

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC

LIBRARY
AND
UNIV OF TEXAS

BI-MONTHLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

STUART ROBINSON AND THOMAS E. PECK.

"Truth, like a torch, the more it's shook it shines."

VOL. II.

FOR THE YEAR 1856.

BALTIMORE.—FROM THE PRESS OF S. S. MILLS.

1856.

130477

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

No. 1.--January & February.

ART.	PAGE.
1.—The Financial Crisis of the Boards—the Rationale thereof.	1
2.—Relief of the Poor.	12
3.—The Action of the Synod of Virginia on the Education Question.	21
4.—Mr. Burt's Discourse on National Character—Relations of the State to Religion,	33
5.—"Is American Evangelical Christianity a Failure?"	40
6.—Statistics of Church Seminaries, and Education in them for 1855-'6.	55
7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—The Christian Spiritualist (Rappers).—Cyclopædia of American Literature, &c.—The Gospel in Ezekiel, illustrated in a Series of Discourses.—The Parabolic Teaching of Christ; or the Engravings of the New Testament.—The Smitten Household, &c.—Maria Cheeseman, or the Candy Girl.—A Treatise on English Punctuation, &c.	59

No. 2.--March & April.

1.—Seymour on Romanism—the Virgin Mary.	65
2.—Learned Lecturers or Learned Preachers?	82
3.—Association of Ideas.	87
4.—Ministerial Support—the Relation of Superannuated Ministers, and the Families of Deceased Ministers, to the Church—Societies for their Support.	90
5.—Zion, the Perfection of Beauty; or, the the Truth, Order and Spirit of the Presbyterian Church briefly considered.	93
6.—Rev. A. Cleveland Coxe's Impressions of England.—Yankeeo-Anglicism.	98
7.—Church and State—Dr. Brownson on the Catholic Chapter in the History of Maryland.	118
8.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Southern Presbyterian Review for April, 1856.—Who burnt Servetus?—The American Presbyterian Almanac for 1856.	125

No. 3.--May & June.

1.—The General Assembly of 1856.	129
2.—An Essay on Liberty and Slavery: By Albert Taylor Bledsoe, L. L. D., Professor of Mathematics in the University of Virginia.	152
3.—Calvin and Geneva: According to the Adversary Evidence of the "Judicious Hooker."	159
4.—Remarks before Baltimore Presbytery, on asking a release from the Pastoral Charge of the Central Presbyterian Church.	166
5.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Western Africa: Its History, Condition and Prospects: by Rev. J. Leighton Wilson.—An Inaugural Discourse: by Rev. B. M. Smith,	

Professor of Oriental Literature in Union Theological Seminary, Prince Edward County, Va.: delivered in the Seminary Chapel, September 12th, 1855.—Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation: by Rev. Jas. McCosh, L. L. D., and George Dickie, A. M.—Miss Bunkley's Book: The Testimony of an Escaped Novice from the Sisterhood of St. Joseph, Emmitsburg, Md., the Mother-House of the Sisters of Charity in the U. S. 174

No. 4.--July & August.

1.—The Westminster Review on Christian Missions.	177
2.—The New Phase of Religious Journalism at the North.	187
3.—The Position of the Church in relation to Slavery—Testimony of the Synod of South Carolina.	195
4.—Letter to a Parishioner: the practical issue between Presbytery & Prelacy.	208
6.—The Last Annual Meeting of the American Tract Society—Developments of Voluntary-ism.	218
7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—To Rome and Back Again; or The Two Proselytes.—The Wedge of Gold; or Achan in El Dorado.—The World and its Influences: written for the Board of Publication.—The Sower and the Seed.—Ellen Sinclair; or the Earnest Enquirer.—Memoir of Reginald Heber, D. D., Bishop of Calcutta.—Select Remains of Rev. John Mason.—From the Presbyterian Board of Publication: Plantation Sermons.—Lizzie Fergusson. An Explanation of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism: by Thomas Vincent.—Obituary.—Notice to Subscribers.	221

Nos. 5 & 6.--September & November.

1.—Idea of the Church—as developed from the Record of the Origin of the Christian Church, in Acts, chap. 2—5.	225
2.—Church Music.	233
3.—Parliamentary Rules.	243
4.—Recent Discussions and Deliverances of the Church Courts, touching the Question of Ministerial Support.	250
5.—The Rationale of Preaching as related to the Idea of the Church.	256
6.—The Fearless Inculcation of Scripture Teaching the great demand of this country at the present time.	263
7.—The Education of our Ministers.	274
8.—The Cartesian Philosophy—and its Author.	287
9.—Popish Literature and Education.	295
10.—Paradoxes of the Gospel.	304
11.—The Last Prophecy of the Old Testament.	307
12.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—The Doctrine of Baptisms.—State Education not Radically Wrong.—Sacred Praise. Selah.—Errata.—Valedictory Note.	317

LIBRARY
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC

AND

BI-MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 1.

JANUARY, 1856.

Vol. 2.

THE FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE BOARDS—THE RATIONALE THEREOF.

A special circular to the Churches from the Board of Missions, under date of the 18th December, as well as other less formal announcements from the Board of Education and of Publication, communicate the unwelcome intelligence of a prospective failure of our contributions to relieve those agencies from actual embarrassment. The fact that in the January number of the Home and Foreign Record, almost the entire space of the Domestic Mission department is devoted to appeals on this subject, indicates an unusual degree of apprehension in regard to the matter, on the part of those most competent to judge of the reality of the danger.

“The Presbyterian Banner and Advocate,” under date of December 29th, taking up the matter as thus presented, sets forth formally in some two columns devoted to this question, the *Rationale* of this unusual occurrence. We cite here some of the chief points, for the benefit of such of our readers as do not read the Banner and Advocate:—

“Systematic Benevolence was inaugurated with great eclat by the General Assembly at Buffalo, and its excellencies were again glowingly presented by a committee to the Assembly at Nashville, and in each case an admirable paper was sent down to the churches. From all which there appeared—the reports, resolutions, speeches and prophecies—it might have been supposed that by this time all the treasuries of our Church, for her varied works and charities, would have been full to overflowing. Such, however, is not the case. Some of our most important operations are sadly threatened, if not with suspension, yet with contraction for want of funds. * * * * *

It is high time that we should inquire, how is this? This inquiry presses with fearful force and practical importance upon the Boards of the Church.

We have often thought that there was too much of imagination or theory, perhaps we had better say *abstraction*, in the speeches and writing on this subject; and also too much of a disposition to let the thing work of itself. Man's nature and habits were not sufficiently considered. His inertness was not duly provided against.

Our Boards, then, have been too rapid in the reduction of their visiting agencies. We say this without intending to lay it to their blame. They were forced into the measure. So much was said about the inefficiency and expensiveness of the plan they were pursuing, and of the economy of the new plan and its adequacy to all wants, that they were obliged to yield. Hence the present barrenness.

But let us not now, like simple ones, abandon a half tried scheme. Systematic Benevolence is beautiful in theory, and it may become most effective in practice. Hold on to it, but infuse into it a real life. Give it a true being and a vigorous nature *in the use of God's ordained means* of bringing such a thing to pass; that is, employ an agency. When God would effect any great thing among men which needs constant toil, he appoints men to attend to *this very thing*.

What folly, then, for certain sons of the Church to declaim against Boards. 'Let the Church do her own work,' say they. True, say we; let her do her work. But by whose hands? And when she has ordained her Boards to attend continually to this very thing, these Boards to reach the individual Synods, Presbyteries, ministers and congregations must *have their visiting Agents*.

There are three reasons for the present poverty of the Board of Missions, which demand a notice. One of these we alluded to in our article above—the too sudden abandonment of the old scheme of raising funds through the exertions of visiting Agents, and the premature trusting to the new plan of supplying the treasury by the operation of Systematic Benevolence.

A *second* reason is the apparently large balances in the treasury at the time of the annual reports, for two or three previous years:

A *third* reason is the (we had almost written *insane*) clamor against the Boards, and especially against the Board of Domestic Missions. To profess friendship to the Church and the Mission cause, and at the same time to oppose, and *strive to bring into disrepute*, and to cover with suspicion the very agency by which the Church carries on this department of her work, are things so utterly inconsistent, that we know not how to account for their being found to emanate from the same mind. Such persons we know are not numerous, but still their opposition has been detrimental."

We give these extracts at so great length, not from any conviction of the importance of the views presented, but simply in conformity with our habit of allowing those whose remarks we make the subject of criticism the advantage of their own statements ungarbled. From this very profound and luminous exposition of the *Rationale* of this financial crisis in the Boards, the Presbyterian selects and re-produces, under the rather inde-

finite caption of "*A Reason*," the third and last of the causes assigned, to wit, the *clamor* of "persons not numerous" against the Boards,—a clamor which nothing but the kind and considerate second thought of the writer prevented him from crushing into silence by applying thereto, with all the weight of such authority as his, the epithet "*insane*." We are at a loss to determine what was precisely the purpose and aim of the Presbyterian in selecting this particular choice bit of the Banner and Advocate's disquisition for re-publication. Is it intended slyly to "make fun of" his old neighbor and rival, by quoting ironically this singular logical abortion? Or is it rather, slyly from under cover to make a "*stab*" (we use the figure simply in conformity with certain high authority in the last Assembly) at the reputation of "persons not numerous?" We are inclined on the whole, with our present light, to the former interpretation; since it seems most naturally to harmonize with the Presbyterian's relation to the parties, and its well known aversion to the manifestation of "a bad spirit." We can readily conceive it possible that the Presbyterian might not be disinclined to a dry joke at the expense of an old rival; whereas, on the other hand, it would be unnatural to suppose that a journal whose candor and excellence of spirit, as well its wisdom, extorts almost weekly tributes of admiration to "the best paper in the Church or out of it," would, in serious earnest, give currency to such a lucubration.

Having had it in view, for some time past, to offer some suggestions touching this general subject of Systematic Benevolence, and its bearings on the present financial crisis, which we regard as a most profoundly significant fact to the Church, we avail ourselves of the opportunity afforded by the very singular things said in the article above quoted. In the first place, as touching the evil done to the Boards by the *clamor*, which sheer charity alone forbids branding as "*insane*," and that inconsistency, which we suppose charity alone forbids to call the *hypocrisy*, of "persons not numerous"—so far as we may be supposed to be aimed at here, we simply falsify the charge by declining to retort it, and thereby show our freedom from the characteristic mark of insanity and hypocrisy both—to wit, the propensity to think all the rest of the world insane and insincere. Indeed the very idea of insanity, especially of that intellectual order which "clamors" about subjects so abstruse, implies the possession originally of powers of mind of which we never suspected the existence in the Editor of the Banner; and the very conception of hypocrisy of this logical sort implies an original capacity for the plausible, of which we are sure he is equally innocent.

But it so happens that, on more than one occasion—we may venture to say in so far as the Banner is concerned, one very *memorable* occasion—we had taken special pains to show the

Banner that our "clamor," as he is pleased to style it, was not against either the Boards as agencies of the Church, or at their officers as agents of the Church, but at certain very serious perversions and abuses to which such agencies are liable, and the danger therefrom to the purity and freedom of the Church. Unfortunately, however, it seems, we have hitherto failed to illustrate to his comprehension the distinction between a clamor against the Boards and their officers, and a clamor against certain incidental evils in the outworking of the Boards; evils which we were compelled in self-defence to prove the existence of—and which proof, neither the parties concerned nor their champion have ever ventured to challenge. We now—though almost despairing of success—attempt one further illustration of our position, in the faint hope that it may be better adapted to the Banner's comprehension, than those heretofore employed.

The Presbyterian church has ever been signalized by zeal for the spread of religious knowledge among the people; and therefore would naturally be presumed to be greatly in favor of a religious journal, cheap enough to be within the reach of the poorest, and widely enough patronized to remunerate its publishers, even at that cheap rate. And yet some four or five years ago such a scheme was projected, its endorsement urged with great zeal and energy on the courts of the Church, its patronage pressed with equal zeal and energy upon the people, and yet it most signally failed. Why? According to the philosophy of the article above cited, the history would be that a "clamor" almost "insane" was raised against religious papers and their agents and contrivers, by "persons not numerous," but whose opposition led astray the people, and thus was detrimental, in causing a financial crisis which embarrassed the cheap paper movement. But the currently received history of the matter, on the other hand, seems to be, that the "clamor" and the indisposition of the people, with the consequent financial embarrassment, was not against the spread of knowledge nor against a cheap paper, nor the advocates of it, but simply against taking even the blessing of a cheap paper with certain undesirable *incidental conditions annexed*. Much as the people wished a cheap, universally circulated journal, yet they did not wish it with the condition that it should become merely the articulate voice of what was popularly, but expressively termed, the "*small potatoism*" of the Presbyterian body. For though in no part of the Church of God is there entertained a deeper sense of the truth, that "not by might nor by power"—nay, but often by the very feeblest instruments, will God in his sovereignty do his great work, yet, at the same time, the conviction is not less profound that ordinarily the place for the employment of such instrumentality is not the newspaper press.

It will be entirely unnecessary, we presume, to point out in

detail the bearings of this analogy; if its bearing on the question be not comprehended at a glance by the Banner, we shall give up the attempt to make him comprehend our position on the question of Boards and the distinction between a clamor against the Boards and a clamor against the misuse of the Boards, and the perversion of their true relation to the Church.

Aside, however, from any question as to the fact of such clamor, we have this additional difficulty with this third cause of the embarrassments of the Boards. Even admitting the existence of the clamor, it is inconceivable how such a cause should produce such an effect. That any intelligent people, such as Presbyterians are presumed to be, should be induced to withdraw their support from great objects of Benevolence by a mere clamor, and that, too, the clamor of "persons not numerous"—yea, an *insane* clamor at that—yea, and of persons whose hypocritical inconsistency in so doing is so transparent—is a fact almost as inconceivable to us as is our position on this subject, to this writer. For even if disposed to make all allowance for the credulity of an unlightened and unwarned people, still we must remember that the people have been fully warned; that these "persons" and their schemes have been signally put down; First, according to the Repertory, they were so utterly extinguished in the Assembly of 1854, as to be beyond hope of even renewing the contest. Secondly, according to the same high authority, they were *re-killed* in the Assembly of 1855; and, according to the almost equally high authority of the Presbyterian, their "whimseys" demonstrated and decided to be unworthy the thought of the Church. Nay, also did not the General Assembly solemnly eulogize these officers in the teeth of these clamors? Has the Presbyterian Church, then, come to such a pass—so heedless of the warnings and assurances of her natural guides—so fascinated by the insane clamors and idle "whimseys" of these inconsistent and insincere declaimers? Well did the Presbyterian head such logic with the curious caption—"A Reason!"

We pass by the *second* of the causes assigned—the reported balances in the treasury—to offer a remark or two on the *first* cause—the "too sudden abandonment of the old scheme of raising funds through the exertions of visiting Agents, and the *premature trusting to the new plan*," to wit, that plan "inaugurated with great eclat by the General Assembly at Buffalo." Now it is sufficient answer to this fling at the "new plan," to state the simple and notorious fact that the Board of Publication and the Board of Foreign Missions had abandoned the use of Agents *before* the "inauguration of the new plan at Buffalo." The Board of Publication received the gratulation of the Assembly at Buffalo for this very reason. The Board of Foreign Missions reported at that Assembly having practically dispensed with Agents during the year previous. That Board has used no Agencies since, and yet it has given no notice

of approaching bankruptcy from that cause. It is a fact equally notorious, though less susceptible of proof, by official documents, that so far from the Boards having given up Agents *because* of the inauguration of a new plan at Buffalo, that the *Church* very generally had declined the labors of Agents, and that, in many cases, in a most practical and decided way. And chief among the causes of this "clamor" from the Churches to that Assembly was not the instigation of "persons not numerous," for they had not been agitating the question, but the spontaneous expression of the discontent of the Church in various quarters with the whole scheme of Agencies. The conviction had grown with the growth of a revived and pure Presbyterianism, that special Agents to teach the one Christian duty of liberality are an anomaly in the Church—that among all the various offices which constituted the Ascension Gift of Christ to his Church, "some prophets, some apostles," &c., agents of this sort are not enumerated; that however needful it may have been to employ an extraordinary instrumentality, in extraordinary circumstances of the Church—however the Lord might have conferred special powers upon the John Breckenridges of one era to raise a dead Church by the enchanting wand of his eloquence to life and action—it did by no means follow that Elisha's staff in the hand of any and every shallow and conceited Gehazi must raise the dead also, or that extraordinary means should be depended upon to keep up the ordinary life and action of the Church.

From such convictions as these spreading abroad in the Church, the Agents' Mission was rapidly becoming unwelcome, and the Agent's work becoming a diplomacy and a bargaining, wherever he went, to get admission to the Churches. And hence the memorials that went up to the Assembly in 1854, and the "inauguration" of whatever was inaugurated there. Truly enough the Boards were not to blame for dispensing with Agents; nor are they likely, after such an experience, to hazard the blame of again introducing them, notwithstanding all the encouraging assurances of the Banner and Advocate. To attribute the present financial troubles of the Boards to the substitution of a "new plan" of collecting funds in place of an old one which had signally failed before, a new one was thought of, is simply preposterous.

Having said thus much as to the reasons assigned for the failure of the finances, we now add that the whole statement of the history of the case in the article above cited betrays an utter misconception, if not an apparent incapacity to comprehend the real issues involved in this question of our benevolent funds. In the first place, the "sons of the Church" who have been guilty of the folly of "declaiming against Boards" and demanding that "the Church shall do her own work," have no responsibility for any

“new plan” inaugurated at Buffalo or elsewhere. Whether by accident or design of the Moderator—though they called for the committee—they were not the committee that devised the plan referred to. That was a committee of the friends of the current measures of the Board. The “admirable paper” and the plan annexed was not drawn by those who raised the insane clamor. A single resolution, by way of amendment to the report, declaring a general principle, not recommending any new plan, was moved by one of the clamorous ones, simply for the sake of drawing attention to the doctrine of our standards on the subject of Benevolent contributions. It is an entire misconception of their views to suppose them to be the projectors or advocates of any sort of plan for raising funds for pious uses other than that plan which they believe, and which our book declares to have been Christ’s Divinely ordained plan, namely, in the regular use of the ordinances of worship, of which this contribution is a part. According to their understanding both of the Bible and of the Confession of Faith, there is no need of planning that which God has already planned in the very organization and worship of the Church itself.

The idea that God has ordained a special and separate agency and office for every part of the service of His house, is in their view not only a “new plan,” but a new doctrine—a new theory of Divine Government, and altogether new logic. If so, the Church is wofully delinquent in having failed to provide Agents to travel and enforce prayer and praise, and the observance of the ordinances, upon the Churches and their Pastors.

This brings us at last, to what we conceive to be the true difficulty in the Church, and the fundamental cause of the failure of the people to sustain the operations of the Boards. It is chiefly because the artificial “plans,” devised properly enough, it may be, to awake the Church to life, but temporary in their very nature, have been allowed to expend all their power in providing for present emergencies in the funds, without having, meantime, brought fully out to the consciousness of the Church the great truth, that in the ordinances of his worship Christ has made provision for this very thing; and that this *koinonia* or expression of fellowship, in the contribution for pious uses, is no extraordinary duty, but the most solemn duty of every man who would worship God aright. If so, then a duty which it is incumbent upon the Church to enforce through her courts—and which it is no more proper to leave to mere resolutions of Assembly and to the coaxing of Agents, than to leave the enforcement of the duty of attending worship or of a moral life, to mere resolutions of advice, or to the coaxing of special agents.

This is the position brought out in “the admirable papers” presented to the Assembly; not very distinctly, indeed, in the paper of ’54, but most distinctly in the paper of ’55. In so far

as the causes of the present trouble in the finances may be traced to any given class of persons in the Church, we humbly submit whether it is not more directly attributable to the journals whose privilege it is to direct, in large measure, the course of thought on these subjects among ministers and people. Instead of laying hold of this great distinctive idea of contributions as one of the ordinances of worship, in harmony with the spirit of these Assemblies, they seem either from unpardonable oversight, or from deliberate design, to have ignored the whole matter, beyond simply publishing the papers. True, they have discoursed of Benevolence, and reiterated the vague generality, that people should be liberal; but in what instance have they endeavored to illustrate and enforce, as Presbyterians are accustomed to have the great doctrines of the Gospel enforced—this fundamental truth, that contributing to aid the Lord's work is an essential part of true and acceptable worship in the Church? In what instance have they labored to enforce the obligation on the part of the Church courts, not only to recommend, as they would recommend a mere ordinary act of charity; but to require, as they require the observance of any other of God's ordinances, the observance of this ordinance also? The very fact that the Banner and Advocate still talks of the utterances of the two last Assemblies as a "new plan," as "the scheme," and as "the system" which needs Agents to carry it out, is a very plain indication that the very first principles of the action of the Assembly are even yet not comprehended. All this seems to him, therefore, to be "imagination" or theory, or perhaps "*abstraction*," and not to be classed among the practical realities of the subject. It is not among the least singular features of this disquisition, that side by side with this fling at abstractions, we have, in an adjoining column, this remarkable illustration of what the writer means by practicalities. An article of near a column in length discusses the action of the Synod of Baltimore in re-annexing to Baltimore Presbytery the Presbytery of Eastern Shore, which, from want of resident members, had not been able to form a quorum for eighteen months—even to grant a dismissal, or to receive and instal a Pastor. The action of the Synod is first pronounced by the writer wise and beneficial; yet, at the same time, we are gravely informed, it "*induces the inquiring mind to test principles*"—and thereupon the "moving power of the Presbytery of Baltimore" is charged "with very great inconsistency" in having done this wise and beneficial act of receiving, *in obedience to the order of Synod*, the members of this defunct Presbytery; for seeing that said Presbytery, among others, had asked that the overgrown caricature of a Synod of Philadelphia should be divided so as to constitute two real practical Synods—they thereby are ever after estopped, by the law of consistency, from even allowing their Synod to add

to their number even the scattered remnants of a Presbytery that can no longer raise a quorum! Not indeed absolutely estopped, but compelled either penitently to confess their wrong doing to the Synod of Philadelphia, or lose all character for consistency! Now, considering that at the outset this writer applauds the "wise and beneficial" act of the Synod of Baltimore—nay more, endorses thoroughly the general principle which he imagines to be involved in this act: nay more, rejoices in being "furnished with so powerful an argument against the divisive principle"—nay, moreover, expressly disavows any fear that the Presbytery of Baltimore will ever misuse the tremendous power thus gained, by the addition of these two effective ministers from Eastern Shore, to the swallowing up first of the Synod of Baltimore, and next of the General Assembly;—considering, we say, all these admissions at the outset, we humbly submit whether this grave disquisition on the "Union of Presbyteries" ought not to be classed among the abstractions of "an inquiring mind?" However that may be, in all seriousness we would suggest to the writer, that such subtlety of inquiry, if directed to some of the abstractions that underlie this great question of spiritual finance, with an honest purpose to learn what the Scripture, as interpreted by our Book, teaches concerning it; he would find that a wonderful provision has already been made for securing the revenues needful to advance Christ's kingdom, without any artificial appliances by any "new plan." He might discover, furthermore, that the insane clamorers have a "marvellous method in their madness"—yea, perhaps he might discover even a clue to that mysterious co-existence of two such ideas in the same mind, as an earnest approval of the true object, aim and nature of the Boards, and also as earnest a disapproval of the errors, practical and theoretical, of those who shape the plans and direct the tendencies of some of these Boards.

We have already transcended our limits. Our remarks have assumed this form of a criticism on the article from the Banner and Advocate, chiefly because we presume that article to be representative of ideas current—perhaps we should rather say *under-current* in certain quarters of the Church, which seldom expose themselves so fairly on the surface, and give us such an opportunity. If we could any longer be amazed at any of the singular vagaries of the human mind, we should be amazed that men whom we esteem truly sincere and earnest in their Presbyterianism, as we consider this writer to be, and even men who are far more capable of enlarged and comprehensive views of principles than we suppose this writer to be, should still so persistently keep up this cant about hostility to our beloved Boards and their Agents. When are we to have an end of the "two hours," and of that very logical shout of "Great is Diana of the

Ephesians?" Is it conceivable that intelligent men who will take the trouble to think, do not see, that so far from any petty warfare against either measures or men, those who have been endeavoring to direct the mind of the Church back to the great principles of our Church Order, have been contending for principles which, right or wrong, relate to the very life of the Church? Does not any intelligent Presbyterian see that the revolution of 1837 had all its significance, as well as its justification, in the fact that the men and *things* which it overthrew were representative things? If it was merely a contest about the most expedient way of managing a scheme of benevolence standing side by side with the Church, or, more correctly still, ruling in a palace-like front building, to which the Church should stand in the important relation of back-building and kitchen—and not an effort to make the Church itself "stand like a palace built for God"—then no wise man will justify the strife and confusion and schism. If the war was merely a war of opinion, divided upon the comparative expediency of this or that form of developing the active life of the Church, and a conceded power of choice between this or that system of measures—and not a war for the vital point that it is not left to the Church to determine between this and that system; then it is not very clear that Finney and his compeers in revivalism, and Absalom Peters and his compeers in Church politics, at all transcended the liberty left to the Church to devise ways and measures according as her feeling and the spirit of the age should demand. On the Princeton theory of the Church, as left at liberty to develop under the restriction merely of a few general principles her measures and agencies, according to her own wisdom and good taste, it is by no means surprising to be told that Princeton followed, rather than led the movement of 1837; yea, followed almost in Peter's fashion! Now if we are right in supposing these important principles to have been involved; then clearly the interpretation which these "persons not numerous" put upon the policy which led to the present Agencies in the Church, is the true interpretation—namely, that it regarded much of the machinery as merely temporary and extraordinary, growing out of the condition in which the Church was then placed—and to be simplified and brought strictly within the provisions of the constitution as speedily as possible. If the reform of '37 was but another Jehoram reform—casting away Baal, but substituting the golden calves; if it was another Henry the Eighth Reformation,—expelling the Pope but keeping the Popery: then we can readily understand that a separate machinery—separated legally, formally and practically—may have been intended to be the permanent policy of the Church; yea, that patent high-pressure measures for raising funds were ordained to be henceforth permanent ordinances—yea, and all the

paraphernalia—of a hundred Doctors *blending* the dignity of idle leisure in beautiful harmony with the bustle of hard work, in the Church's great *committees*; yea, of life estates in seats on the Church's committees for \$100 in fee, or on \$30 ground rent—of newspaper puffs and all manner of ingenious ecclesiastical Jim-Cracks. But if on the other hand, that reform was the struggle and triumph of the great truths already indicated, then the tendencies of years past in the Church have been to declension from some of the great truths of God's law. And just for the same reason that whenever the great revival of religion begins to bring in error, in faith and practice, and more especially the error of substituting man's agency for God's—then sudden decline begins, and soon all the agencies and agents, that once seemed clothed with the power of omnipotence, become the poorest sham:—precisely so in this matter of the Revival of the Spirit of Benevolence.

If this view be correct, then the true causes of the trouble lie far deeper than any insane clamor—and the remedy is not to appoint visiting Agents. On the one hand, the cause of the decline in funds is to be looked for in the spirit of covetousness, avarice and luxury, that is growing with the enormous growth of the country's wealth. Men need more to make them rich now—more to make their style of living genteel:—and more than all, it is much harder to give away money when it will bring two per cent. a month, rather than a half per cent.; and so of half a score such causes. Meanwhile, on the other hand, the means and appliances once used with effect, have now lost all their power. What shall be done? We have heard frequently the response,—“We need prayer that shall prevail for the presence of the Holy Spirit.” This, beyond doubt, is looking in the right direction. But that presence of the Holy Spirit depends not merely on prayer, but on honoring his own chosen instrumentality—the truth—and more especially the restoration and honor of that truth which has been neglected. The Agents which the times demand are His ministers in their pulpits, pointing the people to the great ordinance established by Him, “who, though He was rich, yet for their sakes became poor,” for the purpose at once both of cultivating the true fellowship of saints, and of providing revenues for carrying on His kingdom just as fast, and no faster, than the naturally developed piety of His Church shall furnish them. That by the re-inauguration of the Agency system we can either reach or remedy the evil in the Church, out of which comes this financial trouble to the Boards, is simply preposterous. The statistical history of the Church demonstrates it. In the largest use of Agents, not one-half of our Churches have ever been brought to do anything; perhaps not one-tenth were ever actually reached annually by the Agents of any one Board. And of the number

actually reached and induced to contribute liberally, every one knows that fully half would have done as much as they did, whether an Agent came or not. If a special visiting Agent be the Divinely appointed means of bringing the Church to her duty, then it should be extensive enough to afford *all* the Churches the means of grace. But it is manifest that even if the Churches were eager to receive such Agents—which is very far from the fact—still not more than one hundred Churches out of some three thousand could be efficiently reached by the Agent every year; and that, therefore, at the very lowest computation, thirty such Agents, at an expense of \$50,000 annually, must be employed by each of the Boards, or else a large portion of our Churches must be left destitute of God's appointed means for promoting the grace of giving! Surely, on such a theory, it ought to surprise no one that in the present actual state of spiritual destitution in the Church, there should be a financial crisis. If Agents are God's ordained means of providing funds, then we submit, the entire disuse of them ought to be a sufficient cause for existing evils, without the supposed agency of the "*insane clamor.*"

THE RELIEF OF THE POOR.

This is the great social problem of the age: a problem which has often been solved, to their own satisfaction, by philanthropists seriously concerned for the welfare of their race and appalled by the enduring and obstinate calamities which make its cry continually go up to heaven; by professional expounders of Political Economy anxious to vindicate, as by a crucial experiment, the validity, dignity, and practical value of the science; by socialistic philosophers forced to grapple with it by all that determines the specific direction of their labours;—but all the solutions have failed in the one capital point of providing a remedy adequate to the evil. It has been clearly demonstrated, in mood and figure, that poverty ought not to exist. Statistical figures that cannot lie, Parliamentary reports and Society reports, make a melancholy exhibition of the idleness, improvidence, dissipation and general wickedness of the labouring classes so called; they prove to us that there is no need, in ordinary seasons, for such a pressure of the means of subsistence upon the wages of labour; that in Great Britain, for example, the amount annu-

ally expended by the working classes, out of their earnings, for spirits, malt liquors and tobacco, is equal to the whole amount of the profits of capital in the hands of their employers, that is to say, "they waste annually as large a sum as their employers annually save," and, consequently, "if the operatives saved like their employers, the annual addition to the fund out of which labour is remunerated (the available capital of the country), would be at once doubled." And many other such like things they tell us. But the hydra-headed monster continues to rear his front and bid defiance to speculatists, philanthropists and statesmen. Whether it be an undiscovered fallacy in the theory, or an invincible obstacle in the way of its application, the fact is certain that the evil is growing. The furrows on the brow of the wise man become deeper and the heart of the good man becomes sadder, as the gloomy problem is revolved.

It is not worth while to discuss the question whether poverty can, by any means, legal, moral or religious, be prevented. The condition of human nature as well as the clear statements of the Word of God may satisfy us that it must be a permanent element in the social economy of the race. The ignorance and general incapacity of some, the improvidence and prodigality of others, the low state of morals among the masses in most countries, and above all the sovereign constitution of Him who does all things according to the counsel of His own will, setting up one and putting down another, and producing those great diversities of condition which practical atheism ascribes to chance or fortune,—conspire to assure us that the poor shall always be with us, that they shall never cease out of the land. If men generally could be thoroughly indoctrinated with the lessons of Political Economy, and be made to understand the inexorable laws which govern the relations of capital and labour, we should doubtless have fewer disastrous strikes, and a more satisfactory distribution of the necessaries and even the comforts of life: and it is unquestionably the duty of every member of society to use his abilities for this end. Still this can be only partially done, even with the most heroick effort; and where it is done, the infirmity and sinfulness of our fallen nature will, in great measure, defeat the beneficent purpose. Evil passions and habits will be found too strong for argument. But poverty is not confined to the ignorant and the vicious. There is a large class of cases which has always baffled, and will always baffle the shrewdest philosophy which leaves the wise sovereignty of God out of its calculations. Until the day dawn and the day-star arise upon the world, we may, therefore, expect to continue our struggle with this omnipresent calamity. The great question is, how shall the evil be mitigated, the sufferings of the poor be relieved?

1. If there be a man, in whose breast the fountains of com-

passion have been wholly dried up, and who will assert that the poor deserve their fate and ought to be abandoned to it, we have nothing to say to him, as it is not likely that these pages will ever meet his eye. We have no fear, indeed, that, in any civilized nation, the poor will not, after some fashion, be cared for. Publick policy, if nothing else, will prevent a total neglect of them: and the spirit of Christianity, which pervades with more or less power all modern civilization, is our security that what is done will be done, not in concession merely to stern social and political necessity, but in a good degree also, under the promptings of humane and generous impulses. Whatever the voice of nature, stifled and perverted by the selfishness of sin may say, the voice of God in His Word is clear and explicit. There can be no manner of doubt as to our duty. "If there be among you a poor man of one of thy brethren within any of thy gates in thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thine heart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother: but thou shalt open thine hand wide unto him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need, in that which he wanteth. Beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart saying, The seventh year, the year of release, is at hand; and thine eye be evil against thy poor brother, and thou givest him nought; and he cry unto the Lord against thee, and it be sin unto thee. Thou shalt surely give him, and thine heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him: because that for this thing the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all thy works, and in all that thou puttest thine hand unto. For the poor shall never cease out of the land: therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land." Such is the language of the law of Moses, that law which, some men would have us to believe, is the distilled spirit of austerity and harshness. Would that the spirit of this law pervaded more completely the whole frame-work of society now!

We turn next to the patriarch of Uz, whom the Lord Himself pronounces to be a perfect man. With what satisfaction does he reflect, in the hour of heavy calamity, upon his kindness to the poor! With what confidence does he invoke the vengeance of the Almighty, if he had been guilty of oppressing the helpless and despised! The recollection of his charities sent a thrill of joy through his heart, while he sat in sackcloth and ashes, stripped of property, children and friends, with the terrors of the Almighty arrayed against him and the poison of His arrows drinking up his spirit: for he regarded them as tokens of the past favour of God, and they encouraged him to hope that his righteousness, though now enshrouded with darkness, should yet be revealed as the noon-day: that He who bestowed such rich grace, would not always chide, nor keep His anger for ever:

that the night of weeping should, sooner or later, be succeeded by a day of rejoicing. These charities revealed to him his conformity in character to the Son of God whom, with the eye of faith, he saw standing at the latter day upon the earth, preaching good tidings to the poor, binding up the broken-hearted, proclaiming liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to the bound. "When the eye saw me, it gave witness to me: because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me: and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the poor: and the cause which I knew not I searched out. And I brake the jaws of the wicked, and plucked the spoil out of his teeth."—Job 29: 11, &c. See also the striking passage in ch. 31: 16–22. We offer no apology for asking our merely literary readers to turn to a book, which even Shelley and Byron kept constantly upon their tables, to excite their poetic inspiration. But space would fail us to quote one tenth of what the *gloomy* Old Testament contains of a like import.

When we open the New Testament, we find our Saviour, in one of the earliest of His formal discourses, exhorting His disciples to imitate their Father in Heaven, in the largeness and comprehensiveness of their charity. We find Him sustaining and enforcing His instructions, by a life of unparalleled devotion in the relief of human suffering, and, though supported by charity Himself, requiring His followers to keep a fund for the necessities of the poor. And as if it were not enough that He had chosen the condition of poverty as His own, and thus dignified and exalted it, He condescended to make the poor the representatives, as it were, of Himself, after He should have left the earth, in those memorable words: "The poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always." Compare Matt. 25: 40, 45. He places alms-giving foremost amongst the acts of *worship*, concerning which He gives direction in the Sermon on the Mount. He solemnly warns the Pharisee, that, with all his punctilious ritualism, nothing can be "clean" to him, if he fail "to give alms of such things as he had." He represents alms to the poor as the rental, so to speak, which is at once an acknowledgment of the rights of the great Proprietor of all, and the indispensable condition of the Pharisee's own right to enjoy. See Luke 11: 41, and compare I. Tim., 4: 4, 5. And in the last hour, amidst the excruciating agonies of the Cross, expiring under the frown of God, in testimony of a love as comprehensive as the world, He did not forget to commend her who bare Him, to the affection and care of Him who had leaned upon His breast.

After our Saviour's ascension into Heaven, the promised gift of the Comforter was bestowed: and as it is His office "to take

of the things of Christ," to show them to His people, and to transform them into His image, we are not surprised to find that one of the first and most impressive exhibitions of the new life communicated to the Church, consisted in liberality to the poor. "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul: neither said any that aught of the things which they possessed was his own; but they had all things common. And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all. Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man, according as he had need." On so grand a scale was this primitive liberality, that it became necessary to ordain officers, whose whole time should be given to the business of distribution. And the Deacon is, to this day, an essential element of every regularly organized Church.

But these benefactions were confined to the Jews. After the Gentiles were incorporated into the Church,—the middle wall of partition having been broken down by the Man Christ Jesus,—an interchange of kindly offices took place between those who had once been enemies. The grand idea of "fellowship" came more fully out: the idea of a common nature, a common blood, a common misery, a common salvation, a common father and a common inheritance, swallowed up all national prejudices and put to shame all hereditary alienation of feeling and interest, so far as these circumstances had the effect of annihilating natural human sympathies,—and Jew and Gentile contributed to the necessities of each other. God had long ago made a powerful appeal against the oppression of the poor, upon the ground that it involved a reproach upon Himself as the Maker of all men; that the poor as well as the rich bore His image, and that the true dignity of a man should be estimated by this consideration, and not by the number or splendour of adventitious distinctions: but now is gloriously brought out the related truth,—a truth which had been overlaid and concealed by the Mosaic Institute in its practical effect,—that men were *brethren*, were the children of the same family, and therefore bound, as bearing at once the image of the same Father and the image of one another, to have all things in common so far as necessity might require.

