they judged correctly, when they understood the reference to be made to the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland, as the parent church of the Presbyterian Synod. They un-

derstood the condition thus intimated to be, that, in case of uniting, the correspondence of the United body with the Free Church and with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland should be placed on precisely the same footing. The brethren of the Presbyterian Synod, in their reply, seem willing to keep this condition out of view. In a publication also which professes to be the correspondence between the two bodies in reference to the Union, both Mr Trotter's Letter and the Letter from the Presbyterian Synod, to which the Letter from the Free Synod was an Answer, are wanting; the reason of which may be best explained by those who issued that publication. However, when this condition, laid down by the Presbyterian Synod, is considered, it will be seen that the Free Synod had no reason to suppose that they were making an ultroneous reference to the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. They had no wish to speak of that body at all; but when it was proposed, as they understood it, that they should be as closely connected with the United Presbyterian Church as with the Free Church of Scotland, they felt that they were laid under an obligation to give a reason why they could not go into a Union upon any such condition. The writer of these Remarks ventures to think that they were quite right in this view of the case; and, notwithstanding the disclaimer of the brethren, in their Reply, as they have not thought proper to name any other body which was meant as their mother church, he cannot help still believing that they are connected with the United Presbyterian Church, that they are of course implicated in her proceedings, and that the Free Church were warranted in referring to the proposed connexion with that body, as an insuperable obstacle to the proposed Union. He readily admits, however, that the following Remarks in defence of this particular part of the Free Synod's Answer are quite inapplicable, if the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod can show that the church to which they referred as their mother church was not the United Presbyterian Church, but a totally different body, and one which, as provided for in the Basis of Union, holds fairly and honestly by the Westminster Confession of Faith, as it was received by the General Assembly of 1647. In speaking of the correspondence with the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland as to

be placed on precisely the same footing, it is to be remembered that the correspondence meant, is not that of some individual ministers in this Province who might at one time have been connected with one or other of these bodies; but the correspondence of the United Church, which it was proposed should be formed of the Free and the Presbyterian Synods. Now it by no means follows, as a matter of course, that the Free Church of Scotland would acknowledge as a kindred church the body that might have been thus formed. Unquestionably, if the Union had been gone into upon the principles which it now appears the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod have been contemplating, it would be inconsistent with the hitherto recognized principles of the Free Church to acknowledge such a body. They cannot unite with the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland; and it is not extremely probable that they would unite with the same body thus represented in the Province of Nova Scotia. But whatever the Free Church of Scotland might be inclined to do, the Free Synod of Nova Scotia, acting under a sense of their own responsibility to God, felt that they could not without a dereliction of duty, consent to be placed in the proposed relationship to a body which they could not regard as having faithfully maintained the principles and the testimony to which they themselves are pledged. This was a delicate and unpleasant topic to handle; and, having no wish to refer unnecessarily to those of whom a regard to truth might require them to speak in such terms, they stated just as little as they possibly could, in consistency with the duty which they had to discharge of presenting a justification of their own conduct, in declining to be associated with another Christian body. The little that was stated, was not stated in a way that was intended, or that seem fitted, to give offence. A simple reference was made to certain matters of fact, which are notorious to all who know any thing of that body. The Presbyterian Synod have thought fit not merely to question the correctness of the statements of facts, but to give their contradictions in a style which sets all pretensions to courtesy aside. The writer will not so far forget what is due either to himself or to the Synod of which he has the honour to be a member, as to imitate the example which has thus been set before him; but the reader, in considering what must now be submitted to

him, may have an opportunity of judging whether the Presbyterian Synod have acted with much wisdom, in giving their unceremonious contradictions to statements which must now, in consequence, be substantiated at some length.

The United Presbyterian Church in Scotland is constituted of two bodies which, previous to the union which took place a few years ago, were known as the United Secession, and the Relief Churches. The first remark in the Free Synod's Letter with respect to the United Secession was made in the following terms, "The United Secession was itself formed by the union of two bodies who had embraced what has been called the New Light with regard to the duties of the civil magistrate—which duties every church is bound to proclaim—and, influenced by these views, they did not receive the entire doctrine of the Confession of Faith, their subscription of it being with a qualification." It has been seen, in former Articles, that the Associate Presbytery of Seceders was formed for the expressed purpose of maintaining the Reformation principles of the Church of Scotland, and these particularly as set forth in the Westminster standards. In 1747, after they had become sufficiently numerous to be formed into a Synod, they were split into two bodies, in consequence of a difference of opinion as to whether certain oaths which were required to be taken by Burgesses could be taken in consistency with Secession principles. Those who held that these oaths might be taken, were commonly called Burghers; and those who held that it was inconsistent with their principles to take them, were commonly called Anti-Burghers. A good many years after this division had taken place, certain individuals, in both of these bodies, began to give expression to what they themselves admitted to be, and what their opponents charged as being, new views with respect to certain duties which, according to the Confession of Faith, were incumbent upon the civil magistrate. The Church, as the pillar and ground of the truth, is bound to hold up to all ranks and classes of men the duties that devolve upon them in their various relations, and the Confession of Faith, accordingly, had made certain statements as to the duties of the civil magistrate. Those who had adopted the new views, or, as they were commonly called, the New Light, were dissatisfied with these statements in the Confession. After a

