

The Sabbath Recorder.

New York, December 4, 1851.

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH.

A simultaneous republication, by the religious newspapers of this city, of Sir Matthew Hale's opinions on the observance of the Christian Sabbath, no doubt arises from certain movements said to be contemplated with reference to railroad traveling on Sunday. Of course any project to make Sunday railroad travel more general in this State will awaken lively opposition. The religious portion of the community will oppose it, not they alone. They will oppose it on principle. Others will oppose it on the ground of its inexpediency. Some persons will defend it, though these will be few out of the circle of two interested classes—those who may profit pecuniarily by Sunday traffic on the road, and those who are interested generally in relaxing the stringent observance of the Lord's day. It is a question for discussion and argument, and not for denunciation. There will be a controversy about it, and the advocates of Sabbath observance will find arrayed against them able men on the opposite side, who will take every advantage which their quick perception and subtle powers of reasoning may afford them; and the friends of obedience to the authoritative command, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," will have need to be candid in argument and sound in logic—neither denying nor admitting too much.

Every one knows that a good cause is often injured by the indiscreetness of its advocates and friends. The cause of temperance, of peace, of Sabbath observance—each has been "wounded in the house of its friends," by the indiscretions of its defenders; and we think there is danger lest this question of increased Sunday railroad travel should suffer. It is one in which the whole people are interested, the irreligious as well as the religious, and both classes are to be convinced that railroad traveling on Sunday is wrong, or inexpedient, or both, if we would have the question put at rest and decided in favor of the cause of morality and good order. Irreligious men, too, are generally shrewd, can see through the fallacy of an argument, and are in the main indisposed to take for granted what the advocates of religion may assert. Hence we think the opponents of Sunday railroad travel err in employing such arguments as this:—"The plea of going to see sick friends is generally fallacious. Friends are no more likely to be sick on the Sabbath than on other days; and if sick they need the quiet of the Sabbath, and the Sabbath's blessing." It may be easily retorted—"Friends may be sick on Sunday as well as on other days, and why should we be prohibited from seeing them on that day alone? Would not a visit from a friend or relative—his presence and sympathy and pious converse constitute for the afflicted a sabbatical rest and a sabbatical blessing?"

We have made and commented upon the above extract from a leading journal just to show what use might be made of it. The requirement to keep holy the Sabbath day, however, does not justify a resort to such sophistries. Much stronger arguments may be adduced in its support, and must be adduced if we would have it obeyed by consent of the whole people. For to be remembered that with us the observance of the Christian Sabbath is achieved by the voluntary act of the community. The general observance of that holiday is a tribute to the reasonableness and wisdom of the institution; and that the people may ever continue to pay that tribute, we must continue to exhibit its reasonableness and wisdom. We want reverence for the Sabbath to be the calm dictate of men's judgments; we want all to be consenting parties to its just observance. Under our institutions there is little or no power to compel men to reverence the Sabbath; nor is such power to be desired, except just so far as it shall protect from annoyance those who conscientiously keep it holy.

These things premised, there remain strong and to our mind conclusive reasons—unanswerable arguments—for even a stricter observance of the Christian Sabbath than now prevails, and of course such arguments will apply with tenfold force as reasons why there should be no farther encroachment upon the sanctity of that day. We do not address these arguments to religious men, so much as to irreligious. To the former it is enough that "God spake these words and said, Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," &c. The changing of the original sabbatical day from the last to the first is to them of minor moment, because it still remains a seventh day, "or the seventh day," which the Supreme Being requires us to keep "holy," abstaining from all work upon it, as not being our time but His. Nevertheless, any one reverencing his Maker, must admit that respect should be shown to the slightest intimation of His will concerning us.