But we cannot dwell longer upon the direct argument from Scripture. Enough has been said to show that the poor are never forgotten of God; that He takes them under His peculiar care, blesses those who do them good, curses those who oppress, or refuse to relieve them, and uniformly represents Himself as their advocate, ready at all times to maintain and vindicate their cause. The conscientious performance of our duty to this

unhappy class of our brethren, therefore, is the only *safe* course, under the government of such a God as the Bible reveals to us. It is our highest interest as well as our indispensable obligation : and woe to the man who lives only to be "ministered unto," who "liveth to himself."

This whole subject, in the aspect in which we have endeavored to present it, affords a beautiful illustration of the power of Christianity in subduing the consuming selfishness of the human heart, and thereby promoting the exercise of those affections upon which the comfort of men's social condition almost exclusively depends. Writers on morals make a distinction between duties of *perfect* and duties of *imperfect* obligation : the former embracing that class of duties which imply corresponding rights on the part of others to enforce a performance : the latter constituting that class which do not imply such rights. The distinction of course has reference only to our social relations with one another : in our relations to God all obligation is perfect. Now it is important to observe that while duties of the first class are indispensable to the *being* of society, and therefore are the great objects to be secured by human law with its apparatus of pains, penalties and disabilities ; those of the second class are indispensable to the *well-being*, the comfort of society. Truth and justice,—to adopt the common division of the social virtues,—are secured by law, so far as the existence of the social state demands : benevolence lies beyond the reach of law, as do the virtues of gratitude, filial affection and reverence for worth or age. But what would society be without these ? Society is not a mere juxta-position of human beings ; there is no society in hell. There must be a pulsation of sympathy, heart with heart : benevolence on one side, gratitude on the other. The true idea of society was illustrated in the famous apologue of Menenius Agrippa ; and still more beautifully in the twelfth chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. A chartist, an agrarian, a socialist, will doubtless assert, that aid to the poor is of the nature of a right which the poor may demand : and we have heard some unwary people, who abhor chartism and agrarianism, take the same ground in their zealous pleadings for the poor. But this is all wrong : benevolence must not be confounded with justice, in the nature either of God or man. The poor have a right before God ; that is to say, God has a right to require those who have more to help those who have less, and the man who refuses to acknowledge this obligation, makes himself obnoxious,—as we have seen,—to the displeasure of his Maker : but this is a very different affair from the right of the poor to exact. Property is an institution of God ; let the rights of property, therefore, be sacred, always and everywhere ; but let those who hold it be mindful of their abiding responsibility for

the use of it, and beware lest their poor brethren "cry unto the Lord against them."

We cannot conclude the illustration of this part of the subject, without alluding to a consideration intimately connected with the statements in the last paragraph, and which may serve as a motive to activity in the whole business, at least to all who value the stability of society. The systematic relief of the poor diminishes the danger of revolution and agrarian violence. Providing for them by *law* will not do it, as we shall see; nor will voluntary associations, with paid agents, answer the purpose, for the reason, that they are practically liable to the objections which lie against legal methods of relief. The poor have, in most communities, a majority: they will one day have it in ours. In most countries they are restrained by military force, and are destitute of political power. Here there is no such force, and the ballot-box is in their hands. It is well known how anxiously great statesmen have studied the question, whether, and in what manner, the right of universal suffrage can be made to harmonize with the safety of a commonwealth governed by law and not by an army. Further, the feelings of envy, jealousy, and even hostility, commonly entertained towards the rich by the poor, have been the occasion of serious convulsions. These feelings have been particularly strong in populous communities, the large cities, for example, because the contrast between the two conditions is more obvious and striking; because the poor are more conscious of their numbers and strength; and because the social affections, which are our greatest safe-guard, in their existence and operation, against popular violence, are weaker in cities, being more divided, on account of the number of objects on which they are to be exercised, being thwarted by the selfish passions commonly vigorous in commercial places, and not fortified, to the same extent as in small towns, by the beneficent influences of *home*. *Verbum sat, &c.*

2. Having dwelt so long upon the duty of aiding the poor, we have space only for a statement of the leading points under the other topick, upon which we had intended to enlarge, which is, the *method* in which this aid should be afforded.

That method is the best which shall most effectually subserve the great *moral* ends of that constitution of society, which creates the necessity for any aid at all. There are wheels within wheels, in the vast scheme of providence: there are connexions, gradations and dependencies: there are forces, mechanical, chemical, vital, and moral; and these in their order, rising one above the other, all conspire to declare the glory of God in the restoration of man, and in his preparation, by a course of wonderful discipline, for the destiny before him. Inorganic matter is subservient to the uses of vegetable life, and this, in its turn,

subverses the interests of animal life, and all are subordinate to the purposes of the immortal spirit. All social relations have the same end. Husbands educate their wives, and wives educate their husbands; parents their children, and children their parents; and so on through the whole round, and during our whole lives, down to the last gasp, we are educating one another. God has made individuals dependent upon one another in the same political community; and by this mutual dependence maintains the feeling of brotherhood. He has by diversity of soil, climate, and other conditions, made nations dependent upon each other, and thus created commerce, which, next to Christianity, is the most powerful instrument of civilization, the most effectual means of developing the sentiment of brotherhood among the various branches of the family of man, and of preparing them for their final union under the Man Christ Jesus. In like manner, he has ordained that the rich and poor shall exist together, and side by side, that in the exercise of kindly offices on the part of the one, the feeling of compassion, of sympathy, springing out of a common nature, may be drawn out and strengthened; may emerge from the condition of a mere impulse, or passive sensibility, into the condition of a permanent, active, moral habit: that, by the reception of these kindnesses on the part of the other, the sentiments of gratitude and humility may be excited and confirmed: and, on the part of both, that the feeling of dependence upon God, and of thankfulness for His mercies, may be enlivened and invigorated.

Now apply these principles, as a rule of judgment, to the methods of relief most commonly employed. 1. All *poor laws*, it will be perceived at once, are open to the objection that they are out of harmony with the above-mentioned *moral* ends of poverty. A poor tax, like all other taxes, is paid, if not with grumbling, at least without cheerfulness; no feeling of compassion is brought into play: and the tax-payer is none the better man for it. The poor, upon whom the bounty is expended, know no benefactor but the abstraction, called the State, or the corporation, or the stern business man who represents it, and who is the proximate almoner of its bounty. All legal "out-door" relief, is beset with this additional disadvantage, that it increases the evil it is designed to remedy. All publick institutions for the relief of mere indigence, as Chalmers has clearly shown in his able paper on this subject, give encouragement to idleness and crime. The history of the operation of the English poor laws is positively frightful in its details. The Essay of Chalmers, just referred to, is entitled, "The Distinction, both in Principle and Effect, between a Legal Charity for the Relief of Indigence, and a Legal Charity for the Relief of Disease." It is founded upon the example of the Saviour, who never, but on two occasions,

worked a miracle to *feed* men, and yet never, on any occasion, refused to heal the infirm and the diseased. Any thing is a sore evil which discourages men from work: but men will not cut off their hands or legs in order to be sent to a hospital. The "in-door" relief—it may be added—furnished in our almshouses, can only be defended upon the ground, that, in regard to the able-bodied paupers, it is a relief in the way of work, and is therefore, in a manner, a method of correcting or punishing vagrancy; and, in regard to the infirm and helpless, is of the nature of hospital-care. The policy of these institutions is, in some measure, justified by the very great repugnance the poor feel to going there, and their anxiety to get away.

2. *Voluntary Associations.* *First*, the Church is a voluntary association, in the sense that all its members are such without compulsion or constraint from human authority. In another and a higher sense, all men are bound to be members of it,—such being the command of God. It is a part of the Church's duty to care for the poor. Now, we must bear in mind, that the temporal necessities of men are only among the subordinate things that the Church is to provide for: that this department of her liberality has been entrusted by God to officers of His own appointment, elected by the people, ordained by the spiritual officers to their work, and responsible to these spiritual officers: that the bounty of the Church is to be dispensed for spiritual ends, being itself a part of the worship of God: that it is intended chiefly for its own poor, as a testimony of the fellowship and communion of all the members of Christ's body, one with another, in and through Him:—let these things be remembered, and it will be seen, that this method of relieving the poor *does* fulfil the moral ends before stated: and yet is not exposed as a publick charity, at least in no great degree, to the perils incident to such charities. But it cannot reach all the poor: and, we must, as members of society, resort,—*Secondly*, to voluntary associations, in the common sense of that term. These associations may either be permanent with paid agents, or temporary and occasional, as the exigencies of the poor may demand. The objections which lie against legal relief, lie in almost their full force against associations of the first class, such as "The Associations for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor," in Baltimore and other large cities. And besides, they are very expensive. According to the Sixth Annual Report of the Baltimore Association, which lies before us, nearly twenty-five per cent. of the whole amount contributed, was expended on "Salaries, Office-Rent, &c." Now if the agents of this Society are qualified for their office, they are men who could take care of themselves, without this salary, in some other employment; and yet they absorb nearly one-fourth of a charitable fund! More than this, it is our deliberate judgment, from not a little

observation and information, that the really "deserving poor" would be better taken care of without this association. At the same time, we judge its affairs to be as well managed as those of any other similar institution in the country. We blame the system, not the men who administer it. As to associations of the second class, occasional and temporary, such as the Baltimore institution was substantially at first, whose object it is, by dividing the population into districts small enough to be visited and personally examined in order to a judicious and *kind* distribution of alms, and by some common bond or medium of communication with other districts, to equalize the burden and the relief; in a word, the combination of the "*charities of the neighbourhood,*" the charities of the weeping eye, the tender heart, the open hand, which build up the benevolence of the giver and the gratitude of the receiver, bind each to other as of one bone and one flesh, and from both make the incense of thanksgiving ascend unto the Giver of all,—these constitute the surest reliance of the Poor.

(For the Critic.)

THE ACTION OF THE SYNOD OF VIRGINIA ON THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

The action of the Synod of Virginia on the question in issue with the Board of Education, has been expected, with great interest, ever since the meeting of the body in Alexandria, some sixteen months ago, when a Committee was appointed to report on the subject and present the issues for the deliberate decision of the court. At its late session in Lexington, the Synod acted on the report of the Committee, and with far different results, from what we had hoped and expected. The Committee, or to speak with more accuracy, the majority of the Committee, presented an elaborate report, embodying the legislative history of the question from its incipency in 1846, to the present time. This document is a clear and able statement of the facts relating to the action of the ecclesiastical authorities of all grades, and so far as this statement simply is concerned, we have no objection to it. Its chief aim seemed to be to show, *first*, that the Assembly and not the Board of Education is responsible for the doctrines set forth in the reports of the Board; and *second*, that

the Assembly had proceeded with "extraordinary deliberation" in the whole matter. Upon these points of the report, we have only to say, we have never dreamed of separating the Board of Education from the Assembly in the discussions of this subject. The Board is but the agent of the great court, and the endorsement of its reports from year to year has rendered the Assembly fully responsible for all the positions assumed by the Board, to say nothing of the fact that the original action of the Board on the question was in obedience to the order of the Assembly. We have made the Board prominent in the discussions of the question, not because we desired to put the Assembly out of view, but simply because the Board was the agency to which the Assembly had committed the chief advocacy and management of the subject. Upon the *deliberation* with which the Assembly is said to have proceeded on the subject, we must express the doubt whether any member of the Assembly thought of the matter, in the principles involved, for one hour from the time the subject was referred to a Committee, until the next Assembly convened and the Committee reported. It is certain the *Committee* of the Assembly did not proceed with any great or peculiar deliberation; for it does not appear from the Report on Parochial Schools in 1847, that the question was even raised as to the right of the Church to educate. Care and thought are manifested in relation to the value of christian education and the existing demands for it; but it does not seem as if the question lying at the bottom of the whole subject was even mooted. If any deliberate investigation was made in the Assembly itself, as to the question of jurisdiction, we have never heard of it. Looking merely at the general fact that ecclesiastical bodies had sometimes created schools, and without any investigation into the grounds or limits of such precedents, the Assembly animated by a desire to accomplish a valuable end, took action on the subject, ordered the Board to take the matter in hand, and accepting the reports of the Board from year to year, has become responsible for claims of ecclesiastical power, which in our judgment, are radically unsound, pregnant with disastrous results upon the Church, and distinct from all past claims of ecclesiastical power over secular affairs. In spite of the formal and successive action of the Assembly on the subject, we are deeply convinced there has been a very limited amount of deliberate thought on the real question involved, either in the Assembly or in the Church at large. As for real deliberation, coolness and cautious comprehension of thought in the public sessions of ecclesiastical courts, we have seen a plenty, to convince us, it is folly to expect it under ordinary circumstances. The elaborate statements of the Virginia report are not conclusive on the question, whether the Assembly proceeded on a clear and wide survey of the whole question involved; nothing appears to show

that the question of power was even considered susceptible of dispute, certainly a very bad specimen of deliberation on an issue so important.

But to proceed with the action of the Synod. The *minority* of the Committee presented a paper embodying the principles controlling the subject, which was afterwards spread on the records of the court in the shape of the protest, which appears in the sequel of this article. In the discussion which ensued, the opposition to the views of the Board had the worst possible chance. All the gentlemen who have taken active part on that side of the question were absent, with a single exception. He had to bear the whole burden of the discussion, in a state of physical exhaustion which rendered him incompetent to do justice to any subject in public debate. Consequently the discussion was utterly incompetent on that side, while the chivalrous spirit of the principal champions of the Board, which would not suffer them to press the debate under the circumstances, rendered the discussion equally incomplete on the other. We have never witnessed a discussion of a set question so completely marred, and from such a variety of unexceptionable reasons. After this debate, such as it was, the question came to the vote, and by an overwhelming majority, the Report and Resolutions of the majority of the Committee were adopted. The Report was an elaborate defence of the Board, and while deprecating some of the arguments used in the official papers of the Board, it did unquestionably endorse the substance and the pith of the general doctrine of the Assembly. In view of this endorsement, the protest which follows was offered for record. The answer to this protest, which is also given, in the sequel, has put a new face on the action of the Synod, giving an explanation of the views of the body, which decidedly nullifies the endorsement of the report, and distinctly separates the doctrine of the Synod from the doctrine of the Board. This explanation does not renounce wholly the claim of ecclesiastical jurisdiction: it still claims a power in the Church to educate "her own children and youth," to use the terms of the definition of the power; but it merely makes it an *alternative* power, allowing the Church to educate, *only* when other seats of authority have attempted it and failed. To expose the grounds of this construction of the Synod's Answer to the Protest, and to display more fully the issues involved, we publish in order, the resolutions appended to the report of the Committee and adopted by the Synod, the Protest presented, and the answer to the protest.

"1. *Resolutions annexed to the Report of the majority of the Committee, and adopted by the Synod, extracted from the Minutes of Synod and certified by the Stated Clerk.*

1. *Resolved*, That as the aiding of candidates for the gospel ministry is the primary object, for which the Board of Education was established, so

it should be also the prominent one in all the efforts and appeals of the Board, and in the contributions of the churches to its funds.

2. *Resolved*, That whereas the Board has been made the organ of the General Assembly for aiding in the establishment and support of Christian schools, academies and colleges, under the care of the judicatories of our church, this object may also be commended, as worthy of the enlightened liberality of those whom God has enabled and disposed to contribute to this special purpose.

3. *Resolved*, That the supervision and control of educational institutions, by the courts of the church, is not essential to the attainment of the great object—the religious education of our youth; and those institutions already established within our bounds, where sound learning is combined with Christian influence should enjoy the confidence of our people, as unreservedly as if more formally connected with any of the judicatories of the church.

4. *Resolved*, That whatever diversity of opinion may exist in regard to certain of the views and arguments advanced in former publications of the Board, yet in the educational policy of the church as defined in the resolutions of the General Assembly, and explained in the last report of the Board, will find no grounds for suspicion of the Board, or further controversy in the church.

2. *The Protest.*

Whereas, the Synod of Virginia has formally endorsed the doctrine, that the church of God, acting in its high official and governmental capacity, is possessed of the right to control secular education as a general interest of society, and consequently to erect and control a system of educational institutions to any possible extent; the undersigned, believing this claim to be unfounded, and the principles involved to be of very great importance as involving the just limitations of ecclesiastical power, beg leave to spread the following statement and protest on the records of this body.

The duties made obligatory upon man by the law of God, have been lodged by that law in different locations and circles of duty. The terms, family, church and State, define the existence and determine the bounds of these centres of obligation. Any thing like a general and permanent attempt at interference on the part of one of these seats of authority and obligation with the duties allotted to another, is contrary to the law which has made a different distribution of the authority. An exceptional use of the powers of one seat may under a limited condition of things be employed by another; but this can only be exceptional in its nature, circumstantial in its grounds, and *temporary* in its duration. The duty of the education of children has been lodged by the law of God in the family combination. It is the duty of the *individual parent*. It is therefore the duty of the individual parent to provide all the means and agencies necessary to it: hence the legitimate basis for the creation and control of a system of educational institutions is the principle of *individual combination*. From all which we conclude, that while the courts of the church, acting in their high official capacity may erect a school when immediately incident to their own official duties, or under some peculiar and wholly circumstantial condition of affairs, the creation and control of the general and permanent provisions of the means of education, ought to be in the hands of individual members of the church combining together. If it be expedient to act

through the courts of the church in any instance, it would only be necessary for them to demit their purely official and ecclesiastical capacity, and to act simply as individual Presbyterians for themselves and for all others who might please to identify themselves with them. In this way the limitations of the law of God would be observed, all embarrassing and unnecessary issues of jurisdiction would be avoided, and all possibility of involving the church in difficulty would be wholly prevented. All the good anticipated may thus be attained, and all the evil avoided.

Viewing these principles in connection with the recent action of Synod, the undersigned beg leave earnestly, but with deep respect for this venerable court, to protest against their action in the premises.

(Signed,)

C. R. VAUGHAN,
EDWARD MARTIN,
ALEX. MARTIN,
A. D. DICKENSON,
WM. P. DICKENSON,
JAMES CALHOUN.

3. *The Answer to the Protest.*

The Committee appointed to prepare an answer to the Protest of Rev. C. R. Vaughan and others, presented the following, which was accepted and adopted.

That the Protestants appear to have misapprehended the action of the Synod and the tenor of the resolutions adopted. The Synod do not endorse "the doctrine that the church of God acting in its high official and governmental capacity is possessed of the right to control secular education as a general interest in society, and consequently to erect and control a system of educational institutions to any possible extent." This is not the claim set up by the General Assembly in its educational policy. It does not claim to control secular education as a general interest of society; for such a claim must imply the assertion of a right which is unlimited, and is equivalent to what has been so often disclaimed, and is distinctly disclaimed in the Report and Resolutions of Synod, viz: the claim of *exclusive* right in the matter of education. Nor does the action of Synod imply a claim "to establish and control educational institutions to any possible extent." But it claims the right of the church to provide the means of a Christian education to her own children and youth whenever those means are not otherwise provided.

This statement of the case, together with the *third* resolution of the Synod, should render it evident that the doctrine of the Synod does not involve any interference with the legitimate rights and duties of any other party or parties, to the great work of education.

Signed by Committee,

A. B. VAN ZANDT,
S. D. STUART."

We do not deem it necessary to enter into any very extended discussion of the principles set forth in the Protest presented to the Synod. They are simple and radical ideas, which no man in his senses can question. But it is more difficult to secure the direct and obvious application of these principles than to obtain an acknowledgement of the principles themselves. The

decisions of the Word of God on some of the great questions of modern inquiry, are so simple, that the vanity of human wit cannot be content to receive them at first, as indicative of a practical policy, the wisest and the most complete which could be discovered. A wider and deeper discussion must be elicited, and the pride of the intellect must sweep over a vast field of experimental and deductive investigation, before it can be content to return and rest simply on the teachings of the Word of God, as embodying the widest and most profound conclusions. At the close of all such investigations, when the reason of man is purged most fully into a clear and complete vision of all the element involved, it will be found resting with the invariable precision of the needle and the pole, on the simplest and most obvious teachings of God in His Word. No distinction is more definitely recognized in the Bible than the separation of the Church and the State: yet this distinction is not yet recognized as it ought to be, by immense masses even of some of the purest churches on earth. They will admit the distinction drawn by law; but when they come to the application of it, dismayed by the sweeping effects it would produce in the existing relations of the parties, they fly off into long and able discussions of the necessities of the case, the interest of each in the support of the other, and the consequence is a permanent union of two great systems which were clearly and authoritatively pronounced permanently distinct by the Word of God. In like manner the great questions in relation to popular education still resist the application of these plain and obvious distinctions of the divine law. The intervention of the State, instead of being discussed as a mere temporary and alternative agency, is defended as indispensably necessary, by reason of the greatness of the work and for other reasons, rendering it the only appropriate agency for anything like a system of education. These views advocated with great ability, possess an air of practicality and force which has given and will continue to give them great and controlling currency. But it will be seen in the end, that the wisdom of God is superior to the wisdom of the wisest among men. It will be seen that duties imposed by the law on the individual man, can be far better discharged by Him than by any organic agency seeking to assume His obligations. It will be seen that the simple distinctions of the divine law have a far wider and more perfect intellectual reach, than may at first be imagined. So far from the magnitude of the work of popular education requiring the intervention of the State, it will be seen that the real and full strength of the commonwealth can be far more accurately educed and employed, as it is more exactly measured by the sum of the acts of its individual members, than by any act of its government, no matter how complete and united it may be. It will be seen that this question like other ques-

tions involving the issue, whether a great interest should be conducted specifically by the State or left to the control of individual citizens interested in its success, will be finally determined as most of the questions alluded to have been determined, as most wisely left to Society, in its members, than to Society in its government: in other words, where the law of God has ordered it to be left. The great question of the *control of the Church* in the matter of education, is controlled by the same clear and obvious discriminations of the law. Nor can these discriminations ever be neglected with impunity, especially by the Church of God. *He* has drawn them; nor does *He* ever do anything without a reason. If there is a reason why they should have been made, it is a reason why they should be maintained. If after all we refuse to observe them, the experimental issues of the trial will demonstrate in the end, both the wisdom of God in the enactment of these limitations, and the folly of man in despising them. Let the Church proceed and carry out this claim of official power in the secular training of "her own children and youth," and she will find before long, that she could not encumber herself with the management of a great educational system, without great detriment to her appropriate business and great exposure to convulsion and disturbance in the execution of her secular policy. She cannot violate the law of God, and be either sinless or safe. It is because we are deeply convinced that no one of the great seats of authority, defined in the Word of God, can claim a general concurrent jurisdiction with any other, without committing at once a blunder and a sin that we have opposed and mean to continue to oppose with all earnestness, the claims and policy of the Assembly on the great question before us. Time will show which party are the wisest and truest friends of the Church, those who stand firmly by the great, clear, and far-reaching principles of the law, or those who lead her at the bidding of *expediency*—an expediency determined by short-sighted human wisdom, into the management of affairs wholly foreign to her nature and commission.

The principles of the protest were not disputed in the answer of the Synod; on the contrary, they were impliedly affirmed; and the defence of the Board and of its own action in the premises was based on a simple question of fact, which narrows the field of controversy to a single point, so far as the Synod of Virginia is concerned, and which has the additional and very important effect of distinctly separating the views of the Synod from the views of the Assembly. The Synod expressly declare they *do not endorse* the claim of a *general and permanent power to educate*, as such, in the Church of God. They deny that such is the doctrine of the Board, and *on this denial* they suspend their formal approval of the policy of the Assembly. They expressly repudiate a general and permanent power. They explicitly af-

firm the power they claim to be a *limited and an alternative power*. They pronounce the claim of general and permanent power to be equivalent to the repudiated claim of exclusive power, and deny it wholly, affirming the Church has only a right to educate "her own children and youth," not to offer herself as a candidate to educate the youth of society at large, and only *that* as an *alternative* agency, when the means of this education are not otherwise provided.

It is obvious that this view of the subject is wholly different from the view advocated by the Board. The Synod deny this, obvious as it is; and the whole force of the conflict terminates on the question, *does the Board and the Assembly claim a general and permanent power to educate concurrently with other Agencies?*" This is a simple question of fact which can be easily decided. We must confess our surprise that the Synod of Virginia should have committed itself by the adoption of the Answer to the Protest, to the denial of such a fact. This claim of general power is the very gist of the whole controversy. If the Church had only claimed to erect a School occasionally, when incidental to her own business or under some peculiar and single circumstances in which here interests were peculiarly concerned, no controversy would ever have been raised. If the civil government should undertake to appoint Chaplains in the Navy, or to build a house of worship occasionally where the public interests were particularly concerned in it, as near a public armory or navy-yard, no man in his senses would ever undertake to dispute the propriety of its action. But if the Government should articulately claim a general power to appoint ministers of the gospel, and to establish a general system of ecclesiastical institutions, not *exclusively* of a proper ecclesiastical action, but *concurrently* with it, it would become a very different matter. If the Government, in advancing such a claim, appealed in support of it to the admitted right to appoint Chaplains, or to build a Chapel under the circumstances detailed above, as embodying the general power in view, it would be extremely difficult to determine whether their honors of the Legislature had not taken leave of their senses. It is precisely so with the interference of the Church with the general interests of education. The Church may erect a School when incidental to its own business, and retain the management of it. It may also occasionally erect and temporarily control an institution of learning, when the interests of the Church are *peculiarly* involved in it. But there must be this peculiar involution of ecclesiastical interests, and only a *temporary* relation of the Church even then; simply because, although all the great seats of authority defined by the law are mutually essential and necessary to each other, yet this necessity does not operate to the permanent extinction of the bounds between them, or confer

on any one of them a *permanent* right of concurrent action in what had been assigned to another. An occasional and temporary use of the power of one by another, under some singular and special condition of things may be allowable: at all events, such action, apart from an articulate claim of a permanent concurrent jurisdiction, would never have excited any particular notice or opposition. So far ecclesiastical action may be proper, and so far did the Protest admit it to be so. But the claim of the Board, in spite of the denial of the Synod, is radically different from this. It is a claim of power for the Church in its organic and governmental capacity, carefully distinguished from the State on the one side and the Family on the other, to exercise a concurrent, but general and permanent control, over education as a general interest of human life. It claims it for all parts of the government of the Church, from the Sessions to the General Assembly, and seeks to embark the whole Church, in all its parts, in the practical embodiment of the claim. It claims not a temporary and limited, but a general and permanent power. It claims a right in the Church *to educate* as such, and consequently to erect a School wherever, in its own judgment, a school is needed for educational purposes. It is a claim to erect an educational system, of any extent, on a claim of official power to control education as such. That this is the doctrine of the Board, we refer to the whole of their official papers to prove. The very object for which this claim of ecclesiastical power has been started, demonstrates the nature of the *power* which is claimed. The very aim of the Assembly has been to get an educational system of the widest range, on a safe and Christian basis; and by the necessity of the case, the *power* claimed is the power to do that very thing. The Board proclaims there are three parties to education, and it claims for each of them what it claims for all of them. The *education* here alluded to cannot be mistaken: it must mean the great general interest of society, commonly designated by that term. Nor is the Synod any the less mistaken in asserting, that this claim of general power to educate, is equivalent to the repudiated claim of *exclusive* power. It is, in one important sense, what the Answer to the Protest pronounces it—an *unlimited* claim; but it is *not exclusive* of other agencies bidding for the control of the same great interest of human life. It is unlimited, inasmuch as it allows the Church to go into the business of education to any extent she is able—as far as any other party to the great work of education; but it does not make the Church the *only or exclusive party*. For a statement of the views of the Board, which has never been impeached for accuracy, we refer the reader to the extract below:

“This view is not new in reality: it was announced by the Board itself in the report of 1852. The whole course of argument previously, *logical-*

ly resulted in the conclusion that *the church was the only safe and appropriate depository of power* over the subject, and this seems to have been the conclusion they wished to establish. But it was found necessary to modify this result, and hence the statement in the last two reports that the church is a *party*, but not *the exclusive party* of supervision and control over the general interests of education. This modification of the claims of the Board will not meet the requirements of the truth: we deny it as emphatically as we do the logical conclusion of their original arguments. The whole argument which we submit in the following pamphlet is as good against the claim of the church in her organized capacity to be a *party*, as against her claim to be *the party* to control the interests of education. The claim is that the church, as such, has the right to become, not *merely an alternate agency* where others fail to attend to the subject, but also, a *co-ordinate agency* where others are attending to it; that she may become a *party*, not only to the erection of a secular school as an exceptional instance and as a preliminary basis for teaching the gospel, but to the general system of educational interests, as they always will exist—one of the permanent and universal interests of civilized society; that she may come into the field with her system of schools, as a rival to schools created on another principle, and appeal to all the motives which lead men to confide in the Church of God to enable her to become a *successful rival*. In short, the present modification of the views of the Board, present the church, not indeed as an *exclusive claimant* of the patronage of the people, but as a *great educational rival* of other agencies of concern in the subject, enforcing her appeal still by the sacred grandeur of her character as the visible kingdom of the blessed God, and still insisting on the greater security or the higher value of schools under her control.”

To leave no room for doubt, however, as to the views of the Board of Education, we cite the following passage by way of specimen :

“Whatever may be yielded to the State *temporarily, and in view of present exigencies*, it is clear to the Board that the Church has a divine title to *engage in the work of public education*; and that it is both right and wise for the General Assembly to persevere in efforts to establish religious institutions of every grade, under the care of the Church, *as extensive as possible*.”—(Report of 1852. *The Home, The School, and the Church*: vol. 4, p. 40.)

We hold it to be absolutely unquestionable, that while the Board deny this claim an *exclusive* power for the Church, they do claim a right in the Church concurrent with the conceded rights of other parties, to come into the general field of education, competing with other agencies of control, and necessarily claiming what the Answer to the Protest distinctly repudiates—a *general power to do it*—and urging, as the foundation on which the confidence and patronage of the public is challenged, the superior safety to the interests of education involved in the ecclesiastical control. This is the doctrine of the Board, which is distinctly repudiated in the language of the Synod and denied to exist. We call the attention of the Board directly to this fact. They will, perhaps, find reason to think the victory ob-

tained, by their policy in the Synod of Virginia, does not afford quite so complete an occasion of exultation as at one part of their proceedings, seemed to be displayed. The doctrine of the Synod we hold to be equally unfounded with the doctrine of the Assembly; but not equally extensive or objectionable. The claim to educate "her own children and youth" as an alternative agency, certainly postpones ecclesiastical action until other agencies have tried and failed in the attempt to provide the means of education. Let this doctrine be carried into effect, and its practical result will be to supersede ecclesiastical action altogether. Since the Church may not act, save as alternate to other agencies, the honest interpretation of her power in the premises requires her to exert all her influence to secure the action of other more legitimate parties, before it will become her duty to proceed to action. Let this be done: let the *people*—the masses of the Church in their individual capacity—be first appealed to by the Church, acting in her legitimate relations to the subject, teaching the people their duty, and urging them to discharge it, from the pulpits; and if they fail, we may safely say it will be time enough for the government of the Church to act. Let the Church urge the individual parent to his duty, and there will be but little use for ecclesiastical intervention. But we object strongly to the insinuations conveyed in the language of the Synod, that the relation of baptized children to the Church of God gives, in certain contingencies, a right to interfere with the secular education of "her own youth." We deny wholly that any such rights appertain to the Church, directly or collaterally, from that relation. The Church has no right, alternate or otherwise, to control the secular education, the professional career, or any other private affair of her baptized children; and if the friends of these views of the relation of children to the Church are determined to press them, we tell them beforehand they are preparing a convulsion in the Church which will shatter it to pieces. It was well said on the floor of the Synod, the Church has only to do with her children through their parents. We are only surprised the avowers of that sentiment could not see it gave the Church a right to meddle with their education only through their parents.

The result of the action of the Virginia Synod, on the education question, has assured us of one thing; and that is, that it is of all things the most difficult to obtain a calm and comprehensive understanding of an issue of power or jurisdiction amid the excitements and incomplete statements of truth, incident to the discussions of a court of the Church. The contest must be waged elsewhere, and in forms which will secure the reiterated attention of the ministry of the gospel. The influence of precedents, without considering the necessity of a due estimate of the limits and grounds on which they proceeded, is

controlling with the masses of our ecclesiastical bodies. The fact that Church courts, in the days of the fathers, had sometimes erected secular Schools, was considered all-sufficient to justify an unlimited claim of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the interests of education at large. When the Church, in her Assemblies and in her great agencies, has become so deeply committed to any view, it must be a slow and laborious work to urge her back within the limits of the truth. But it can be done by the constant impetus of a bold and able Press. The doctrine of a distinct and general official control over the interests of education, by the courts of the Church, cannot maintain itself before the public sentiment of this country. Let the masses of the people fairly comprehend it, and it will perish, in defiance of the votes of ecclesiastical bodies. The action of the Virginia Synod, is significant on this subject, in more than one respect. For all the strong endorsements of the Report, there is a very distinct, though implied censure passed in the Resolutions, on some of the views and arguments of the Board in all its official papers *but the last*, the approval of the Synod being articulately *confined to that Report*. This is somewhat remarkable, since the Report for the last year contains a distinct appeal to all the reports before presented, and a re-affirmation of all their positions. This is certainly difficult to reconcile with the position which the Synod allege to be now held by the Assembly and the Board. If this allegation is true, we shall find it extremely difficult to comprehend the official utterances of the parties in question. If it is true, it will indicate one more revolution in the positions of the Board, which will make us decidedly hopeful of a complete return to sound views of the subject. At first it seemed to be argued, that the Church was the only safe and reliable agency for the control of education. But the noise raised by this position caused the public retreat to the new position, that the Church is only a party, not the *exclusive* party to education. Now, according to the Virginia Synod, the Church has become merely an *alternate* agency, only entitled to act where other parties have not provided the means of education. We call upon the papers of the Board to say distinctly, whether the Virginia interpretation of their present position is correct or not. If it is, we feel all the more encouraged to apply the same remedy of a bold, but candid criticism, which has been found so effective heretofore; and we trust we shall be able to congratulate the Church, before long, on the complete return of her great agents, to a just theory, and a safe practical interpretation, of the true limits and bounds of ecclesiastical action.

MR. BURT'S DISCOURSE ON NATIONAL CHARACTER—
RELATIONS OF THE STATE TO RELIGION.

We know not how or when originated the prevalent fashion of prefacing pamphlet discourses,—and even volumes of discourses,—with a formidable roll of names attached to a note of request for publication, instead of the request through a committee, as formerly. To our taste, and with our views of being “buried in a pamphlet,” the whole thing sadly associates itself in idea, with the long array of carriages which city notions of respectability seem to demand; oft times, alas, of families who can illy afford it—as a testimony to the honorable standing of the dead. Do the two ideas originate in the same tendency of human nature to “pay last honors?”

The first instance of this fashion which fell under our notice, was the case of the publication of a sermon preached in the Hall of Congress some years since, by Archbishop Hughes. Though the intrinsic merit of the discourse was not above the average performances of that dignitary—which average itself is of proverbial mediocrity—yet its publication is called for and heralded forth to mankind by a roll of names of most enormous length and prodigious greatness in political circles. Whether it was that the grave statesmen, fascinated with the witchery of a sermon by an Archbishop, were constrained to think, it must from its high source, contain something of momentous importance to mankind;—or whether in those days when the “Catholic vote” was so ingeniously made to loom up before the imaginations of politicians, it was thought desirable that each party should be as strongly as possible represented in paying honor to the great politician, though the poor preacher, is among the curious questions about which men differ. Immediately subsequent to this, we find the fashion current in New York, and still more in Philadelphia. Discourses of about the same grade with the Archbishop's, and prefaced with a note of the same peacock elegance, with similar peacock tail, became at once the established order among the clerical diletanti of all denominations.

We would be very far, however, from either classing Mr. Burt's sermon with that of the Archbishop and his imitators, or the note of the sixty-six gentlemen, members of his congregation, requesting its publication with the complimentary notes just referred to. It is but sheer justice to our good neighbors of the Franklin street church to say, that they have been the *occasion*, not the *cause* of this present utterance. We have for some time past desired an opportunity to enter our protest against this fashion as evil in its tendencies. Evil, if for no other reason, than this, that the effect is practically to set the

critics at defiance. For what critic would have the nerve to raise his lash over a back already endorsed by a *backing* of sixty to seventy names, already publicly committed in the author's favor? As an unlawful conspiracy, therefore, against the rightful authority of the profession, we have only been waiting for a fair occasion to speak out. Heretofore such an outspokening was inexpedient, chiefly because it might be construed as an attack upon the fashions of our neighbors and rivals, the Philadelphians, with whom, as all the world knows, we have reason to be specially careful how we meddle. But now that our own home people afford us the occasion, we are very ready to avail ourselves of it. And we are less cautious about doing so, since, we regard the discourse, not only as one of marked ability, but as indicating a degree of *thinking power* in the author, not likely to need the aid of names to work its way to the attention of men. Besides we think it altogether likely that other reasons than mere compliance with fashion, may have induced the publication, with the preface of the sixty-six names. From a very liberal use of their own rights and privileges, as well as of the courtesy and forbearance extended by the church courts to certain dissentients from the action of the congregation it has become generally known, through pamphlets busily disseminated, and through newspaper articles, as well as through the ordinary channels of information in the published proceedings of some of the church courts, that our friends of the Franklin street congregation have had some trouble, in relation to the settlement of a pastor among them. As rarely fails to be the case in such instances, especially when either of the parties undertake to heal the troubles of the congregation by laying them before a sympathizing world at large, through pamphlets and newspapers, as well as before the tribunals of the Church; the public abroad is very apt to imagine the trouble greater than it is, and not unfrequently to misapprehend entirely the true position of the parties to it. The present Franklin street congregation have, we think, displayed a commendable degree of patience and forbearance, under the strongest temptation to lay their cause before the world too, in self-defence.