variety of proceedings, in which those who maintained the New Light, both in the Burgher and in the Anti-Burgher Synods, endeavoured to reach their object by setting themselves and their respective churches free from an adherence to the particular points referred to in the confession, and those who adhered to the old doctrine resisted these attempts and insisted upon the maintenance of the Confession in all its integrity, the two bodies again divide. A few years before the close of the last century, the Burgher Synod formed themselves into two distinctive bodies called the Old Light and the New Light Burghers. A few years after the commencement of the present century, a similar division took place among the Anti-Burghers, who also were broken up into two separate bodies, the old Light Anti-Burghers, and the New Light Anti-Burghers. These designations are given here, not as being the most formal, but as being those by which, it is supposed, the respective bodies are most commonly known. The Free Synod, then, holding by the Confession of Faith in its integrity, and persuaded that the Basis of Union, if properly understood, had secured this, in the passage just quoted, and without a single word to aggravate the feeling of difference, referred to the well known historical fact that the United Secession had adopted the New Light, and had consequently ceased to hold the Confession in its integrity; that it might be at once seen that she could not consistently unite with that body, or with those who concurred with them in their views. Upon this, the Presbyterian Synod, in their Reply, say, "We regret that they have expressed themselves so very generally upon this subject, but from their reference to 'what has been called the new light;' we are at no loss to understand what are the duties or supposed duties of the civil magistrate to which they allude. Toward the close of the last century, a controversy arose in the United Secession Church, then divided in two branches, on the question whether or not their standards favoured persecution for conscience sake. For the purpose of terminating the controversy, and settling the agitation which it had occasioned, both branches passed what may be called a declaratory act to the effect, that they did not approve of enforcing religion by civil pains and penalties." "The New Light Seceders did not object to the conceding of any other

power to the civil magistrate, or the imposing upon him of any other duty than that of promoting religion by compulsory measures." In like manner, Mr. Trotter, in his Letter which appeared in the "Guardian" of Sept. 21st., 1849, says, "Had you been more general I should have supposed you to refer to the Voluntary movement, which is comparatively recent, but as it would be ungenerous to impute to you such palpable ignorance as this would take for granted, I must believe you to refer to the New Light controversy, which is more than fifty years old, and was terminated before the commencement of this century; and if so, the duties of the magistrate to which you refer, namely, those of roasting the living bodies of men for the benefit of souls, and of enlightening their consciences by crushing their bones, will hardly find abettors in any other body than your own."

In this latter passage, which is to be understood as something particularly smart, Mr. Trotter has expressed himself in a coarseness of style to which the Synod in their Letter have not ventured to commit themselves. Both his Letter, however, and the Synod's would represent the New Light which began to be maintained in the Secession towards the close of last century as being simply an opposition to persecuting principles. It is thus modestly assumed that the adherents to the New Light are the grand advocates of the rights of conscience, and of civil and religious liberty; while those who differed from them on the points which were really in dispute are slandered as the abettors of persecution. Speaking of that portion of the adherents to the Old Light who joined the Church of Scotland in 1839, Mr. Trotter, in the above-mentioned Letter, says, "They held, as you of course must do, since you approve of their principles, that magistrates are bound by fire and sword, boots, screws, and thumbkins, &c., to suppress heresy and preserve orthodoxy in the Christian Church." In an Appendix also (No ii.) to the Reply of the Presbyterian Synod, these brethren say, "As not many persons in this country are acquainted with the New Light controversy, it may be as well to quote the words of the Synodical decision in order that the public may see distinctly what it is, at which our Free Church brethren have taken offence." Instead, however, of quoting to the extent that is necessary to enable the public to see what are the points of difference,

they give a short extract from the records of the New Light Burgher Synod, and another from the records of the New Light Anti-burgher Synod, which extracts may be said to contain in substance a disapproval of persecution; and then they add, "And the holding of such sentiments as these, is made by our Free Church brethren a ground of objection against uniting with us!" Now the offensive charges implied in these quotations are brought against men who take their stand honestly, without equivocation or reserve, on that Basis of Union by which it was expressly provided that "the United Body repudiates the idea of attempting to enforce the belief or profession of Christianity by the power of the sword, as alike contrary to the Law of Christ, the spirit of His gospel, the rights of conscience, and the liberties of man." But the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod seem to have presumed greatly on the want of acquaintance in this country with the New Light controversy. Perhaps they were not far wrong in thinking that numbers would be swayed by any thing they might be pleased to say on the subject, and it is quite possible that their bold assertions may pass with a currency that is due only to the truth, among multitudes who will not give themselves the trouble to look at evidence to the contrary, even where it may be placed within their reach. An exposition of the truth, however, is due to the character of the Free Synod which has been aspersed, it is due to the character of the Westminster Standards which are involved in the aspersion, it is due to the truth of God's Word, and to the best interests of society, both civil and ecclesiastical, which are deeply concerned in the questions which these brethren have so grossly misrepresented.