But there are considerations which appeal to us as men, as members of society, and as citizens, and which ought not to be without influence upon the minds of all. The Sabbath is one of those institutions which the physical condition and moral character of man make absolutely necessary. All experience goes to show that man requires rest every seventh day from bodily labor, while the moral effect of the Sabbath is beyond estimation. And it is on this argument that we deprecate any extension of means for Sunday traveling than is absolutely and palpably necessary. The general morality of a people will always be found to bear proportion to its respect for the Sabbath. The demoralization and profligacy of Paris, for instance, are remarkable, as the wholesome morality of a New England village is gratifying. In the one the Sabbath is wholly disregarded, in the other cordially respected and observed; and the same would hold good in many other illustrations which might be given. Indeed, it is in the very nature of Sabbath desecration, of every form, to demoralize and degrade. It cannot be otherwise in the very nature of things.

It is an established truth, that true religion elevates and improves man. True religion consists in reverence for God, and obedience to his requirements. In proportion as that obedience is withheld voluntarily, man sinks in moral character. He falls from a high name, and his moral character inevitably suffers in proportion as his lofty purpose of obeying his Maker's will is abandoned. This is especially the case when, for the sake of personal gratification and indulgence, he lowers his standard of reverence for the Supreme Being. This principle admitted, not only is the inexpediency of unnecessary Sunday labor or

amusement made apparent, but it is proved that the Sabbath has the sanction of high moral necessity. We must observe the Sabbath-day if we would maintain our high standard of national morality. We have made an exception in favor of works of necessity. But the continued observance of the Sabbath is the greatest necessity of all. It is necessary to the preservation of our national morality, which is necessary for the preservation of any form of national existence of which self-government is the radical constituent. The institution of the Sabbath, then, we say, is the great bulwark of the morality of a people, and though we may be unwilling to denounce any man's opinion about what are and what are not works of necessity, we shall deeply regret the introduction of any plan which may prove an entering wedge for contempt of the Sabbath day.

While upon this subject we desire to say a few words upon certain Sabbath practices which prevail in this city, and which perhaps are doing more to undermine reverence for the day than even railroad travel would do. We allude to the seemingly established custom of keeping open drug stores, fancy restaurants and confectionery retreats. Seeing how these have multiplied within the last few years, the friends of the Sabbath may well take alarm at any further projected encroachment upon that day. It seems to us that special effort should be made to inoculate the public mind with this sentiment—that just as we submit our individual predilections and abstract rights to the government of laws, just as we deny ourselves of whatsoever those laws prohibit—so ought we to forego such conveniences or indulgences as would militate against reverence for the Sabbath, which is the safeguard of sound morals and of national purity and prosperity.

REMARKS.

A desire to keep our readers informed of the various phases which the Sabbath controversy assumes, induces us to publish the foregoing. From the time of the organization of the "American and Foreign Sabbath Union," there appears to have been a systematic, and measurably successful, effort to bring about the cessation of Sunday travel on our railroads, and other thoroughfares. Nevertheless, there have always been found some who persisted in demanding the authority for making the Sunday a holiday. As long as this demand was made only by a handful of Seventh-day Baptists, whose influence it was easy to neutralize by falsely representing them as *Judaizers*, who sought only to create disturbance, but little attention was paid to it. But since doubts of any Bible authority for Sunday keeping have begun to pervade community to considerable extent, and anti-sabbatarianism threatens to cast its blighting influence upon the piety of the land, it is found to be, (and we hail the announcement with pleasure), "a question for discussion and argument, and not for denunciation." "The advocates of Sabbath (?) observance" are informed, that they "will find arrayed against them able men on the opposite side, who will take every advantage which their quick perception and subtle powers of reasoning afford them;" and that they "will have need to be candid in argument and sound in logic—neither denying nor admitting too much."