In no instance that we are aware of, (for their article in the Presbyterian had not then been published,) had they ever undertaken, by means of the press, to set the public right, even though feeling that the public had been led altogether wrong in reference to them and their affairs; choosing rather to endure the injury, till time should set things right, than keep up, and add to the excitement by publications in defence of their course. Under these circumstances they are certainly to be excused, if prominent among the reasons for this publication in just this fashion, were to let their friends abroad know in this very quiet way how well things were going on among them.

Whether this, our conjecture as to their motive, be well founded or not, we cannot conceive of a better method of proving in response to all rumors to the contrary: first, that the congregation has a *man* as their pastor, and secondly, that the man has as a *congregation*,—and a congregation very far from being in a crippled and enfeebled condition at that. The sermon is very satisfactory proof of the one, and the prefatory list of sixty-six such names, by most pastors, even of large city churches, would be considered very satisfactory proof of the other.

Our chief purpose, however, in this notice of Mr. Burt's discourse, is to offer some remarks upon a single point in it, wherein we differ very materially from him, as well as from some very eminent writers in our Church; we refer to the statement of the position of the State in America toward the question of Religion. Mr. Burt, treating of the matter only incidentally, does not indeed bring out very fully, or state in a strongly objectionable form the doctrine against which we protest. It may be, even, that he did not himself mean all that his language necessarily implies; and perhaps had not our attention been particularly aroused to the subject by what had been said and written of a similar kind by others, we would not have construed his language as we do. As the subject is one of paramount interest, at the present junction of affairs, both in Church and State, and one that deserves more particular attention than it has hitherto received from our ministry; we are the more disposed to call in question statements in regard to it, which *seem* even to have a bearing in what we cannot but consider a wrong direction.

With a view to present the theory of the State to which we object, in the language of the advocates of that theory, we cite several passages from the discourse of Mr. Burt, and shall present in connection therewith citations from other recent writers in our Church going to the same general conclusion.

"It is in the idea of Government, the idea of the State, in which an associated body of men *rises to view as a personality*, and as a sovereign power, clothed with divine privileges and prerogatives, subsisting for high moral ends, dispensing justice amongst its own citizens in the name of God, and treating with other *States as responsible persons* like itself, with whom it dwells as in a family of nations to possess the earth;—it is in this idea that the ideas of community of origin and of language, and occupation of the same territory, merge themselves as subordinate or accidental, and that our view of a nation is most satisfactory and complete. * * * *
And especially is it because the State as a sovereign power, not only holds the persons and property of its citizens at its disposal, *but deals with its citizens and with all mankind as moral beings, and as itself a moral person responsible to God*,—being a sovereign only as his minister;—it is because of all this, that we give the name history to the biography of nations rather than to that of any other society. * * * The State has a religious character. Nations derive their existence as such from God. The State

is of divine institution. It enjoys and exercises divine prerogatives. It is hence under duty to God; *it has herein a religious character.*

I do not propose to argue the question of the nature of civil government. I will not undertake to show that the theory of a social compact—the theory that all just powers of government are derived from the people, who voluntarily yield them up and consent to their exercise—that this theory is false. Enough for me—enough for you, I presume,—that it is unscriptural and infidel. * * * The State, then, *has a character directly religious*, due to its origin and nature, as instituted by God for doing his ministry with men. * * * And yet, on the other hand, it must seek to promote the interests of true religion, with whose prosperity the public welfare is vitally connected.

It belongs to our government, my hearers, to conform its legislation to the principles of the Bible, and to impose its penalties for violated law, on the authority and with the sanction of the God of the Bible: and it belongs to our government, while indulging the largest and most liberal toleration of religious opinions and practices, still to seek the diffusion and establishment of Christianity throughout the length and breadth of our land. It is right that our government enforces, to a good degree, the observance of the Christian Sabbath. It is demanded that such observance be enforced in still larger degree. Our government, if it be bound to afford an education to the children of its citizens at all, is bound to give them a Christian education. The Bible should be in all our Public Schools. Chaplains should be provided for all State institutions, as they are for the Army and Navy.

I know, indeed, that these views, when fully expressed, are not generally conceded. Many seem to think that government has no proper connection with religion. The cry of Church and State—of the invasion of religious rights, is raised against these views.* But not only has government a necessary connection with religion, but what may seem still more objectionable, the freest government must have reference, in its laws and institutions, to some *form* of religion, as that held by the great body of its citizens: and it is a mistake, as egregious as it is frequent, which supposes that because our Federal Constitution prescribes no religion as that of this country, and unites the government to no Church, our country is therefore as much Pagan or Infidel as it is Christian. The Constitution and the legislation of our country presuppose and take for granted, if they do not distinctly affirm, that Bible Christianity is the religion of this country.”

Now in regard to this whole view of the religious character of the State, we hold it to be altogether too broad—broader by far than is consistent with the freedom—we will not say of the *State*, but of the *Church*. For our fundamental objection to this whole idea of strengthening and aiding the Christian religion by the strong arm of the State, is not the fear of what the Demagogues make such an ado about—the danger of Church and

* See Congressional Reports—Col. R. M. Johnson on Sunday Mails, and Mr. Pettit on Chaplains to Congress. Of course, in practically meeting and adjusting the two claims upon the government, first to respect the conscience of its citizens, and secondly, to promote the interests of religion, great diversity of opinion may exist even among those who hold to the same principles. There is room for a variety of prudential considerations. Yet the *principles* above expressed are discarded in the documents referred to, as they very often are elsewhere.

State; but on the contrary, the danger of State and Church. If any truth stands out clearly on every page of history, it is that Church of God is ever the principal sufferer by this co-partnership between Cæsar kingdom and God's.

Mr. Colwell, whom Mr. Burt cites with commendation, though arguing in the same general strain, is yet very far from assuming the same broad premises, as to the personality and the *moral character* of the State which is here assumed. He cites indeed Mr. Webster and Judge Story to prove that "Christianity is the law of the land,"—but on page 28 places a restriction around the power of the State altogether against Mr. Burt's view. We cite both passages that they may be compared.

"Mr. Webster in connection with his reference to this leading case, has the following remarks. Referring to certain great features in the Constitution and laws of Pennsylvania, he says: "These great principles have always been recognized; and they are no more part and parcel of the public law of Pennsylvania, than is the Christian religion. We have in the Charter of Pennsylvania, as prepared by its great founder, William Penn, we have in his "great law," as it was called, that the preservation of Christianity is one of the great and leading ends of government. This is declared in the Charter of the State. Then the laws of Pennsylvania, the statutes against blasphemy, the violation of the Lord's day, and others to the same effect, proceed on this great broad principle that the preservation of Christianity is one of the main ends of government. This is the general public policy of Pennsylvania. * * * In fact, the members of Congress have only such powers in relation to religion as belong to them individually and such as have not been excluded from their consideration by the Constitution itself. The power thus left to Congress, though exceedingly restricted, would be large if exercised for the good of the whole nation in the enlarged spirit of that Christianity which requires men to love others as they love themselves. Under this great law the Congress of the United States has power to promote the general welfare to the full extent of all their wisdom and skill without trenching on any religious dogma in a way to excite jealousy or apprehension even in the most sensitive."

A statement of the case far nearer Mr. Burt's view, will be found in the following view taken by the Biblical Repertory, of the relation of the State to religion:

"Neither the existence nor the power of the State, depend on any social compact as their ultimate foundation. The State is a body of organized men under Divine authority, as a political community, for the protection of human rights, the promotion of the common good, and enforcing of the moral law. * * * It is a new and a latitudinarian doctrine, that the State cannot teach, or cause to be taught, the great truths and duties of religion.

All the arguments which go to prove the right and duty of the State to provide for the education of the people, go to establish the right and duty of making that education religious. * * * It may be objected to this argument, that since the preaching of the gospel is essential to the public good, the State is under obligation to secure the preaching of the gospel to the people. *So it would be, were there not other agencies by which that*

end might be more safely and effectually accomplished. In every case in which other agencies cannot operate, the State is bound to provide its subjects with the ministrations of the gospel. It is under the most sacred obligations to provide chaplains for the Army and Navy, for Military Schools and Penitentiaries, and on this principle all Christian States, our own among the number, have ever acted."—*Biblical Repertory, July, 1854, pp. 517-19-20.*

Now to this general view of the whole subject, we are obliged to object very earnestly, as involving a theory of the duties and prerogatives of the State, wholly inconsistent with the best interests of the kingdom of God on earth. Inconsistent with these interests because any theory of the nature and function of the State from which the rights and duties here claimed are derived, must necessarily involve a concession to the State of still wider prerogatives, such as all experience has shown to be subversive of true religion. We confess our inability to see any wide distinction between the views above cited, and the famous views of Mr. Gladstone as developed in "The State in its relations with the Church;" first published in 1840, and received with such applause by the high-toned advocates of Church and State in England. Nay, we have been forcibly struck by the remarkable similarity of the reasoning, especially in the first steps of the reasoning process; and we are by no means sure that, if we could go on in company with the two parties as far as they go together, we should not feel obliged, by logical consistency, to go on with Mr. Gladstone to his conclusions. We cite here a few passages from Mr. Gladstone's "State in its relations with the Church," to illustrate what we have said.

"Why, then, we now come to ask, should the governing body in a State profess a religion? First, because it is composed of individual *men*; and they, being appointed to act in a definite moral capacity, must sanctify their acts done in that capacity by the offices of religion; inasmuch as the acts cannot otherwise be acceptable to God, or any thing but sinful and punishable to themselves. * * * They must offer prayer and praise in their public and collective character—in that character wherein they constitute the organ of the nation, and wield its collective force. Wherever there is a reasoning agency, there is a moral duty and responsibility involved in it. The governors are reasoning agents for the nation in their conjoint acts as such. And therefore there must be attached to this agency, as that without which none of our responsibilities can be met, a religion. And this religion must be that of the conscience of the government, or none."

National honor and good faith are words in every one's mouth. How do they less imply a personality to nations, than the duty towards God for which we now contend? * * * A nation then, having a personality, lies under the obligation like the individuals composing its governing body, of sanctifying the acts of that personality, by the offices of religion, and thus we have a new and imperative ground for the existence of a State religion."

Now, as we understand it, the premises here laid down in Mr. Gladstone's argument, and in the argument of Mr. Burt,

(in pages 7 and 9,) and that of the Repertory are substantially the same, nay more the steps of the reasoning the same—as far as they go; the chief difference being that the latter two stop short, having gotten as far as the exigencies of their argument require; whereas the exigencies of Mr. Gladstone's argument require him to go on farther. Nor if his premises be admitted, and the correctness of his reasoning, up to the point at which they stop, is it easy to see how his subsequent reasoning and his conclusion can be impeached.

With the presentation of this parallelism simply, we might stop, and here rest the justification of our dissent from the views of Mr. Burt and the Repertory. For to American readers at least, it will ever be conclusive demonstration that any doctrine concerning the relation of the State to religion is erroneous, which may be shown to justify in any degree a State religion. And the length to which these remarks have already extended forbids us from even entering into the general argument on the subject. We venture however, without attempting to present even a synopsis of the reasoning by which we would defend them, to enunciate several propositions affirming the contrary of most of the positions contained in the foregoing citations, for the serious consideration of all who take an interest in the the subject of the relation of the State to religion in our country. We affirm then:—

1. That it is not true as an abstract proposition that "The preservation of Christianity is one of the main ends of government." Nor that the promotion of true religion is primarily among the objects for which the State is established. But that, primarily, the ends of government are simply the protection of the persons and property of men, irrespective of any religious opinions they may entertain. And therefore any relation which the State may have to religion is merely incidental, and any respect which the State as such pays to any religious opinions, is not because they are *true* in the judgment of the government, but simply because the people, creating the State *hold, such opinions.*

2. That the State has no such *moral personality*, nor "is itself a moral person responsible to God" in any such sense as infers any obligation devolving on the State, as such, to promote the true religion. Nor can any moral personality be predicated of the State which is not equally predicable of any other association of men under solemn covenant—as a bank or a railroad corporation. For though there be in an important sense a judgment (temporal) appointed for national wrong doing, yet not States as States, but men as men are to stand at the judgment bar of God, and "every one of *us* shall give account of *himself* before God."

3 That, therefore, in no direct and proper sense, can the

“State have a character directly religious.” Nor in any other sense religious, than a railroad corporation must be religious. That government is of Divine appointment, no more infers that government is a religious thing, than the fact that Cyrus was constituted a government by Divine appointment infers that Cyrus was religious.

4. That the ground on which our laws recognize the Sabbath as a day of rest, and prohibit blasphemy, appoint oaths, &c., is not because the State as a religious “moral person” determines the Sabbath to be of Divine authority, or that blasphemy is a sin against God, or that God will punish men who swear falsely, but simply that the people who have created the government believe the Sabbath to be of Divine appointment and necessary, and that the people are aggrieved in their religious feelings by blasphemy, &c.

5. That it is not one of the functions of the State, as such, to teach religion, or to send out missionaries, or to ordain, or cause to be ordained, Chaplains for its Legislature, and Army and Navy. Nor does the use of Chaplains involve any determination by authority, of the question of religion. But Chaplains are simply recognized thereby as among the proper personal necessities of the members of the Legislature, or of the men in the service of the government—just as stationary and fuel and rations are personal necessities to be provided for. And but for the peculiar position of men in the Army and Navy, which renders a choice and a “call” of a minister impossible, the government ought not to assume the prerogative of appointing them. We hope at another time to return to this subject.

“IS AMERICAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY A FAILURE?”

Time was, even so late as half a century since, when the cry, “Christianity a failure,” was the watch-word of philosophic infidelity alone. *Grave Savans* demonstrated, as they thought, the inevitable bankruptcy of the whole scheme of revelation, from its failure, as they averred, to satisfy the scruples of science—as she discovered now startling variations of the sacred text—now a mysteriously sculptured Zodiac in Egypt—now some curious astronomical tables in India—or now the stony historic leaves in the lava of Vesuvius.

It was reserved for our Democratic era and country to hear this cry no longer from the privileged circles of the *Savans* merely, but also from the million; not only as the dignified philosophic scoff at all revelation; but as the only common catch-word in the Babel chorus of that war song chanted ever by the allied elements of a *nominal* as against a *real* Christianity.

This fact renders it important, therefore, in the outset, to elucidate and to justify fully the classification of religious ideas implied in the very terms of our theme—“*Evangelical and Unevangelical.*” If then, it is demanded, why adopt this instead of the popular distinction,—as Protestant and Roman Catholic—Episcopal or Presbyterian—Lutheran—Calvinist, or Arminian? We answer—First: because it is our aim to discuss *things*, not *words*—fundamental ideas, not forms. Secondly: because there is no more fruitful source of the current confusion of ideas about religion; or any more favorite battle-ground of mere theological sophists, than this popular classification of religious opinions according to some mere historic incident in the Church, or to the relation of these opinions to great men in the Church—or to some distinction of mere outward form of the Church. Perhaps no one controversial trick has imposed so extensively upon the popular mind in modern times, as that of playing off the word *Protestant* for a mere negation of *faith*, or as a comprehensive term for all phases of religion not Roman Catholic—not excluding even the vulgar atheism of Theodore Parker, or the hybrid Mohammedism of the Mormons.

Thirdly: we adopt this, rather than the popular distinctions, because they are utterly inconsistent with any scientific arrangement of the question. As well might one attempt to discuss the principles of Botany, adopting merely an alphabetical arrangement of the popular names of plants. Whereas, on the contrary, the distinction of evangelical and unevangelical is in precise analogy with the classification of subjects of science. If we rightly define religion, with Cicero, as that science which expounds the relation of obligation between man and his Maker, then the scientific classification of religious systems should be according to their theories, severally, of man's natural condition in the sight of his Maker, and the terms on which man may secure the Divine favor. This is precisely the nature of the distinction involved in the use of the term “*Evangelical religion*”—viz: “*the good news*” religion. It is that theory which assumes man to be in a state of guilt and misery, and comes with the “good news” of pardon and strength offered freely to all who will accept of it. Any theory on the contrary, which contemplates man as either not originally guilty—or, if guilty, offers him the favor of God on condition of his working out some equivalent good works as an offset to his guilt—is *unevangelical*, not “good news” religion, from the simple fact

that it brings him no *news* at all. For already, by the spontaneous instincts of his moral nature, he knows that *innocence* has nothing to be afraid of in all the realms of God, and that a just equivalent for sin, if it were only procurable, would not be refused by a righteous Judge. And therefore the announcement of such truths can be no "Evangel," no "good *news*," for however good *reasoning*, it is no "*news*" at all. Since, therefore, it is of the very essence of a logical definition that it be "*the explication of a thing by its kind and differences*," it is manifest from the foregoing views that our definition of religion as evangelical or unevangelical is the only true scientific distinction. Any religion that answers the great question—"What shall I do to be saved?" by the direction "*believe*,"—only "*believe with thy heart*,"—is Evangelical; on the other hand, any religion which grounds the hope of divine favor on something in the way of character or merit in the man himself, is unevangelical. Or again, if we consider the question of religion in reference, not to its intrinsic nature, but the sources whence its ideas are derived, we should find the distinction we have made to be the clearest and most intelligible distinction. In this view the difference between Evangelical and unevangelical religion is organic. As the former of these views of religion holds as the grand central article of its creed, the justification of man before God by faith *only*—though a faith evidencing itself by *works*—so its rule of faith, the source from which it derives its ideas, is the word of God *only*. Whereas it is the grand characteristic of all unevangelical theories of religion, that whilst they may agree to the word of God as the rule, they at the same time strike out the "*only*." Obviously it is little matter what other thing is appended to the Bible, as a part of the rule, it must change essentially the character of the religion derived from its rule. For the difference between an authority wholly divine, and an authority partly divine and partly human, is in its nature an infinite difference. The religion, therefore, founded upon a rule of faith wholly divine, is generically a different religion from any that is founded on even the divine word, and also additions thereto. And these latter must scientifically be considered as belonging to the same genus, however variant the species. All religions are properly classed as unevangelical therefore, that strike out the "*only*" from the definition of the rule of faith; and that no matter what they add, or however discordant the addition, whether it be traditions and dogmas of councils, or the antecedent speculations of reason—or the supplemental revelation of Joe Smith's Golden book, or the supplemental communications from heaven, strangely enough sent, through either wooden table legs or through wooden human heads, by "spirits, red, white, or grey."

And these more abstract views of the subject are at once illustrated and confirmed by the more practical view of the facts arising under the outworking of these great principles in the daily life of the Church. As would naturally be anticipated, those who hold intrinsically to the same theory of salvation and a common rule of faith, are found to adhere together in all that is essential to religion in that view. Whatever varieties in their external form, or whatever varieties even in the expression of their creed, yet what is in the creed, *being there only because it is in the Bible first*, there can in the nature of the case be no generic difference, whatever the seeming diversity. Nay, the rule of faith being in the very structure of it a harmony amid diversity, a like diversity with harmony must be anticipated in the religion which is derived from it. As the gospel of Jesus is yet a four-fold gospel—of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; as the one theology is yet a two-fold theology—now the theology of Paul starting with man groaning, “O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?” and ascending height upon height till the groan becomes a shout from the Alpine summit—“Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory!”—and now again the theology of John, starting from the throne of God and coming down with its shout, “God is Love”—As there is one practical Christian life, yet two-fold—now of Peter teaching men how to *suffer for Jesus*, and now of James teaching men how to *work for Jesus*—so we should expect to find the one Evangelical Church of God, yet diverse in the outward exhibitions of its inner life. And the most slight and casual observation of the actual relations of these evangelical bodies of Christians will manifest the truth of these general views. In spite of many differences they tend ever to unite in common objects with each other, but never with those of the other classes. However they differ, and however strong the prejudices in favor of favorite forms of the Church, neither ever objects against the others teaching his child the way of salvation, apart from all questions of form; while scarcely, if ever, will the intelligent man of either of the two great classes be found willing to have the other teach his family his exposition of the way of salvation. So in the hour of sorrow, or of approaching death, when the soul of man is made conscious of his need of the great truths of religion, the professor of one form of evangelical faith, in the absence of his own religious guide, is not only willing to receive, but grateful for the guidance of the other.

Harmony out of diversity is then the law of the Church as of the rule of faith. Hence may be seen why we speak of Evangelical religion as one thing, though of different names; and also may be seen the groundlessness of the scoff and cavil at these diversities, as though inconsistent with the truth of their religion. There is no essential dissonance—nay, there is combination of

all in harmony. Just as we remember to have heard that wondrous combination of most unlike sounds—yea, by most unlike instruments—in the Julien band;—all would *seem* to be separate, and each musician intent upon his own part, as though unconscious of the presence of any other but he. This one with his Obœ at work as if the atmosphere were made for nothing else than to conduct the sounds of the Obœ. This one tooting upon his great horn, as though the world of men were made simply to be an audience to the notes of the horn. This one sawing upon his viol as though the chief end of man were to saw music out of the viol. All seem to be independent, and each to have his own one idea, and yet the work of all combined was glorious harmony. Just so all these varieties of Evangelical religion, make the one glorious harmony in the anthem of “Grace! Grace!” that ascends ever from earth to heaven. This then is that Evangelical Christianity concerning whose position and prospects we proposed to inquire. And if we seem to have dwelt long on the preliminary exposition, it will be found, presently, that we have rather saved time greatly thereby, for we have now the matter of inquiry so distinctly before us that nothing is wanting but a few synoptical statements to complete our answer to the question—is it a failure? and to give the answer, and that in shape of stubborn facts, easily remembered and not to be gain-sayed.

But whence comes this hue and cry of the failure of Christianity? We are obliged to glance, at least, at the answer to this question in order to appreciate the force of any response to the clamor. So far as relates to its philosophic history we may state in a word that this cant of Christianity a failure, comes imported to us from Britain, whither it had been imported from the neological schools of Germany; and was the next phase of the fashion, after the going out of vogue of the cant made current by the celebrated satanic school of Literature.

It was a natural and fit succession. For as the cardinal article of the creed of the satanic school was “whatever is, is *wrong*,” and as it had become fashionable to regard modern society with its marriage laws and family notions, as a profound failure; and gloomy and interesting young gentlemen professed to find life itself a blank at the age of twenty-five, it was therefore a most natural and easy change of the fashion, to find next, the church a failure, and all religion but “unreality and sham.” Of this new fashion the two Newmans—Francis William of the Westminster Review, and John Henry, of Oxford Tract notoriety—became chiefly the articulate voice. It is no paradoxical classification which puts them in the same category—though apparently at opposite poles. So far as concerns religion—evangelical religion—their clamors were remarkably in unison. And though travelling in exactly opposite directions, they ar-

rived after a Columbus voyage of circumnavigation of the spiritual globe at the same point, in regard to our religion. The one travelling east through realms of old and venerable traditions; the other westward over wild and trackless ocean wastes of speculation, meet again—one as he comes in shouting “no bibliolatry,” but the voice of the church—the other, “no bibliolatry” but the voice of the soul within. And in like manner, on our own side of the Atlantic, so far as concerns the mere intellectual fashion of this cant, we have had a remarkable parallelism to the English case in the very similar spiritual histories of two young men, (originally personal friends we believe,) who, starting from the same point, also have performed a similar circumnavigation: we allude to Orestes A. Brownson and Theodore Parker. And we cite them as illustrations of the fact of which we speak; and as, both of them, remarkably representative men. We mean not in the sense of representing the religious sects to which they severally adhere, but representatives of a certain class of ideas in a modern American philosophy which finds Christianity, the Christianity of this country, a failure—an “unreality and sham.” True, there is a most important sense in which those writers represent most faithfully the two great evangelical sects to which they belong. But it would be unjust to hold all of either of these sects to the opinions of representatives whom they sometimes seem eager to disown. However, they may be grateful to them for their attacks on all other religions in general—they seem disposed to have more regard for them as independent volunteers for a “free fight,” than a portion of the regular army responsible to the laws of war.

But as already intimated, with us the cry no longer confines itself to the intellectual men. Once the fashion set, all sorts of men of all sorts of incredible impostures, take up the cry, and with most ludicrous pomp, discourse of the “failure of the Church,”—“failure of Protestantism, failure of Christianity.” While, as of old, here philosophy, falsely so called, with haughty patronizing sneer, suggests the failure to meet the demands of science for an explanation of her facts:—or, here, again, Pantheistic Spiritualism, proclaims all without the soul of man to be unreality and sham, and christianity a failure to satisfy the yearnings of its infinite soul within—or, here, secularism with its evangel of a new social structure, scoffs at the failure of the church to relieve the beggary and wretchedness of a suffering humanity:—on the other hand all manner of fanaticisms, taking up the burden, rant at every street corner amid the busy toiling multitudes. Here pseudo philanthropism rants at the church’s failure to fulminate blasphemous anathemas over humanity *chattelized*. Here baptised infidelity, given over to driveling delusion, mumbles its pious curses and its dogmatic assurances that Protestantism is a failure. Here debased and degraded

sensualism proclaims a new latter-day church, risen upon the ruins of Christianity already passed away. Here brazen-faced imposture chuckles over the credulity of nineteenth-centuryism;—and any, and every braying ass, assuming the philosophic lion's skin, most solemnly swears to his captives,—silly women of either sex—by his own long ears, that the church—that is the revelation that is, has failed to meet the necessities of natures so lofty as theirs! And whatever be the alleged point of failure, all combine to declare that the church and christianity is utterly losing hold of the people.

Now, to the grand burden of this Babel chorus, we have a very simple answer to make; a simple statement of facts against these balloon-fulls of theoretic gas. What has the Evangelical Church done here in America? What is the present position and strength relatively to her unevangelical opponents and to professed indifference?

With a view to the illustration of the general subject, we have condensed the results of a somewhat careful investigation of the statistics of Religion in the United States, into a general tabular form, so as to exhibit at a glance the relative position of Evangelical to unevangelical religious organizations, and to the population of the whole country. For the facts contained in the table, we have relied in chief upon the last year's official reports of the several bodies of christians. For some of the smaller bodies whose statistics were not within reach, we have relied upon the admirable report of Dr. Baird on religion in America, to the Conference at Paris, in August, 1855—a pamphlet which we would recommend to the reading of all who feel an interest in such views as we are now considering. Most of the estimates of the value of church property and church accommodations are based upon the census of 1850, with certain portions of Prof. De Bows estimates. For the exhibit of the Roman Catholic Church, we have relied upon the statistics and estimates of the large almanac of the Lucas Brothers, of Baltimore (Roman Catholic.)

As it is the purpose of this exhibit to illustrate a general idea, rather than present accurate details, we have used in every case, merely the nearest round numbers, that the facts may more readily be borne in memory. And, lastly, we have selected only those elements of religious statistics which are most important in estimating the strength and activity of such organizations. First; the number of ministers engaged—next the number of members in actual communion with the church. Thirdly: the amounts raised annually for their benevolent objects as indicative of the spirit and activity of the body. 4th; the value of the property occupied by them. 5th; the amount of accommodation provided for the hearing of the Gospel. And, lastly, the portion of the population of the country directly or indirectly con-

nected with the congregations by reason of their general religious preferences. To avoid prolixity, we have grouped together bodies of the same general character—

	No. of Ministers, ex- of Local Preachers and Licentiates.	No. of Members in communion.	Probable amount of Funds for Benevo- lent objects.	Value of Church Buildings.	Accommodations in the Churches.	Population in con- nexion with Deno- mination.
1. Evangelical Denominations.						
Several bodies of Methodists, - - -	8,500	1,500,000	\$750,000	\$15,030,000	4,000,000	6,000,000
Several bodies of Ev. Baptists, - - -	10,000	1,250,000	11,000,000	3,250,000	5,000,000
Several Presbyterian Bodies, - - -	6,000	600,000	750,000	20,000,000	2,500,000	2,750,000
Episcopal, - - - - -	1,800	108,000	728,000	11,500,000	650,000	600,000
Lutheran, - - - - -	1,000	230,000	3,000,000	600,000	850,000
Orthodox Congregationalists, - - -	1,800	200,000	8,000,000	800,000	800,000
Other smaller Evangelical Bodies, -	1,000	112,000	1,500,000	450,000	500,000
Total, - - - - -	30,100	4,056,000	\$70,000,000	12,250,000	16,500,000
2. Unevangelical Denominations.						
Roman Catholic, - - - - -	1,800	10,000,000	750,000	2,250,000
Unitarian, - - - - -	250	35,000	4,000,000	140,000	150,000
Universalists, - - - - -	650	1,250,000	205,000	200,000
Campbellites and Christian, - - -	1,350	150,000	1,000,000	350,000	600,000
Other Unevangelical Denominations,	50	51,000	1,750,000	150,000	200,000
Total, - - - - -	4,100	\$18,000,000	1,595,000	3,400,000

Before proceeding to remark on the facts presented in this table, let it be distinctly understood that we are far from presenting this array of the numbers and strength of evangelical religion in the way of proof of the truth of this, as against any other religion. Evangelical religion must be the last to teach that truth goes by majorities. Nor are we disposed either to lay much stress upon the fact that our Church makes progress in so enlightened an age and country. On the Evangelical theory, the obstacles that oppose the reception of the true faith in the hearts of men are not removed by the enlightenment of the age. Nor is the enlightenment of the age any guarantee against even the grossest forms of delusion. "Man is not rational, but rather has capacity for being rational." If the fact of making the greatest number of converts is to be relied on, then Mormonism stands high, for it is a pregnant fact against this whole boasting of converts in this great age and country, that Mormonism numbers its hundreds of thousands. And surely if the question is to be carried by the loudest boasting of converts, spiritual rappingism stands beyond all hope of rivalry, for we find in one of the organs of that grand burlesque of 19th centuryism, under date of 12th January last, this modest estimate:—"In addition to more than 3,000,000 believers in the United States, it numbers among its converts more than 25,000 professed infidels, whom the teachings of the Bible and the efforts of the clergy in vain sought to arrest or control." Surely, after this, boasting of converts will

be at a discount. But this table serves far higher ends. A slight examination of it reveals several very striking facts in regard to the religion of our country. First: as a general statement of the relative numerical strength of religion, it brings out this grand total, that out of a population estimated at twenty-six and a half millions, we have sixteen and a half millions (near two-thirds of the whole) connected by education and sympathy with the evangelical bodies. Three millions and a half, something more than one-eighth of the whole, connected with unevangelical bodies; and six millions and a half, about one-fourth of the whole, under no ascertained relations to either. In so far as concerns the cry of *failure*, with reference to which only it is presented, it certainly leaves that cry with its "spinal column broken."

A second fact from this view is, that these bodies composing the two-thirds of the population, in spite of all the clamor and demagoguery to the contrary, are tolerant in their spirit, not from want of power, but in accordance with true principle. For not only is the very abuse founded upon them so incessantly by some of the weaker parties, itself a standing contradiction of the authors of it, but also the rapid growth, and the spread of more and more liberal views with the growth and spread of the influence of these great bodies, demonstrates that their influence is all in favor of "largest liberty" as their professions are. Why has the question of the Baptist vote or of the Methodist vote never yet in the history of our politics been made an element in calculating the prospects of a candidate for the Presidency? Surely not because the vote of one-fourth of the entire nation was unimportant, but simply because "the Baptist principles" and "the Methodist principles" made it needless for politicians to ask for it—simply because the spirit of evangelical religion accords with the spirit of Him who said, "My kingdom is not of this world."

A third fact is made manifest from this view, to wit: the triumphant success of the voluntary principle in sustaining the institutions of religion. Here in the space of fifty years have been built Churches enough to afford sittings to thirteen and a half millions of people,—full two-thirds of the entire adult population of the country; an evangelical ministry of 30,000—sufficient to supply one to every nine hundred of the inhabitants; a Church membership, in full communion, of four millions—nearly one in four of all the adult population; near seventy millions invested in Church property by voluntary gift of the people; twenty millions annually expended in supporting their own ministers and ordinances—also voluntary offerings of the people; and perhaps not less than four millions expended annually in the efforts to send the gospel with its blessings to others in all parts of the world.

Here is the evidence we have to offer that Evangelical religion needs only to be let alone. And here, at the same time, our answer to the clamor of "Protestantism a failure." Surely if a failure, it has failed "full-handed!" With such assets as these, might not charity and kind feeling call it a "suspension" rather than a "failure?" Thirty thousand ministers; four millions of Church members; seventy millions invested in Church property; twenty millions annually raised for the support of ordinances at home, and four millions for the spread of the gospel abroad; twelve millions of sittings in their houses of worship for our sixteen and a half millions of population. Will they not soften down the clamor to simple "suspension?" And yet we have taken no account of the Church's investment in educational agencies. If space permitted to tabulate and analyze the educational efforts of the evangelical churches; if we should calculate the direct agencies of these religious bodies in furnishing the means, especially of the higher education of the generation of men now on the public stage, and making provisions for coming generations, it might turn out not less surprising than the facts already exhibited. And on this score, if no other, would we plead with those profound scoffers at the Church, whose intellects have reached such a vast expansion, that even the Church and her christianity have become dwarfed into childishness—we would ask them to remember, in the sovereignty of their contempt, for how much of that superiority of knowledge and mental discipline they are indebted to the Church at whom they scoff? If the Church of God is to be contemned for her imbecility, she at least deserves some gratitude and respect for helping them to become so great. But we shall have failed to appreciate the full force of the answer above made to the cry, "the Church a failure," until we come to inquire into the relation of the present to the past state of things, and the growth of the evangelical Church as compared with the growth of the country itself.

It is claimed by Archbishop Hughes, that the growth of the Roman Catholic body, from Father Carroll and 24 priests and 30,000 people, at its organization in 1785, to its present extent of 1,800 priests and two and a quarter millions of population in 1855, is a most conclusive proof that in America that Church is no failure. But what then of the Methodist Church, whose first single church was organized within a few months of the date of Father Carroll's commission, and which has grown from that one Church, in the same space of time, to a ministry of 8,500, (besides her 12,000 local preachers,) to a membership of a million and a half,—and to a population of six millions, against the Roman Catholic population of two and a quarter millions? What of the Baptist Church that, during about the same period, has grown from perhaps some 450 ministers and 40,000 mem-

bers to 10,000 ministers, a million and a quarter of members, and a population of five millions? What of the Presbyterians of the two Assemblies, who organized in 1789 with their 177 ministers and probably 30,000 communicants, and during a corresponding period have grown to 4,000 ministers, near half a million of communicants, and a population of some two millions? But it must be borne in mind in this comparison, that several most important abatements are to be made from this view of the Roman Catholic statistics—first: that during this period the filibustering propensities of the American people had bought up, or *fought into* the original territory over two millions of square miles, more than twice the original area of the country, *and all that, save Oregon, perhaps, Roman Catholic territory.*

What aid came from that quarter in the way of helping to make up the present two and a quarter millions of Roman Catholic population may be inferred from the fact that by the summary of the Roman Catholic population, given in the almanac of Messrs. Lucas from the reports of the Bishops of each diocese, out of the 1,996,000 there reported, near 400,000, about one-fifth of the whole, are reported from this *annexed* Roman Catholic territory: Thus, New Orleans 175,000, Natchitoches 30,000, Santa Fe 68,000, San Francisco 70,000, Monterey, 28,000, &c. From Texas no report. With some half a million of the original stock, or their offspring, thus converted into American Catholics, by *act of the Government*, not of the Church; and the eleven hundred thousand acknowledged on all hands to have been imported, we may be able to account for the remaining 800,000 of Roman Catholic population much more easily than for the six millions Methodists, *even without the help of native converts from Protestantism.* But after an examination of these statistics in the almanac of the Messrs. Lucas, we feel constrained to differ materially from Archbishop Hughes' conjecture of only eleven hundred thousand foreign Catholic population, out of the two and a quarter millions, against twelve hundred and odd thousand American born, at least independent of the half million of the annexed and their descendants. In the first place, to read aloud a page of the alphabetical roll of the Priesthood in the almanac referred to, and then a page of a Methodist Conference roll, or a Presbyterian General Assembly roll, will of itself throw suspicion upon this theory. The large proportion of the sounds of the names utterly impracticable to an English tongue, (we should judge 35 out of 50 on a page,) indicates a far greater proportion of foreign element in the Church. Think of the roll of the ministry of a native American Church, that can boast the romantic prefix of "*De,*" twenty-five times repeated in a roll of 1,800, and the jolly Irish O', some 84, and yet but two John Smiths, three Millers, two Wilsons, and not a Robinson! To the great mass of the people, this fact alone would be very significant.

There are, however, some grave facts in these reports of several dioceses. Among the most significant of these is the *distribution* of this population. In the dioceses of the four great commercial cities, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New Orleans, four out of forty-one, are reported 448 clergy—one-fourth of the whole priesthood—348 churches—near one-fifth of the whole, and 700,000 population, near one-third of the whole. No one living in these cities need be told that the foreign immigration accounts for these in large part. So again, what is rather more remarkable from the dioceses of the four new western cities, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Chicago and Milwaukee, the four great centres of attraction to western immigration, we have reported 430,000 more. Can any one be at a loss to account for the origin of these? Here then, in and around these four eastern centres of foreign commerce, and four western centres of emigration, we have already over one-half of the entire Roman Catholic population. And from this view of the matter is it not apparent that we have no need of any ingenious speculation as to the reason of this phenomenon of the two and a quarter millions? That the philosopher ought first to let the fish drop into the brimfull bowl of water without causing overflow, before he begins to account for the water not running over.

From all that has been said it is manifest that, considering the sources of the growth of the Roman Catholic population, in connection with the present relation of this to the Evangelical portion of the country, Dr. Brownson and the organ of the Archbishop of New York should, at least, have hesitated to make themselves conspicuous in this clamor of "Evangelical Religion a Failure."

We find that space will not permit us even to attempt an analysis of the growth of the other unevangelical sects of the country. For the same reason, we shall be obliged to omit the comparison which we intended between the growth of the Evangelical churches and the growth of the country itself, during the same period, from five millions to twenty-six and a half millions. Suffice it to say, the result would establish the fact that, great as has been the growth of the country, the growth of the Evangelical churches has been much greater. So far from falling behind, as is constantly asserted, they gain upon the population. Whilst the population, in the first half of the present century, multiplied four times and a half, the ministers and communicants of Evangelical churches multiplied near ten times. This argument, however, cannot now be pursued.