Let it be observed then that, when, in the Letter from the Free to the Presbyterian Synod, it is stated that the United Secession, influenced by the New Light which they had embraced, "did not receive the entire doctrine of the Confession of Faith—their subscription of it being with a qualification," this is something very different from saying that they had rejected the entire doctrine of the Confession. It is not said that they have renounced every principle which had been maintained by their "fathers of the Secession." When Mr. Trotter, therefore, in order to show that the New Light Seceders have not departed from the principles of the "fathers of the Secession,"

tells, as he does in his Letter last quoted, that "when expressing their views respecting the duties of the civil magistrate, in 1743, they fearlessly denounce what they call 'the dangerous extreme of espousing principles in favour of propagating religion by offensive arms,'" he says nothing at all to the purpose. It was not charged either as a novelty or as an error against those holding the New Light, that they denounced that "dangerous extreme." Let them denounce it as much as they please; they cannot be more honest in denouncing it than their brethren of the Old Light, whom Mr. Trotter nevertheless accuses of holding "that magistrates are bound by fire and sword, boots, screws, and thumbkins, &c to suppress heresy and preserve orthodoxy in the Christian Church." This seems, indeed, to be a favourite mode with him of dealing with an opponent.—He cannot allow that opponent to express his own views in his own words. He must express them for him; and, having exercised his fancy in the statement which he puts into his mouth, he becomes quite irresistible in attacking what he has taken good care shall be very easily overcome. If, however, instead of occupying himself so much with works of fiction, he would make himself a little better acquainted with History, and attend to Chronology, he might perhaps come to understand that the New Light was not troubling the Secession in 1743. The Secession did not need to wait for the outbreaking of the New Light in order to learn that persecuting principles are not Bible principles. Alexander Moncrieff, Minister of Abernethy, and one of the four brethren who seceded in 1733, says, "Christian magistrates in their characters, are to maintain and defend the faith in Christ. *We do not mean that they are to propagate the religion of Jesus by sword, fire, and faggot*, but that Christian states are to employ their power and a authority for support of the worship and service of God, as well as for regulating our behaviour to our fellow creatures." Why, the principle embodied in the words which Mr. Trotter has quoted from the act of the Associate Presbytery 1743, is a part of the Old Light testimony. That act was agreed to by the Presbytery for the purpose of expressing their mind upon certain important points which they were led to consider, in proceeding to the solemn work of renewing the covenants. It is a document, therefore, which was agreed to while the Secession

was still undivided; and the *Old Light* not only has as much interest in it, but, to say the least, holds as steadily by it as the *New*. Still farther, this is not only the Light received and diffused by the "fathers of the Secession," and which the *New Light*, as professing to be their descendants, must not, in opposition to the *Old Light*, claim as exclusively their own inheritance; but it is a Light with which these fathers were acquainted while they were still in the Establishment. In short, it is just a portion of God's truth embodied in those Westminster Standards which the "fathers of the Secession" were determined to adhere to, and which are maintained in their integrity by the Free Church. The *New Light* cannot hold that principle, in the character of *Seceders*, but as finding it agreeable both to the word of God and to the Westminster Confession of Faith.

—o—

TRANSMISSION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PROFESSORIAL FUND.

Notwithstanding some hints which we took the liberty of throwing out some months ago, there has been considerable irregularity this season in the transmission of the contributions to the Professorial Fund. This involves the Secretary of the College and Academy Board in very serious difficulties, in the transaction of the varied matters which, at much inconvenience to himself, he has agreed to superintend. It has a tendency also both to occasion direct loss, and to create most unjustly a feeling of dissatisfaction and distrust in reference to the officials in Halifax. A case or two can be understood where the collecting of the contributions may have been delayed, in order to obtain the benefit of that season of the year in which means are most abundant in particular localities. This is quite proper; and the diversified circumstances of the country require that something should be left to the discretion of the friends who are upon the spot, as to the most favourable season of the year for making the collections. But there are cases where this can scarcely be assigned as the reason for the delay, and in which parties may require to be reminded that when the year's subscriptions are gathered in, they ought to be transmitted by the earliest opportunity. In availing themselves however of an early opportunity some care should be exercised by those at a distance in endeavoring

to secure the transmission thro' a proper channel. The intercourse between Halifax and all the quarters from which subscriptions come is such, that it does not appear as if it should involve any very great effort to obtain the services of those who take an interest in the object. At all events, it is hoped that some improvement may be the result of calling attention to the subject, and therefore we very readily give a place in this number to the Letter from Mr Liddell which follows; and also to the excellent hints in Mr. Drummond's Tract which he has enclosed. It seems to be universally allowed that the Province has been highly favoured with the bounties of God's providence in the course of the year that has just elapsed; and surely it is not too much to expect that some manifestations of gratitude should appear in the enlarged contributions of those who profess to take an interest in his cause.

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE COLLEGE AND ACADEMY BOARD.

(To the Editor of the Free Church Record.)