It would have been well, had the observers of the so-called Christian Sabbath taken this into consideration a little sooner. But the idea that all their learned doctors, who had advocated the popular practice from the days of Constantine downwards, might possibly be wrong, was not to be entertained; and to be taught it by a sect of people who could boast of nothing which is highly esteemed among men, was too humiliating—it was perfectly intolerable. But tell us, ye who now find the question to be one "for discussion, and not for denunciation," what is it that gives your anti-sabbatarian opponents such power against you? What renders them formidable as controversialists, and fills you with anxiety lest the Christian Sabbath should become generally despised? Not the strength of the anti-sabbatarian argument in the abstract, certainly. You well know that its strength is perfect weakness, except so far as it finds a support in the depravity of the human heart; and even this support must give way before the power of God's truth. It matters but little what may be the ability of those who are enlisted in the work of propagating it, even if they "take every advantage which their quick perception and subtle powers of reasoning afford them." For as it is not written, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent;" "With him is strength and wisdom; and the deceived and the deceived are his. He leadeth counselors away spoiled, and maketh the judges fools." Job. 12: 16, 17. No, sirs, your anxiety arises from a very different cause. You have some secret misgivings as to the strength of your own position. Anti-sabbatarians are using our arguments, to show you how sophistical is your defense of Sunday observance, and you are beginning to open your eyes. You are beginning to understand, that "Remember the first day of the week, to keep it holy," is not written anywhere in the Bible. You begin to feel that such doctrine will not do for the people much longer. Led on by anti-sabbatarians, they demand, and will have, a "thus saith the Lord" for what you impose upon their consciences, or they will reject it altogether. This you are at last beginning to see. The formidableness of anti-sabbatarianism lies in your own weakness, gentlemen. Run into the strong tower of God's word, and you are safe enough. The Babel you have undertaken to build, is doomed to destruction; and your workmen are already confounded, that they cannot understand one another's speech.

As to the merit of the particular question upon which the *Commercial* has expatiated so largely, we have but little to say. If there are to be increased facilities for railroad travel on

Sunday, we are partly glad, and partly sorry. We are sorry that temptations should be held out for people to break what they even imagine to be the Sabbath-day. We wish no man to violate the dictates of his conscience; and if any do feel that the First Day of the Week is a divinely appointed season of rest, we would not ask them to desecrate it, nor provide any facilities for their doing so. But, on the other hand, we are glad to see the ramparts about the Sunday beginning to fall. We would that they were razed to the ground. Not that we desire to see such a state of things as will be when there is no Sabbath acknowledged by the community; far from it. We look forward to such a state, as one to be deplored by all the truly good. But we have long since made up our mind, that the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment will never become the Sabbath of the land, till all the hedges about the falsely-named Christian Sabbath are broken down and destroyed. God's institutions will not be honored till man's are rendered contemptible.

But while we respect the conscientious convictions of those who look upon the Sunday as a divinely appointed season of rest, we must say, that such people are not quite so numerous as is sometimes supposed. There are thousands in our land—and the number is constantly increasing—who can see in the act of traveling on the First Day of the Week, or even in the performance of common labor, no delinquency whatever. We are glad, when we find such persons among the number of those who are engaged in destroying the factitious sacredness of the day. We are glad, because while they thus fulfill the designs of Providence, they are not at the same time, and by the very act, doing their own souls an injury. Many of them are persons of general good character; and were they rationally convicted of their error in regarding no day whatever as holy to the Lord, we trust they would make very good Sabbatarians according to the Bible standard. But it must be something worthy of the name of argument, which will show them their error. That kind of logic which builds up the Sabbath institution, and then immediately demolishes it by a special plea for a day which the law of the Sabbath does not enjoin, does but excite their contempt. It will never convince them. We are also glad that such persons are engaged in the work, because of the relief which it affords to the otherwise discouraging prospect. Were all the opposers of the popular Sabbath reckless of moral principle, and accustomed to break over the restraints of conscience whenever inclination prompted, there is no calculating the amount of evil which might for a season ensue. Without doubt, it would be found that their opposition to Sunday sabbatizing was but a stealthy method of attacking the whole system of religion. The terrible drama of French infidelity, which blotted out the weekly festival of the Church, and substituted the decade, would be acted over again, with all its attendant blasphemies and abominations. But, thank God, the opposers of Sunday sabbatizing are not all of this class. Besides, the question, in this country, wears a different aspect from what it did in France, where the corruptions of the Papal Church almost by a law of necessity gave birth to infidelity. The conviction that in this country the popular Sabbath will lose its reputation, without being followed by such fearful wickedness, as attended its abrogation in France, is quite a relief to our minds; though the best relief of all is, that God reigns, and that "when the enemy cometh in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him."