As to the prospect for the future, we have little to say. For the same reason that Evangelical Christianity is not disposed to press past success as an argument, for its truth as a religion, it is as little disposed to rest on outward prospects for the future. For however bright the prospect—nay, however great the suc-

cess, which already attained, spiritual declension may begin in the midst of the highest prosperity. Evangelical faith, as embodied in the Church of God, has ever been peculiar in the world's history as the only embodiment of thought that can survive decline, and even apparent ruin. That Church floated once, a single speck upon the blank desolation of waters which was a dead world's winding sheet—yea, and even then was nursing a *traitorous Ham*, to become a scoffer at her "*failures.*" A thousand years later that Church hid herself in the dens and caves of her own covenanted inheritance, where under David and Solomon she sat queen of empires; then, a thousand years later, she stood represented by a lone widow and her three friends by the cross of her murdered Lord. Yea, and a thousand years later, after unparalleled triumphs, once more was driven to her lone eyrie in the Alps. And therefore if even now her dominions were from "the river to the ends of the earth," true faith would not point to that as the ground of her confidence. The falling away may follow that. The great battle of Armageddon may remain still to be fought. True faith rests her hope of conquest simply on the promise, "I will give the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." The Church's Sovereign holds a title to the whole world against adverse possession. And though "possession be nine points of the law," it shall not stand good, nor shall limitation be a bar, no matter how long it runs. Standing upon this promise, the true Church of God calmly waits, unterrified by all the clamor of besieging legions.

History dwells with exultation upon the story of how stern old Rome, with Hannibal at her gates, went on with the public sale of her grounds; and the auctioneer put up the very lots upon which the Carthaginian was encamped, and sold them too, at no sacrifice of price. Just so the Church of God. Amid the clamor of these combined hosts, of her "failure" and their certain triumph, she goes forward offering to the enterprise of her people, the very ground upon which the fiercest of her foes encamp. True, alas, it is, in an important sense, the Church of our day *fails*—fails in faithfulness—fails in holy zeal—fails to make half the impression she ought; but not true in the sense of her foes. The Church herself, "now in the winter of her discontent," takes up the complaint of failure. And the great mistake of her foes is that they, judging by the outward appearance only, know not that this is her strength.

Imagine some Esquimaux who had heard the description of the country and home he had left from Dr. Kane—a description of nature all alive in balmy breezes, flowing streams, and green fields, and golden harvests—which to the inhabitants of the polar circle, would seem as wild and fanciful as the Church's description of Millennial glory. But imagine now that, lured

by the enchanting picture, the Esquimeaux had left all and followed Dr. Kane, and arrived here at any time within the last six weeks, what language could he find to express strongly enough his deep conviction that Dr. Kane had deluded him with the merest yarn-spinning?

Where are the running streams, and green fields of the living nature? Alas, these terrific blasts have killed her? She is dead and wrapped in her white winding-sheet—just as at the poles! All this seems indisputable proof to him of the utter *failure* of Dr. Kane's promises. And seems so simply because he perceives not the one grand fact, that nature is not "dead but sleepeth." He understands not that faith in the power and goodness of God, which is hid in the hearts of our people, that "summer and winter, seed-time and harvest shall not cease." That in due time His love shall breathe itself forth in soft breezes and warm sunshine. Nature shall have a resurrection; the tender buds shall begin to burst, the green blade to spring forth, the blossom to expand, and in its season the golden harvest be shouted home by the voices of happy myriads! So with the Church of God—the decline of her zeal, and the chilling down of her active life may call forth many a terrific blast to sweep over her surface, as fierce and loud as blowing geese and hissing adders and well plied puffing bellows can make it—and the cry through a whole spiritual January be—"the church is a failure, is dead;" but "her life is hid with Christ in God."

As to the external prospects for the future of the American Evangelical Church, everything is full of encouragement. Such a country—such a race of men—such agencies for doing good—such strength already attained—what shall limit the results? Amid all the elements that enter into the calculation for the future, we see but one—save that of desertion of God's Spirit, which can possibly stay the progress of Evangelical religion. And that one not to be feared for any intrinsic power in itself, but simply from its satanic recklessness in doing evil. We allude to that Atheistic pseudo Philanthropism whose zeal for the down-trodden and oppressed instead of assuming the natural phase of kindness and sympathy for the suffering, aspires to the glory of destroying the glorious theatre which God hath erected here, as if for the very purpose of displaying the glory of his Church, and thereby, if possible to win the world to himself. All else would seem to indicate the speedy, universal triumph of true religion.

Here then is our answer to the cavil of *failure* in the ordinary and popular sense in which it has been applied to the Church. And here finally is our answer to the manifold phases of the same cavil among the speculators and essayists of the age. "Where are the great men of the Church?" ask these logical Goliaths in proof that the glory of the Church has departed.

Where now the Titans who warred in past ages—the Cudworths—the Hookers—the Leslies and their hosts; that Christianity (as saith the Westminster Review) hath failed to meet her modern enemies on the field of battle? “Here!” we answer, “feeding and taking care of these four millions of God’s redeemed ones and proclaiming still, ‘There is room! There is room!’” Other employment by far hath God for the great intellects of his Church now than spinning metaphysical cobwebs to catch such flies as you. He has interfused the intellect of the Church with that practical spirit which glories more in saving one soul from destruction than impaling two infidels on either horn of a merciless dilemma.

“Where now the martyr spirit to suffer for Jesus,” ask you?—

“Here!” changed into the propagandist spirit to *labor* for Jesus. God raises not up the martyrs for holiday show. When the hour for suffering and testifying to the death shall come, then shall the martyr spirit be found. The same Spirit traces the same lineaments upon the souls now as ever. But as with sympathetic ink that shows not till exposed to the heat of the fiery furnace of affliction. Martyrs will they be, when martyrs are wanting.

“Where, do you ask, is the spirit of holy ambition that inspired her heroes in time past, to toil and struggle in the Church’s defence?”—

“Here!” at work in this great world-field, with its Chinese walls all broken down, aspiring to gather trophies of God’s saving grace to be “stars in their crown of rejoicing,” rather than trophies of fading laurels won in academic logical victories over such as you. “Here,” at work among the million, who have snatched from the Monarch his sceptre—in the true spirit of this new democratic age recognizing the truth that all men are equal as before the law, and still more that all souls are equal as before God. Wisely choosing to expend their strength for the docile thousands that will hear God’s voice rather than in hopeless struggle with the one “disputer, of this world,” given over to strong delusion to believe a lie. If Christianity has “*failed*,” it has been only in the same sense, as she has been wont to fail from the first—namely, to accomplish the conversion of such as, from the foregone conclusions of folly, prejudice and pride, “will not come to Him that they may have life.”

STATISTICKS OF CHURCH SEMINARIES, AND EDUCATION IN THEM FOR 1855-6.

We have had access to the Catalogues of Princeton, Allegheny, and Danville Seminaries, for the session of 1855-6: and propose to analyze their statistical statements, and illustrate their significance. We have not seen any thing from either of the remaining Seminaries.

The three Seminaries above named, are under the care of the General Assembly: and are therefore in a manner, the property of the whole church. They are a part of the instrumentality used by the church, in executing one of its plainest as well as most important duties—in striving to perpetuate an adequate supply of able and faithful ministers of the gospel. No part of the operations of the Church, ought to be more carefully regarded, more liberally provided for, or more deeply sympathised with, by the people of God, than this vital part of them.

These three Seminaries were established by the General Assembly,—Princeton in 1810,—Allegheny in 1826, sixteen years after Princeton,—Danville in 1853—twenty-seven years after Allegheny. They are located nearly on an east and west line—passing through the central portion of the nation on the east side of the Mississippi river: Princeton and Danville being seven or eight hundred miles apart, and Allegheny about mid-way between them! Princeton in New Jersey, and Allegheny in Pennsylvania, are located in two of the more southerly of the sixteen non-slaveholding States: Danville in Kentucky is located in one of the most northern of the fifteen slave-holding States. The first of these Seminaries was established 21 years after the organization of the General Assembly, the second one 37 years, and the third one 64 years after that event. The first one is now 46 years old, the second one 30 years old, and the third one 3 years old.

The number of candidates for the Gospel Ministry reported in the Minutes of the Assembly for 1855, is 435. The Report of the Board of Education for 1855, states the number of candidates under its care at 364. We have no means of determining with certainty what proportion of these candidates reported either by the Presbyteries or the Board of Education, are in their preliminary course—and what proportion are pursuing Theological studies. It is to be regretted that both sets of reports do not distinguish precisely, on this very important part of a most important subject. Will the Clerks of the Assembly, and the Secretary of the Board, try to have matters put on a better footing?

Princeton has, according to its catalogue, 100 candidates for the ministry studying there this session: Allegheny has 76:

Danville has 45 : in all 221. Resident Graduates and Resident Licentiates are omitted in all cases : the whole number of both classes however is but 5, of whom 3 are at Allegheny and 2 at Princeton. Such private information as we have, leads us to suppose that the whole number of candidates for the ministry at Columbia, Prince Edward and Albany, does not exceed 70 this session : making, for the six Seminaries about 290 students in all. If the whole number reported by the Board of Education (364) were studying theology—then about 74 of them would be studying privately—even if all the students in all the Seminaries were Beneficiaries. But as it is probable that not so many as half of them, probably not one-third of them are Beneficiaries : and as it is believed nearly all the Beneficiaries of the Board who finally reach the ministry—do study in some Seminary : upon rectifying the matter by these principles, it is probable that of the Beneficiaries of the Board, not above 120 out of 364, are in their Theological course ; and that out of 290 students in the Seminaries, at least 170 have no connection with the Board of Education. Moreover, if the whole of the 435 candidates reported by the Presbyteries to the last Assembly, were students of Theology, then at least 145 of them were studying privately. But as it is known that many students of Theology in our Seminaries do not put themselves under the care of any Presbytery until they are nearly ready to ask for License (a most unsafe and improper practice) : and as it is also known that many of those reported by the Presbyteries as candidates, are in Colleges and Academies ; there are no means of forming even an approximate conjecture, as to the proportion of the 290 students in the Seminaries, who are embraced in the 435 candidates reported by the Presbyteries : no means, therefore, of even guessing, how many of the 435 are students of Theology : no means of forming the remotest conjecture, what proportion of those amongst these 435 who are students of Theology, are studying privately. Surely statisticks which are of no value in enabling one even to *guess* at important facts, need to be put on a more sensible plan. One more source of error, is outside of all these Reports. These 290 students in the Seminaries, are not all members of our church or looking to our ministry : a number of them, no one can tell by means of any published information,—how many, are members of other christian denominations : but so many as they may be—that for an error is produced every time they are counted—an error vitiating every subsequent result.

If we have been accurate in a hasty count, the 100 students at Princeton, are distributed as follows : 36 of them reside in New York—28 of them in Pennsylvania—11 in New Jersey—6 in Ohio—from those 4 States 81 :—while the remaining 19, are collected from 11 other States—except that one is a foreigner, and the residence of one is not stated. Of these 11 States last

mentioned, Indiana and Missouri, furnish 3 each : Virginia, N. Carolina, S. Carolina, and Georgia 2 each : and Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Alabama 1 each. Twelve States, including Ohio—furnish 25 students : three States around the Seminary, to wit, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania—furnish 75 students : and sixteen States are without any student in that Seminary. So far as these statisticks reveal the state of public feeling, Princeton has a hold, more or less, in various parts of the Union, more or less remote from it : but its reliable patronage is local. This is a most weighty fact : and must have results of great importance in many ways. We observe with surprise that not a single student of Theology from all New England is found in any of these Seminaries. This also is a most significant fact.

Again if our hurried count is correct, the 76 students in Allegheny, are distributed as follows : 53 from Pennsylvania, 14 from Ohio—making 67 from those two States : while the remaining 9 come from 5 of our States—and 3 foreign countries. Of these 5 States, Virginia furnishes 2 students, and Iowa, Indiana, Tennessee and New York 1 each. Here the local patronage is almost the totality. Out of our 31 States, only 7 are represented at all ; while of these 7, there are 4 who send 1 student each, and 1 that sends 2 students : and 24 States are without a student there. It is Pennsylvania—aided by Ohio, which furnishes the students for this important Institution. The two Colleges near to it, at Canonsburg and Washington, graduated no less than 53 of its 76 students : as we observe that Nassau Hall graduated 34 of the 100 at Princeton. That noble Presbyterian Population of Pennsylvania furnishes 84 of the 221 candidates now pursuing their studies at Princeton, Allegheny and Danville.

Supposing our rapid count to be again correct, in the case of Danville, its 45 students are distributed as follows : 12 from Kentucky, 10 from Ohio, 6 from Tennessee, 6 from Virginia, making 34 from these 4 States : the remaining 11 are gathered from 6 other States, except that 1 is from the District of Columbia, and 1 is a Prussian. Those 6 States, are Pennsylvania 3 students, Illinois 2, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, and Maryland 1 each. By the way the only Marylander in any of these Seminaries, is the one in Danville : and we observe no Kentuckian or Mississippian, reported in any Seminary but it. Ohio divides her patronage—14 to Allegheny, 10 to Danville, 6 to Princeton. Of our 31 States, 10 are represented at Danville—but mainly 4 : and 21 are not : nevertheless the figures are not by any means so decisive in fixing the patronage as local, as in the case of either of the other Seminaries—more particularly Allegheny.

In Princeton 15 States are represented : in Danville 10 States

and the District of Columbia are represented: in Allegheny 7 States are represented. But the rate of 10 States to 45 students—which is the rate at Danville, ought to have given Princeton 22 States to the 100 students instead of 15, with the same position as to local and general patronage. And upon a similar basis, Allegheny ought to have had students from 17 instead of 7 States. Danville appears to have absorbed all the local patronage of Kentucky—and Princeton to have absorbed all the local patronage of New Jersey (12 in the former case—11 in the latter),—but Allegheny, though the most local of all—did not absorb the immense local patronage of Pennsylvania—of whose students 53 are at Allegheny—28 at Princeton—and 3 at Danville. Considering the relations of Philadelphia and the greater part of Eastern Pennsylvania, to Princeton, it is rather surprising that her share is not larger, than that it is so large. It is rather odd that Danville got any there.

There are 19 States represented in these Seminaries taken all together: to wit: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, N. Carolina, S. Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio. There are 12 States not represented, to wit: Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, California. Still however the Presbyterian Church has important interests, in all these twelve States—unless perhaps in about three of the New England States; interests of the greatest magnitude in several of them. Of the 7 States represented at Allegheny, all except Tennessee, are also represented at Princeton: 3 out of the 7, to wit, New York, Iowa, and Indiana, are not represented at Danville. Out of the 10 States represented at Danville, 6 are not represented at Allegheny, to wit: Kentucky, Illinois, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, and Maryland: while four of them are not represented at Princeton, to wit: Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi and Maryland. Of the 15 States represented at Princeton, 9 are not represented at Allegheny, to wit: Missouri, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Alabama: and 9 are not represented at Danville, to wit: New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Iowa, Indiana, Wisconsin, Missouri, Georgia and North Carolina.

It is rather tedious to adjust these statements, and rather dry, perhaps, to read them: but whoever will put himself to the trouble of comprehending the facts themselves, and their significance, will be rewarded for his pains—provided he cares any thing about either of these Seminaries, or about the actual posture of the Presbyterian Church with regard to the position, bearing, and probable outworking of the immense question of Theological Education in its bosom. There is an eternal nexus

in events: and we had as well examine the way in which it forces things to tend—and try to estimate the rate, as well as the direction of the drift. The surest of all methods, in case like this, is the wise and candid use of accurate facts, past and present. We have tried to make the facts which lie in silence and pell-mell, in these three catalogues, articulate and orderly. Their testimony has surprised us, and instructed us.

We have not said any thing as to the Seminaries themselves, in general or in particular. Every one will judge for himself, as to the advantages afforded by all of them, or any of them. What the Church does think—and is likely to think—may be guessed, in part, by the facts we have copied and stated: what the Church ought to think, these statistics, do not, of course open their mouth concerning: nor shall we, at present. Our wish is, that all these Seminaries may be furnished with every thing that is really necessary—houses, books, endowments, &c., &c., to enable them to do in the most effectual manner, the great and difficult work committed to them. Our conviction is, that they who do their work as it ought to be done—will rise higher: while they who do it otherwise, will sink lower. There are fluctuations in all things human; and these hidden causes at work always, disturbing the natural course of things: so that delay, and some uncertainty, must be expected, in all mortal things. But, unless we greatly deceive ourselves, the Presbyterian people of this country have made up their minds to provide and use an improved article in the way of preaching the Gospel. Let those whom it concerns, therefore, take heed; for verily they have much at stake.

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

FOR JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1856.

I. *The Christian Spiritualist (Rapper.)* Published by the Society for the diffusion of *Spiritual (Rapping) Knowledge*. New York, January 12th, 1856.

Some one having sent us this paper, which purports to be a sort of organ; we have had the curiosity to look into it, and the patience (for we mention it as a proof of our remarkable patience) to look through it. It has occurred to us that we might do a service to our readers, who have not been favored either with our opportunity or our patience, to present them with a sort of copy, on a reduced scale, of this picture of Spiritualism; by quoting and arranging in some sort of logical order, representative passages from this paper. The quoting would be easy enough, but as to the arranging, that is a more serious matter. For the (self-styled) "apostles of the New Dispensation" seem to reason with Rowan Hardin's dying client,

that as his is a *hard case*, he had better send for ministers of every sort of name, and thus *secure all the chances*. Or what may illustrate the case still more appropriately; as "fishers of men," they seem to operate altogether with what is known among fishermen—especially in muddy waters in the West—as a "*trot line*"—viz: a long rope stretched in the water, from which are pendant innumerable hooks, of all sorts of sizes, and freighted with all sorts of baits; the purpose being, while securing, in chief, the larger species, as the *mud-cat* and others, whose instincts render them a sure prey, yet incidentally also to catch the less wary occasional straggler of the *small fry*, whose instincts are less muddy—with a view to use them as bait for the next setting of the line(!) Hence, therefore, the difficulty of classifying the utterances of this oracle, and also the still greater difficulty of classifying its devotees, in whose Sabbath evening gatherings around some "inspired speaker," may be found not unfrequently side by side, a member of the last Tom Paine's birth-day committee, and a member perhaps of the last church business committee. We are driven, therefore, by the necessity of the case, to the use of parallel columns—by aid of which we may be able to exhibit, by representative extracts, from this organ, a true picture of this "*Christian Spiritualism*." And with a view to the greatest possible clearness and brevity, we arrange them under the heads severally of—Philosophy and Theology; of the church, and of themselves—then opinions of the doings of the body—and lastly, of the agencies by which the New Evangel is to be spread.

1. PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALISM.

1. "Of religion—to a thinking generation—that of Christianity is most vital; and this, because in its pure philosophy it is *in advance of all the creeds*, which from time to time have shaken the ground work of society." * * *

"The creeds which now exist, or have had existence in the world, may be said to be the mile marks, or eras of human intelligence, *suited to the capacities of particular races*."

"That Christ lived, was impaled, and died are historical facts. * * * But are we to be called upon to believe in a *miraculous birth*, and a *mysterious death* without proof. * * * Because we *reject a miserable legend* which has not the merit even of being new, are they to be consigned to eternal perdition. The Hindoo Mythology dating ages before the Christian era, abounds in *miraculous conceptions*, and other such stupendous narratives."

"To the church we say bear with us." "Spiritualism (is) not inimical to Christianity." For though conversing with spirits be forbidden by the Old Testament, yet, it is *only the New Testament* which any Protestant can recognize as authority in the case. "What then does faith in Spiritualism require? Only this, that miracles are now being wrought as in the time of Christ," &c. That the Bible and its teachings are a finality *for the sake of argument* we grant."

"Instead of entering into this wicked crusade against Spiritualism, the clergy should hail its re-appearance, its manifestations through miracles and clairvoyance, as an old and powerful ally, and co-worker with them in the great business of preparing souls for the joys of a never ending eternity. Such was the original object as proclaimed in the Scriptures."

"Mr. Pierpont, with Henry Ward Beecher, Chapin and others, have had something to say against wearing the beard and moustache. They are atheistic in logic, irreverent in character, impious in example, and inconsistent with these honored antecedents in Bible times—when thus making war on the beard."

2. OPINIONS OF THE CHURCH—AND OF THEMSELVES.

"Time honored faith is a tyrant over timid minds." "In addition to more than THREE MILLIONS OF BELIEVERS in the United States, Spiritualism numbers among its converts more than *twenty-five thousand* professed in-

The church is feared to-day by people who have no faith in its forms, doctrines

and dogmas, and who have no respect for it.

"Believer in the consoling doctrines of spiritual intercourse—those who *hast cast aside and forever*, the teachings of creed and form, be thine," &c., &c. "Let all Spiritualists who have become released from the bonds of the churches, read this little book."

"Thank God! the chains which have bound down the world, has been broken." &c.

3. OF THE DOINGS OF SPIRITUALISM.

"Some of the most refined and intellectual women of Troy are mediums of these private circles, and they all live in constant fear of the church. *Heart stricken widows steal away to the presence of mediums under cover of dark stormy nights to be strengthened and encouraged by their spirit husbands.*"

"The spirit of Lorenzo Dow came and answered several test questions. If this measure (excommunication) is carried out, it will leave some vacant spots in the body of the church, and break up some of the best choirs in the city," &c.

fidels, whom the teachings of the BIBLE and efforts of the clergy in VAIN SOUGHT TO ARREST, or control." (!)

"And yet when Spiritualism with its army of teachers tenders its services, it is spit upon, scoffed at, and rejected. Thus it was with the people of Israel who rejected the Saviour of mankind," &c.

"There hung the bell-wire all in scraps dangling down the wall. Who broke it? Some *unseen* power! Twang! Twang! went the wires Twang! Twang! A bonnet belonging to a young lady who dislikes spirits, was left a complete wreck."

Something like a heavy *arm or leg* floated over us * * while one was attempting to describe its manner, he was *slapped* upon the forehead so smartly, that every one in the room *heard the spank*. It would have been considered a sound one in the nursery! The tips of the fingers were downward as if from some one over head(!)

OF THE AGENCIES FOR PROMOTING SPIRITUALISM.

"It is with pleasure that the society for the diffusion of spiritual knowledge informs the public * * * That Miss Kate Fox resumes her labors at the rooms of the society, subject to the *direction and pay of the same*. She will sit without charge to the public, for the benefit of SCEPTICS, or such ENQUIRERS as are not yet convinced. * * * It is expected that those who are CONVERTED will not *occupy the time of the medium.*"

"Now received and offered for sale at the office of the CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALIST, the following works:

HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF ALL THINGS—written by God's Holy Spirits—through an earthly medium.

SPIRIT VOICES. Odes dictated by spirits. THE PHILOSOPHY OF CREATION, By THOS. PAINE, through the hand of Horace Wood, Medium, &c.

PARENTS' GUIDE, or *Child-birth made easy*. THE SPIRIT MINSTREL, a collection of Hymns for Spiritualists in the churches," &c. &c.

RESIDENCES OF MEDIUMS.

"Mrs. E. J. French, Clairvoyant and Healing Physician, 341 Broadway, G. A. Redman, Rapping, Tipping and Writing Medium, 45 Carver street Boston."

"J. M. BARNES, Publisher of the Lockport Messenger, devoted to *Spiritual and Anti-Slavery* principles, also dealer in *Spiritual, Anti-Slavery, and Liberal books.*"

"A. C. STILES, M. D., Bridgeport, Conn. Is developed as a Clairvoyant Medium, and can describe perfectly the locale of disease, and the feelings of the patient. Those who cannot personally visit him, CAN FORWARD A LOCK OF THEIR HAIR. Consultation fee \$1. *Best consulting physician of the age.*" (!)

"Mrs. LINES, Clairvoyant. Healing and developing medium.

Those who cannot attend in person, send a lock of hair for examination.

P. S. A small FEE to be sent in all letters containing hair."

Our space forbids further extracts from the Organ, but we think these may suffice to enlighten our readers concerning this wonderful phenomenon of the 19th century. We speak of it as *wonderful*. To us it is so.—Though not so much because of the wonderfulness of its strange spirit works, by half, as of the ineffably brazen-faced hypocrisy of the real flesh and blood, which dares call this *blasphemous* impertinence "*Christian*" spiritualism. After the birth of such a monster as Mormonism in that great centre of light—Western New York, and in the 19th century—we

cannot well be astonished at any possible degradation of the human mind. The effrontery of Joe Smith and Brigham Young was and is utterly ineffable. But what was theirs compared with the nauseous whine and cant of this vulgar infidel rant against the Word and the Church of God, baptizing itself "*Christian?*" The credulity of Joe Smith's dupes was immeasurable, yet what cool philosophic incredulity compared with the credulity of the victims of this imposture. We speak not now of the poor agonized, nervous females, already half insane, from loss of husband, children or friends, whom these impostors, with more than Moloch cruelty, lure into their dens, with the hope of a message from their dead. God forbid, our pen should ever drop a word of gall, into the cup of their bitterness! But what shall we say of *men*—at least those who physically wear the form of men—led by the nose after such imposture? To us this is the true wonder of this phenomenon. We care little to "*investigate*" (as their cant is) the wonders done by their "*spirits,*" till we shall first have solved the more puzzling riddle involved in the fact of such an insanity of credulity in the real flesh and blood. Nay, we might perhaps have been less surprised, that such a phenomenon should find a nativity in the land, become of late famous for its cod fish philosophy and *wooden nutmeg* theology; but to think of its ever "*playing its fantastic tricks*" outside the limits of the cod fish malaria,—even here in our own city;—this we confess is to us more amazing than all its achievements, through spiritual bell wires, spiritual bed-posts, or spiritual *spankings*. We confess ourselves *stumped*, at the threshold of the inquiry. The only solution we can find of the mystery, is one which would be scouted at by these progressive philosophers. It is that suggested by an ancient writer, "So that they are without excuse; because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were they thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God to four-footed beasts, (or still worse tables). * * * For this cause God gave them up to vile affections. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming—even him whose coming is after the manner of Satan, with all power and *signs and lying wonders*, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should (not become incredulous of every thing,) but that *they should believe a lie.*"

II. *Cyclopaedia of American Literature; embracing Personal and Critical Notices of Authors, and Selections from their Writings; from the earliest period down to the present day; with portraits, autographs and other illustrations.* By Evert A. Duyckinck and George L. Duyckinck. In two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner, 1855.

These imperial octavos, of about 700 pages each, must have required an immense research among worm-eaten pamphlets and forgotten biographical dictionaries. The specimens of writing are not taken from professed authors merely, but from sermonizers and pamphleteers. It is not to be expected, that in a work of such magnitude there should not be serious omissions. But there is one which is unaccountable to us. The compiler

give us a swarm of small fry, whose only chance for immortality is to be found in a compilation like this: they have not overlooked the Ballous, Hosea, Moses and Adin: they devote two whole pages (a large space in a work like this) to Mr. E. H. Chapin: but the name of a man who has written voluminously; who has done more to mould public opinion in this country, during the last quarter of a century, than any other one man connected with the Church; who has a world-wide reputation as a sort of representative American; a man, the lustre of whose name will be increasing, when the vast majority of those commemorated in this work will be known only to some indefatigable Dryasdust like the Messrs. Duyckinck—is not even mentioned, except incidentally in connection with one of the contributors to the Baltimore Religious and Literary Magazine, of inferior reputation to himself. That name is ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE. If the Messrs. Duyckinck ever undertake to publish a catalogue of the fixed stars, they will of course omit Sirius.

What makes the omission the more marked is, that the Compilers, in the Preface, call special attention to the honour they have done to the South. They have actually discovered that there is some intellectual power in that dark corner of the country; that it can boast of some names worthy to have a place alongside of obscure Unitarians and Universalists of the North; but one of the most illustrious of Southern men they did not chance to stumble on. The name of his brother John is in the Index; but, on turning to the page referred to, we find that he only figures in the back-ground of a sketch of Hughes, of New York! This is *American Literature* with a vengeance!

We cannot understand the principles upon which the "selections," illustrating the style and other characteristic of the authors, have been made. They appear to us, to border upon the ridiculous. But the art of book-making is a wonderful art; and we leave it to our Yankee neighbors.

The work may be examined at Rev. Mr. Guiteau's Book-store, Fayette street near Charles.

III. *The Gospel in Ezekiel, illustrated in a Series of Discourses.* By the Rev. Thomas Guthrie, D. D., of Edinburg. New York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1856. (From Mr. Guiteau's).

This series of discourses is based on a part of the thirty-sixth chapter of Ezekiel. The Preacher has all the liveliness of fancy which belongs to Dr. Cumming; but is a far better theologian. We have found none of that recklessness, or at least incautiousness, of statement in these sermons, which the Westminster Review, with some show of reason, charges upon the popular London preacher. Dr. Guthrie's faculty of "ideal presence" (as Lord Kaimes terms it) might have made him a rival of Thompson as a descriptive poet, if he had given himself to that kind of composition. His theology, though accurate, is not obtruded upon the reader. It is like the bones in the "valley of vision" of the same prophet, after they had become clothed with flesh, and the spirit of life had been breathed into them. We predict for Dr. Guthrie a more durable, if not a wider popularity, than that of Dr. Cumming.

IV. *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ; or the Engravings of the New Testament.* By the Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, B. A., Oxon. N. York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1855. (From Mr. Guiteau's).

Mr. Trench's work on the Parables has given an extraordinary impetus

to the study of those utterances of our Lord, which as miracles of speech, are scarcely less wonderful than His miracles of work : but we have not yet met with any treatise at all to be compared with that exquisite performance. Mr. Drummond differs from his predecessor, in giving a wider range to the Parable and including the Proverbs as well. He has erred, we think, in going too far ; as Trench, perhaps, has erred in not going far enough. His classification of the Parables is as follows : 1. Those which contemplate man as a member of Satan's kingdom. 2. Those which describe the Person of the Prince of the Kingdom of Light, with His principal offices. 3. Those which illustrate Christ's work of grace in its personal and experimental character. 4. Those concerning Christ's work of grace, in its historical and prophetic character. The tone of the book is evangelical.

It is gratifying to see the Messrs. Carter using their capital as publishers, under a sense of their *personal* responsibility to God ; while the sole purpose of other publishers, professing to be Christian men, seems to be the making of money. Not a few Christian tradesmen need to be sometimes reminded of the anecdote of the Baron and the Bishop. Men who aid in circulating such works as "Little Dorritt," whose aim or tendency is, to undermine the Sabbath and all true religion, and thereby to degrade men to the level of mere beasts of burden,—have a grave responsibility to meet. Alas ! that the mass of men should get their opinions, on the most important of all subjects, from dandies and perfumed exquisites, upon whom God has been pleased to confer great descriptive powers !

V. *The Smitten Household : or Thoughts for the Afflicted.* By Drs. Prime, Sprague, Bethune, Waterbury and Butler. New York : Anson Randolph, 1856.

Maria Cheeseman, or the Candy Girl : with a Preface by the Rev. James W. Alexander, D. D., of New York. Philadelphia : A. S. S. U. (From Mr. Guiteau's).

If the people who confine their reading to the daily newspaper,—which is emphatically a "map of busy life" in and of the world,—would look into such books as these, they might learn that something else exists on earth, beside the love of gain, the love of power and the love of sensual pleasure ; that murder, larceny, adultery, and Schuylerism, great and small, are not the only things done by men ; that there is such a thing as Christian sympathy and self-denying beneficence. The little book last named is a veritable history, and serves to show what can be done by persevering effort, in rescuing pauper children from ruin. It is a sufficient vindication of the Christian people of the great city of New York from the charge which is indiscriminately brought against them, of systematically neglecting the religious interests of the poor.

VI. *A Treatise on English Punctuation ; designed for Letter-Writers, Authors, Printers, and Correctors of the Press ; and for the use of Schools and Academies. With an Appendix, containing rules on the use of Capitals, a list of Abbreviations, Hints on the preparation of Copy and on Proof-Reading, etc.* By John Wilson. Fifth Edition. Boston, 1856.

A very useful book, evidently written by a practical printer. His reading, however, if we are to judge by the examples given under the rules, has been chiefly in Unitarian authors. Is it accidental, or is it another illustration of the policy of that little sect which employs every expedient except the preaching of the gospel in its proselyting efforts,—that so much of their fine-sounding nonsense is found here ? Addison, Johnson and Burke, we suppose, have been forgotten in the "Athens" of America.

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
BI-MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 2.

MARCH, 1856.

Vol. 2.

SEYMOUR ON ROMANISM—THE VIRGIN MARY.

The work entitled "Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome," by the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M. A., has been for some years before the world. It consists of "brief notes of conversations on the subject of religion held with certain Jesuits," while the author was residing in Rome. These champions of Popery were selected, as it would seem, from amongst the most subtle and practised dialecticians connected with the literary institutions of that city; they were men who had made victims of Protestants before, and had all the confidence and quiet self-possession in debate which experience and the memory of past victories are adapted to inspire; and some of them, perhaps, were really anxious for Mr. Seymour's salvation from the doom of a heretick, and talked with that persuasive manner which is the natural offspring of sincerity, but which it is hard for any but a Jesuit to assume. Whatever may be thought of their religious knowledge,—and it is extremely small according to any other than a papal standard,—they were men of very considerable attainments in science, men of renown among their fellows. Mr. Seymour's statements are pervaded by such an air of truthfulness, and indeed have so much antecedent probability to commend them, that we are sure no candid mind can hesitate to accept them as a record substantially authentick: and this being admitted, the perusal of his book will of necessity deepen our impressions of the pitiful weakness of the logical foundations of Romanism. The weakness of the system has a tolerably fair exponent, in the Jesuitical arguments—if we may be allowed to abuse that word,—recorded here. We ought to give up the theory of insanity, which is the fashionable method of accounting

for perversions to Popery, as it is for swindling and suicide, and adopt that of idiocy. We honestly confess that we can come to but one of three conclusions in regard to those who go Protestants to Rome, and are converted there by Jesuit reasonings. Either they listen with a foregone conclusion, and are Papists before they begin; or they are in such a state of natural imbecility as to be incapable of comprehending any principles of logick; or they are judicially abandoned and given up to believe a lie. A French manikin manufacturer could make as good a reasoning animal as one of Mr. Seymour's interlocutors.

His last work, reprinted in this country a few months ago, is entitled "Evenings with the Romanists;" and is mainly a record of the substance of conversations and familiar cottage lectures, among the Irish. It is a more valuable work by far than the other. The author was not exposed to the temptation of playing the Jesuit himself on a small scale, in his intercourse with the impulsive Celts, as he had been in his debates with the wary champions at Rome; and, consequently, there is an atmosphere of honesty and candour about this book, quite refreshing, after having just emerged from the sulphurous azote of the other. As to the Irish side of the controversy, it would be very faint praise to say, that they argue infinitely better than the learned priests at Rome; that is to say, the peasants; for when an Irish priest comes upon the stage, he seems smitten with the same fatuity as his Italian brethren. The great strength of the "Evenings with the Romanists" lies in the free and almost exclusive appeal to Scripture as the only umpire on all questions of religion. This is the sword of the Spirit, and is always the most effectual weapon in debates of this sort. It may now and then be necessary, in obedience to Scripture, to answer a fool according to his folly by turning his own weapons against himself: but where conviction, as well as victory, is our aim, we shall find no weapon so piercing as the ipsissima verba of the most High God. It is the incessant flashing of this trenchant blade in Mr. Seymour's chapters, which has produced a fluttering among his Episcopal brethren of a certain party; and which has led, we imagine, to the disreputable expedient of publishing a mutilated edition of the work. If a *two edged sword* be necessary to cut, at the same time, Popery and Tractarianism, here we have it. The author is a minister of the Church of England, and we cannot endorse every sentence in his book: but we hope the editions will be multiplied, until a copy is in the hands of all our American people. It is the best adapted book for popular circulation, on the subject of Romanism, we have ever seen. We say it is adapted for *popular* circulation, not as implying that there are any clap-trap, ad captandum arguments in it, such as often disgrace books intended for the many: but as being a simple, pointed, striking exhibition of the truth.

It is a book which any plain Christian may read to aid his devotion, as well as to furnish his mind. In the manner of putting his points, in his handling of Scripture, and in the general tone and spirit of discussion, we have been frequently reminded of the simple majesty of Jonathan Edwards. And we say again, that it is a book which cannot well be dispensed with by those who are called in providence to deal with Popery in the pulpit, in the market-place, and at the fire-side.

We transfer to our pages the greater part of the chapter on the Virgin Mary, as at once a fair specimen of the author's manner, and a conclusive argument in itself. The late superfluous blasphemy of the Roman See in "defining" the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, has given additional interest to the whole subject of Mariolatry in that apostate community.

Papal popular orators in the United States have industriously laboured to persuade the people,—and such is the ignorance of Mr. Chandler and others of his class, in regard to the dogmas of their own church, charity requires us to suppose that they themselves believe,—that Popery in this country, is essentially a different thing from Popery in Europe. Without stopping to ask,—if this be so, where is the boasted *unity* of the universal church of Rome?, we remark, that no greater difference exists between that church in Italy and the same church in the United States, than exists between that church in Italy and the same church in France or Ireland. *Cælum non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt*—ought to be as true of a community which boasts of being the "same always and everywhere," as it is of individuals. It is very evident that † John Hughes had a very strong conviction of the identity of American and Foreign Popery, when he thought proper, in his late lecture in Baltimore, to attempt the proof of the paradox, that such a religion as his could flourish in such a country as this; that the religion of besotted and down-trodden Rome *could* flourish in enlightened, free, and progressive America. But the reader will see from the extracts we have added from the "Freeman's Journal," (which blazons upon its front, the words, "The official organ of the Most Rev. Archbishop Hughes") that Mariolatry, the worship of the Virgin, is as deep an abomination here as across the seas. We insert these extracts, together with some from Brownson—who has been endorsed by all the Bishops—for the very purpose of forestalling this cry about the superiority of American Popery. It will be seen that not even a Protestant publick is any longer able to shame the priests and doctors of "Catholicity" out of an avowal, before the face of the sun, of their blasphemous absurdities.