DEAR SIR,—Would you be so kind as allow me to notice in the Record, a few facts respecting our College Fund, which may tend to guide the friends of that cause, and at the same time to lead them to renewed exertions. In the first place, I am sorry to say, that up to the present time, many of the Associations have sent nothing forward for the last year, although I am well aware that collections have been made. In some cases, I have received lists of contributions without property, and in others, property without lists. I feel it to be very difficult, under such circumstances, to keep my accounts as correctly as I would wish, but really do not know with whom the blame rests; for in many cases I never see the parties who bring along the property, and I am sometimes at a loss to know from whence it comes. I have frequently had persons, unconnected in every way with the scheme, calling upon me to say, that Butter had been left in their charge, which they supposed was for our College; and in one instance, a small lot had been in a Merchant's cellar for weeks before I knew any thing of it's being there. Complaints have been made to me that lists of subscribers' names had not made their appearance in print. I think what I have stated above, sufficiently explains the reasons; for I am scrupulously particular about such as I receive: and if parties who feel aggrieved would take the trouble to search carefully into the matter, they might find that the fault was not with me, but lay nearer home. I have in many cases, handed lists for printing, long before

had received any part of the amount named on them. This I shall avoid in future, as it leads to errors which may be serious.

As far as my observations go, I feel persuaded that the Associations cannot be working as formerly, but have allowed themselves to fall into careless and indifferent ways; for I know they have a willing people to work amongst, who, if regularly called upon, would not refuse to give of the gifts bestowed upon them. Of this we have had decided proof.

I must not trespass too far upon your space; but I would wish, through your Record, to impress upon the Local Treasurers the urgent necessity of sending forward as soon as possible such amounts as they may have in their possession; and to remind them that if they have allowed the Associations to fall off, they should take immediate steps to reorganize them, and by a good example to encourage them to such vigorous operation as will lead to better things for the future, and eventually place the College Fund in such a position as must be ardently desired by all who have their Master's work at heart. The sum is still far short of what was originally aimed at; and there is no hope of attaining the desired end except by steady perseverance, by systematic organization among the different Associations, and a faithful reliance on Him whose cause it is, and who will sustain those who are heartily engaged in his service. If the Local Treasurers would, when sending the proceeds of their various stations, endeavour to have them placed in charge of the proper party here, and therewith send some document explanatory of the transaction, much inconvenience and, I may say, loss, would thereby be avoided. As these matters are now conducted in several quarters, it would seem to indicate a very great indifference as to whether the property reaches its destination or not. I enclose one of Mr. P. Drummond's tracts, which seems to me very applicable. It might be useful to have it transferred to the columns of the Record. Believe me, dear Sir,

Yours very respectfully,

JAMES H. LINDELL,
Secretary to College Board.

THE "CHRISTIAN" MONEY-HOARDER.

"I hid thy talent in the earth,"—Matt. xxv. 25.

We read of a Syrian king sending a vaunting message to one of the kings of Israel—"thy silver and thy gold are mine; thy wives also and thy children, even the goodliest, are mine;" and the reply of the cowardly and hypocritical Ahab was, "My lord, O King, according to thy saying, I am thine, and all that I have." But when the king of Syria sent to bring away a portion of what was thus in words declared to be his, the monarch of Israel showed that he had no idea of its being more than an empty

acknowledgment of inferiority, and dared the consequences of a war with Syria, rather than lose any part of his property.—How like the professing Christians of this generation! They read in the Word of God that their silver and their gold is the Lord's, Hag. ii. 8; and they answer, "True, O king." They hear their obligation to use it for the advancement of his cause pressed upon them in the sanctuary, and their consciences assent to the claim. They sit down at a Communion Table, and there virtually say, "We are not our own, but bought with a price; we are the Lord's, and all that we have." But where is the evidence of their sincerity? Who is spending, and being spent for God?

"With their mouth they shew much love, but their heart goeth after their covetousness," Ezek. xxxiii. 31.

"Let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth," 1 John iii. 18.

1. Christian professor, is your admission that all you have is the Lord's like Ahab's, unsupported by what you give to his claim? 1 Kings xx. 2-9.

2. Are you not sometimes glad, when you can offer to the Lord that which costs you nothing? unlike David, 2 Sam. xxiv. 24:

3. Do you ever *grudge* comforts to yourself when the Lord's cause wants means? 2 Sam. vii. 2.

4. Or can you enjoy your comforts without a thought what might be given up to Zion? Hag. i. 4.

5. Do you believe that the Lord is able to repay what you sacrifice at his call? 2 Chron. xxv. 6.

6. When you meet with a worldly loss, do you ever reflect the Lord may be showing you your sin in your punishment? Hag. i. 6. 9-11.

7. Have you ever *proved* the Lord whether you might not become richer by giving than withholding? Mal. iii. 10; Prov. iii. 9, 10; xi. 24.

8. Do you give your *best* to the Lord, or what you can best spare? Mal. i. 7, 8, 13, 14.

9. Do you think most about what you can get for your dying body, or what you can give for the kingdom of Christ? Matt. vi. 31-33.

10. Does Christ *know* that you so love him, as that you would follow him, were he to require you to sell all that you have? Mar. x. 21.

11. Did you ever *once* give all that you had in possession, and trust the Lord for the morrow? Mar. xii. 44.

12. How many evidences of discipleship will you have on the judgment-day, in what you have given to Christ? Matt. xxv. 35, 36.