The relief which we feel in the fact that anti-sabbatarianism is partly in the hands of virtuous men, must not be understood as an admission, or even as approximating to an admission, that the cause of religion is perfectly safe though no Sabbath at all should be acknowledged by the community. We repeat what we said above, that such a state of things is to be deplored by the truly good. It might not issue *all at once* in the wild desolation of infidelity, (that it would eventually, we have no doubt), but it would most unquestionably be attended with such a marked prostration of those interests which are the delight of Christians, and the true source of prosperity to all, that *Ichabod—the glory is departed*—might be written upon the land. The blind persistence of Christendom in repudiating the Bible Sabbath, and upholding a human tradition instead, is hastening this state of things. In all, or nearly all, that the *Commercial* has said concerning the advantages of the Sabbath, physical and moral, its indispensableness to our national morality, &c., we cordially concur. We feel no sympathy for that kind of reasoning, which pleads for Sunday recreations on the ground of the laboring man's necessities for something of the kind to promote health and cheerfulness of spirits. All such reasoning is airy sophistry. Nevertheless, if the Directors of any of our railroads can, without doing violence to their own consciences, run their cars on Sunday, we hope they will do so. We should be glad, however, if they would all lie still on the Sabbath. But even this we want achieved by the voluntary act of those who are concerned, and not by coercion of law. Let the laws which sanctify the popular day of rest, be blotted from our statute books. They are oppressive to some, and a benefit to none.

T. B. B.
SAILING OF MISSIONARIES.—Rev. Wm. W. Eddy and wife, Henry Lobdell, wife and child, and Rev. Joseph W. Lutphen and wife, all Missionaries for the Syrian station, have taken passage in the bark *Sultana*, soon to sail from Boston for Smyrna.

BRITISH CORRESPONDENCE.

Sunday Observance in Scotland—Romanism in France.—GLASGOW, November 14th, 1851.

At the Free Church Synod of Lothians and Tweeddale, the Rev. Mr. Davidson made a statement on the part of the Sunday Observance Committee. They are convinced that the postponing of the agitation of the question last year has done great injury to their cause. Although, he said, there had been a diminution of occupation in the post-offices of Edinburgh and some other places, yet Sunday employment still continued there, and therefore the movement against it ought to be recommenced and prosecuted with vigor. At the walking match at Restalrigg, in the neighborhood of Edinburgh, to which I adverted a week ago, Mr. Davidson stated, that £15 had been taken, in sixpences, one Sunday lately. (If this be a correct statement, it is a further evidence of the waning influence of Sunday among those who can afford to pay sixpences for their amusement.) There was doubt, he said, as to whether it was the Kirk Session or the Presbytery of the bounds which had the privilege of prosecuting; but, whichever of them, the responsibility ought to be undertaken. Dr. Candlish, on the same occasion, said that any Anti-Popery agitation which does not take the Sunday question, is singularly defective, and the subject should be kept before Town Councils and others. It does not indeed seem to occur to the Reverend Doctor, that the Sunday for which he is thus anxious to enlist the power of Town Councils is retained by the Protestant Church only because the Reformation from Popery was "singularly defective," and that while he imagines himself engaged in the overthrow of all Popery, he is in this enlisting in its behalf.