THE VIRGIN MARY.

"The distinctive characteristic of the Church of Rome at the present day, is the worship of the Virgin Mary; not that it is a modern invention,

but that it has of late years assumed a prominence, all-pervading and all-absorbing, which it had not known before. I once remarked to an ecclesiastic in the city of Rome, that it appeared to me that *the religion of Christ*, as received in that city, would be more fitly called *the religion of Mary*. He replied, approving the sentiment, and adding that every year it was becoming more and more developed as—THE RELIGION OF MARY!

It is important, therefore, that we should understand something of the nature and extent of this worship.

In almost all the devotional books of the Church of Rome the Virgin Mary is styled—THE MOTHER OF GOD, and in most of the pictures and images in the churches she is crowned and sceptered and enthroned as—THE QUEEN OF HEAVEN. These titles are so frequently given to her, that they are regarded as distinctively belonging to her, as is that of—God of heaven, to the Almighty himself.

The origin of this is far deeper than a mere corruption of Christianity. It has its roots as deep and as universal as human nature. It originated in a symbol—a symbol universal among the nations in the darkness of heathenism. The ideal of the creative or productive power was intimately connected in their minds with the idea of maternity. It was a power that conceived and brought forth, and in ages in which it was thought necessary to represent the creator or creative power under a symbol, it was not unnatural to adopt the symbol of a WOMAN, as developing this idea of maternity. Accordingly, in almost all the mythologies of ancient times, whether in the east or in the west, there was a female divinity—a goddess whose maternity was worshiped. In one mythology it was Astarte of the Assyrians; in another it was Ashtoreth of the Sidonians; in another it was Bawaney of the Hindoos. In the classic mythology of Greece and of Rome, eclectic as it was, there was a Venus adopted from one, and a Juno from another. It is said, that the image of Diana of Ephesus was that of a female, from whose body, in every part, there seemed to be issuing all the various animals of creation, symbolizing the conception and production of all things. The Egyptians on one hand, and the Etruscans on the other, had their Isis, the same symbol, a female divinity whom they regarded as “the mother of the gods.”

Even the Scandinavian mythology had its Freigha; and of the two great systems of religion that held possession of the platform of the Roman Empire, namely, Judaism, and the classic mythology, the latter styled its Juno, the “Queen of Heaven,” and the former, when corrupted by the admixture of the heathenism around it, was charged by the prophet Jeremiah, with having also its “Queen of Heaven.” Jer. vii. 18, and Jer. xlv. 17. This divinity in all the systems had a mysterious and indefinite position. Her power and province were left very much to the imaginations of her votaries; it would seem as if it was an element congenial with all natural mythologies, as answering some impulse or feeling in the fallen and natural heart, that there should be the embodiment of some such idea—the symbol of the creation or production of all things, enthroned among the gods, as the Queen of Heaven. Now the argument against the Church of Rome is, that she has adopted that element of heathenism—that instead of imitating the prophet Jeremiah in denouncing this worship among the Jews—instead of following the apostle Paul in opposing it among the Gentiles; instead of fighting against this tendency of the people of the Roman Empire, she rather encouraged it; and though perhaps with the zealous but illregulated

desire to induce a more easy and extended profession of Christianity, she allowed the easterns to accept the Virgin, instead of Astarte—their former queen of heaven, and permitted the westerns to receive Mary, instead of Juno, the queen of heaven they had previously worshiped. It is not the least striking fact connected with this, that the two favorite titles ascribed to Mary in the Church of Rome—namely the “queen of Heaven,” and “mother of God,” are the very same titles ascribed to this female divinity—the goddess of the ancients. She was entitled in the east—the *mother of the gods*, and in the west—the *queen of heaven!* But, however it originated, there is no doubt that Mary is now as much recognized as worshiped in the Roman Church, as was the queen of heaven in the wide platform of the Roman Empire. In all its essential elements the Roman Empire and the Roman church—the Pagan Rome, and the Papal Rome are in accord in this matter. The transfer to Mary, of all the devotion previously paid to a Juno, an Astarte, an Ashteroth, or an Isis, does not alter the essence of the thing. It is as much idolatry to worship Mary, as it was to worship Juno, as the queen of heaven.

There are persons in Italy and Spain who freely and readily admit much of this, and say that the prevalence of this conception, of a female divinity among so many ancient mythologies, was as it were the dispersed and scattered element of a coming truth—a sort of all-pervading prophecy or anticipation of a future reality—a looking into the depths of the future, as “coming events cast their shadows before,” and that all was to be fulfilled in the exaltation of the Virgin Mother. They imagine, that as the promise of a Messiah was once universally spread among the families of Noah, and as it passed by tradition through many generations, so the woman, through whom He was to come, became a hope, a creation in their mythologies, and was thus the great archetype of all these female divinities of the heathen world. Persons who believe this, argue, that when the nations lost all knowledge of the true God, and created false gods for their worship, and worshiped them in his stead, their idolatry consisted not in their worship of god, but in their worshipping a false one; and in like manner the idolatry of the heathen was not their worshipping a female divinity, but in worshipping these that were false, instead of her who is revealed as the only true one—even Mary. This view of the subject is a favorite one in countries where Mary is worshiped, not indeed in name and title, *as a goddess*, but with all the same reverence and devotion and service and worship, *as if she were a goddess*. There can be no question as to the fact that, in those countries, she is the divinity prayed to more frequently—loved more fervently—worshiped more devoutly, and depended on more entirely, than either God, the Son, or the Holy Spirit. Whether the Church of Rome approves of this is another question; but of the matter of fact, there can be no doubt whatever.

All this, it is apparent, only makes the charge of idolatry more strictly and painfully applicable. That which was the religion of Christ is gradually becoming the religion of Mary. And in these countries it is customary, as with us, to speak of, the *religion of Christ*, so with them to speak of the *religion of Mary*.

The answer, however, which they usually give on this subject is, that they do not worship Mary *as a goddess* or *as a divinity*—that they regard her as a creature; the most exalted of all, even as queen of angels and of men, but a creature still—that they feel as strongly as ourselves the hei-

nous sin of giving divine worship to a creature—that they give to her a different worship—an inferior worship to that which they give to God. And that, inasmuch as they do not worship her *as God* or *as a goddess*, they are not liable to the charge of idolatry, which, in their view, consists of giving to a creature that kind and degree of worship which belongs only to the Creator.

I have answered this by reminding them that our charge against the Church of Rome, was not that she worshiped Mary *as a goddess*; our charge was, that she worshiped her *as a creature*; that knowing her to be only a creature, a woman, she worshiped her as God only ought to be worshiped. If the Church of Rome regarded her *as a goddess*, and worshiped her *as such*, it would at least be consistent; but regarding her *as a creature*, and worshiping her *as a woman*, with a religious worship which belongs exclusively to God, is the very essence of idolatry.

I have often asked yet further—wherein consists the difference between *the worship paid to Mary*, and *the worship rendered to God*? The offering prayer—the presenting Hymns of praise—the making solemn vows—the consecration of the votary to her service—the devoting gifts and offerings of wealth—the dedication of children—the sacrifice of the Mass—all these are done to Mary, and in honor of Mary, as well as to God, and in honor of God. They pray to her by her sufferings beneath the cross.—They plead her merits even as they do those of Jesus Christ. And therefore I ask—wherein consists the distinction in the Church of Rome, between the worship *paid to Mary*, and the worship *paid to God*?

The following illustrates the full extent of the power she is supposed to possess, not indeed inherently, but by cession from her Son. We read in “The Glories of Mary,” by SAINT Alphonso de Liguori:

“St. Bernardine of Sienna does not fear to advance that all, even *God himself*, is *subject to the empire of Mary*. The saint wishes to insinuate thereby, that God hears Mary’s prayers, as if they were commands. The Lord, O Mary, says St. Anselm, has so exalted you that his favor has rendered you omnipotent! yes, says Richard of St. Lawrence, Mary is omnipotent, for according to all laws the queen enjoys THE SAME PRIVILEGES as the king, and that power may be EQUAL between the Son and the mother. Jesus has rendered Mary OMNIPOTENT; the one is omnipotent by nature, the other is omnipotent by grace,” c. vi. sec. 1.

There is here an ascription of the Divine attribute of OMNIPOTENCE to Mary. There is also an assertion of an EQUALITY in “privilege” and in “power” with Jesus Christ. There is also a statement that God himself is SUBJECT to the empire of Mary. As this awful statement professes to be founded on a saying of Saint Bernardine, the original words may here be cited. The words of SAINT Bernardine are these:

“*As many creatures serve the glorious Virgin Mary as serve THE TRINITY*, namely, all created things, whatsoever degree they may hold in creation, whether spiritual as angels, or rational as men, or corporeal as the heavenly bodies or the elements. And all things that are in Heaven and in earth, whether they be the damned or the blessed, *all which are brought under the government of God, are likewise subject to the glorious Virgin*. Forasmuch as He, who is the Son of God, and of the blessed Virgin, wishing to *make the sovereignty of his mother EQUAL in some sort to the sovereignty of his Father*, even He, who was God, served his mother on earth. Whence, Luke ii. 51, it is written of the Virgin and the glorious Joseph, ‘He was

subject unto them,' that as this proposition is true—all things are subject to the command of God, even the Virgin herself, so this again is also true—all things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God himself."

These words make the government of the Virgin *co-extensive* with the government of God. They also expressly state that Christ has willed the sovereignty of the Mother to be *equal* with the sovereignty of the Father. They also state that as the Virgin is subject unto God, so it is *equally true* that God is subject to the Virgin!

These are the sentiments of SAINT Bernardine and SAINT Alphonso de Liguori. And in the act of canonization of the saints, it is declared by the Church of Rome, that there is no error contained in their writings. These words, therefore, are pronounced to be free from error! And yet a Christian can not read them without inexpressible sadness and dread.

The American Romanists endorse the foregoing doctrine, and St. Alphonsus's work above cited. Brownson begins a Review of this work thus:—"The *Glories of Mary*, by St. Alphonso di Liguorio, is a standard work on the subject of which it treats, and too well known and too highly appreciated to require, or to admit, any other notice of it at our hands than the simple announcement of its publication. The works of the saints are to be read and meditated, not criticised, and whoever finds himself unable to relish the *Glories of Mary* must accuse himself, not the author. The edition before us is a new translation of the unabridged work of the Saint, from the Italian, by an estimable lady of New York, like ourselves a convert from Unitarianism, and has been executed at the suggestion, and under the supervision of the children of St. Alphonsus established in this country. The translator has, we doubt not, found in the performance of her pious labour an ample reward, for Our Lady never fails to obtain rich graces for those who devote themselves to her service." * * * "But we have named these works merely as the occasion of some remarks which we wish to offer, in the light of Catholic faith and theology, on the honour which we as Catholics pay to Our Lady, *the Most Holy Mother of God and Queen of Heaven, our life, our sweetness, and our hope.*" In the same article, an argument is made upon Luke 1: 38, to show that Mary's consent was necessary, before the Incarnation could take place. Brownson says:—"There was then a moment when the salvation of the world depended on the consent of Mary. Man could not be redeemed, satisfaction could not be made for sin, and grace obtained, without the Incarnation, and the Incarnation could not take place without the free, voluntary consent of the humble Jewish maiden." (Brownson's Quarterly Review, Jan., 1853, pp. 1, 2, 15.) The imprimatur of twenty-odd Bishops of the Church in America is on the cover of this number. As to the extent of this endorsement, see "Critick" Vol. 1, pp. 320—329.

This system of placing Mary practically on an *equality* with Christ is

carried out in a variety of ways. The following prayer is a well-known instance :

“Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, have mercy on us.

“Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, receive my last breath.

“Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, receive me now and in the hour of death.”

Another illustration is in the closing words of “The Glories of Mary.”

“O Jesus! O Mary! may your names live in my heart and in the hearts of all men! may I forget all other names in order to remember your admirable names alone! O Jesus, my Redeemer! O Mary, my Mother! when my last hour shall come, when my soul shall be at the eve of its departure from the world, grant, I beseech you, that my last words may be—Jesus! Mary! I love you! Jesus! Mary! I give you my heart and my soul.—Amen.”

This certainly places Mary on an equality with Christ as one to be prayed to, invoked, and loved alike. The Spanish form of the doxology is still more striking

“Glory be to the Father.

“Glory be to the Son.

“Glory be to the Holy Ghost.

“Glory be to the Most Holy Virgin.

“Throughout all ages, forever and ever. Amen!”*

It is due to many Roman Catholics of the laity, to say that I have never read these and similar passages from the devotional books of the Church of Rome, while conversing with her members, without observing shame and confusion in the faces of my opponents. It is the homage they are forced to pay to truth. It is always apparent that they feel such language to be blasphemous and idolatrous; or, at least, that it approaches thereto—that it justifies the strong feeling that we manifest against the practice; that such language completely cuts away the ground under their feet; and it comes before them vexatiously when arguing with us; and they have no answer or explanation further than, that these passages have a meaning widely different from what they seem to convey—that they are to be understood in what they call a *Catholic sense*—that a Catholic reads them with a *Catholic sense*; and that they do no harm to one who knows that, however idolatrous and blasphemous the language may seem, yet it is not to be understood in that sense. I have asked what that Catholic sense was, and I never could learn it. It certainly must be something very different from the natural construction of the words.

I have pressed this matter further; I have asserted that in these books they not only place Mary sometimes on an equality with Christ, but sometimes above him.

And first for placing her on an equality with Christ.

I can never, while I live, forget the shock I received when I first saw in their churches in Italy the Virgin Mary crowned as Queen of Heaven, seated on the same throne with Jesus crowned as King of Heaven. They were the God-man and the God-woman enthroned alike. In all my previous experience of Romanism it never occurred to me for a moment that any thing so truly awful could possibly have been perpetrated. I felt the shock; every holy feeling felt its violence; no heathen idolatry could have done more. There were Jesus and Mary, crowned alike, enthroned alike, bearing a scepter alike. There was nothing to distinguish one above the

* See Meyrick's “Working of the Church in Spain.”

other. They appeared precisely like a Jupiter and Juno, like a man and wife, like a king and queen. And I loathed in my soul such representations, as elevating the creature Mary to a level with the God Christ, or lowering the God Christ to a level with the creature Mary. It made them both on an equality. They were god and goddess, or they were merely man and woman. I soon found that this pervaded the whole region of Italy. However kindly I might be disposed to interpret or explain, and however gently I might be disposed to judge, I could not shut my eyes or ears to the evidence that there was a manifest tendency to exalt Mary to a level with Jesus, that she should be crowned, sceptered, and enthroned alike, and that she should be loved and served and worshiped alike, and that Christianity should be made the religion of Mary as well as the religion of Christ.*

But this was by no means the only or most sad evidence of an equality. It is painful—it is saddening, to commit the dark and dreary reality to paper. It is enough to freeze the blood of any Christian man; and yet it is the common, I may say, the universal faith of Southern Europe. It is this: whatever were the mysteries or glories connected with the miraculous conception, the miraculous birth, the miraculous resurrection, the miraculous ascension; whatever were the mysteries of wonder and of awe in the history of Jesus Christ, they are all copied or rather travestied and applied to the Virgin Mary; so as that she may appear as wondrous a person as Jesus Christ, as having been characterized by an immaculate conception as miraculous, a birth as wonderful, a resurrection as marvelous, and an ascension or assumption as glorious. Whatever were the miracles of awe and of mystery and of glory connected with one, are claimed and attributed to the other. And to such an extent is this carried, that in some of their churches the paintings on one side represent the striking incidents that give wonder to the birth and life and death of Jesus Christ, and on the other side the very same or similar incidents as characteristic of the birth and life and death of the Virgin Mary. For example, if on one side of the church there is painted the angel announcing to Mary the miraculous conception of Jesus, it is paralleled by another on the other side, representing an angel announcing to Anna the immaculate conception of Mary. If there be on one side the miraculous birth and the infancy of the Son, there will be on the other the birth and infancy of the mother. If here there is a representation of the reception of the child Jesus by the High Priest in the temple, there is another representing the presentation of the child Mary under similar circumstances. In one compartment there may be seen represented the death of the Saviour, and opposite may be seen in another compartment a representation of all connected with the death of the Virgin. Here we see portrayed all connected with the resurrection of the Lord, and there we see in like manner all the apocryphal details of the resurrection of the Mother. On one side may be seen all that human art can do to exhibit the glories of the ascension of Jesus Christ, and on the other side all that the most exquisite art can accomplish to represent the glories of the assumption of Mary. Here the eye is arrested to see

* In the Baptistery of Parma there is a representation of the Trinity. At the top of the triangle is the Father. At the two angles of the base are the Son and the Mother; the two arms of the Father resting on the heads of the Son and Mary, form the legs of the triangle; while the arms of the Son, extended to the head of Mary, form the base. I looked at it with horror! The Sacristan smiled, and called it the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Virgin.

the paintings of Jesus Christ entering the heavens and enthroned and crowned as the King of Heaven, and there the eye is attracted to another painting of Mary entering the heavens and enthroned and crowned as Queen of Heaven. In all the miracles and mysteries of His life, she is placed on a level with Him. If she is not the rival, she certainly is the equal in every wonder and mystery. And, therefore, in one half the churches of Italy, Mary may be seen crowned with a like crown, seated on the same throne, and holding a similar scepter with Jesus Christ. It is impossible to see all this and not feel that it embodies an item in the popular faith of the Church of Rome; and that she, in authorizing these pictures in her churches, does authorize the notion, so prevalent, that the Virgin Mary is the equal of Jesus Christ; not, indeed, in the essence of her nature, but in something which she has never defined, and which is left to the imaginations of her votaries.

The Church of Rome has taken away the Holy Scriptures, and has given these pictures to the people in their stead. God gave the Holy Scriptures to teach the people, and the Church of Rome has taken them away, on the ground that the people might mistake their meaning; and she has given in their stead these pictures, which are still more liable to lead them astray. God has permitted no error in that Book which He has given; and the Church of Rome was bound to see that there was no error in these pictures which she has substituted for them. The truth is, that the Holy Scriptures do not teach the doctrines of Rome, and therefore she has removed them; while those pictures do teach her unscriptural tenets; and therefore she allows them. The people naturally think that what is permitted to be seen in the Church is authorized by the Church. These pictures come before them with all the apparent sanction of the Church; and no one can be surprised that, seeing them, they regard Mary as equal with Jesus Christ.

I have sometimes called the attention of my Roman Catholic friends to the practice in the Church of Rome of taking those passages of the Holy Scripture which are applicable only to Jesus Christ, and applying them to Mary; and even going so far as to apply to her the distinctive titles that belong to Him. In the devotional books of that Church, even in her authorized litanies, as the litany of the Virgin, the very titles that in Holy Scripture are applied to Jesus Christ are addressed to her. In the Holy Scripture He is styled "the Advocate with the Father;" in those books she is addressed as "our advocate." If in Holy Scripture He is called "the one Mediator," in these books she is called "our mediator, or mediatrix." If in Holy Scripture He is described as "the Door," or Gate, in these books she is designated as "the gate." If in Holy Scripture He is described as the "Refuge for sinners," in these books she is likewise declared to be the refuge for sinners. If in the word of God He is called "the Father of mercies," she is styled in these books "the mother of mercy." If in Holy Scriptures He is "our Saviour," in these books she is also designated "our saviour." If He is styled in Scripture "the Good Shepherd," she is called "the divine shepherdess." If He is "our Lord," she is "our lady;" and if He is the "King of Heaven," she is proclaimed the "queen of heaven." She is thus, as far as the language of Holy Scripture goes, placed on an equality with Him, and although they profess not to mean or intend this, yet it is enough that they do it, and that every one who reads their devotional books may see it, and read it for themselves.

Hear American Popery again, through Brownson:—"Mary is thus called, and rightly called, 'The Mother of Grace', for she is it inasmuch as she is mother of the Sacred Flesh through which grace has been purchased and is communicated to us." * * * "So long as spiritual life is dependent on God in His human nature, so long is Mary truly the mother of spiritual life, and so long as she is the mother of that life, so long is she our spiritual mother, and to be honoured as such, and honoured even more than our natural mother, for the spiritual life is infinitely more than the natural life. Mary is also our spiritual mother, inasmuch as it has been through her intercession that we have been regenerated, and hope to obtain the gift of perseverance." * * * "We are unworthy clients of Mary, and we may fail of beholding her and her Divine Son in heaven, but we have no hope to persevere unto the end but through her intercession for us; and we are sure that we become acceptable to her Son, only in proportion as we love and honour her. She is our sweet mother; she is the mother of our life, of our hope, and we pray to her to obtain grace for us that we may be made worthy to be termed her son." (Art. above cited, pp. 14, 19, 24.)

Of the same import, are the following sentences from the "Freeman's Journal" of January 6th, 1855. They are taken from the editorial leader:—"The glorious news has reached us that on the eighth of December, Pope Pius IX., of immortal renown, in the presence of the Cardinals and Princes of the Church, declared it an article of Divine Faith that THE MOTHER OF GOD, OUR MOST BLESSED LADY WAS CONCEIVED WITHOUT ORIGINAL STAIN. He that has ears to hear, let him hear! He that is athirst, let him leave off waiting beside dry and broken cisterns [Query? John 4: 10, 7: 37], and make haste to this City of God, which is made glad by the torrent of a river flowing from the living fountain of waters." [Qu. The Virgin?] * * * "The very depths of human misery and anguish have plead before the throne of God for a *more powerful intercession*; and the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, has taught by His church truths that the world in earlier ages was not able to bear. A new banner is raised on the walls of our salvation. It is set up by a strong hand, and one that cannot fail." * * * "Let the Catholics of America acknowledge their past tepidity of faith, and hasten to shake it off. Let us betake ourselves to our great Patroness—MARY OF IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. Let faith, and hope, and charity, grow strong within us, and let us remember that God has set our task before us—that of being, all of us, in our various places, missionaries of the '*Tabernacle of God with men*, [Qu. The Virgin?] whose great business it is to save our own souls, and to convert this young and mighty nation to the love of God, who was born, for love of it and us, of the IMMACULATE VIRGIN."

We cite one more passage from Brownson, to show how the doctrine concerning Mary has been growing in his capacious and stable understanding, in the lapse of three years. In the number of his Review for January, 1856, we have the following latest exposition of the theory of the Church:—"If it be asked, since the Church in one sense is the congregation of the faithful, Where was the Church or what was the Church organization prior to the gathering of believers? we might answer by asking, Where or what was natural humanity prior to individual men and women? If humanity is inconceivable without individuals, individuals are equally inconceivable without humanity. But we will not insist on that answer. The Church derives from Christ, through the Incarnation, typified in the fact that Eve was taken from the side of Adam, and formed from him, bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh. Regarded as prior to the visible congregation of believers, *the Church was in the Blessed Virgin, from whom our Lord assumed His flesh.* Hence the Blessed Virgin, a mother and yet a virgin, is termed the Mother of God, and the Spouse of the Holy Ghost. *She is the second Eve, as Christ is the second Adam; the mother, as He is the father, of regenerated humanity.* In a certain sense, we may even say that she is the Church, and hence the Saints apply to her those texts and epithets which they apply to the Church herself. She is in more than a figurative sense our spiritual mother. *She is the mother of grace, through whom flows the Christian life, and through whom we receive from God His gifts and graces.* As the mother of our Redeemer, she is intimately connected with the work of our Redemption, and participates in our regeneration. Hence the reasonableness and justice of that high honour and deep veneration which we Catholics render her, the filial love we bear her, and the prominent place she holds in our devotions, so scandalous to no-Church Protestants, and which they foolishly, not to say *blasphemously*, affect to brand as 'Mariolatry.' Poor men! How little do they understand of the mystery of the Incarnation, and of the part of Our Lady, through the grace and election of God, in the conception, birth, and progress of the Christian life." (Rev. for Jan., 1856, pp. 4, 5.)

There lies upon our table a book with the following title:—"The Holy House of Loretto: or an Examination of the Historical Evidence of its miraculous Translation. By the *very* Rev. P. R. Kenrick, V. G. Philadelphia: Published by Eugene Cumiskey, 130 South Sixth Street." The author, we suppose, is the dignitary whose imprimatur appears on the cover of Brownson's Review, as "† Peter Richard, Archbishop of St. Louis." He attempts to show, that the house "in which the Virgin was born and brought up at Nazareth, in which she received the message of the Angel Gabriel, and conceived the Son of God,

and in which her Divine Son lived with her, until the time of his manifestation among men,"—was taken up from its foundation, and transported whole, (through the air, or in some other miraculous way) first to Dalmatia on the Eastern Shore of the Adriatic; then, across the gulf, to Italy into the midst of a wood in the district called Lauretum (Loretto;) then, to a small hill, not far distant from the road; and lastly, to its present site!! We say, here are one hundred and eighty odd pages written by an Archbishop—the book, perhaps, being the cause of his promotion—to prove to the people of the United States, in this nineteenth century, the historical verity of a ridiculous old wives' fable, which, according to his own showing, has been rejected by a number even of European Papists!! *Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat.*

And not only this: they have gone further; for in the well-known Psalter of Saint Bonaventura, a portion of which was republished with authority in Rome, in 1844, every prayer, every blessing, every thanksgiving that the sacred Psalmist addressed to God, is altered and adapted to the Virgin Mary, as being to be ascribed to her, and prayed of her. The title "God" is omitted, and "Mary" substituted for it. The title "Lord" is removed, and "lady" inserted in its stead. The awful character of this blasphemy and sacrilege can only be understood by examples. Even the Lord's prayer is altered and addressed to her—"Our lady who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name," etc.; and the *Te Deum* is changed and addressed to her—"We praise thee, O Mary; we acknowledge thee to be the lady," etc.

And now, as to elevating Mary *above* Christ.

These devotional books proceed further. If they sometimes elevate Mary to be the equal with Christ, they also sometimes elevate her beyond and above Him in all the attributes of mercy and love. I have myself been witness to this; for in my conversations with the priests at Rome, they repeatedly asserted that as Christ was the Judge who must deal justice, and as Mary was the "mother of mercy," who could exercise pity and love; so it was better for us to pray through her than through Christ; that His nature and characteristic was justice and not mercy; and that hers was mercy and not justice: and that God heard those prayers sooner which were offered through her, than those that were offered through Him. This belief is prevalent now universally in the south of Europe.

The following passage from "The Glories of Mary" will illustrate this in their own words, c. 4. sec. 1.

"In order to increase our confidence in Mary, SAINT Anselm assures us that *our prayers will often be more speedily heard in invoking her name, than in calling on that of Jesus Christ*; and the reason he assigns is, that Jesus being no less our Judge than our Saviour, he must avenge the wrongs we do him by our sins. While the Holy Virgin being solely our advocate, is obliged to entertain only sentiments of pity for us. We are far from insinuating, nevertheless that she is *more powerful* than her son; Jesus Christ is our only Mediator, He alone has obtained our reconciliation with God the Father; but as in rendering to Him, whom we must necessarily consider a judge who will punish the ungrateful, it is probable a sentiment of fear may lessen the confidence necessary for being heard, it would seem that in applying to Mary, whose office is that of mercy, our hope would be

so strong as to obtain all we ask for. *How is it, that whereas we ask many things of God without obtaining them, we no sooner ask through Mary than they are granted us?*"

This assuredly is strong language, and as strange as it is strong. It plainly teaches, that prayers presented through Mary are more readily heard than prayers presented through Jesus Christ. It is practically dashing the Mediatorial crown from the brow of Jesus, and hurling Him from the Mediatorial throne; and as a greater blasphemy could not be uttered, so a greater sacrilege could not be committed by man or devil. But it does not stand alone. Let the following speak for itself.

"We read in the chronicles of St. Francis, that brother Leo once saw in a vision, two ladders, one red, on the summit of which was Jesus Christ, and the other white, on the top of which presided his blessed Mother. He observed that many who endeavored to ascend the first ladder, after mounting a few steps, fell down. And on trying again were equally unsuccessful, so that *they never attained the summit*. But a voice having told them to make trial of the white ladder *they soon gained the top*, the blessed Virgin having held forth her hands to help them." c. 8. sec. 3.

These are the words of SAINT ALPHONSO, in whose writings it is asserted that there are no errors. And these words are from that very book of which a new edition has been published, with the authority and recommendation of Cardinal Wiseman. And yet these words plainly teach that those who seek to enter heaven by Jesus Christ "never attain the summit," while those who approach through the Virgin Mary "soon reach" their place of glory!

It is plainly implied by the former extract, that Mary is more accessible, more pitiful, more merciful than Jesus Christ; at least that He is a Judge to avenge, and she is an advocate to compassionate—that He is all justice, and she is all mercy—and that our prayers when offered through her are more easily and quickly answered than when offered through him. This certainly is placing Mary above Christ, in that which is the gem of the royal diadem, mercy and compassion. In the second extract this is carried out to its natural sequence. Those that approach heaven by Christ fail. Those that approach by Mary succeed. And this at least is placing her above him, in the matter of our salvation. The ladder or way red with his blood has failed; while that which is white with her virginity is found to succeed. Christ is described as giving no help. Mary is pictured as putting forth her hand and saving!

And now the question comes—What saith the Scripture?

The contrast is striking indeed. The devotional books of the Church of Rome are full, even to overflowing of *the religion of Mary*. The Holy Scriptures contain nothing of it, but only *the religion of Christ*.

The Holy Scriptures "given by inspiration of God," and "able to make us wise unto salvation through faith," say nothing whatever respecting her birth, as little as possible concerning her *life*, and not one word about her *death*. This silence is significant.

But the Church of Rome, instead of imitating the Divine silence, has supplied material in abundance; she professes to tell us all about the marriage of her parents—her own miraculous birth—the incidents of her childhood—her intercourse with Joseph—her betrothal and marriage—her conversations with the kings of the east—her after life—her death, burial, and assumption into heaven—her coronation as queen of heaven, of angels and of saints! An inventive genius has not been wanting.

There is in all that concerns Mary, a strange contrast indeed between the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Church of Rome.

It is not the least remarkable fact of the gospel history, that it does not give a single instance of our Lord's having addressed Mary as *his mother*. The gospels omit all mention of his childhood, except that he was subject to his parents, and of course that they directed him as his parents, and that he obeyed them as their child. But in all his ministerial life—from the moment of his manifesting his Messiahship—from the baptism in the Jordan, he never once addresses Mary as *his mother*. He seems never to have recognized her as such.

There are only three instances in the Holy Scriptures where our Lord is described as speaking to Mary.

I. The first occurred in his childhood. He left his parents, and they knew not where he was. They found him among the doctors in the temple. The Gospel narrates, Luke ii. 48—51, that "when they saw him, they were amazed, and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them. And he went down with them, and became subject unto them: but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart." This incident occurred in his childhood and these his first words detailed as addressed to Mary, certainly do not justify any very extravagant devotional language toward her on our part.

II. The next occasion was after he had commenced his public teaching.

The Gospel narrates, John ii. 3, 4, "When they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, they have no wine. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." He here addresses her not as his "mother," but simply as "woman," a term not of contempt or of slight, but the term of respect or courtesy ordinarily applied to females. He thus addresses her with no peculiar deference, but only with the same language in which he would have addressed any other woman present. And when he adds "What have I to do with thee?" or as the Roman Catholics translate it, "What is it to me, and to thee?" the words seem to convey some gentle reproof for her interference, implying that he could not recognize any thing in common between them—any relation which could justify her interfering; and though she might think the time was come for his intended miracle, he preferred waiting longer, "*My time,*" he said, "is not yet come."

III. The last instance of his addressing Mary was on the cross. He could then see her natural sorrows—the sorrows of a mother beside a dying son. One might suppose it the occasion of drawing from him language of touching endearment and tenderness—but no. He knew what was in man, and knew what any endearing or tender words toward her might and would be perverted into words to justify the worship of a woman. He therefore would not even call her his mother; he addressed her only as he would have addressed any other female, "Woman." And he commits her, now widowed, childless, destitute, to the care of his loved disciple John; and desires her to regard John in future as her son, and desires John to protect her as his mother in future. "Woman," said he, "behold thy son!" and addressing John—"Behold thy mother!" And in obedience to this dying wish, the beloved disciple "took her unto his own home. John was to be a son to Mary, and Mary was to be a mother to John.

In these, which are the only instances in which our Lord is described as having spoken to Mary, there certainly is nothing to warrant the high, extreme, extravagant language of devotion which characterizes the devotional books of the Church of Rome. On the other hand, the fact—the simple fact—that in all the gospel history these are the only instances recorded; the simple fact that there is a settled, formal, deliberate silence on the subject, is calculated to convey the feeling that the Holy Ghost designed to cut away all excuse or occasion or ground for such language of devotion and worship, as He, who knew the future as well as the present, foresaw would be introduced into the Church.

But the Holy Scriptures go further than this. Our Lord is described as speaking twice about his mother; and on both occasions his words bear a wonderful significance.

I. The first is in Matt. xii. 46—“While he yet talked to the people, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in Heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.” He thus heard of Mary wishing to speak with him; He does not comply; He remains as he was; and though He had then the opportunity of magnifying her before the eyes of all, He carefully avoids it, and seems not so much as to recognize her as His mother. He asks—“Who is *my mother*?” and he answers the question Himself—“Whosoever will do the will of my Father which is in Heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.” Whatever the tie or the love He owed a mother, should now be the tie and love which He would feel for all who do the will of God; and other relationship He recognized not. He was now the manifested Messiah, and He knew no ties on earth but that common manhood which gave Him sympathy with all the people of God.

II. The second instance in which He is narrated as speaking of His mother is still more remarkable. Luke xi. 27—“It came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked! But he said, Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.” Here is a woman, in the feeling so natural in a woman, blessing her who was the mother of Jesus. She blesses the womb that bore Him and the breast which suckled Him. It is to this day the universal argument among the members of the Church of Rome. And here we learn how our Lord regarded it. His answer is remarkable; “Yea,” was his confirmation of the words of the woman. She was indeed blessed who had borne and suckled Him; but there was a greater blessedness still than this—and however great was the blessedness of Mary as His mother, there was a blessedness still greater which every Christian woman may possess; for, “rather blessed,” that is, “more blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.” If, then, any woman among us would have a blessedness, still greater than that which Mary possessed, as his mother, she has only to hear the word of God and keep it.

Truly there is a great contrast between the words of the Holy Scriptures and the teaching of the Church of Rome.

One only consideration remains ; it is that connected with what is called—most untruly called—the Angelical Salutation.

A young man, a fine, open, generous fellow, who was very earnest and zealous for the religion of Rome, stopped me one day to ask me whether “the Angelical Salutation” was not in the Holy Scriptures ; that a Protestant had denied it to him ; and he wished to hear it from myself.

I asked him to repeat it for me.

He did so.—“Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee.

“Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of the womb—
JESUS.

“Holy Mary, pray for us now and at the hour of death. Amen.”

I then said, that it consisted of three parts. There was, first, the salutation of the angel : there was, next, the words of Elizabeth, the mother of the Baptist : and, lastly, there was a prayer of the Church of Rome, which is not in the Holy Scriptures at all.

He did not seem quite to understand me ; so I produced my little Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament, and showed him the place in Luke, i. 28—“Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women.” There is nothing more, I remarked, in the angel’s salutation.

He read it again and again ; he was inexpressibly puzzled ; but, he asked me, where was the rest of it ? Was not the rest of it a part of the Angelical Salutation ?

I replied, of course, that it was not, and showed him the second part of it in Luke, i. 42. It was not the angel—it was Elizabeth who said, “Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.” I desired him to read it for himself

He read it, and paused, and read it again and again, and asked where was the remainder of it ? He seemed perplexed, and, as I thought, angered and chagrined.

I said, that the third part was, “Holy Mary, pray for us now and at the hour of death,” and this was not spoken by the angel, nor by Elizabeth, and was not in the Holy Scriptures at all. It was the mere invention of the priests of Rome. And, I added, it was wickedly added to the angel’s salutation ;—it had been wickedly taught to you under the name of the angel’s salutation ;—it has been wickedly done to deceive you into the belief that the angel prayed to Mary, that you might be induced to think it could not be wrong for you to do what the angel did, and thus to pray to Mary to pray for you. Here is the Roman Catholic translation ; you can judge for yourself.

He looked on the ground for a few moments—clasped his hands almost convulsively—covered his face with his hands—then letting them fall, he said, with a voice of deep pathos—O, sir, when our clergy deceive us, poor, ignorant people, thus, what is to become of us, and what are we to believe ? He spoke with intense earnestness.

I said—God has given to you His word, the Holy Scriptures : He has told you “they are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith.” He has commanded you to “search the Scriptures ;” read and believe them, and then no man shall be able to deceive you.

I believe you are right, was his only reply, as he left me very thoughtfully.

It may here be noticed that there is nothing in the angel’s salutation to justify either prayer or worship to the Virgin Mary.

The word, "Hail" does not justify it, for it was only the ordinary salute of the time, and was addressed by our Lord himself to his disciples: he said, "All hail," when certainly he did not pray to them nor worship them.—Matt. xxviii. 9.

The words—"The Lord be with thee," do not justify it, for the very same words are addressed also by the angel to Gideon, "The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valor;" Judges vi. 12, and certainly they do not entitle Gideon to any worship.

The words—"Thou art highly favored," or, as the Romanists translate it, "full of grace," will not justify it, for the same words, indeed stronger, are addressed to the prophet Daniel—"O man, greatly beloved," Dan. x. 19, and such words do not imply prayer or worship to him.