13. How often have you made to yourself a "friend" of this world's wealth so

that it shall witness for and not against you at that day? Luke xvi. 9.

14. If you think you have the excuse of straitened circumstances, are you as anxious to give like a gentleman or lady, as to dress like one? 1 Tim. ii. 9, 10.

15. CHRISTIAN PROFESSOR, WHY DO YOU HOARD OR WITHHOLD? IT WILL NOT ENRICH YOU FOR TIME. IT WILL IMPOVERISH YOU FOR ETERNITY. Jam. v. 3.

"So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God," Luke xii. 21.

(The MS. furnished by a friend in Clackmannanshire.)

P. DRUMMOND.

Stirling, May, 1851.

From the *Missionary Record of the Free Church of Scotland.*

OUR LARGE TOWNS.

The object of the Home Mission and Church-extension Scheme is to assail irreligion, infidelity, and social degradation within the borders of our own country—to supply religious ordinances to those who are destitute of them—and to gather in souls to the kingdom of Christ from all quarters of the country, and from all classes of the population. The scheme is of vast magnitude, and of such a nature as is fitted to awaken the sympathies, and to demand the active and energetic support, of all members of our Church who truly love their country and who have had compassion for the souls of men. And yet it is a scheme which has not commanded that universal interest and support which might reasonably have been expected, and which the urgency of the claims upon it require. It has been crippled and restricted in its operations, not by the want of opportunities for usefulness, nor by the want of agents to undertake the work, but by the want of means necessary for the prosecution of its labours.

For some years it has been felt that the great and peculiar field for the operation of this scheme is among the irreligious and neglected masses of our large towns. It is there that the danger is most pressing, and the need of missionary effort is most urgently felt. Hitherto, however, comparatively little has been accomplished in this department. It is true that this promising and most necessitous field of labour has not been utterly neglected. In most, if not all the large towns, something has been doing for the evangelization of their irreligious population. These efforts have been made, not so much through the instrumentality of the General Assembly's Committee, as by the spontaneous movement of individual congregations. They have not, however, been made on a scale of sufficient magnitude, nor with a direct view to the establishment of completely-equipped Christian congregations. Previously to last General Assembly,

the only thing that had been accomplished by the Free Church in this way was the establishment of the church and schools at the West Port, Edinburgh, and a similar establishment at Holyrood, in the same town.—These have both proved most successful experiments, such as are well fitted to encourage the Free Church to renewed and more extended efforts in the same direction. Both Holyrood and West Port are now nearly self-sustaining Christian congregations; and, in the prosperity which has attended them, God has been very plainly and emphatically inviting the Free Church to enter upon and occupy the field of Christian effort and usefulness.

At last General Assembly a fresh impulse was given to this department of the scheme. The attention of the Church had turned to it for some time previously, and a large number of overtures from all quarters of the country had come up to the Assembly.—This state of things was due very much to what had been done and said in Glasgow, to the revelations of the social and religious condition of a large proportion of its population made by Dr. Buchanan, and to the fact that a proposal had been made then to organize a new Church Building Society to start with a capital of £100,000, to be expended in promoting the erection of places of worship in destitute localities. The Assembly appointed a special Sub-committee to co-operate with parties in Glasgow in the promotion of Church-extension there, and recommend a collection to be made in all the congregations of the Free Church for behoof of this scheme.

The movement did not arrest the progress of the cause in other localities. It rather gave a fresh impulse to that cause, while it helped materially to give a proper form and direction to the efforts which congregations had been making in various localities. Accordingly, we have been delighted to observe, that in Edinburgh the labours of Free St. George's congregation at Fountainbridge, promise soon to be aided by the erection of a Territorial Church there, and the establishment of a thoroughly-equipped congregation. In Dundee, also, some progress has been making. Three of the congregations there united in selecting a destitute district, in providing the funds necessary for the support of a probationer, and in sending forth a Christian agency to aid the probationer in gathering a congregation. These operations have now become so far ripened, that the subscriptions for building a church are nearly all realised, and we may soon expect to see, in that district, a thoroughly-organised congregation.

The operations in Glasgow are on a more extended scale. It was intended they should be so; and for this reason an appeal is to be made to the whole Church to aid the congregations of Glasgow in carrying them forward. If any one should ask the cause of

this arrangement, and be disposed to grudge the preference which has been shown to that city. we would answer in the words of the Convener of the General Assembly's Sub-Committee, when laying the proposed plan of operations before the Presbytery of Glasgow, on Wednesday 10th ult.