In the number of *Evangelical Christendom* for the present month, there is a lengthy paper on the state of Romanism in France, which gives a lively idea of the energies and resources of that politic system there. The State Budget for Popish Worship in that country, it appears, is upwards of 38 millions of francs, besides 837,000 francs under the heads of Public Worship and Ecclesiastical Pensions. And for their worship and instruction in the Colonies, the State provision is two and a half millions of francs. There is again a large amount of State expenditure in religious edifices. Upwards of 37 thousand communes have all churches thus built, maintained, and enlarged. It is calculated that jointly these demands amount to 100 million of francs yearly. The officiating clergy paid by the State amount to more than 40 thousand, without reckoning fellows of colleges. Then there is a vast number of Communities which are formed independent of the clergy—a perfect army of volunteers, enlisted under the banners of Romanism. Indeed, none of the larger towns are without several monasteries, asylums, sisterhoods, or brotherhoods. These nurseries are sending colonies into almost every village. Exclusive of the monasteries, (to be afterwards spoken of) we observe, that, besides the Houses of Sisters of Mercy, so termed, spread every where throughout the land, 38 communities "of the Sacred Heart," and other fantastic titles, maintain 2,310 establishments in the villages and country—the parent Houses being in the towns.

There are 83 diocesan clerical colleges, 118 smaller ecclesiastical colleges, 565 monasteries, 1,012 boarding schools for young ladies, and 939 hospitals or charitable institutions, which, even where not of Romish origin, confide the care of the sick to "the sisters." There are 3,379 small colonies of sisters, 761 establishments of brothers (schools), and 48 missionary establishments in the interior. All these are organized by the bishops, are under their control, and skillfully directed to subvert the purposes of this apostate system. The receipts for the year 1850 of the single Society of St. Vincent de Paul, (established amongst young people) in subscriptions, lottery, and donations, was 217,668 francs.

Besides all these home appliances for maintaining and extending Popery in France, are to be noticed the efforts for the same purpose abroad. Different missions are sustained by the Propagation Society of the Faith, established at Lyons in 1822. Its object is the extension of Popery throughout the world. It has had and continues to receive the countenance of Popes, Princes, and Bishops; and Papists throughout Europe generally take part in it, while America, India, and the East, also lend their aid. It has a most perfect organization of collectors to its funds. Its receipts in 1850 amounted to 3,309,646 francs; towards which France contributed 1,907,916 francs. Through its means, popish operations abroad have greatly increased. They maintain missionaries in China, Cochinchina, Japan, Tartary, Central Asia, and India. They have increased their missions in Syria and Asia Minor, in the United States and Australia. Indulgences are promised to those who promote subscriptions to the funds and say the prayers prescribed—these indulgences being extended even to the dead. Alas! for the church; alas! for the world!

The monstrous evils which this system inflicts upon every community within which it finds a lodgment and support, are in this country becoming more obvious to many. Preparations are therefore being made in London for a keen agitation throughout the land to urge upon Government the duty of absolutely withholding the £30,000 annually given to the Irish Popish Seminary of Maynooth. It certainly seems the reverse even of worldly wisdom to be contributing largely to the maintenance of an institution which, besides

propagating superstition, makes a business of rearing priests to teach treachery to our liberties, civil and religious. On the other hand, the Protestant Prussian Government has issued final orders for the suppression of all the congregations of what are called in Germany "Free Catholics." It is not improbable, however, that this may have been for political plottings—political rather than religious reasons having always been predominant among these seceders from the Romish yoke.

The connections of the Submarine Telegraph, are now so far complete that the Glasgow papers of this morning contain a dispatch dated Paris yesterday afternoon at one o'clock—received in London an hour and a half afterwards.

And here, I mention, that Elihu Burritt has a letter in yesterday's *Morning Chronicle*, explaining what he means by Ocean Penny Postage, which he labors to get introduced. Some have supposed the penny designed to cover not only the expense of ship transmission from shore to shore, but also the expense incurred by inland carriage—which, of course, is not his meaning.

J. A. BEGG.

THE SABBATH.

There is much uneasiness in the minds of many individuals with regard to the Sabbath, among whom are those called Adventists, who, like many others, strive to quiet conscience by some metaphysical reasoning, or tradition, or in some other way, so that they may use the Sabbath as a thing of convenience, and throw off all obligation to God as respects the day. Now, would it not be much easier for such to take the Word of God as it is, and leave all cavil on the subject to skeptics? Did not God require of his creatures, in connection with the command to keep the Sabbath day holy, that they should remember what he had done in creating the heavens and the earth?—and does he not require the same thing now? Surely, we have no evidence that he does not.