The words—"Blessed art thou among women," as spoken to Mary, are no more than the words spoken of Jael—"Blessed shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be; blessed shall she be above women in the tent;" Judges v. 24. Such words do not justify prayer or worship, either to Jael on one hand, or to the Virgin Mary on the other.

Let us think of Mary with tender affection, as of the mother of Jesus; but let us neither pray to her nor worship her; for prayer and worship belong exclusively to the Godhead.

[For the Critic.]

LEARNED LECTURERS OR LEARNED PREACHERS?

It is now generally admitted that man is an improvable being in regard of all his faculties, and that special gymnastic preparation is always of advantage before the athlete appears upon the arena. None will deny that eloquence is a proper theme for study, and any youth whose profession will lie in endeavoring to persuade his fellow man, should make this study a prominent speciality. If all art in ministerial education be a profanity, then let us proclaim ourselves disciples of George Fox: but by the same token all ministerial education, whether secular or sacred, is profane, and we should tear down our seminaries of learning and burn our books. But, as a church we have adopted the principle, that the instruments offered to God for his service, should be finished to their utmost capability. We believe that whilst God often blesses very rude instruments to the accomplishment of great ends, the rule of His providence is to bless the means in proportion as they are adapted to the end. It is so in all the departments of His government. The appeal to individual cases of men who have preached eloquently without having studied elocution, should not be made unless it is meant to take the ground, that elocution is a useless study—a position that few intelligent men, in this age, would be willing to assume.

It is acknowledged that in a sparsely settled country like ours, there is a great tendency in the common mind to undervalue special training generally. Long apprenticeships are unpopular with the masses. People are apt to "take up" trades, and sometimes even professions—and sometimes you meet a man who has tried a half-a-dozen without ever having had a preliminary training for any one of them. This is the lowest form of anti-education. It has, however, this to recommend it: it is practical. The aspirant begins at once to *do* the thing aimed at. He begins his practice of gymnastics in the arena itself: and if he has the stamina to endure the failures and hard knocks he gets, he may finally hold his standing with the best. Thus some men, "take up" preaching, and by dint of working at it with untiring devotion, like Pitt in the Halls of Parliament, rise even to eminence. There was good sense in the plan of the pious Baptist lady, who appeared on Sunday afternoon in the midst of a congregation of colored Baptists, and addressed them to this effect, "Brethren, my son John, has, you know, lately been baptized, and I want him to be a preacher. I came here to know if you would allow him to come to your meetings every Sabbath afternoon, and *practice on you*, till he gets fit to preach to white people."

How 'son John' turned out, the deponent saith not, but we think that the Baptist lady's philosophy was rather better than that of some who hold a form of anti-education which is very learned in its mien. Its radix seems to be the idea that arts should all be learned speculatively; so that when the learned has his brain (or his note book) well furnished with theorems he is ready for the full practice of his business. The sham science-man walks out very superciliously on his stilts among the homely experienced men,—but alas, he soon trips and spreads his dignity in the dust. Not many years ago, a college bred gentleman came from a great city to our neighborhood, and settled upon a farm. His shelves exhibited an array of books on Chemistry, Geology, Meteorology, and all the branches of farming, such as had never been heard of in this country. He treated the opinions of his unlearned neighbors with no great respect—followed his books in defiance of all the experience of the country, and it was told on him (perhaps untruly) that he would carry out to the field a selection of his books, and would issue an order from Stephens, and one from Allen, and then one from Norton—until the laborers were bewildered, and the whole neighborhood were laughing.

Now we would not be understood to affirm that our seminary students come forth to their pastoral duties just so learnedly-foolish as this—but there might be worse illustrations than the one we have used, of the unpractical style of our theological education. Let us suppose that Lowell Mason, instead of drilling his pupils through a variety of exercises under rythm, melo-

dy and dynamics—rehearsing times without number, scales, airs and anthems—curbing, correcting, stimulating—leading on to greater ease of execution, to purer tones, to juster expression,—should undertake to make singers of a hundred boys and girls by burying himself up to his arm-pits in a big chair, and prosing away hour after hour, day after day, on the art of music in the abstract—its history, its power, the different systems which have prevailed, the biographies of its great composers, and the rules for becoming adepts in the art—and then as he finally left the tripod saying, “Go forth my young friends and *sing*—sing with heart and voice—I have filled the cask—you have only to turn the spiggot and pour forth your liquid notes to refresh the world. It would have been desirable to have bestowed more attention upon the details and practice of the art—but facility comes by time and experience. Farewell. Let my “Musical Letter” be your *vade mecum*.”

Of course some will choose to interpret this as a satire upon learning, and will retort that dogs bark at strangers;—but these had better “hold their breath,” and see if it may not mean something different. Learning is a most important part of ministerial furniture, but learning is not training, and learning alone may tend to *unfit* a man for being a good speaker. There are instances in which good natural gifts for speaking seem to be extinguished by what is called education. The secluded life of a student tends to make him awkward and diffident when he appears in public, and some scholars have usually a morbid aversion to all public performances. And that system of training men for the ministry is defective, which has no provision for keeping the thoughts and sympathies of the pupils in their proper relations to their fellow men. Behold the unpractised *savan* on the platform with the practised ‘man of the people.’ The *savan* may feel something like contempt for the shallow spouter at his side—nevertheless both he and the audience would at that moment give something if he possessed a little more of the spouter’s ease and fluency, and power of touching the hearts of the people. He is in a manner chest-foundered—and the people first sympathize, then murmur, then sleep or retire—or the more devout ones pray for grace suited to the emergency.

It is not a rare sight at a watering place to see a fine young gentleman arrive with an incredible cargo of sundries for sporting—horses, dogs, guns, fishing rods, and fixtures innumerable. He first would go a fishing. A neighborhood man is hunted up to guide him to the trout stream. The sportsman steps forth in presence of the company all furnished and equipped—rules of angling in his pocket, jointed and silver mounted rod, India rubber boots to his thigh, his body girt with game bag, bait bag, and tackle bag, gauntlet, canteen and lunch: whilst along side of him walks the plain countryman with his hazel rod,

thread line, and grasshopper bait—but when they reach the rugged creek-bank, and have to force their way through the tangled thicket, the sportsman finds many things to be attended to, which the books had not provided him against, and his elaborate incumbrances distress him beyond measure, and worse than all, the trout will not bite at his jaunty flies; whilst the nimble woodman glides lithely along without slip or scratch, and soon has his forked switch bedecked with a long row of bright, spotted trout—and as the pair return to the hotel, there seems to be a general giving in, to the divine's old proverb. "He is not the best fisherman who has the best tackle, but he who catches the most fish."

Some are of the opinion that the art of speaking belongs more particularly to the college than to the seminary course. We are of the opinion that it belongs very particularly to both, but most particularly to the seminary. Education in this department properly begins with the first reader of the primary school, if not sooner—and ought to proceed *pari passu* with all other studies to the end of a professional man's life. But there is a delivery specially becoming the pulpit, which ought specially to be attended to under the eye—not of an ordinary teacher of elocution—who is commonly a jackanapes—but of a pious, experienced and accomplished professor—who can often conduct a pupil to a point of much higher elocutionary effectiveness than he has ever attained himself—as we not unfrequently observe to be the case with the very best teachers of music. We desiderate no thing like the theatric training—which is a system of acknowledged hypocrisy. The most painfully ridiculous performance we ever heard, was a literary address from a clergyman, who is said to have been in the habit of boasting that he spent two years under the tuition of a certain well-known actor, "in order to acquire a natural manner." Many of his attitudes and expressions of countenance strikingly reminded us of the Laocoon group, and of the Centaurs in their battles with Hercules. Far distant be the day when such solemn farces shall be enacted in our pulpits. Cicero said that no one was qualified to be an orator without a pure character and a sincere heart. Let us have an elocutionist in our seminaries whose critical thong shall never cease to play upon the shoulders of the pupil, who dares to utter a religious address, except from a sincere, devout, and profoundly earnest heart, or who indulges in the slightest coxcombry of tone or gesture. It forms the very staple of a suitable culture, to remove all unpleasant peculiarities of manner from each pupil, and to promote simplicity, grace and warmth. Can it be well for the church, or kind to the youth to send forth the licentiate with all his peculiar faults left to offend the eye and ear of the auditor, and to be brought back to him in the form of criticisms, which tend only to irritate, or dishearten him!

Of course this sort of training cannot be done independently of the study of the composition of sermons. For a suitable pulpit manner cannot be superinduced upon a chapter of divinity. The student without very frequent practice in the composition, as well as delivery of sermons, will inevitably come away from the seminary with the professorial lecture floating in his mind as the beau ideal of a discourse, than which nothing could be more unfortunate—and the lecture room delivery is apt to follow, which will effectually guard his prospects for an audience after the first trial.

Is it not a principle almost too axiomatic for argument, that along with the acquisition of knowledge, there ought to be formed and strengthened by almost constant exercise, a habit of weaving that knowledge into the warp of the student's thinking? He ought to be compelled, not simply to write as a compiler, but as a thinker, and to utter his thoughts, not as a child saying the alphabet, but as one who has passed the bullion he has dug from the placer through the mint of his own mind, and stamped it with the image of his own originality.

The facile reply to all this is, that such attention to the development of the individual student's powers would trench too much upon the hours needed for acquisition. We meet this by a simple joining of issue, and declare the position that the former is entitled to its full share of attention even at some expense to the latter. After a symmetrical outline of fact and doctrine is once fastened in the memory and comprehension, the filling up can go on without the living teacher. In old seminaries, much of the pupil's time is occupied with studying books written by the professors themselves, and containing the substance of all their prelections upon those topics. And the press is always craving fresh pabulum. So that the active pastor can usually replenish his "cask" at pleasure, at the theological hydrant (it sounds as if the old divine was thinking of a wine press!) But *training* is not a thing of books and lectures exclusively—not a thing to be postponed to mature life and active service. The drilling and the target practice must precede the day of battle, or the men will fight as those who beat the air. One reason why Americans make the best volunteer soldiers in the world is, that they are bred to the use of arms from boyhood. He who would be a good rifleman, *must practice* in his youth. And thus one may say of every thing else, as a rule. The orators who move multitudes, are not the men who have spent their early life in the closest study of books: but usually those who have exercised freely their social affections, and insensibly learned where lie the hidden springs of human thought and feeling. The mountain streams, retired groves, and village lyceums of the land, have given us some of our greatest orators.

It is an error to suppose, that constant application of the

mind to books, is the way to make some *scholars*, much less preachers. After all the wide fields of knowledge which our young men have traversed, this is not a *learned* generation of divines. May it not be that too much is attempted, and that when the student comes forth, his knowledge is to him like great continents seen through a mist, which gradually thickens into an opaque fog. Which of the ancients was it who said, "Beware of the man of *one book?*"—by which he meant not that such a man must be narrow—but that he possesses at least one instrument perfectly at command. We once heard of an old lady, who had committed to memory Young's Night Thoughts, and she always had an effective couplet ready to apply a moral, or confound an adversary. And the reader of Scott's novels will remember the Cameronian woman, who could hurl texts about with such tremendous effect. And there is no doubt that were the *ipsissima verba* of the Bible made more of a speciality in the training our youth, the ministry would be rendered far more powerful. But, what we wish here to say is, that the ministers who have the most leisure for collateral studies, are not commonly those who have during their curriculum, gone over the most ground—but those who planted in their minds the seeds of things, and undertook only what they could digest. And we often see those who have been most absorbed during their seminary course in mere acquisition, the most driven through life in preparing discourses, and have the least time for adding to their stock of ideas.

It is indeed to be lamented that so many are prone to lay the blame of the church's inaction upon some one or other defect in the machinery of doing good, instead of upon the general want of earnest prayer and deep faith—but surely God will approve all honest efforts to elevate the tone of the ministry.