"It was not I any confidently say, because they thought that nothing should be done, or because they meant to do nothing, to extend Christian ordinances, and to promote gospel influences among the fallen sections of the people in our large towns.—No one will allege, in regard to our evangelistic operations in India, that the Church is of the mind that nothing should be done for the general population of Bengal, because she has been concentrating her efforts upon Calcutta. On the contrary, it is acknowledged that, in that vast metropolis, she is laying the foundations of a work which, by the blessing of God, must contribute to place the gospel on a vantage ground for giving deadly blows to the superstitions that prevail in Bengal and Hindustan. In like manner we hold that a concentrated movement upon Glasgow is fraught, if the Lord see good to own it, with life and revival which will extend to many in all parts of the country. The seeds of a terrible disease have long been sown in the constitution of the body-politic of the Scottish people; and now we see that it has reached the stage at which it threatens to produce ruin and dissolution. Is there any remedy for that disease? There is a remedy—one grand specific and only one. We know not what sort of future Providence has ordained for a land so sinful; but a remedy there is, and it is our duty—it is the duty of all the Churches of Christ—prayerfully and zealously to apply it. And where is it that the main force of the remedy should be brought to bear? Where should it be but on the seat of the disease—on the spot in which it exists in greatest virulence and power? Therefore has our Assembly fixed on Glasgow, with its teeming myriads of non-church-goers, as the sphere of peculiar evangelistic exertions and appliances. Glasgow which has quintupled its inhabitants since the beginning of the century, while the inhabitants of Scotland at large have scarcely been doubled—Glasgow, which now contains one-eighth of our whole population, while fifty years ago it had only a twentieth, and which has probably a fourth within a radius of twenty miles round it—Glasgow is the seat of the disease. Nowhere, in all our native country, have the means of grace been left so far behind by the increase of the people.—No where have such masses been congregated without the leaven of religion as in and around this great city, once so exalted by its privileges and its piety, and which, we may well say, is highly distinguished for them still, if the state of one-half its population could be overlooked! The evil to

be dealt with is widely spread; it exists in every town of any size; but its seat and stronghold are mainly here. And, if the healing virtue of the gospel of Jesus did but gain the ascendancy in the alleys and wynds of Glasgow, with its crowded and far-reaching suburbs, so that Glasgow rose from its spiritual decline, and flourished again by the preaching of the Word, what an impulse might thereby be given to the work of recovering the ignorant and careless in all our large towns! One remark more. Our sub-committee has been appointed, and the collection for Glasgow has been recommended, because the Church, while not relaxing her efforts, but, on the contrary, increasing them, for other parts of the country, thinks it right to try what can be done through exertions that are concentrated upon a particular locality. It is plainly her duty to adopt every likely expedient in the prosecution of the work set before her. And the idea now is, that, instead of leaving Glasgow to itself, or of leaving it to come in for its share of attention with the rest of our populous manufacturing districts, we should resort to the expedient of taking it separately in hand, and bringing down upon it, for a season, the gathered energies and united action of the whole Church. The idea, in fact, is to proclaim a crusade—not a military crusade—as of old, but a true, peaceful, missionary crusade—against the infidelity, and ignorance, and ungodliness, that have entrenched themselves in Glasgow. Yes, and it is a crusade in which all the churches of Christ, ought to join. There is need of them all. Let our own, and every other denomination of evangelical Christians, arise with the cry of the Psalmist—"Who will bring me into the strong city? who will lead me into Edom? Wilt not thou, O God! who hadst cast us off? And wilt not thou, O God! go forth with our hosts?"

MADRAS.

Extract Letter—Rev. Mr. Anderson—20th Oct. Efficiency of the Native Preachers—Afflictions and Mercies—Preachings and Discussions—Numbers in attendance at the Schools.

Our great help, under God, has been our three native preachers, Rajahgopaul, Venkataramiah, and Ettirajiloo. They have laid themselves out nobly, both in teaching and preaching in the native languages and English. We hope the Lord may give us strength to ordain them shortly; for, unless we give them a standing, should anything befall us, our great work could hardly fail to suffer loss. May the Lord strengthen and direct us!

This has been a year of special and sore affliction, both personal, and in the mission, as regards its inward working, and yet, we have had many special and very tender mercies. Six souls, since May last, seem hopefully added to our little band, two of

them tender females, who still cleave to the Lord Jesus. The evangelistic work, too, on the Sabbaths, goes on bravely at Madras and Triplicane. At the two places last Sabbath, where Venka and Ettiraji preached in Tamil, and Rajah catechised, there were well-nigh *eight hundred*, male and female, the great majority of them being idolaters of all classes and castes, from the Brahmin to the Pariah.

After the service was over at Madras, Rajah held an animated discussion with a Pandarum on how we were to get the forgiveness of sin; and Venka replied to the objections of a respectable Hindu at Triplicane, who was offended by his preaching of Christ crucified, and who argued against the gospel from the bad lives of many of its European professors. The Word of the Lord is thus preached, and his word is thus fulfilled—"I am not come to send peace, but a sword," which, while it awakens enmity, will kill some to their salvation.

On Tuesday last there were present *six hundred and thirty-five* pupils in our institution at Madras; in our Triplicane branch school, about two miles off, one day last month, *three hundred and thirty*;—in all, at the two places, 965 present, on a roll of 1150.

At Conjeveram, Chingleput, and Nettore, we have between 800 and 900, so that now, in all our schools, we have upwards of 2000 on the roll, more than 500 being girls of caste.

Contributions to the Professional Fund.

St. George's Channel, C.B.

(Continued.)