The subject of the Sabbath has been treated, at least on one side, in the *Advent Herald*, Boston, in the *Advent Harbinger*, Rochester, in the *Bible Advocate*, Hartford, (now united with the *Harbinger*), and in the *Monitor and Messenger*, New York. The writers in these papers have each set forth some particular reason or reasons for observing the day commonly called Sunday; some averring that it is the true seventh day; others, that it matters not what day we keep, only we ought to keep a seventh part of time; and others, (I believe the largest number), that it is only a matter of convenience for worship in obedience to our laws; while others claim that it ought to be observed in commemoration of Christ's resurrection. All these profess to find satisfactory evidence in some way, and so continue to discard the most positive evidences of the Word of God and of history, that the Decalogue, or the ten commandments, remain unchanged; yes, and they are willing, at the same time, to allow that all of them except the fourth are just as obligatory now as ever they were. Now, if the fourth commandment is null and void, what consistency is there in making it a rule for keeping a seventh part of time? for the day and the object of the day are as clearly specified in the commandment as the portion of time. Did God leave this commandment so indefinite and incomplete, while all the others are complete?

It was, no doubt, in reference to this very thing—observing days of their own choosing—that the apostle wrote to the Galatians in chapter 4, verse 10. But, says the objector, Paul, in writing to the Colossians, (2: 14), says that the whole law, commandments and all, was nailed to the cross. Then what have you done, my dear objector, but sacrilegiously torn these commandments from the cross, and applied them as the great rule of social and religious living! Is such a course consistent with truth or reason? If not, how can God be pleased with it?

But, says another, the work of redemption is much greater than the work of creation, and we ought to commemorate it. Perhaps so; but have you or I a right to reject what we please, and substitute another thing instead thereof? God says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." The reason he gives is, "For in six days," &c. Thus he continually reminds us of what he has done, and thereby also enjoins an obligation upon us to glorify him. Well indeed will it be for us if we are found keeping "his commandments," without adding, diminishing, or substituting one jot or tittle; for Christ declares, (Matt. 5: 18), "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." What law? Read verses 19, 21, 27, and 33. If that is not a part of the law, then I do not understand the meaning of my Lord and Saviour. Again, "I am not come to destroy, [the law or the prophets], but to fulfill." V. 7. Did he fulfill the Sabbath, the seventh day? Nay, verily, you and I are looking for its fulfillment in the rest that remaineth for the people of God. What, then, did he do with the Sabbath? He taught its observance by his own example, and by calling it the Sabbath; not according to Jewish tradition, but according to the true intention of God, and this he did as clearly and forcibly as he gave those precepts concerning the commandments referred to in the before-named verses. Is it consistent with sound reason to refer to the fourth commandment, and follow it as respects the portion of time, and yet deny the particular day therein appointed, and also the particular object for which that day was appointed? Observe of Sunday, or the first day, how stands your faith in God's law? God gives

you a command to remember his wonderful work of creation; do you respect that command? Has he said that the work of redemption by Jesus Christ is greater than the work of creation? Has Jesus, or have the apostles, said, or even intimated, any such thing? Nothing like it. It is all inference. Christ gave a command to remember him; but it is not, "Keep the first day, the day of my resurrection;" it is, "Do this in remembrance of me." 1 Cor. 11: 24. Here is no transfer of a memorial, but a new memorial instituted, commemorative of a new and glorious work. Then let both have their proper place, and be observed according to each distinct command. Both God in creation, and Jesus Christ in redemption, ought to receive our homage and praise; and in no way can we better do our duty in this thing, as well as in all other things, than by implicit obedience to the revealed will of God and his own beloved Son.