A PRESBYTERIAN FARMER.

~~~~~

[ For the Critic. ]  
ASSOCIATION OF IDEAS.

Eating my breakfast in my sick-room—five minutes ago : took a mouthful of *buckwheat cake*—and asked the servant woman, Aunt Becky—if she knew whether old Uncle Isaac had saved any *pumpkin seed* for me, last Fall? The *question* followed the *cake* immediately—long before the mouthful was swallowed : the time allowed to the *mind*, being probably one, or at most two seconds, in which to fill up the gap between the buckwheat cake now, and the pumpkin seeds last Fall—and give any decent show of sense to such an incoherent proceeding. Of course,

neither Aunt Becky, nor any one else standing by,—could have had the least idea, what induced me to enquire about pumpkin seeds—in that abrupt manner. That, I propose to tell—if any one cares to know,—and thereby give a specimen of the mental operations, which precede all abrupt questions.

1. The cake was too much salted ; so I thought I would direct my servant to tell the cook about it.

2. At the instant I saw the butter before me, and it occurred to me, that the excess of salt might be in so much of it as was on the cake, and not in the batter of which the cake was made : so I changed my mind about sending any message to the cook.

3. It then occurred to me, that some fresh butter had been sent to me, a few days before, by one of my daughters from my principal farm, some fifty miles off, by one of my young sons—who had come to see me, in my sickness : then I wondered if this could be it : then I thought of the kindness of my children—and years of love and anxiety rushed through my mind : and then I wondered if they did not deprive themselves to send this to me : I doubted if their cows gave milk enough this terrible winter : then I took in, in an inconceivably short space of time, all my plantation affairs—past and present : chiefly my beautiful Durham cows : and the question came up, is corn a good food to keep them in full milk?—for they are being wintered on corn chiefly.

4. Upon the *good food* question, come up the fact that in 1854 the pumpkin crop had failed almost entirely in that region : that in 1855, we farmers there had been extensively imposed on, by having seed of the large yellow squash imported from the East, and sold to us for extra fine pumpkin seed, at the rate of \$8 a bushel, which was about eight hundred times more than it was worth: and my consequent vexation—and the disappointment and contempt of my Durham cattle last Fall over these bogus pumpkins,—with which I, like a ninny, had been, through sheer inattention, imposed on with the rest.

5. Then came a scene in the streets of this little village last October—of my casually meeting a negro driving a two horse wagon which was full of very fine *true* pumpkins : my having a talk with him—and engaging him to bring me a couple of loads to my stable—if his master would sell them : then his telling me—a few days afterwards, that he could not bring them—but that I would get them by sending for them : and the conclusion that I had better see his master personally—but would probably miss getting them.

6. Then a scene a couple of weeks later, at the sale of Mr. Hutchinson, out in the country, who was about to move to Texas : my going there for other purposes, to wit, to purchase pork and a wagon,—forgetting all about the pumpkins and Mr. Davis ; saw him at that sale, and then remembered the pumpkins when

I saw him—and now recalled the whole of that, and all things at the sale: how I bought several loads—had them hauled home: and could not now recollect whether they had been paid for.

7. Remembered on reflection, that I had given my old servant Isaac, who is head man over us all, in his department, the money to pay Mr. Davis for the pumpkins—and at the same time had directed him to save a bushel of the seeds of those fine pumpkins, for use next Spring, on the farm where the present of butter came from: Uncle Isaac's habits, I reflected, are none of the best—*did he in fact save the seeds for me?* Did he, Becky?

Fact;—mouthful of buckwheat cake:—Question; about pumpkin seeds: The gap between the two—most imperfectly filled up—by the above detail. I suppose the case illustrates millions of millions of processes, through which the human mind is continually passing: but to which we pay no attention. And I suppose further, that if we did attend to the operations of our own minds with as much assiduity as we do to the operations of matter; and then reason upon them as carefully: we should be as well acquainted with our souls as with our bodies.

In a second or two—as it were in a mere flash—the mind pervades and takes in whole years of past existence, and innumerable objects:—at the same instant, viewed with the past, the whole future as connected with the views of the part then taken; and simultaneously with both, a distinct sense of our present existence and action. All the faculties of the soul set to work, in this instantaneous way, and with this inconceivable velocity, power and exactness. Not running pell mell—but fastening on specific things—and while seeing and feeling every thing in all directions—yet using only these specific things, to link up a chain more or less extended, until at a certain link, the chain breaks off—in an abrupt act or question. Meantime, the consciousness of every one of these complicated, innumerable, and inconceivably swift and powerful operations—is perfect in the mind; and the attention is directed, effectively to every one of them—by the million in a second; and the memory retains every one of them, long enough for you to reflect on them, if you think fit; and if you will do it, the mind passes along through them, and looks steadily at them—and makes its note of every thing; or if you will not—dismisses the whole—and they vanish.

The manner in which the most ordinary *physical* sensations—in this case the taste of salt—are capable of setting all the faculties of the mind to work—is well worthy of our grave attention. The manner in which the chain of movements thus set agoing, terminates sooner or later, in an outward act, *on a level* with the starting sensation—in this case a question about pumpkin seeds, is a most important element for us to ponder. The immeasurable compass, power, elevation—of the range between the exciting sensation and the abrupt end of the chain of associated ideas—is most wonderful of all.

\* \*

[For the Critic.]

MINISTERIAL SUPPORT—THE RELATION OF SUPER-  
ANNATED MINISTERS, AND THE FAMILIES OF  
DECEASED MINISTERS, TO THE CHURCH—SOCIE-  
TIES FOR THEIR SUPPORT.

The Old School Presbyterian Church has spoken with emphasis, while she would urge and enjoin Ministerial support. She has spoken in the acts of her General Assembly, and the Presbyteries and Synods, all over the land, have re-affirmed her doctrines, and repeated her injunctions in the solemn form of enactments, and in the adoption of plans to secure, at least in part, the adequate pecuniary support of our Ministry. And she unites her testimony that it is a divine injunction, which can never be neglected, without detriment to the active and efficient work of the church, and without involving a deep criminality of the church in withholding that support claimed by Jesus Christ. The Jewish priest was always supported from the service of the altar. Moses and Paul both claim, as a dictate of nature, that the laborer, though a beast, should live of the avails of his labor, (Deut. 25, 4; 1 Cor. 9, 9.) Then it is positively claimed, as the right of the Christian Minister; even though it may not be demanded by him, or may be withheld by the church; (1 Cor. 9 chap. 9, 14. Thus nature, reason and scripture, unite their testimony that the church is bound to furnish a full physical support to those whose time, energies and substance, are bestowed upon her service. Nor can there be any appeal from the voice of a devoted pastor's or evangelist's wants. The church *must* supply their wants. And to relieve this doctrine of a common prejudice, that operates injuriously against it, we would exclude the entire band of *sine titulo* reverends (who are not the servants of the church, in any proper sense, and are not even laboring under her direction and control,) from this high claim for support, at the hands of the church. But we would insist, that the obligation is correspondingly binding, to see to it that "they which wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar" And as this is the doctrine of our church, and of the orthodox everywhere, there is no need that it should be discussed. The bare statement is sufficient for our present purpose, viz:—That it shall become the basis of a few enquiries respecting the relations of superannuated Ministers, and the families of deceased Ministers to the church.

And *first*. What is necessary to the severance of the relations of a Minister from the church? (so as to relieve the church from the obligation to support him.)

No one will deny, that, should he hold and promulgate opinions, or exhibit a character and life warranting deposition, the



church would be freed from the obligation. This, however, does not present the case of a superannuated Minister. But the declaration is, that he is not a Minister in any proper sense. The case we are considering, is one in which the Minister has become physically disabled for the performance of his ministerial labors. It may be from accident, disease or age.

Well, here he is. And what is to become of him? Is it true that, physically, he is dependent upon the charity of somebody for support, as, that while he served the church actively, she was bound for it? Is the relation he sustained to the church, at all changed, because of his inability to work actively? I trow not. Civilized and Christian States not only pay the charges of their soldiers while actively employed, but if any are disabled in the prosecution of warfare, or remain soldiers until disqualified from age, they have the guarantee of a pension for life. And if a slave becomes disabled, from any cause, to do his master's service, the laws of all well regulated Christian States, require the master to support him. And the best dictates of our nature demand that the faithful horse or dog, shall be fed and protected by the master, even after they have become useless; having worn out their energies in his service.

Nor does the church fail to recognize the transcendently higher obligations to her Ministers, worn out in her sacred service, even in the service of their Divine Master. Particular cases have been met and supplied by the promptings of a public charity, in the communities where they have occurred, thus acknowledging the general Christian duty to sustain both the superannuated Minister, and the family of the deceased Minister.

Individual congregations have made permanent provisions for such cases as may arise in their church and with their Minister. Different denominations have sanctioned, and even urged, the duty upon the Christian public to provide the means of such support, in the way of permanent funds and otherwise. It is time then, that both in recognition of the duty, and in the fact that the thing is done, the Christian public is agreed. And so far, the thing is right, and should receive the the full sanction that it does, in the *great Christian heart*.

But there arises, just at this point, several important suggestions, or rather inquiries, viz:—By whose authority should this work be done? Under whose control? and in whose name? But what of the associations and societies, that exist in the name of different denominations, with reference to this subject? In some cases, they are so much under the ecclesiastical control of the church, as to constitute them boards, or committees of the church, (in a tolerably good sense.) Against such, there is no objection, so far as the principle is involved, for which we are contending. There are instances, however, in which they are strictly voluntary societies or clubs, without the least control of

any of the judicatories of the church. And we know that such societies exist under the sanction of our own church, and in different sections thereof; but we do not believe that they express the deliberate judgment of the church, or even those sections of it, on the subject of voluntary societies as agents in the work of the church; but we believe that they are more the result of inattention, or from the want of mature deliberation. To illustrate. A case like this can easily occur, viz:—A particular synod may be impressed with a sense of duty to provide the means of support for superannuated Ministers and the families of deceased Ministers, within its own bounds, and that a general contribution should be made by the congregations in its connection; whereupon, a committee may be raised to report upon the constitution of a society for the conduct of the work, in connection with the synod. The synod may request each of its Ministers to act in the interim, as agents, to collect funds for the object, &c. But when the committee shall appear upon the floor of the synod, ready to report, a motion may prevail that synod take recess from business, in order to receive the report of this her committee. Thereupon, a public meeting may be constituted, with a ruling elder or minister in the chair. The report may then be read, embracing a constitution and by-laws, and the whole may be adopted. And, as we have seen, it may turn out, at last, that a *voluntary society* is formed, and that the synod has absolutely no control over it—nor can have, only at the option of the society.

It may also be true, that the qualifications of membership, in said society, do not involve membership in the synod, nor even in the Presbyterian or any other church; but that it is purely *pecuniary*, requiring an initiation fee, and the payment, annually, of a fixed amount. It may, however, be provided, that said society shall hold its annual meetings at the place, and during the time of the annual meetings of the synod. It may be further provided, that all the funds of the society, shall be for the exclusive use and benefit of the objects above named. And when all this shall have been said and done, there is not the semblance of any real connection with the synod. For, as to its meeting at the time and place of the meeting of the synod, so also might the State Agricultural Society provide; and the only thing that could be claimed on that score, would be, that that society afforded a liberal convenience to the members of synod, who happened to be of its members. And should it also provide, that all its funds were to be held for the exclusive use and benefit of the same objects, but wholly under its own control, we should then have two societies on the same footing, as to the synod.

But let us come to the main issue at once. If the support of the objects contemplated, is a *Christian duty*, why does not the

*Church*, as such, distinctly, in recognition of her obligations to her *Divine Head*, resolve to do the work, in her own name and under her own control? And if the church has not excluded from her brotherhood her superannuated Ministers, and the families of her deceased Ministers, let her frankly acknowledge the duty, and claim the privilege and right "to sustain them in her own pale, and in honor to the Father of us all," even to Christ, whose beneficiaries they are.

---

ZION, THE PERFECTION OF BEAUTY; OR, THE TRUTH, ORDER AND SPIRIT OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BRIEFLY CONSIDERED. A SERMON PREACHED AT THE OPENING OF THE SYNOD OF IOWA, AT OSKALOOSA, OCTOBER 11th, 1855: BY THE REV. JOSHUA PHELPS, *President of Alexandria College and Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Dubuque*. Published at the request of the Synod. Dubuque, 1856.

This is a bold, honest, manly defence of Presbyterianism, and we congratulate our church in the far West in having a man like Mr. Phelps to stand and plead for her distinctive character and mission. As the President of a Literary Institution and Pastor of a Church, he has a noble opportunity of doing good in the vigorous and growing Commonwealth in which his lot has been cast; and we rejoice in the assurance afforded by this sermon, that his influence will be exercised very decidedly in behalf of our Scriptural faith and order. There is one point, however, in regard to which we are constrained to take exception to Mr. Phelps' views: and we do it the more freely, because, as it appears to us, he departs from his own analogy of faith, under an unconscious reverence for the authority of Princeton; and because the Board of Publication, by printing Doctor Hodge's Discourse on Presbyterianism, and the Assembly of 1855, by causing to be printed Dr. Boardman's Sermon, have given greater conspicuity and currency to the error. In illustrating his views, Mr. Phelps, we think, betrays some apprehension that the proposition he is defending is not exactly the truth; and whether it be the actual struggle with Congregationalism, the great foe of Presbyterian order,—which constitutes no small part of the discipline of our ministers in the West, or whatever may be the cause, it is quite evident, we think, that he has some lurking doubt in regard to the theory

of the "Discourse on Presbyterianism." The point to which we refer, is the statement on p. 28, of the "2d fundamental principle of Presbyterian Church Order," which is, "*the right of the people to exercise government through their divinely appointed officers.*" Now, the right of the people "to exercise government" in Christ's House, we deny to be any principle at all, much less a fundamental principle of Presbyterian Order. And on this point, we would respectfully commend to the candid study of Mr. Phelps and our readers generally, the following extracts from an old number of the "Southern Presbyterian Review." The subject of these extracts is the nature of the office of the Ruling Elder, considered as "the representative of the people:"

"It is becoming common to represent it, not as the immediate appointment and institution of Christ, the only King and Head of the Church, but as the creature of the people, possessed of no other powers but those which they have chosen to entrust to it. The Elder is an organ through which the people exercise the jurisdiction which Christ originally committed to them. He can do nothing but what the people themselves might do, and his office is Divine only in the sense that God is supposed to sanction the act of his constituents in delegating their power to him, instead of exercising it in their own collective capacity. According to this extraordinary theory, the people in mass might constitute, in connection with the ministry, the judicial Assemblies of the Church. The Session might be composed, not of the Pastor and Elders, but of the Pastor and the brotherhood. The Presbytery might be composed, not of the Ministers and a Ruling Elder from each church within the bounds of a district—but of the ministers and entire congregations of professed believers committed to their charge. Our government upon this scheme, as it was originally instituted by Christ, and as it might now be *jure divino* practically administered, is an odd mixture of an elective aristocracy—the clergy—and a pure democracy, the people. We have no hesitation in affirming that this whole theory of the origin and nature of the Elder's office, is absolutely false—unsupported by a single text of Scripture, or a single doctrine of our standards. Presbyterianism venerates the *rights*, but it is a new thing under the sun to maintain the *judicial power* of the people. Christ has not committed the government of the church into their hands. The language of our law is as clear and explicit as language can be made. "The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a government—IN THE HANDS OF CHURCH-OFFICERS, distinct from the civil magistrate."\* Not a word is said about the right of the people to co-operate in all acts of

\* Confession of Faith, chap. xxx., §1.

discipline and government. The potestas jurisdictionis pertains to *church-officers*,—"to these officers"—it is added—and not to the people, "the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed"\*—"it belongeth to the overseers and other rulers of the particular churches, by virtue of their office, and the power which *Christ* hath given them, for edification, and not for destruction, to appoint "Synods and Councils"—"and to convene together in them as often as they shall judge it expedient for the good of the church."† "Our blessed Saviour, for the edification of the visible church, which is his body, hath appointed officers, not only to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments, but also to exercise discipline, for the preservation both of truth and duty; and it is incumbent upon these officers, and upon the whole church in whose name they act, to censure or cast out the erroneous and scandalous."‡

These passages of our Standards recognize the doctrine of Owen, § which we apprehend to be the true doctrine of the Scriptures—that "all church-power in actu primo, or fundamentally is in the church itself: in actu secundo, or its exercise, in them that are especially called thereunto." "He hath instituted," says this great man, || "and appointed the officers themselves, and made a grant of them unto the church for its edification. As also, he hath determined and limited the powers and duties of the officers. It is not in the power of any or of all the churches in the world, to appoint any office, or officer in the church, that *Christ* hath not appointed. And where there are any such, they can have no church-authority properly so called; for that entirely riseth from and is resolved into the institution of the office by *Christ* Himself. And hence, in the first place, all the authority of officers in the church proceeds from the authority of *Christ* in the institution of the office itself: for that which gives being unto any thing, gives it also its essential properties." "It is hence evident," he insists in another place,\*\* "that in the communication of church-power in office unto any person called thereunto, the work and duty of the church consists formally in acts of obedience unto the commands of *Christ*. Hence, it doth not give unto such officers a power or authority that was formally and actually in the body of the community, by virtue of any grant or law of *Christ*, so as they should receive and act the power of the church, by virtue of a delegation from them; but only they design, choose, set apart the individual persons, who thereon are entrusted with office-power by *Christ* Himself, according as was before declared." While,

\* Confession of Faith, chap. xxx., §2. † Ibid., chap. xxx., §1.

‡ Form of Government, Book I., chap. 1, §3.

§ Owen on the Nature of a Gospel Church, chap. iii., §2. Works, vol. 20, p. 378.

|| Ibid., p. 386. \*\*Ibid., p. 383.

therefore, "all church-power, which is nothing but a right to perform church duties in obedience unto the commands of Christ and according unto his mind, is originally given unto the church essentially considered," yet it has evidently "a double exercise—1, in the call or choosing of officers; 2, in their voluntary acting with them and under them in all duties of rule."

That the people, and not Christ, are the direct and immediate source of all the power and authority committed to the office of Ruling Elder, is an error which, though it evidently contradicts the express teachings of our standards, has arisen from a total misapprehension of the title with which they distinguish him—the *representative of the people*. A representative and a delegate are essentially distinct—they differ not merely, as Lord Brougham \* seems to suppose, in the extent of the subjects on which they are authorized to act, but in the *relation* which they bear to those who elect them. \* \* \* \* \*

Representative government is a different kind of government from a pure democracy. It is essentially a limitation upon the people—they choose representatives because it is not safe that they themselves should discharge the functions of legislators or rulers. In human governments, the power of representatives may, for the most part, be ultimately traced to the people, as this whole system of polity is generally, though not always, the offspring of popular will. In establishing this species of government, the people create the office of representative, define its powers, specify its duties, and settle its rights. They form a Constitution, the very object of which is to prevent the accumulation of too much power in their own hands—to restrain the supremacy of their own will—and to check the tendencies of absolute authority to abuse and tyranny. This Constitution once fixed, is the immediate source of all power to all the representatives chosen under it—to it, and to it alone, must they appeal for a knowledge of their rights, privileges and duties. *It*, and not the will of those who elect them, becomes their law. Their relations to the Constitution, which equally binds them and their constituents, render it absurd that they should be treated as mere organs, machines or automaton through which others act. It deserves further to be remarked, that in all organized States in which the representative principle is a part of the Constitution, the representatives possess powers and discharge functions to which their constituents as a mass can lay no claim—putting it in this way beyond all doubt that a representative and deputy are fundamentally distinct. In the Church the representative government is not, as in the State, even ultimately the creature of the people—it is the direct appointment of Christ, and the powers and duties of ecclesiastical representa-

\* Political Philosophy, vol. 3, chap. 6, p. 31.

tives are prescribed and defined in the word of God—the only Constitution of the Church. They are there represented as rulers, and not as tools—they are to study and administer the laws of the Saviour, and not bend to the caprices of the people; and they are to listen to no authoritative instructions but those which have proceeded from the throne of God. Christ never gave to the people, as a mass, any right to exercise jurisdiction or to administer discipline. They cannot appear in Session or Presbytery. It is not only inconvenient that they should be there, in their collective capacity, but they have no right to be there. The privilege of attending as members, as component elements of the Court, would be destructive of all the ends which representation is designed to secure—it would subvert the whole system of government. The business of the people is to elect the men who give sufficient evidence that they are fitted by the Spirit to fill the offices which Christ has appointed. “This is the power and right given unto the church essentially considered with respect unto their officers, namely, to design, call, choose and set apart the persons by the ways of Christ’s appointment unto those offices whereunto by His laws He hath annexed church-power and authority.”\* These men represent the people, because they are the choice of the people. The term representative, therefore, is equivalent to chosen ruler—it designates the manner in which the office is acquired, and the source of its powers. When Elders, consequently, are styled in our Standards the representatives of the people, it is a total misapprehension to suppose that the meaning intended to be conveyed is, that they are the deputies or delegates of the people, occupying a position and exercising powers which the people themselves might occupy and exercise. The title imports nothing more than that they are the persons whom the people have selected, as duly qualified and called of God, to perform the functions which Christ has enjoined upon the rulers of His house. The people *as such* possess not a single element of the potestas jurisdictionis which pertains to the Elders and the Courts of the Church.

It is obvious from this explanation of the term, that Pastors are as truly representatives of the people as Ruling Elders. They have, in this respect, a common ministry; and the reason why the title is not given to them as well as to the elders is, that they are called to discharge other duties, unconnected with the department of government, so that this title cannot be a complete description of their office. Pastors are more prominently preachers than rulers—and hence the names by which they are distinguished have a more pointed reference to the ministry of the word than the power of jurisdiction. But in rela-

\* Owen on the Nature of the Gospel Church, chap. iii. Works, vol. 20, p. 389.

tion to the Ruling Elder, the term representative of the people is a complete description of his office. He is a chosen ruler and nothing more. While the Pastor, in so far as he is a ruler, is as much a representative of the people as himself, yet he combines other functions with his representative character, which would render this term a very inadequate description of all his relations to the Church of God. His right to rule depends precisely upon the same grounds with the right of the Ruling Elder. \* \* \* \* \*

---

REV. A. CLEVELAND COXE'S IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND.—YANKEEO-ANGLICANISM.

*Impressions of England; or, Sketches of English Scenery and Society.* By A. CLEVELAND COXE, Rector of Grace Church, Baltimore. New York: Dana & Company. 1856.

*Christian Ballads.* By ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE, M. A., Rector of Grace Church, Baltimore. With Corrections and Additions. Fifth Edition. H. Hooker. Philadelphia: 1855.

The latter of these volumes is named in connection with the former, to which special attention is now to be called, first, because it would seem that an English re-print of the "Ballads" previous to the Author's visit, was his "letter of credit", and determined in a good degree the character of his associations with English society; and secondly, because the Ballads obviously furnish a key to the spirit and sentiment of the Book of Travels, which itself might not unaptly have been entitled "*An Ecclesiological Sentimental Journey.*"

We felt sorry in reading, and feel not less so now in being called upon as Journalists to give utterance to our impressions of this author's Impressions of England. The book presents altogether a reverse side to that character with which, in the natural partiality of an ecclesiastical neighbor, we had invested the author's Churchmanship. Of good report, as an amiable Christian gentleman, even to the full measure in which that character is supposed to be compatible with the spirit of a certain phase of Episcopacy toward other Christian people; and, judging from a published volume of discourses, as also from current report, an earnest and practical Gospel preacher,—perhaps to the full measure in which that peculiar phase of Episcopacy is compatible with being a Gospel preacher at all;—we



are not a little surprised that such a book should have emanated from such a source. Our charity disposes us to regard it as a sort of vacation piece,—of a grave Rector in the exuberance of freedom turning young again: transporting himself back to his seminary days to re-“sow his (ecclesiastical) wild oats.” If it seem unfair to hold a mere book of impressions and sketches to so grave a responsibility, it must be borne in mind that the author himself avows it as among the objects of the publication, to contrast “the sober and healthful progress of society in our ancestral land” with “the *vulgarizing influences* of a *dissocial sectarianism* which are beginning to be perceived” in our own country;—and this for the special benefit of “those of his countrymen who deprecate this deterioration, and who for themselves and their families are anxious to cultivate an acquaintance with those domestic, educational and religious institutions which have given to England her moral power and dignity among the nations of the civilized world.”\* With so important an object in view, and seeking the attainment of that object in so peculiar a way, to say nothing of the importance of that peculiar class of vulgarity-hating, if not sin-hating Christians to which especial reference is had throughout the volume, it can hardly be unjust to hold this book responsible in a higher measure than as a mere series of fugitive sketches. The light form which it assumes, renders it only the more dangerous in so far as its religious sentiment may be erroneous, since that form will give it the more currency among just that class of semi-religious readers least likely to possess the requisite amount either of religious intelligence or of good sense, to counteract its injurious tendencies.—And independent of all this, the official relation to the community of any pastor of a large city congregation of itself gives importance to whatever he may publish.

It is not, however, from any considerations of this sort, that we now call attention to this production; but altogether because, beyond any volume which we have met with, it is a representative book: representative of a novel and singular system of Episcopacy, which (perhaps, because of its being chiefly local to New York and Connecticut) the American Christian public seems not generally to have discriminated as a system distinct from both the High and Low Church, so called. For the purpose of making this distinction, we have, after due consideration, been able to devise no better term than that at the head of this article.—We vouch not by any means for the classic Latinity of the term. But desiring to find a convenient expression whereby to distinguish from the two other phases of Episcopacy, a peculiar system of ideas, which has recently grown up in the particular locality referred to, and at the same time grown out of the modern mania for an independent Anglican succession, we have ventured the use of this term—Yankeo-Anglicanism.

---

\* Preface, page 8.

As it is the chief purpose of this present writing to illustrate some peculiarities of this new system, we shall aim to sink the author out of view, and look only at the book. This we are the more free to do, since, as already intimated, the book must certainly misrepresent its author, whom we highly esteem as a neighbor, whilst on the other hand it is singularly articulate in representing the new system of religious ideas, which we are aiming to illustrate.

In order to a just comprehension of the phase of American Episcopacy developed in these "Impressions of England", it is needful first to glance at the leading points of the Oxford system in which this New York system had its origin, and to which it owes chiefly its growth and progress. It will be remembered that the Oxford movement had its origin, by way of reaction, from the extreme Low Church tendencies of the English Reform party from '25 to '33. The passage of the Irish Church Act of 1833, abolishing several Irish Bishopsrics, and the open talk of a reform of the Prayer Book itself by Parliament, proved to be the last drop poured into the cup of High Church affliction. And thereupon measures—and very effective measures—were taken for organized opposition and for staying the threatening overflow of Church Reform. In this effort originated the Oxford Tract writing; which, as we infer from Mr. Perceval's famous letter to the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, was the semi-official utterance of a sort of "voluntary society" gotten up in the Church of England for the Church's defence. As we learn from the same authority, the principles, which this body of writers combined to spread, by tracts, sermons, reviews, stories, ballads, poems, &c., were by no means merely of any temporary sort, but far-reaching in their extent, scarcely coming down to the low level of current Church politics at all. The fundamental points of the new doctrine are these: 1. "The only way of salvation, is the *partaking of the body and blood of the Redeemer*, through the Sacrament of the Supper." 2. The security for the due application of that sacrament is the apostolical succession of Bishops and Presbyters under them.

Setting out with this as the grand fundamental principle of Christian faith, they resolved, "That there is great danger of these truths being slighted, and Christians tempted to *unauthorised ways* of communion; and therefore, (we quote Mr. Perceval's words), We pledge ourselves one to another, reserving our canonical obedience; (1) To be on the watch for all opportunities of inculcating on all committed to our charge, a due sense of the inestimable privilege of communion with our Lord *through the successors of the Apostles*, and of leading them to the resolution to transmit it, by His blessing, unimpaired to their children. (2.) To do what in us lies towards reviving among Churchmen the practice of *daily common prayer* and more fre-

quent participation in the Lord's Supper." This was the origin of Oxfordism, since become so renowned for its prolific writers, its intensity of zeal—its effectiveness in the work of corruption, and its fruits of folly. Starting out thus from a purely sacramental platform of faith, and all the while spurred on by all the excitements of party zeal—it seems not so wonderful that the more logical, earnest and enthusiastic of these theorists should have found their anti-Protestant theory of religion compelling them onward to Rome. Indeed with all the ado about the insanity of Newman, we gravely doubt whether it be possible, for any mind capable of perceiving logical relations at all, (bating always of course, an understanding narrowed after the manner of a Chinese lady's foot, by the patent Anglicanizing process) can accept the two fundamental propositions above cited, and not be driven to adopt the Roman rather than the Anglican succession. It is surely beyond the bounds of human effort, to accept it as true, that one's salvation hinges upon the unimpaired integrity of a line of succession—and that too, an "*opposition line*", of one insular, national church against all other churches combined;—and that line moreover running through a thousand years of illiterate barbarism;—and among a people not only the most fierce and revolutionary, but perhaps the most frequently revolutionized of all nations during that thousand years;—and in face of all these grounds of uncertainty still feel sure of salvation! The world had learned to listen with politeness to the dogma of an Apostolical Succession, which cautiously gave its line full sea-room to drift deviously in any direction, back over the trackless ocean that separates the ancient from the modern church and civilization, to the Age of the Apostles. But this *Anglican* Succession—this line straight back through all the ignorance, and superstitions, and bestial coarseness, and blood-thirst, and feuds, and wholesale murders, and exterminating wars, and civil revolutions and dynastic changes of British history—and yet assuring us of a sound welding of each successive link of the chain by three competent workmen—this is altogether another sort of draught upon our politeness. The common mind of the world, at least, can never comprehend how a mere sacramental religion, resting its faith upon administration by an unimpeachable line of succession, can be essentially a different religion in its nature from that of Rome;—and as to the comparative lines of succession, can the common mind comprehend how men should pronounce the Roman credentials counterfeit, if the Anglican be genuine? Its sympathies must be with that distinguished Kentucky statesman, better versed perhaps in political than ecclesiastical affairs, who after patiently hearing an enthusiastic Anglican through his demonstration of his official pedigree, could only respond: "All well enough, except at that one point of your being a different spiritual race from the Pope's people, and

yet tracing back through the Roman line! Your argument has just the defect of General M.'s elaborate speech at the cattle show, in regard to the pedigree of a certain imported bull there on exhibition;—more learned in law than in cattle, he traced back the line of his bull to the great Godolphin Arabian, (race horse)—a cross of breeds that our plain farmers seem puzzled to understand'! Is it at all singular, that John Henry Newman and many of his co-laborers, having first accomplished the wonderful feat of deriving the bull from the race horse, should have come next to regard the distinction between the two species of animals as very unessential!

The relation between the American and the English Episcopal Church, is too intimate, to admit the possibility of any so remarkable a movement in the English, without a corresponding movement in the American Church. Independent of the political agitation in which the counteracting Oxford movement took its rise, and aside from the political issues which are necessarily involved in all the prominent ecclesiastical agitations in England—the causes of excitement in both churches—the divisions of sentiment—the platforms of contending parties are very much the same. As the Oxford movement gave rise to a third party in the Church of England—distinct from either the Old High Church or Low-Church parties—nay, utterly repudiating these old distinctions, so the germinal elements of a third party soon began to manifest themselves in the American Episcopal Church. Aside from the natural propensity of a certain class of the Episcopal mind here, to await in eager expectancy, the latest new "definition" of religious dogma, ritual, or fashion from England, with almost the implicit reverence of Roman Catholics awaiting some new "definition" of Immaculate Conception, or latest new wonder of winking Madonna from Rome;—aside, too, from the natural propensity of Jonathan, under either Roman or Anglican rule, to outdo his brethren across the water in implicit credulity,—by way of relieving himself of suspicions to which the very vulgar and democratic company he is obliged to keep here "*in partibus infidelium*" naturally exposes him;—there was much in the earlier development of the Oxford movement, to win for it favor. Its obliteration of old party lines in the church, was looked upon by peace-loving eclectics, as an omen of good. Its appeals to the *esprit du corps* struck a sympathetic chord in the hearts of the more exclusive and enthusiastic churchmen. Its muddy patristical logic filled with profoundest awe that class of young theologians, whose only measure of depth is inability to see bottom. Its exquisite, pious and sentimental aesthetics fascinated that very large class of aspiring sprigs of theology—larger in the Episcopal Church than any other—the Unitarian even not excepted—that class who choose the *clerical profession* for the sake of its imagined gentility, and

the easy way it offers to indolent mediocrity and unfortunate incapacity to clothe itself in black silk and white linen, and become altogether very respectable. But higher causes than these gave it currency for a time. The very earnestness of the Oxford spirit, as a stern rebuke of the fashionable semi-Christian indifference and worldliness of the Old High Church, made it attractive to all Low-Churchmen whose earnestness and pious zeal exceeded their "knowledge to discern" truth and error. Whilst on the other hand, the Pharisaic punctiliousness of Oxford delighted the High-Churchmen as being a terrible rebuke of the Low-Church indifference to the "anise, mint and cummin." And it must be borne in mind, that the earlier developments of Oxford theology, were cautious in the extreme. The doctrine of "reserve," was no mere barren abstraction with Newman its author. Professing merely the vague desire "for something deeper and truer, than satisfied the last century"—a desire in which, surely, every pious Episcopalian might well unite,—Newman's drift was not at first generally suspected in this country. True, he had announced in the advertisement prefixed to the first volume of the Tracts—that "*the sacraments, and not preaching, are the sources of divine grace.*" But such oracular announcement, apart from any detail of the logical results which flow from it, was not alone sufficient to startle the fears of a religious community, so long accustomed to hear the sacraments magnified. Once Oxford proceeded to deduce the irresistible conclusions from this dogma, it was easy enough to see that it utterly overthrows all the reformed doctrines. And very soon did Oxford, condescending to "*do their thinking,*" for the mass of her admirers, proceed to deduce from this germinal proposition;—first, the Apostolical Succession as an essential security for the sacraments—next, the mysterious sacredness of the ministry as holding in their hands the most precious gifts of the church—nay, as being essentially the corporate church itself;—next, the consequent propriety that men with whom the means of salvation are deposited, should be endowed with wisdom to discern the truth and authority to enforce it;—next, the consequent danger of trusting to the individual conscience, rather than the command of the church, and of claiming for the individual reason the right to interrogate the record, or question the dogma of the church;—next, the practical conclusions, that in the judgment of this body of men, the corporate church, celibacy is the state of higher perfection—fasting and penance, are of highest Christian obligation, &c., &c. No sooner were these deductions fully made, than all eyes were opened to the utter falsehood of the first proposition. And when, now, the reasoners themselves proceeded to avouch their honest confidence in their own logic, by accepting practically, as well as theoretically, their own conclusions, then the whole church was

filled with horror, at the "Roman intrusion!" But, up to the period of the publication of Tract No. 90, if not even up to the period when the author of the Tract practically attested his honest belief in its truth—there was a general applause, more or less open, in the American Church. A re-print of the "Tracts for the Times" was undertaken in New York. Episcopal Doctors in their sermons, patronizingly declared the Tracts to be the best expositions of Christian doctrine. Bishops, in their official addresses, lauded their high attainment in primitive theology—their skillful expositions of apostolic truth—their general apostolic spirit. Even moderate Low-Churchmen ventured to hint mysteriously that *with* a little error, there may be mixed up much truth. And such was the impetus in that direction, that a young man—even after openly avowing his belief of the dogmas of Tract No. 90, yea even of the decrees of Trent, bating the damnatory clauses—was solemnly ordained notwithstanding. In short, it was not until the general alarm that arose from the open defection of the Oxford leaders, and a large portion of their more logical and consistent followers, that the fascination abated. Once the spell was broken, the zeal against Rome became intense, and of a fierceness hitherto unknown in High-Churchism. For ourselves, we have no particular partiality for the "erring sister" of our High-Church brethren, yet, we are free to confess our inability to understand their charge against her, of "intrusion" into their household. To our notion, it sounds somewhat *Hibernian* to hear of "intrusion" in a case in which one hostile power receives the deserters from the other, and accepts an invitation from those disaffected towards the government, to come and receive the surrender of a strong hold. It is, at most, nothing more than the intrusion which the Stuart head of the English Church, suffered from the Orange head of the same church.

It was during this era, upon which we have thus dwelt at length, that the foundation was laid for the new third party in the Episcopal Church. As after the subsiding of the momentary volcanic throes, the little island in the sea, or the range of hills upon the land, remain as the permanent memorial of their action and power; so, in the little ecclesiastical world of which we have been speaking, this new party which we have denominated the Yankee-Anglican, remains the enduring memorial of the Oxford era. Having detailed so fully the causes which gave it origin, and the elements out of which it was formed, we are enabled the more briefly now, to present an analysis of what seems to be its spirit, its principles, and agencies. As illustrating in a practical way the more abstract and theoretic views of this party, nothing could be more apt than Mr. Coxe's "Impressions of England." On the one hand, being the production of a mind in the process of training, just

while the Oxford excitement was rising, and trained at the very centre into which, as a focus, the rays of Oxford light were gathered in this country: on the other hand, treating almost solely of the ecclesiastical aspects of the field in which Oxfordism had done its work, and revealing fully the 'impressions' produced upon the character of one so trained—it leaves us nothing to be desired. The Ballads too—most of them written while under the full influence of the Oxford fascination, and obviously intended as an exposition of the sentiment, and emotional religion which the Oxford influence engenders in the Episcopal mind in this country,—furnish at once a specimen of the spirit of the student life in the New York seminary, and also a key to the book of 'impressions.' It may seem, indeed, that something more profound than such a series of sketches—some theological treatise, or volume of sermons, should be chosen as the exemplar of a rising party in the church. It will be found, however, that in this case, theology in any large scientific sense, is not one of the distinguishing elements of the system. In fact, the Yankee-Anglican is distinguished from the Oxonio-Anglican system, from which it sprang, chiefly in this, that the former is Oxfordism, with the theology of Oxford left out,—a sort of theological Hamlet-play, with "the part of Hamlet omitted." And in this fortunate ignoring of theology lies chiefly the comparative harmlessness of the new party. Its chief positive peculiarities as its chief zeal, regard rather the social position and spirit, the pedigree and prerogatives, the ritual and sacraments, the architecture,—and generally the aesthetics of the church..

It will not have escaped the notice of any thoughtful observer, during the last twenty years, that in a certain quarter of the Episcopal Church, it seems to be regarded as the first, the second, and the third fundamental mark of the true church, that it is *highly genteel*. Not unlike the royal ambition of George IV, a former head of the church of England, to be renowned as "the first gentleman in Europe," is the holy ambition of this phase of American Episcopacy, to be renowned as the most genteel church in America. Unfortunately the gratification of this ambition of gentility is too often at the expense of its Christianity. Thackeray's witty analysis of the character of that royal "first gentleman," struck us when we heard it, as a very apt analysis of the religion which George IV represented; it is still more apt as the analysis of this American religion of first gentility. "Beginning with the exterior of this royal first gentleman, George IV," says the wit, "we have first an outer garment bedecked and bedizzened with stars and lace of gold. Removing this, we have next a coat of finest fabric and texture; next, a vest of exquisite finish—after that, linen; then flannel; then ——— nothing!" It is very far from our intention to charge

this folly upon the whole Episcopal body, for we rejoice to know, that in that body are to be found as earnest advocates for "the truth, as it is in Jesus," as noble spirited, and as humble christians as any in the world—our only regret is, that relatively to the growth of the whole body, in the last ten years, this portion seems to be becoming smaller. Nor do we mean to charge this folly even upon the less evangelical old High-Church party as a body, for in that party, were many, who, by education and position, were beyond the reach of these uneasy, self-conscious aspirations after this Jonah's gourd aristocracy, and vulgar gentility. But what we do mean to intimate is, that over and above the causes which engender this spirit in the church—causes which are common to the Episcopal and other churches alike;—causes growing out of the sudden influx of wealth in large cities, and the sudden social importance which wealth gives often to vulgar, coarse, and ignorant people, with the natural jealousy of its standing, which is the characteristic mark of wealthy vulgarity;—over and above these influences, common to all our churches,—there are peculiarities in certain portions of the Episcopal Church, which so far from holding in check, tend naturally, though indirectly, to foster in the minds of such a class, this Pharisaic and exclusive spirit. The affectation of social distinctions of high and low, analagous to the English social distinction of nobility and peasantry; the everlasting din about the essential importance of a pure spiritual pedigree; the incessant eulogium of the beautiful decencies; and the modest claim to a monopoly of all true dignity and taste in religious worship; the pious sneer at *dissent*, so very soft in its meekness, as to melt into a sigh of compassion;—what more natural than a spirit of Pharisaic bitterness, exclusiveness, and haughty self-righteousness, as the result of such a system?

We cite from Mr. Coxe a few passages by way of illustration. Our readers may judge therefrom, whether our notions of the tendencies of such a church spirit, to promote both social and spiritual Pharisaism are exaggerated. It has been observed, already, that one avowed aim of these "sketches," is to counteract the vulgarising "influences of a dissocial sectarianism"—or what on p. 226 is termed "saturnalia of unbelief, which are fast developing under the influences of our illimitable sectarianism." Our readers must understand that in the view of this new Anglicanism, "the sects" and vulgarity, seem to be synonymous terms for that which is the bane, and "Anglican unity," and gentility, for that which is the crowning glory of Christianity.

The traveller philosophizes thus over the "three spires of Coventry," (p. 174.)

"A town of many spires in America, is generally a town of many wrangling creeds; and the major part of the steeples are but *vulgar rivals*, re-



alizing the droll idea of Carlyle's eel-pot, in which each individual eel is trying to get his head higher than his neighbor's. The fact, however, is less droll than melancholy, when one thinks of the sickening results upon a community of so many religions, all claiming to be reputable types of Christ's dear Gospel, although so widely differing among themselves, that some of them must necessarily be its pestilent antagonist. Dissocial habits; cold incivilities; open wars; disgraceful rivalries; bickering animosities; and a degraded moral sentiment—these are the things signified by your *poly-steepled towns in our own land*, and God only knows the irreligion, and the contempt for truth, which are festering within them, as the result of these acrid humors; but as yet, it is not generally so in England. The three spires of Coventry all point faithfully to the throne of the Triune God, and are symbols of one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism."

We confess ourselves somewhat at a loss to know how England is better off in this regard, than the "*poly-steepled American towns*." Since, whether English towns be *poly-steepled*, literally or not, it is manifest they must be quite as "*poly-sected*" as the American. For by the public census of Britain, in this very year 1851—the year of Mr. Coxe's visit—it is shown that, in spite of all the advantages of an enormous State patronage, one-half the church going people of England were in attendance at "the vulgar rival" churches,—and, therefore, at least one-half the people of England were exposed to all the evils so graphically portrayed in the foregoing paragraph. Mr. Coxe, indeed, seems to have a holy horror of all figures, save figures of speech, and some half a score times, cautions his readers against the "untrustworthy statistics of Dissenting Almanacs." We presume, however, that the census taken on 30th March, 1851, of the attendance at all the places of worship in England, some three weeks before Mr. Coxe landed, is free from the suspicion of untrustworthiness. Though we are not without our misgivings, that this census, just then taken—and its depressing influences upon the particular ecclesiastical circle in which he moved, may have had quite as much to do with creating our author's poetical disgust for all statistics, as had the Dissenting Almanacs. By this census, it appears that of seven and a quarter millions of church-goers in England and Wales—three and three quarter millions attend the Church of England, which all are compelled to support; and three and a half millions attend other churches, which they support by their voluntary contributions in addition to supporting the established church. Now, to our mind this single statement is of most fatal significance to the theory of English exemption from the vulgar rivalry of spires. For it appears, that after two hundred years of uninterrupted effort on a clear field—the Anglican Church, with all the powerful aid of the British Government to back the respectability and attractiveness of Anglicanism, has not been able to elevate more than one-half even of the serious church-going people, above the condition of the American people of the

“poly-steepled towns!” One of two things follows: either there is a peculiar proclivity to vulgar *poly-steepleism* in the English mind, that no amount of church respectability, decency, refinement, learning, wealth, and power can resist,—or else *mono-steepleism*, is sadly deficient in energy and piety; too sadly deficient to authorize the hope that, unaided by State patronage, it is ever to redeem the “American towns” from the like proclivity to vulgarity.

Mr. Coxe, however, assures us, that the influence of the Church of England extends beyond her own pale.

“And let it be remembered too, that all that is good among English Dissenters, is sucked from the church, as the parasite derives its nourishment from the oak. The Dissenters are mainly the small tradesmen of England, a people intelligent enough to perceive the faults of their hereditary religion, but not generally enlightened enough to know its value and its services to themselves.” (p. 317.)

Whether the Dissenters suck what is good among them from the church, or whether, what is notoriously nearer the truth—the church sucks what little spiritual life there is in her, from the fervid evangelical zeal of the Dissenters, and is kept from utter intellectual stagnation and death, by the healthy exercise which the rivalry and political hostility of dissent compels her to take—we care not now to enquire. The “good sucked from the church,” cannot be very great, according to Mr. Coxe’s own showing, since it makes them only “*intelligent enough to perceive the faults of Anglicanism* ;” to perceive which certainly requires a very small amount of intelligence. Nay, it appears, they derive not enough of good even to elevate them, in point of intelligence and religious respectability, to a level with the unfortunate dupes of American poly-steepleism, who have no such Holy Mother’s breast provided for them by the munificence of the government. For Mr. Coxe tells us in the very same page:

“I have known even American Presbyterians to experience the greatest revulsion of feeling against the mass of English Dissenters, after actual contact with their *coarse* and semi-political religionism.”

This no doubt is true; one of the most fruitful sources of evil to religion in America has been the transfer from the Independents of Old England to those of New England of the spirit and measures of that “*coarse semi-political religionism*.” The consequences of the “*evil communication*” have been almost as corrupting to American Independency, as have been the consequences of a similar and cotemporaneous transfer of the impertinent arrogance of this Oxonio-Anglican Sacramentalism to American Episcopacy. But the obvious inference from all this is, the ineffable folly of the thing proposed as the aim of this book; viz: to counteract “the vulgarizing influences of our dis-social sectarianism”, and to restrain “the Saturnalia of un-

belief which the influences of an illimitable sectarianism are fast developing",—by holding up such a specimen of "the simple but always dignified" religion of "our ancestral land"—as a model. English *Mono-steepleism* has certainly not yet presented such results at either pole of its duality, as to claim our confidence in it as a panacea for our American *Poly-steepleism!*

It was not our purpose, however, to *refute*, but merely for the information of our readers to *cite* the "Impressions." Unfortunately our space is now becoming too narrow for the full citations we intended. We shall therefore subjoin merely a few random specimens, as representative at once of the books and of the system of which the books are a type. And in order to greater clearness, as well as brevity, we shall aim so to arrange our citations as to illustrate severally some of the distinctive features of the system—

I. Of its arrogance, exclusiveness and unevangelical Pharisaism.

"This is enchanting, and more, 'tis heavenly! A church but a few rods in one direction—and another less than a mile before us, and many others near us all around! All *churches* too—not so many tokens of religious strife and schism, but each the centre of one faith and one baptism and the worship of one Lord. \* \* \* One wonders what a dissenter is made of, when he beholds these churches", &c. Impressions, p 158.

"The Roman Churches have divorced themselves from the promises, and in the Catholicity of England chiefly *is fulfilled the promise of Christ* to be always with His own Apostolic Commission even to the end of the world." p. 320.

"And though the injudicious counsels of good John Newton gave a turn to his (Cowper's) piety *which may well be deplored* in its consequences upon himself, it is ground for rejoicing that the *influences of the Church* upon his own good taste were strong enough to rescue his contributions to literature from the *degrading effects of religious enthusiasm*. \* \* \* There (in Pollok's 'Course of Time') the same enthusiasm exhibits itself *as developed by sectarianism*." p. 304.

"He (Whitfield) now lies buried under a Puritan pulpit in New England, having completely revolutionized the Calvinism of our country, and entailed upon it the *Convulsionism* of which it is now expiring." p. 161.

"There is nothing left us, as the direct result of Puritanism, except a few Socinian congregations and the Dissenters' Chapels bill." p. 284.

"In Geneva, where the Presbyterian schism was instituted by Calvin, we find that the whole sect, in the time of Voltaire, had privily lapsed into Socinian Deism, *denying* the Lord that bought them. The Presbyterians of England have so universally lapsed into the same heresy that the Dissenters' Chapels bill has been passed, within the last few years, to allow them to retain the property which they received as Calvinists. The Puritans of Massachusetts have, in like manner, lapsed from the strictest Calvinism into the coldest Socinianism. And let earnest minded persons consider

whether schisms thus universally running to seed in the most heathenizing of heresies, can possibly have been the planting of the Lord." (Notes to Ballads, p. 205.)\*

"God help thee, Church of Scotland, it seemeth thy death-blow!  
They've robbed thee of thine altars, *they've ta'en thine ancient name;*  
But thou'rt the Church of Scotland, till Scotland melts in flame.  
Not *she that thus usurpeth*, can boast one grace of thine;  
That Grace—*it cometh only of Apostolic line.*  
Then *leave to grim Genevans*, Cathedral choir and aisle,  
Let *psalms of Covenanters*, be quavered there awhile:  
The very stones shall flout them,—in beauty built, and might,  
For Apostolic service, and high liturgic rite."

Ballads, pp. 88, 90.

"Ye love your dear home festivals with every month entwined;  
Oh weep for those *whose sullen hearths*, no Christmas garlands bind!  
Those *Iceland regions of the faith*, no changing seasons cheer,  
While our sweet paths drop fruitfulness through all the joyous year,  
And eat thy bitter herbs awhile, that when our Feast is spread,  
*These too—that gather up the crumbs*, may eat the children's bread."(!)

Ballads, pp. 57, 58.

Let this suffice as a specimen of the "brotherly affection" of the new system. Comparing the last with the first of them, we doubt whether the puling Anti-Churchism, which in these days claims a monopoly of all the brotherly love, ever produced a more melting specimen of what we may call the ice-dagger tear-drop than this last cited passage.

We cite next, passages in illustration,

II. Of the Mecca, or Holy Pilgrim centre of the Yankeeo-Anglicans.