Mr. John Cameron, col.	
Robert Calder	2 6
Kenneth McIntosh	2 6
John McInnes	1 3
Mrs. John Campbell	2 6
Mrs. Alex. McLachlan	2 6
Margaret McLachlan	1 10½
Alex. Graham	7½
Mrs. Graham	1 10½
Angus Graham	1 3
Hugh McPherson	1 3
Ann McColl	1 0
John McColl	1 0
Duncan McKillop	1 3
Peter McKichan	1 6
Ann McKillop	7½
Mrs. McKillop	1 3
John Gray	1 3
Archibald McLachlan	1 3
Donald McLachlan	2 6
Archibald McKinnon	1 3
Mary McKinnon	1 3
Mrs. Cameron	2 6
John Cameron	1 3
Peter Cameron	1 3
Robert Cameron	1 3
Margaret McLenn	1 3

Neil McKenzie	1 0
Archibald Kennedy	2 6
Mrs. Kennedy	1 10½
Allan Kennedy	1 3
John Cameron (widow's son)	1 3
Angus McLeod	2 2
John McPherson	2 6
Mrs. McLeod	1 3
Mrs. McLean	2 6
Archibald McKillop	1 10½
Jessie McKillop	1 3
McFarlane	1 10½
Mrs. McFarlane	1 10½
Dugald Cameron	1 3
Donald McKenzie	1 10½
Mrs. McKenzie (widow)	2 6
John McLeod	2 6
Sarah McLeod	7½
Ann McLeod	7½
Dugald Cameron	1 1½
Neil McKinnon	1 6
Christy McKichan	2 2

£3 19 1

Alex. McDonald, col.	
Murdoch McKeuzie	1 10
John McRae	2 6
Alex. McPhie	2 6
John McAskill	2 6
Norman McAskill	1 3
Kenneth McPhie	2 4
Neil McKinnon	3 0
John McRae, Senr.	1 3
Duncan McDonald	5 0
Angus McDonald	1 3

£1 3 5

John Campbell, col. (Kemp road)	
Peter McFarlane	1 3
Duncan McDonald	1 3
Malcolm McDonald	2 0
Hugh Cameron	11
Archibald McLellan	2 6
Angus McDonald	1 6
Donald McDonald	1 3
Donald McPherson	2 6
Norman McLellan	1 3
Mrs. McLeod	1 3
William McLeod	1 3
Catherine McLeod	1 3
Duncan Campbell	2 6
John Campbell	1 3
Christy McDonald	1 6

£1 3 5

Mr. Arch. McPherson, col.	15 0
Hector McPherson	1 5 0
Alex. Campbell	2 6
Jessie Campbell	1 3
Elizabeth McPherson	2 6
John McDonald	2 6
Alex. McPherson	2 6
John McPherson	1 3
Sarah McPherson	1 3
Catherine McPherson	1 3
John Allan	1 3
Mary McDougald	1 3
Hugh McDougald	1 3

Jessie McDougald	7½	James McMillan	5	0		
Alex. McDougald	7½	Duncan McCormick	5	0		
Donald McRae	2	6	Robert Reid	1	3	
Duncan McPhail	2	6	Mary Reid	1	3	
Hugh McKinnon	4	4½	Ebenezer Ferguson	3	0	
John Campbell	1	3	William Ferguson	3	0	
William Campbell	1	3	Arch. Cook	2	7	
John Campbell	2	6	Robert Alexander	2	0	
Angus McPhie	5	0	Donald McNiesh	2	6	
			David Alexander	3	6	
	£3	19	4½	James Alexander	1	6
Mr. Alex. McLean, col.			Donald McAlister	4	0	
William Hill	1	3	Rev. A. McMaster	10	0	
Allan Ferguson	2	6				
Alex. McInnes	1	3			£4	
James McPherson	1	0			13	
Hugh McLean	1	3			6	
John McLean	1	3				
Lachlan McLean	1	3				
Hugh McKenzie	1	6				
Lachlan McLean	2	0				
Allan McLean	1	3				
Charles McLean	1	3				
Alex. McLean	1	3				
A Friend	5	0				
	£1	2	0			

Mr. Donald Urquhart, col.				
Donald Urquhart, Junr.	2	6		
Donald Urquhart, Senr.	5	0		
Alex. Urquhart	2	6		
Mrs. Urquhart, Senr.	1	3		
Mrs. Urquhart, Junr.	1	3		
Murdoch Smith	12	6		
Mrs. Smith	5	0		
Allan Morrison	5	0		
Margaret Morrison	1	3		
John Morrison	1	3		
Alex. Neil	2	6		
Mrs. Hill	1	3		
Donald McDonald	4	0		
Angus McDonald	3	3		
Donald Murray	2	0		
Norman McDonald	2	0		
William Urquhart	5	0		
Murdoch Morrison	5	2		
John Nicolson	2	6		
William Ross	5	0		
Roderick McDonald	2	6		
Neil McPhail	2	6		
John McInnes	2	0		
	£3	17	2	
Donald McKay, R. G. Harbour	5	0		
Roderick McIntosh, R. G. Harbour	5	0		

New Mills, Bay Chaleur, N. B.			
William Fleck Bellduin	5	0	
John Hamilton, junr.	7	0½	
Alex. Cook	5	0	
James Muráceh	2	6	
Donald McMillan	5	0	
William Cook	5	0	
John Murchie	5	0	
Donald Fraser	3	1½	
Peter Stewart	5	0	
James McPherson	1	3	
John Cook	5	0	
			£1
			18
			9½

MIRA, C. B.
DISTRICT NO. 1.