As for Sunday, or *first day*, I am astonished to find it in the English New Testament. I am much mistaken if any word can be found in the Greek Testament which can, by any fair exegesis, be rendered first day of the week. It is not a correct exposition of the terms *sabbatum* in the plural, and of *sabbaton* in the singular. They mean Sabbath in the singular, and Sabbaths in the plural, and nothing else. There is a forced construction given us by this professed translation, an unwarrantable liberty used in applying either one or the other to the first day of the week, and in every instance where the terms are so applied in our English Testament, they undoubtedly refer to the seven Sabbaths mentioned in Leviticus 23. EUREKA.

GERRIT SMITH TO JOHN C. SPENCER.—A few weeks ago, John C. Spencer wrote a letter to George Wood, in which he fully endorsed the "Compromise Measures," as they are called. For this, Gerrit Smith has taken him in hand; and in a lengthy letter, a printed copy of which is before us, shows the inconsistency of Mr. Spencer's present views with his former speeches and his general course of conduct. Mr. Smith says that the following positions are fairly deducible from Mr. Spencer's letter: 1st. To be "an abolitionist, little if any short of Gerrit Smith," is to be disqualified for civil office; 2d. A "cordial" enforcement of the "Fugitive Slave Law" is our duty; 3d. Such enforcement is "patriotic," and "the salvation of the Union depends upon it;" 4th. The law is constitutional. Each of these positions is reviewed by Mr. Smith in his usual candid and convincing manner.

ORDINATION OF A COLORED MINISTER.—A correspondent of the *Philadelphia Presbyterian* says that on Sunday evening, Nov. 16th, Mr. Henry M. Wilson, a colored licentiate, was ordained by the Presbytery of New York, with a view to his laboring as a stated supply in Emanuel Church. The services were, invocation and reading the Scriptures, by the Rev. Samuel E. Cornish, a colored minister; prayer by the Rev. J. W. C. Pennington, D. D., of the Third Presbytery of New York, also a colored minister; hymn by the Rev. John Neander, a converted Hebrew; sermon by the Rev. Edward E. Rankin; ordination service by the Rev. William Barnard and the Rev. Dr. Phillips; charge to the Evangelist by the Rev. Dr. Krebs; address to the people by the Rev. Dr. Phillips. Thus, it may be perceived, was there an illustration, in this fellowship of the gospel, adapted to, and partaken by our common nature, of that unity of our race which is derived from the one blood whereof God hath made all nations of men; for on the head of the newly ordained evangelist were laid the hands of descendants of all the three sons of Noah—Shem, Ham and Japhet.

A NEW SOCIETY.—A call has been issued for a Convention at Cincinnati, Ohio, on the 17th of December, to form "An American Reform Book and Tract Society." The reason for this movement is thus stated in the Call:—

"To many pious people it is a matter of deep regret, that the American Tract Society, the American Sunday School Union, and other similar institutions, do not publish books and tracts on some of the most important subjects of reform. It is a painful fact that there are prominent strongholds of error and sin, against which these institutions do not send forth the voice of warning, nor a single sentence of rebuke. In view of a delinquency so lamentable, it is deemed necessary to form a new institution adapted to the condition of the age and nation, one that will assail every system of oppression and wrong doing, and one that will be willing to suffer reproach in sustaining the cause of righteousness."

PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINAL TRACT SOCIETY.—At a recent meeting of the New School Presbyterian Synod of Tennessee, the following memorial was adopted:—

"Feeling the importance of Doctrinal Tract Society and a Board of Publication, under the direction and control of our branch of the Church, we earnestly recommend that the next General Assembly establish such Society, and such Board, as in their wisdom may meet the demands of the Church. We need such agencies very much within our bounds. Indeed, our existence and prosperity very much depend upon them. Sectarian influences around us imperatively require that we, as a denomination, cultivate our own field, and such agencies are needed to help us."

BIBLES IN ENGLAND.—Recent returns laid before the House of Commons, show that during three years ending December 31, 1850, the Queen's printers printed 1,157,500 Bibles and 754,000 Testaments. For the same period, there were printed at the Oxford press 872,750 Bibles and 750,000 Testaments. At the Cambridge press, 138,500 Bibles and 204,000 Testaments.