Catherine MacKigan, col.		
Christy McDonald	2	6
Sally Ferguson	1	4½
Sally Ferguson	1	10½
Margaret McDona'd	1	4½
Mary McQueen	1	7
Christy McPherson	2	0
Mary McDougald	1	10½
Betsy Morrison	2	6
Mary McLean	2	0
Jessie McAulay	3	1½
Catherine Morrison	1	3
Mrs. McDonald	1	3
	£1	2
		8½

DISTRICT 2ND.

Mrs. McDonald, col.		
Alexander McMillan	1	3
Angus McAulay	1	10½
Lauchlan McLean	1	10½
Widow W. McDonald	2	6
Neil McDonald	1	3
James McIsaac	1	3
Finlay McDonald	1	3
John McInnis		8½
Angus McDonald	1	2
Donald Lamont	1	1
John McKigan	1	1
Alex. McCuish	1	3
Rory Morrison	1	10½
Alex. McLeod	1	3
C. McLeod	1	1
Widow Archd. McDonald	1	10½
Widow D. McIsaac, Jr.	1	4½
Ronald Johnston	1	3
W. D. McInnis, Jr.	1	3
John McDonald	1	3
W. McKinnon	1	8½
Donald McDonald	1	3
Alex. McDonald		7½
JohnMcAulay		7½
Mr. Alex. McDonald	5	0
Mrs D. McDonald	1	3
	£1	18
		9½

DISTRICT 3RD.	
Miss Isabella McNeil, col	£2 2 6
DISTRICT 4TH.	
Miss Evelina Hill, col.	
Mrs. John Hill	1 10½
John McArthur	1 10½
John Johnston	1 3
Dougald McGibbon	7½
Donald McDonald	1 3
John Nicholson	1 11
Donald McVicar	1 3
Hugh McVicar	1 10½
John McColl	1 3
Hector Matheson	1 10½
Sarah McInnis	1 0
Sarah McDonald	1 3
Miss Evelina Hill	1 8½
	£0 18 2
DISTRICT 5TH.	
Mrs. Johnston, col.	£0 3 1½
DISTRICT 6TH.	
Mrs. Ferguson, col.	£0 10 3

CONTENTS. Page

The Law, Obligations, and Privileges of the Sabbath	209
Remarks on the Reply of the Presbyterian Synod	212
Transmission of contributions to the Professorial Fund	218
Letter from the Secretary of the College and Academy Board	218
The "Christian" Money-Boarder	219
Extracts from the H. & F. M. Record of the Free Church	
Our Large Towns	220
Madras	221
Contributions to the Professorial Fund	222
Advertisements, &c.	224

SCHEMES OF THE CHURCH.

The following sums have been received for the Schemes of the Church:—

I. SYNOD FUND.

Lunenburg and Stations £3 2 4½

II. CURRENT EXPENSES OF COLLEGE AND ACADEMY.

Lunenburg and Stations £2 4 0

Lawrencetown 1 2 2

Middle River 13 0½

Lake Ainslie 11 8

Baddeck 10 0

Little Baddeck 13 7½

Indian Rear 8 8

W. S. STIRLING, Treasurer.

JOHN ESSON & CO.

Corner of Duke and Barrington Streets.

GENERAL IMPORTERS & DEALERS IN
Flour, Meal, Groceries, Fish,
Fishing Supplies, West
India Produce, &c.

HALIFAX, N. S.

No 10 Granville St. Halifax, N.S.

A. & W. MACKINLAY,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL

Booksellers & Stationers,

They have constantly on hand a choice and extensive assortment of BOOKS AND STATIONERY of every description, amongst which are, Day Books, Journals, Ledgers, and Memoranda, Books; Post, Foolscap, and every description of writing paper, Note paper, Drawing paper, Drawing and Common Pencils, Bristol Board, Nories Navigation, Thompson's Lunar Tables, Mathematical Instruments, Charts in great variety, Dilworth's, Universal, Mavour's, Murray's, and Carpenter's Spellings, Murray's Reader and Introduction, Lennie's Grammar, Chamber's Educational Course, Chamber's Journal, Chamber's Papers for the People, Bibles, Testaments, Prayer Books, Slates & Pencils, Ink, and Inkpowders, Framed Engravings, Also—an assortment of Salmon & Trout Flies, Rods, Reels & Lines.

Morrison's Universal Medicine

Sold in Halifax, only by

A. & W. MACKINLAY,

General Agents for Nova Scotia.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

TO THE

MISSIONARY RECORD,

OF THE

Free Church of Nova Scotia.

If paid within the first quarter. 2s. 6d. Per An.

If not paid until the expiry of

the first quarter 3s. 9d. do.

Single Copies 3d

All communications whether on Business, or for the Editors, must be addressed to Messrs. A. & W. MACKINLAY, Booksellers, Halifax, N. S.

Printed for the Committee, by JAMES BARNES, Halifax, N. S.