"On landing in the morning, I inwardly saluted the dear soil, on which I was permitted at last to place my feet, and on which I could not feel altogether a foreigner. \* \* \* It was Holy Week. The Bishop of W—— had sent me his permission to officiate, and when I went to Church it was always as a priest of the One Communion. \* \* After the Nicene Creed, I ascended the pulpit and preached 'Jesus and the Resurrection,' and then returning to the Altar, celebrated according to the English rite the HOLY EUCHARIST,† administering to my reverend brethren and the lay communicants. To this high privilege I was pressingly invited by the pastor himself, in token of entire communion with the Church in America." (Impressions, pp. 2, 3, 5.)

"And I could yet my dust lay down, beneath Old England's sward,  
For lulled by her, 'twere sweet to wait the coming of the Lord.

\* This specimen of "Notes" to a "*Book of careless Ballads*" may suffice to justify our opinion that so light a form of book may represent thoroughly an ecclesiastical system. The "Stories" of Paget and poems of others of the school did more to give currency to Oxfordism than the "Tracts." Yankeeo-Anglicanism seems to have profited by the hint and provided a "parlor theology" of intense sectarianism; as these two books will show.

† The capitals are the author's own—and the obligation so to print this word wherever it occurs in the book seems to be as binding as the bowing at the mention of the name of Jesus.

What though upon thy dear green hills, my footsteps never trod,  
Thine empire is as far and wide as all the world of God!  
And by the sea-side glorious have I been wont to stand,  
*For Ocean is Old England's own wher'er it beats the land. (!)*  
Thy Holy Church, the Church of God, that hath grown old in thee,  
Since then the ocean-roving dove, came bleeding from the sea:—  
At least that Holy Church is mine, and every hallowed day  
I bend where England's anthems swell, and hear Old England pray;  
But here by Hudson's glorious wave, a song of thee I'll sound,  
For England's sons and spires are here, and England's God around.”

Ballads, pp. 70—72.

We take it for granted, that this claim for England of “all of Ocean” is merely “poetic license”, and therefore pass on to cite illustrations;

III. Of its saint and hero-worship—and the contrary.

“The earnest Laud, the gorgeous Taylor, the magnificent Strafford, the royal Charles \* \* \* there is something belonging to them in common, which invests them with no ordinary glory. It is the beauty of holiness which they drew from the breasts of the Church in which they lived and died.” (Preface to Ballads, p. 9.)

“The great man (Dr. Johnson) went to the site of his father's humble book-stall in the market place *and there stood bare-headed in the storm, one rainy day, bewailing his sin.* (Disobedience to his father when a child.) What moral sublimity! worthy indeed of a memorial, and doubtless recorded in the book of the Lamb that was slain to take away his sin.” (!)

Impressions, p. 16.

We may properly remind our readers, that Dr. Johnson's recent canonization as an Oxford saint, rests on the additional ground of his high example as a *model reasoner* ecclesiastical. They will remember his memorable demonstration of Campbell's piety. “Campbell is a good man—a *pious man*. I am afraid *he has not been inside of a church* for many years, but he never passes a church *without pulling off his hat*. This shows he has good principles.” It will be remembered too how Johnson noted in his diary his sin of drinking coffee on Friday; and how, in Scotland, he spent months without attending church, because the ministers had not been ordained by Bishops. Bearing these things in mind, they will be somewhat prepared for this item from the “Impressions”:

“Surely,” said I, ‘old Samuel's bones must have been stirred to-day by the Church's Jubilee; but don't think you have shown me his grave for the first time. I already know all the choice spots in this floor, *and have knelt on that very slab and given God thanks for His servant Samuel.*” (!)

This is all the more remarkable when contrasted with the following moralizing, in another place, at the tomb of Bishop Hoadley, the famous Latitudinarian champion of Civil and Religious Liberty;—and, of course, no favorite of Oxford:—

“Strange that the same Church should contain the tomb of that *bloated Hanoverian, the notorious Hoadley*, surrounded by such emblems as the

Cap of Liberty, and the Magna Charta, in close juxtaposition with the Holy Bible! The character of the Bishop would have been better symbolized by some ingenious device illustrative of the truth that "the ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib." (Impressions, p. 252.)

We promised not to comment, yet cannot but add one word of approbation of this closing suggestion as to the proper symbolizing of the Prelatical office in England;—with the slight modification, that it be the official emblazonry of the living rather than sepulchral ornament of the dead. Any one who has ever seen the list of incomes of the English Bishops, and heard of the small service to religion and learning rendered by them, cannot fail to be delighted with the surprising felicity of Mr. Coxe's conception. As to the ingenuity requisite to execute in detail a "device" for the conception, we do not see but the very simplest and most obvious symbol would be the most truly expressive;—say a crib—well filled—in some cases enormously piled up—the animal haltered to the crib—and leisurely, lazily eating! We pass over a score of like spiteful thrusts at living men—as Lord John Russel, Macauley, Brougham, Prince Albert, Newman—in fact, any and every public man in England, not within the pale of the Oxford political High Tory faith—to make room for illustrations on the more important article;

IV. Of the *Ecclesiology* of the new religion,—which indeed is fundamental in the whole scheme. Accordingly this will be found to be the ever-recurring topic. We undertook to count—but soon gave up in despair—the number of churches described in detail of nave, aisle, chancel and altar, in the "Impressions." The first that comes in our way, and which immediately follows the happy suggestion of the asinine symbol just discussed—as though yet under the same spell of inspiration—is this:

"One cannot but hope that the superb Altar screen of this Cathedral will be more fully restored than at present, and that a proper altar, a Holy Table, will be added, *such as may illustrate the true spirit of the Anglican Liturgy, and the richness of its Orthodoxy.* (!!) A poverty stricken altar is surely no recommendation of reformed religion; and *were I only an Ecclesiologist*, it would delight me to show that such a Holy Table as even the Court of Arches could not presume to desecrate, might be erected, in strict conformity with the Anglican ritual, and in perfect keeping with such a choir that *should put to shame the tawdry Babylonianism of the Romish Altars on the Continent.*" (pp. 252–3.)

"The restorations are truly superb! the choir of Ely will be one of the most impressive temples in Christendom. What an age of restoration is this in the Church of England! 'Tis a nobler reformation than that three hundred years ago." p. 284.

"In the Church of St. Michael, the font, which is a relic of very high antiquity, has lately been restored to its place; and nearly the whole of the nave is a late restoration. Here *there is another proof of the revival of primitive life and zeal in the Church of England!* And all so truly national, Anglican, and yet Catholic; consistent with itself and with antiquity—

ty, and attesting a continuous ecclesiastical life from the days of Ceadda and his predecessors till now." Impressions, p. 17.

"St. Philip's looks like nothing more than a plethoric Hanoverian temple, in which indolent and drowsy worldliness would be content to say its prayers not more than once a week." Ibid, p. 20.

"Wykeham (an Oxford architect in 1400) was, for his day, a reformer as really as Wyckliff, and the true Anglican alone has a right to glory in his achievements. They mark a period of contest with the Papacy", &c. p. 57.

"A church in the suburbs, built in George IVth's day, partaking both the merits and defects of that period of transition, when the Church was in palmy prosperity, as the venerable Establishment \* \* The Curate, I can testify from personal knowledge, is of the true spirit of an English Parish priest. *In his church the prayers are perpetual; the fire never going out on the altar, and its gates standing open, as it were, night and day.*" Ibid, p. 20.

"Alas, how much rather would I have seen the old Paul's, which poor Laud so munificently repaired \* \* than all this Italian and classical display of Wren's. \* \* Cold, cheerless, modern, all but Hanoverian St. Paul's! Who dreamed of such a worship here! Yet so it was; and I am sure, from subsequent experience, that it is capable of being made a most attractive Cathedral, and a very useful one. Knock away that detestable screen", &c., &c. p. 77.

But in the "Ballads" we have the Ecclesiological Creed summed up, both negative and positive:—

"Its merit, first is—what 'tis not; that hippogriff of art  
By crule Genevan rites begot, half temple and half mart;  
Nor yet that type of changing shifts, a hall low-roofed and tinned,  
On which a wooden Babel lifts, its weathercock to wind.  
Like many a pine wood parody of Parthenon or Pnyx,  
Which oft as frontispiece we see, *to meeting house of bricks.*  
Again—as country parsons speak, some merit it may claim,  
*In that it dares to look antique, in color and in frame.*  
And then no passer-by can doubt, *its spiritual kin,*  
For O it tells the truth without, of what it is within.  
*All that the Church requires it hath, chancel, and porch, and nave,*  
A sacristy, and holy bath *the sinner's soul to lave,*  
And in the baptistery, a well; *o'erhead an open roof,*  
A gabel cot to hold the bell; the Cross, *a Church's proof."*

As befits so profound a subject, this "careless ballad" is interpreted by a series of learned "notes"—one of which we cannot forbear citing, if for no other reason than for expressing our alarm at the sad dilemma to which its merciless logic reduces our "dissenting" neighbors in New England:—

"*There is a kind of respectability about it (the "old Puritan meeting house") as being the honest exponent of its origin; a respectability which vanishes when the modern meeting house, with its tin roof and Grecian pillars, is substituted; and which is superseded by vulgar pretension when, as is sometimes the case, its place is supplied by a Gothic structure, with all the external symbols of Liturgy and Episcopacy.*" Notes, 217.

It would seem, therefore, that the "uncovenanted" are in a sad predicament. If they build "Hippogriffs, with tin roofs and Grecian pillars," their "respectability *vanishes*." If they build "Gothic structures", their respectability *is superseded by vulgar pretension*. Of course, those who have them, must stay in the "old meeting houses" as long as they shall stand up—then go without,—or—still worse—to *Church*; unless the ingenuity of Yankeeism shall devise some way of building an *old* meeting house. Or would it consist with orthodox Ecclesiology—in an extremity—to apply some patent *antiquizing* process to a new house? Doubtless Yankee genius could master the problem of some machine, or process for antiquity manufacturing, which could clothe a new structure with, at least, "a green old age," and make a new house "look just as good as old." But would that conform to this canon:—

"And O it tells the truth without, of what it is within."

Being ourselves Presbyterians of the strict construction school, we should say not; yet we see no reason why an Oxonio-Anglican, or a Yankeeco-Anglican, who can devise a construction of the 39 Articles wide enough to let his conscience work easy, might not construe this canon favorably for the case we have supposed. And this the more especially since, having themselves already applied the principle of the patent above suggested, in the structure of their *venerable* Anglo-Catholicity, they ought not, as consistent Ecclesiologists, be over-jealous of the application of the same principle in a mere question of Architecture.

Our readers in their simplicity will suppose that we have been occupying too much space with what they may deem this unimportant matter of Ecclesiology;—may, perhaps, think we have been quoting only to amuse ourselves and them. Let them be assured that not only we are in grave earnest in making these numerous extracts, but that Mr. Coxe was in still graver earnest in writing them. As they will now see, this matter of an orthodox architecture is really a fundamental principle of the new theory;—nay the germinal truth out of which their theory of practical religion springs, and from which it derives its sustenance. Not more essential to the development of the acorn is its peculiar cup, or to the hickory nut its peculiar sheath, than is its own peculiar architecture to this sacramental religion. When it lays down its great fundamental dogma, "The sacraments, not preaching, are the means of grace", it does not mean the sacraments of a "starving Table", or "poverty-stricken Altar", as Mr. Coxe so expressively terms them. The relation between ecclesiology and worship will be perceived more readily from a few illustrations;



## V. Of Ritual, Worship and Devotional feeling.

"The Evening Service at the Cathedral was far more gratifying than the morning's experience had led me to anticipate. The evening sun streamed through the windows of the clere-story with inspiring effect, and the Magnificat quite lifted me up to the devotional heights I had desired to attain." Impressions, p. 17.

"Going to St. Paul's to morning service on Sunday \* \* I never, before or since, heard any Cathedral chaunting, whether in England or on the Continent, that could be compared with it for effect. The Clergyman who intoned the Litany, knelt in the midst of the Choir, *looking towards the Altar.* \* \* Then as the next suffrage was continued, the throbbings and echoes of this organ blast supplied a sort of under current to its simple tone, at first pouring down from the dome like the floods of Niagara, and then dying off along the distant nave and aisles like the waves of the ocean. *Tears gushed from my eyes, and my heart swelled to my throat, as this overwhelming worship continued.*" p. 77.

"The Service was intoned by one of the curates in a severe old tone, authorized in Archbishop Cranmer's time." p. 7.

"Was the Duke (Wellington) about to communicate? Was I to see him in the most solemn act of our holy religion? Was I to kneel beside him and receive the *same cup of salvation and bread of life?* \* \* \* I could not but observe the Duke at the saying of the Nicene Creed. As usual in England, he faced about to the East, and at the name of Jesus, the great Captain of his Salvation, *he bowed down his hoar head full low*", &c. He is now gone to the dread realities we then confessed; and there is something peculiarly touching in the recollection of that morning at St. James's, when that cup of salvation, out of which Kings and Queens *have so often drank their weal or woe*, passed from his lips to mine." pp. 74, 75.

We feel constrained to subjoin the following very significant parallel between the Anglican and the Roman services at Westminster and at Rouen respectively.

"On the preceeding Sunday, I had left the Cathedral services at Rouen, in circumstances precisely similar, and my mind naturally fell into a comparative train of thought. There was a *great similarity in the effects produced on the senses by the two services.* A stranger to the Latin and English languages would have failed to note any marked difference between them. He would have recognized the *Catholic unites of the two rites*, and would have failed to observe their diversities (!!) Papal and Reformed. The French sermon had been vastly better than the English one; the former was preached by an orator, the latter by a spiritless and formal favorite of Lord John Russell. Yet, between the two solemnities, in their entire effect, the disparity was greatly in favor of the English service, which was *audibly and reverently performed*, while the other was *mumbled and not understood* by the congregation. I felt that the Church of England was strong." &c., (p. 315.)

We are obliged to pass this very remarkable demonstration of the superiority of the Reformed to the Papal religion, without comment—our thoughtful readers will doubtless not pass it so rapidly. The Ballads still more clearly developed the de-

votional spirit of this system—thus in the model church of “Dreamland:”

“ And Dreamland folk, they kneel them down right *on the stony floor*,  
I saw they were uncivilized, nor knew how we adore,  
And Dreamland folk *do lowly bow*, to own that Christ is God,  
And I confess I taught them not the *fashionable nod*;  
The Dreamland folk *they wed in church*, they dream the Lord is there,  
And as of old in Galilee, may bless a bridal pair.  
• The Dreamland folk count seasons four, all woven into one,  
’Tis Advent, Lent, or Easter-tide, or Trinity begun.

Ballads, pp. 45, 47.

I know thine Abbey Westminster, as seabirds know their *nest*,  
And flies my home sick soul to thee, where it would find a rest;  
I feel the *sacramental hue of choir and chapel there*,  
And pictured panes that chasten down *the day's unholy glare*.  
I hear the priest's far dying chant, the organ's thunder roll,  
*I kneel me on the chilly floor, and pray with all my soul.*” [p. 68, 69.]

The musings over the New Trinity Church New York after the re-erection in 1846, are highly significant; not only as terrible back handed thrust at the Low-Church Episcopalians, and the Gothic-loving Presbyterians, but as thoroughly representative of the spirit and doctrines of the Yankeeco-Anglicans.

“ Not this a church without—to hide conventicle within,  
Here is no masquerade outside, of but the Lion's skin!  
As human flesh grows sound and fair around the human bone,  
So doth the church this glory wear, and clothe herself in stone.  
Not this a Gothic gazing stock, when *naught is meant or told*;  
*Translated into solid rock* the prayer book's self behold!  
But Oh! to all the faithful—see, from porch to topmost tower  
It telleth of the Trinity, and *preacheth Christ* with power.”

p. 113, 114.

Such, then, is this New Evangel, claiming to “preach Christ with power.” For ourselves, who have no partiality for ‘new versions of any sort, we are little pleased with this new “translation into rock,” and its new method of preaching Christ. The translation is altogether too free, and the preaching altogether too obscure and pointless—especially for a religion whose mission is to preach the Gospel to the poor. The commission of Jesus to his church, reads rather oddly in this new version. “Go ye into all the world, translating this Gospel into stone,—*intoning* it in severest old orthodox tone, and blowing the organ's thunder blast at all people.”! And not less oddly, all the cautions, precepts and exhortations of the Gospel in this new translation. The warfare of the church now, is of “a little flock” against a whole world wholly given to conventicles—and lying under the “vulgar influences of a dissocial sectarianism.” The mission of the church is, to teach the right pattern of nave and aisle and choir. The inspiration of the worship, not from His Spirit, but from “light bathed in sacramental hue,” falling on priestly head and altar, “and organ-echoed high liturgic words.”

The promise of His special presence with His people, is no longer where "two or three are gathered—there am I"—but where there is fit temple, with "open roof" over head, and "chilly floor" under the knees, and altar before the face, and book in the hand of the worshipper; there I am; "there enter and pray,—and not in thy closet, or in thy family, or in conventicle of two or three." So also the evidences of grace in the heart, are, that "he taketh off his hat in passing, though he go not inside the church for years;" and that, "though (Wellington-like) not eminent for his sanctity," yet, "he bows low his head, with no fashionable nod, at the name of Jesus." Indeed, we hardly dare make the simplest substitution of the new readings in the old connection, lest we seem to speak profanely.

We have expressed our regret, that this evangel should have found its utterance and its representative in a book with a Baltimore imprimatur. For this reason chiefly, have we felt called upon as Baltimore journalists, to enter our remonstrance against it. Though fully aware of the existence and the activity of this new fashion of Episcopacy in the region around the New York General Theological Seminary—and the Episcopal College in Connecticut, we had fondly hoped that the tastes and habits, and the sober good sense of the more Southern latitudes would have operated as a barrier to confine this, as also the many other strange, moral and religious epidemics of that singularly 'ism'-producing country, to the original locality which gave it birth. We feel bound in our humble way, to resist any 'intrusion' of the new evangel, directly or indirectly, cunningly or boldly, among us here. We think we have a warm place in our hearts for almost any sort of Christian people, of almost any name—even though we make less ado about it than some others. We have no war to make upon the Episcopal Church. For the old Low-Church party, as ardent lovers of simple evangelical truth, we feel not merely the highest regard, but the most earnest sympathy; for the old High-Churchism, with its burly dogmatism, we have become accustomed to make allowance—as for a worthy kind old neighbor, sometimes a little crusty in his ways. But with this parvenu Episcopacy, that comes clad in the cast-off aristocratic finery, and aping the airs of Rome, neither our self-respect, nor our respect for the truth of Christ will allow us to keep any terms. Of its spirit, our readers may judge from the full samples we have quoted. Of its tendencies, they can be "only evil, and that continually." Ecclesiastical Jesuitism; grace-hating Formalism; heartless sentimentalism; spiritual Pharisaism; intellectual diletteranism; social cockneyism; Mammon worshipping, and fashion worshipping toadyism; civil and political Jacobitism:—these have been, and these only can be its legitimate fruits—and, indeed, nly because of the tendencies of the country to luxury and rrup tion, is it possible for such a plant to bear fruit at all.

CHURCH AND STATE—DR. BROWNSON ON THE CATHOLIC CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF MARYLAND.

In our last number we took occasion to raise our remonstrance against certain views of the relation of the State to Religion in the United States, which we are sorry to find current among even Presbyterians of deserved repute as thinkers. By way of illustrating still further the brief hints there thrown out, as well as of putting an extinguisher upon a vast amount of latitudinarian cant, from both the inner courts and "the outer courts of the Gentiles" of the American Papacy, we transfer to our pages a portion of a very remarkable article in the last number of Brownson's Review. How some of the sentiments of this article are to be reconciled with some previous utterances of Dr. Brownson, in regard to the power of the spiritual over the temporal, it is not for us to concern ourselves about. Whether the recent developments of American sentiment have had a modifying and mollifying effect upon Dr. Brownson's theoretic views, or whether his recent change of locality has withdrawn him from the temptation, by which Yankee thinkers are so commonly beset, of saying *surprising and extreme things*, rather than *true and sensible things*—it is needless for us to speculate. It certainly gives us too great pleasure to find Dr. Brownson leaning toward the right side of any question, to quarrel with his want of consistency, in so doing. Nor would it be generous in us, who have labored somewhat to extend the Dr's fame as a champion of the highest claims of the Pope, to withhold our aid in extending his fame as a champion of the Puritans; especially since, in becoming their champion in this case, he will doubtless bring down upon his head the curses of "the Custom House Catholics," for having "taken away their gods."

To enable our readers the better to understand the force of the following extract, we remark that the article from which it is selected, is in review of a recent publication entitled "*The Day-Star of American Freedom, or the Early Growth of Toleration in the Province of Maryland, &c., &c.*" By G. L. L. Davis, of the Baltimore Bar."

"But the first government of Maryland was not founded on the distinctive principles of American freedom. It was a feudal government; and the charter instituting it, provided for a Colonial aristocracy by subinfeudation. It recognized religious toleration; but toleration is not a principle of American freedom. The American principle is religious liberty, not religious toleration. The charter secured to the freemen of the Colony a voice in the government, and so far it was democratic; but the general spirit and tendency of the Colonial Constitution were to an aristocracy, into which it would have developed, if a political aristocracy could have taken root in our new world, colonized by Englished Commoners. But without underrating

the popular character of the Maryland Charter government, it certainly was not so democratic as the government of the Plymouth Colony, or that of Massachusetts Bay, the northern source of American freedom, as Virginia was the southern. We, however, are not disposed to enter further into this question. Comparisons, as Dogberry says, are odorous. Few of the colonists, we apprehend, except those of New England and New Netherlands, were, in our present American sense, republicans when leaving the mother country, but nearly all gradually became so; and when the struggle came for national independence, none were more patriotic or more ready to devote themselves to the cause of American liberty, than those of Maryland. She holds an honorable place in the Union, and has contributed her full share to the glory and prosperity of the Republic. \* \* \*

But, passing over this, we must beg leave to remark, that toleration is not liberty, and the act of the Maryland Assembly does not assert religious liberty. It tolerates all Christian denominations holding the Divinity of our Lord, and belief in the Ever Adorable Trinity; but it does not recognize this liberty as a right prior to, and independent of, the civil power. The civil power grants or confers the right; it does not recognize it as an existent right which the State cannot take away, and which it is bound to respect and protect for each one and all of its citizens. In this respect, the Puritans of Massachusetts really went farther in the assertion of religious liberty than the Catholics of Maryland. Maryland was not founded exclusively by Catholics, or for Catholic purposes. It seems pretty evident that the majority, a very large majority, of the first settlers were Catholics; but there certainly were several Protestant settlers who came over in the Ark and Dove. It was no part of the plan of the first or the second Lord Baltimore, to found a Catholic Colony. His plan was to found a colony in which Catholics, then oppressed and persecuted in England, might profess their religion in peace, and enjoy equal rights and privileges with any other class of citizens. Neither aimed at anything more; and whatever might have been their abstract convictions as Catholics, it is evident that, as founders of a colony, they could claim no exclusive privileges for the Church, and must concede to Protestants, of the so-called Orthodox Sects, what they attempted to secure to the followers of their own religion. Intolerance, or exclusion, would have been in direct violation of their plan, directly opposed to the very idea of such a colony as they contemplated. But the case was different with the Puritans. They had no intention of founding a general colony, open to settlers from all creeds and nations. They had their peculiar notions of Christianity. Right or wrong, true or false, they were theirs; and they fled to the wilderness, in order to found a community in which they could enjoy them in peace and tranquility. They did not invite those who differed from them, to join with them in their enterprise; they professedly excluded them. They sought not to enforce their peculiar views upon others; but they thought they had, as against others, the right to hold them for themselves, and to found a State for themselves and in their children, accordance with them, and from which all others should be excluded. They were not persecutors in principle. They did not deny to others the liberty they claimed for themselves; they only denied to those who differed from them, the right to come and settle in their community. What they did, when persons of different notions came among them, was to warn them off. If they did not go, they sent them out of the Colony; if they returned, they punished them, not for their heresies, but for being found in a colony from which they had been banished.

Their right to do so, depends on their right to be Puritans. If they had a right to be Puritans, they had the right to found, in the wilderness, a Puritan Commonwealth, and to exclude from it all not Puritans. You may, or you may not, approve their policy, but you cannot say that they were persecutors, any more than you are a persecutor for turning out of doors a troublesome fellow that you do not choose to have in your house. Their condemnation is, that they were Puritans; not that, being Puritans, they did as they did.

But, aside from this notion of founding an exclusive Puritan Commonwealth, the New England Puritans asserted, *what the Catholics of Maryland, in their Toleration Act, did not assert, the absolute independence of the Church, and the incompetency of the State in spirituals, the foundation of all true religious freedom.* In the Puritan Commonwealth, the magistrates had no authority in any spiritual matter, and whenever they had to act on a matter which involved a spiritual question, they were bound to take the decision of that question from the ministers, the alleged expounders of the word of God. The incompetency of the State, in spirituals, was a fundamental principle with the old Puritans; and this is the fundamental principle of that religious freedom, not granted, but recognized, by the American people in their institutions. It is the Puritan doctrine of the spiritual incompetency of the State, and the freedom and independence of the Church, rather than the doctrine of toleration of the Maryland Assembly, that has prevailed, and become incorporated into the fundamental institutions of the country.

We are quite willing to concede this, Catholic as we are, because the Puritan doctrine, thus far, save in its application, was borrowed from the Church, and is unquestionably that of the Holy Scriptures. The pretence that religious liberty was first understood and applied by Lord Baltimore and his colonists, we look upon as ridiculous, notwithstanding it is supported by names we cannot but respect. We believe there was an emperor of Rome, named Constantine, sometimes Constantine the Great, usually reckoned as the first Christian emperor. Well, this Constantine issued an edict, giving liberty to Christians, and allowing, at the same time, the free exercise of the old worship to the Pagans. Constantine, if we mistake not, lived some time before Lord Baltimore. There is a very strong assertion of religious liberty, in its true sense, earlier still, which it is not well to overlook. Certain magistrates commanded Peter and John, Apostles of our Lord, to teach no more in the name of Jesus. These refused to obey, and answering, said: "If it be just in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye." We have a profound respect for Lord Baltimore and the Maryland colonists, and cherish, in many respects, the memory of our Puritan ancestors, but both came quite too late into the world, to be regarded as the inventors either of religious liberty or of religious toleration.

The question of religious liberty, though always asserted by the Church, has, we concede, been more fully recognized by our government, than by any that had preceded it. The modern political world holds, as to most of its principles, from the ancient Roman world. In that old world, under Paganism, the civil power and the spiritual were united and vested in the same hands. Cæsar was Imperator, or supreme civil ruler, and Maximus Pontifex, or Supreme Pontiff, and the temporal government has always, down to the American Revolution, had a tendency to perpetuate the union of the two powers in the person of Cæsar, and has warred, almost constantly,

against the separation and independence of the spiritual authority. It has struggled, almost without interruption, to rule men's souls as well as men's bodies, and to be supreme in spirituals as well as in temporals. It has never willingly recognized the freedom of religion, and has seldom been forced to do more than to concede it as a favor, as a franchise, not as a right, anterior to the State, and which it is bound to recognize and protect. It would never, unequivocally, confess its own incompetency in spirituals, and leave all spiritual questions to be settled by the Church or individual conscience. Hence it has seldom left conscience free, and accountable to God alone. It has sometimes left it free as to some points, but seldom, if ever, free throughout. This has caused the existence of religious tyranny and oppression. When the Church existed alone as the only religion, she was oppressed by the State, and when there were various sects existing along with her, then she, or some one of them, was favored by the State, and the others were tyrannized over by it, though in general she far more than they.

Among the American colonists, the first to protest energetically and practically against this assumption of spiritual authority on the part of the State, were the first settlers of New England, the rigid old Puritans. They left England and her church, to get rid of the tyranny exercised by the State over conscience. So far were they from suffering the State to oppress conscience, they, not having the true religion, run to the opposite extreme, and tyrannized through their associated churches over the State. Lord Baltimore and his colonists, without disavowing the right of the State to exercise spiritual authority, did, as a fact, in the name of the State, grant freedom to Catholics and Trinitarian Protestants. The American revolution came in time, and with it American independence. In organizing the government and founding the republic, or rather a confederacy of republics, the principle of the incompetency of the State in spirituals was recognized, and frankly conceded. This is the case with the Federal government, and with all the State governments, except that of New Hampshire, which is officially Protestant, and only tolerates the Catholic religion. Here for the first time, we will not say, has religious liberty been asserted, or toleration conceded; but has the State frankly, fully, and unequivocally abandoned the reminiscences of Pagan Rome, and acknowledged its own spiritual incompetency. In doing this it leaves religion perfectly free, and therefore fully and distinctly recognizes religious liberty as a right of American citizens, and its duty to protect it."

Dr. Brownson applies to Abbe Poisson, in this number, the Dublin Review's sarcastic appellation "one of the class of candid Catholics"—(and by the way, we think the combination a witty paradox, sure enough)—who cause us to exclaim, "save me from my friends." We gravely suspect that our Baltimore and Georgetown neighbors will reproach him as pre-eminent among the class of "candid Catholics," after such an utterance as this. Surely, they have need to cry "save us from our friends."

Having cited thus far Dr. Brownson's testimony—in behalf of Puritanism—in justice to him, as well as for the sake of illustrating some of the views presented in our last number, by showing how they appear as contemplated from the new Papal



stand-point; we present the following disquisition from the same article—on the relation of the State to religion in our country :

“In this reasoning we assume that the government in recognizing religious liberty, declares simply its incompetency in spirituals, not its hostility to religion. The American state is not an infidel or a godless state, nor is it indifferent to religion. It does not, indeed, as the state, profess any particular form of Christianity, but it recognizes the importance and necessity of religion, and its obligation to respect and protect the religion of its citizens. It does not assume that it has the right to ignore their religion, and pursue a policy of its own, regardless of its effect on the forms of religion they profess. In all spiritual questions the teachings of the Church, in dealing with Catholics, and each sect in dealing with its members, is its law in so far as protecting the claims of one is compatible with those of the others. The state must recognise and protect the doctrine and discipline of the Church in all cases where they exact of it nothing inconsistent with the equal rights of the sects. This obligation to protect the religion of the citizen, in so far as it demands nothing against the equal rights of others, rests on the principle that all citizens are equal before the state. Our government is founded on the principle that all men have certain inalienable rights, which they do not hold as grants from civil society, and revocable by it, but from a source above and anterior to it. These rights are, in some cases, enumerated and prefixed to the constitution of the state in what is called a “Bill of Rights,” which the government is bound to recognise, to protect, and when occasion demands, to vindicate against the domestic or the foreign aggressor. These rights, again, are equal, equally the rights of all citizens; and among them is the right of each citizen to choose his own religion, and worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, providing he does nothing under plea of conscience, *contra bonos mores*, and to interfere with the same right in others. Hence my religion is my right, my property as a citizen, not dependent on the will of the state, but, so far as I am concerned, my liberty and its law. The state is bound to protect me in the free, full, and peaceable enjoyment of my religion, because it is bound to protect me in the free, full, and peaceable enjoyment of all my rights, held independently of its concessions, and not subject to its will. For this reason, it must recognise the entire freedom, and afford full protection to my Church according to her own constitution, doctrine, and discipline. It is my right, an element of my liberty, and, therefore, of its duty. As the Catholic Church, it can claim nothing from the state; but as the Church of American citizens, it can claim full freedom and protection. The principle is my equal rights as a citizen. If my Church is not protected, or if not placed on a footing of perfect equality with the other sects, my equal rights as a citizen are denied me, and the boasted equality, recognised as the American principle, is outraged. My equality is denied in the denial of the equality of my Church. I have the right, within the limits already mentioned, to have whatever I hold sacred respected and protected by the state. The same, undoubtedly, may be said by any Protestant citizen in regard to his peculiar form of Protestantism. Though a Protestant, he has the same rights before the American state that I have as a Catholic, because he is equally with me a citizen, with rights the same with mine,



and may demand protection for his religion to the same extent, and on the same ground. He can demand nothing on the ground that he is a Protestant, but can demand perfect equality for his Protestantism on the ground that his right as an American citizen is equal to that of any other American citizen. If he asks a special favor for his Protestantism, or the aid of the state to use it against my equal rights as a Catholic, the state cannot conform to his wishes; but so long as he keeps within the limits of equality, asking only what is equal, he has the right, as well as I, to the respect and protection of the government.

This conceded, it is not correct to say, that our government has no religion, or is free to treat all religions with indifference; for it is bound by the religion of the citizen, which it must recognize and protect; and against which it has no right to perform any act, whether that religion be Catholic or Protestant. Some of our friends, very few of them, indeed, misinterpreting the relations of the state to religion in former times, and not finding our government making a formal profession of religion, have joined with the enemies of religion in representing our government, whether State or National, as an infidel, and irreligious, or a godless government. This is not true, if we look either to its principles or to the intentions of its founders. According to its principles, the religion of the citizen is its religion, in so far as the religion of one citizen does not exclude that of another: and according to the intentions of its founders, it is bound to maintain the freedom of all religions, and defend each in all its peculiarities for those who embrace it, against all physical, material, or legal violence."

But it will greatly add to the value of this extract, to be able to compare Dr. Brownson in 1856 with Dr. Brownson in 1853. Whether, as already intimated, recent events in our country have operated to lower the tone of the great Papal mouth-piece, (as certain sorts of drizzly weather are said to lower the key of the pig's squeal;) or whether this is the natural result of progressive infallibility, is not for us to determine. We present without comment, in contrast with this—Dr. Brownson's utterance on "The Spiritual Order Supreme," in July, 1853:

"In these revolutionary times the great point to be specially insisted on, it seems to us, is, that the Church is a government, a kingdom, the Kingdom of kingdoms and Principality of principalities. What is most important is, to understand that she is a power, an organized power, divinely constituted, assisted and protected, representing the Divine authority on earth, and as such universal and supreme. How the state is organized, or by whom administered, is a matter of comparative indifference. The state may be monarchical or republican, aristocratic or democratic, if it only be understood and conceded that over it, as over every individual, there is a spiritual kingdom, a spiritual authority, commissioned by God himself, to interpret and apply his law to every department of human life, individual or social, public or private; for if such authority be recognized and submitted to, no interest, temporal or spiritual, can fail to be protracted and promoted. \* \* \* \* \*

"We do not, indeed, claim for the Church in relation to the temporal authority the right to make the law, for God himself, and he only, makes the law; but we do claim for her the right to declare and apply his law

to kings and princes, states and empires, as well as to individuals, in public as well as in private matters. The Church, of course, has no right to depose a legitimate prince, that is, a prince who has the right to reign, or to absolve his subjects from their allegiance, for she has no right to do wrong or to violate the law of God, and we are not at liberty to suppose that she ever does, ever will, or ever can, for she is holy and infallible by virtue of the indwelling and assistance of the Holy Ghost; but she has the right to judge who has or has not, according to the law of God, the right to reign,—whether the prince has by his infidelity, his misdeeds, his tyranny and oppression, forfeited his trust, and lost his right to the allegiance of his subjects, and therefore, whether they are still held to their allegiance or are released from it by the laws of God. If she have the right to judge, she has the right to pronounce judgment, and order its execution; therefore, to pronounce sentence of deposition upon the prince who has forfeited his right to reign, and to declare his subjects absolved from their allegiance to him, and free to elect themselves a new sovereign.

She has the right, we say, to pronounce sentence, but whether the sentence shall be carried into effect or not in the temporal order depends, in point of fact, on that order itself; not because she has no authority over the temporal power, but because she has no temporal arms with which to enforce the execution of the sentence. She bears indeed the temporal sword, but it was not the will of her Spouse that she should wield it with her own hands. She ordinarily exercises it only by the hands of the laity, and she has only spiritual means by which to compel them to exercise it according to her orders. So, however extensive her authority, or full her right over the temporal power, she depends solely on the faith and conscience of her children for its practical assertion beyond the sphere of the spiritual order. \* \* \* \* \*

“So he has not willed that his Church should with her own hands wield the temporal sword, and has left the nations, not the right, but the ability, to resist her judgments, and to refuse to execute her decrees. If their faith and conscience will not lead them to execute her sentence, when that sentence requires the exercise of physical force, she can herself do no more, and the responsibility rests with them. Her practical power over temporal affairs is therefore restricted to that which is yielded her by the faith and piety of the faithful, although her right, her authority, is supreme and universal. If her children are uninstructed as to this right, if they grow up with the persuasion that she has no authority over temporals, and that her power is restricted to teaching the Catechism and administering the Sacraments, she will be able to exert little or no power over temporal governments, and her children, as in the French Revolution, will too often be found siding with the state against her, and rushing headlong into heresy and schism, to the ruin of the state and the perdition of their own souls.”

---

It is due to both our correspondents and our readers, to say, that a portion of the matter in the present No. was prepared for No. 1, but crowded out. In like manner, by a miscalculation of space, and a mistake of the printer—most of the “Exchange” of the present No.—embracing many notices of books, &c., and even a portion of the last article—has been crowded out again. We have been delayed in our present issue some three weeks, by reason of sickness in the family of one of the editors. Our next issue will, perhaps, be delayed till the last of June, for the article on the General Assembly.

## EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

FOR MARCH AND APRIL, 1856.

I. *Southern Presbyterian Review for April, 1856. Who burnt Servetus?*

The articles in this number of the Review, are of unusual interest and ability. The article of Mr. Wallace on Michael Servetus, has the more specially arrested our attention, for its being the second of the only two answers, in what we consider the right direction, to the current cant and clamor against Calvin as a persecutor. Dr. Smyth, in 1843, in an address delivered during the sittings of the General Assembly, with that patience of historical research for which he is distinguished, had, for the first time, so far as we know, directed public attention to the utter groundlessness of the charge against Calvin, as the instigator and procurer of the death of Servetus. Mr. Wallace, from new sources of information, discovered a year or two subsequent to Dr. Smyth's publication, demonstrates still more conclusively, that after all the clamor on the subject, the responsibility for the death of Servetus rests neither upon Calvin, Calvinists, nor Calvinism. We have thought it worth while to subjoin a brief synopsis of the facts, for the benefit of such of our readers as have not access to the Southern Presbyterian Review, and especially such as have occasion to meet this popular cant.

It appears that, in 1844, a Mons. Albert Rilliet, of Geneva, a Unitarian Minister, (and of course having little partiality for Calvin,) discovered the original records of the trial of Servetus before the "Little Council of Geneva;" which records had been supposed hitherto to be irrecoverably lost. Mons. Rilliet immediately published a treatise founded upon these documents, entitled "*Relation du process Criminel intente a Geneve, en 1553, contre Michel Servete, redigee d'apres les Documents Originiaux par Albert Rilliet.*" It is in a review of a translation of this important work, that the article of Mr. Wallace brings out the facts concerning Calvin's relation to the matter of Servetus. The facts in the case are as follows:—

1. About the beginning of 1553, Servetus procured secretly, at Vienna, the printing of his "*Restitutio Christianismi*," containing Pantheistic sentiments, and blaspheming the Trinity as a "three-headed Cerberus"—which he secretly circulated over Europe. Through a correspondence between one Arneys, a Papist of Lyons, and his kinsman, De Trie, a Protestant gentleman of Geneva, it leaked out that Servetus was the author of the anonymous book; and on information of Arneys, he was brought to trial at Vienna by the inquisitor of the diocese. On the trial, there was a failure in fixing the authorship of the work upon Servetus, and De Trie, who, in a private letter to his kinsman, had ascribed the work to Servetus, was called upon to make good his statement or stand disgraced as a slanderer. De Trie, after great difficulty, prevailed upon Calvin to allow him the use of certain letters of Servetus to Calvin, in which he announced himself as the author. By aid of these letters, the proof was complete. Servetus was condemned, by the Popish authorities at Vienna, to be burnt. He escaped from prison and thus avoided the doom.

2. Servetus then went to Geneva—not as a forlorn outlaw, for shelter and concealment, but as a restless adventurer, to try his fortune. For

being fully aware of the precarious position of Calvin, at that time, and the violence of the Libertine faction against him, and supposing Calvin to have been the procuring cause of his late trial at Vienna, he thought to revenge himself by aiding in his overthrow.

3. At this time Calvin and his adherents in Geneva, after a fierce struggle of ten years with the party who opposed his efforts in behalf of the liberties and purity of the church, were *in the minority*, as a party, in the three governing Councils of Geneva. Perrin, at the head of the Libertine faction, had procured the election of a number of his friends to the "Little Council;" and had also procured the prohibition of Ministers of the Gospel from sitting in the "Council General."

4. Not only so, but at the very time of the trial of Servetus, Calvin and the Consistory of the Church, were at open war with the "Little Council." The Consistory (session) having excommunicated Berthelier from the Church, the civil tribunal cancelled the sentence, and undertook to command Calvin to administer to him the Lord's Supper. Determined to maintain the independence of the Church, Calvin refused to administer the sacrament on the appointed day.

5. Coming, in disguise, to Geneva, just at this exciting juncture, Servetus found patrons among the friends of Berthelier—and all the circumstances indicate clearly a purpose not to hide himself; but, as the ally of these powerful opponents, to overthrow Calvin. And his malignity toward Calvin, manifested during the entire progress of the trial, was in accordance with this spirit.

6. At Calvin's suggestion of the danger of the presence of such a man in the city, Servetus was arrested and committed to prison in August 1553, and according to the singular requirements of the Genevan law, his prosecutor, Nicholas de Fontaine, formerly a student of Calvin's, was committed with him. He was brought to trial before the "Little Council," on an indictment for heresy—thirty-eight articles having been drawn from his book by Calvin, to whom he had sent it. A stormy debate arose in the Council, in which Calvin, rather than Servetus, was the object of attack. Servetus having made the attack, it was followed up by one of his most powerful advocates. Calvin, in self-defence, was compelled to appear in the Council. In the discussion which thereupon arose, Servetus gave utterance to Pantheistic and blasphemous sentiments, which lost him the sympathies of the friends in whom he relied so confidently.

5. At the next sitting of the Council, (21st August,) it having appeared to the minds of the members, from previous developments, that Servetus was a dangerous person—they resolved "to write to Vienna, to know why Servetus had been imprisoned there, and, after that, to write to the magistracy of Berne, of Bale, of Zurich, &c., to acquaint them with the whole." *Laying aside now the articles of Fontaine, charging heresy*, the attorney general framed a new bill of indictment, *of an almost entirely political complexion*—referring chiefly to Servetus' previous history, his object in coming to Geneva, and his connections in that city. Says Mons. Rilliet, (the Unitarian compiler from the original documents,) he was tried "not at all as the opponent of Calvin—scarcely as a heretic—but essentially as SEDITIOUS. Politics acted a much more important part than theology, towards the close of his trial. They came on the stage with the Attorney General."

6. On the 31st August, a response came from Vienna, demanding the rendition of the prisoner, as one under sentence, which, at Servetus' en-

treaty, was refused. And though the prosecution was now closed, it was yet determined to grant Servetus another hearing, in a written discussion with Calvin, in order to make the whole matter intelligible to the Swiss Churches. The friends of Servetus had, mean time, been exceedingly active in exciting public opinion against Calvin. And on the very day on which this discussion occurred, Berthelier's appeal to the Council, to be restored to the communion, over the heads of Calvin and the Consistory, was granted. Servetus entered into the discussion flushed with the success of his party, and avowed, publicly, his design to pursue Calvin, "*till the cause be determined by the death of him or me.*"

7. At the close of the discussion, at the desire of Servetus, but against Calvin's desire, the matter was referred to the Swiss Churches. On the 18th October, an answer was returned, unanimously adjudging Servetus guilty and worthy of death. Thus confirmed in their own opinions, the "Little Council" proceeded to condemn him to death by burning. *That Council was composed of twenty members, ONLY SEVEN OF WHOM WERE CALVINISTS!* Of the remaining thirteen, only four voted with Perrin against the condemnation of Servetus.

8. From all which facts, it is plain that whoever was responsible for the death of Servetus, it was not either Calvin, Calvinists, or Calvinism. The court that issued the sentence, was not an ecclesiastical but a civil court. Nor was Calvin a member of the court, but, on the contrary, had actually been excluded with other ministers, from his political rights, to sit even in the Council General. Nor was Calvin's party in the majority in the Council that passed sentence. It is plain, moreover, that Servetus was not burned for heresy; but, in the language of Mons. Rilliet, "the heresy of Servetus had assumed, in the minds of the Council, the two-fold character of blasphemy and sedition. That the sentence was not procured by Calvin's personal influence, is manifest from what has been said of the state of feeling toward him in the court. His personal influence was not sufficient to defend himself and his Consistory, against the appeal of Berthelier from their sentence of suspension from the sacraments. That Calvin's feelings were strongly enlisted against Servetus—but more especially against the party who were using Servetus for their own purposes—will hardly be deemed a crime, when it is borne in mind that the triumph of this party, in the matter of Servetus, involved, almost certainly, his own overthrow, and exile or death. That his part in the case, should have furnished fruitful theme for the rant of Anti-Calvinistic demagogues—both theological and political—for three hundred years, is not surprising, once we remember that the whole affair, originally, was part and parcel of a fierce struggle between two political parties in a little republic. All candid men, in view of all the facts, will say, with Coleridge, "if any poor fanatic ever thrust himself into the flames, that man was Servetus."

## II. *The American Presbyterian Almanac for 1856.*

Having occasion to look for some statistical information recently, we fell in with our quondam acquaintance, the "American Presbyterian Almanac;" and rarely have more enjoyed a half hour's reading. Not, indeed, that we found much reading beyond the usual statistics and exhibits of the Denomination; but that what we did find, was of a character so entirely in contrast with that of the former year. Perhaps no one thing better exhibits the tone prevalent in a Denomination than the Almanac—of late, an indis-

pensible to every Church. We have been struck with this fact, in looking over recently some half dozen. They who get up the Almanacs, seem somehow to understand the spirit of their people far better than they who write the elaborate reviews; and they seem, also, to be peculiarly sensitive to all changes of the weather, (Ecclesiastical.) Thus nothing can be more manifest than the change which has come over the Almanac, from the recent effort of our New School neighbors to denominationalize themselves. The very captions of the paragraphs are full of the idea—"we are getting to be somebody." For instance, we have first "*Our Church*"—then "*Our position*"—then "*Our Efforts at reconciliation*"—then "*Our Mission*"—then "*Our theology compared with Richard Baxter's*"—then "*Our work for the year*"—then "*Our Seminaries*," and so on. And as a natural consequence of this new esprit du corps, the temper and spirit of the whole thing is greatly improved. From this, as from other instances, it is manifest that a true love of one's own Church, and the feeling that ours is *indeed* a Church, if not *the* Church, generates a good feeling toward all churches of Christ. Whereas, the wretched canting professions of ecclesiastical cosmopolites never fail, somehow, to generate, under all its hypocritical show of love, a spirit of malignity toward all who have a Church that they care something about. We are free to confess, moreover, that to our eye, the show of "our" standing committee of missions, of education, &c., each one of some dozen names all told, looks very attractive. We are glad to find our New School neighbors getting back to sound views of ecclesiastical policy, and cannot but indulge still a faint hope of a like improvement in their theology, at some distant day. Though we confess that recent developments, in the Presbyterian Quarterly Review and in Mr. Barnes' new "way of Salvation," augur not so favorably in that direction.

Among the first things we looked for in the new Almanac, was the *Free immortality list*, which last year so arrested our attention. We were curious to know what additions had been made during the year, to the "*List of 84 Clerical Authors, who are, or have been, connected with our Church.*" Perhaps, indeed, we may have felt a vague, inarticulate apprehension of finding ourselves in that unlucky list. The fact that the Presbyterian Quarterly Review had claimed that we had "*adopted their suggestions,*" furnished some ground for alarm. But, to our pleasure and surprise, the roll of the immortals is missing! Dare we claim a share in the honor of abolishing that roll? May not a paragraph in our polite note to John Livingston, Esq., declining the honor of a place in his immortality list, have had its influence in determining the "Publishing Committee," to give up the project? The very thought that it might be so, stirs joyfully the Puritan blood within us, over the success of our incipient iconoclasm. And if we seem to magnify our office, let it be borne in mind, that in that roll may have been—nay, most likely was—the germ of another Saint's Calendar. How easy the transfer of this list to the vacant spaces of the Monthly Calendar! How plausibly justified on the score of economy! Once so transferred, how readily connected—each name with a day; and then all that is wanting, is the lapse of a little time to give venerableness—and these names become objects of pious commemoration! St. Barnes' day—St. Bush's day—St. Beecher's day! Who that knows how easy is the lapse into such corruptions of worship, will think lightly of the amount of evil prevented by our successful foray into that list of the 84 immortals!

THE  
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC  
AND  
BI-MONTHLY REVIEW.

---

---

No. 3.

MAY, 1856.

Vol. 2.

---

---

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1856.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

The number of commissioners present at the opening of the sessions of the Assembly of 1855,—one of the largest since the disruption,—was less than two hundred. The number of votes cast for Moderator of the Assembly which has just adjourned, was two hundred and thirty-two. This full attendance at the beginning was, doubtless, due to the extraordinary facilities for travel furnished by the capital and enterprise of the great commercial metropolis of the country, and to the natural curiosity felt by the more distant members, to see the city of which all the rest of the United States is a sort of suburbs.

This is the first meeting of the Assembly in the city of New York, and we doubt not, that the good Presbyterian people thereof, will not only be willing, but even anxious, to welcome it again, if we may judge by the heartiness and largeness of their hospitality to the members at this meeting. We feel assured also that good has been done by this meeting, to the churches connected with us in that city. City churches are too apt to live for themselves, to be vigilant and active in promoting their own prosperity, and to forget that a single congregation, however large or rich, is but a small fraction of the great Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. There is a tendency to isolation of effort, and consequent alienation and jealousy of feeling, in every quarter of our church, among the particular congregations; but this tendency is aggravated by many circumstances in a crowded commercial population. The absence of a vigorous social life, the very feeble play of those affections and sympathies which can only be nourished by a vigorous social life, the conventional forms which have been substituted in its stead, to some extent insincere, because conventional,—these are among the circumstances which go to increase the unhappy tendency referred to. There are gentlemen in New York, we have reason to fear, who do not know that the Presbyterian Church in the United States has its Foreign Missionary Office in that city, although they contribute to its funds. Now, if any thing can annihilate such narrowness of views, it is a

meeting like this of the representatives of a church extending over a territory of three millions of square miles: and we earnestly trust that not only the members of this body, but the Christian friends who entertained them, have a wider conception and a sweeter sense of the fellowship of the saints, since this meeting has been held.

As to the effect of the meeting on the city at large, it was probably the same as the effect of all other sorts of conventions,—that is to say, nothing. An enthusiastick gathering of thousands at the City Hall, with all the noisy pomp of musick and cannon, would never be known to the inhabitants up-town, but for the press. There were several assemblies ecclesiastical in session at the same time in New York during the month of May; but the great monster was scarcely more conscious of their presence than the ox in the fable was of the presence of the fly upon his horn. It is impossible to determine how many assemblies might pour into that city, without in the slightest degree, disturbing its equanimity. For purposes of general impression, there can be no doubt that any other place in the country ought to be preferred to New York, for the meeting of the General Assembly.

In looking over the Assembly, one of the most striking features to an observer, was the large, perhaps unusual number of grey heads. No man could doubt that a body of men was here, who worked hard, and endured privation for Christ's sake: and it was a pleasant reflection, that no man ever worked or suffered for that Blessed Master in vain; and that the time was coming, when a premature old age, brought on by incessant labours in His cause, should be rewarded with the joys of immortal youth and vigour. If our infidels who are always canting about "earnest-minded-men," would look in now and then, upon an Assembly like this, during the devotional exercises, they might perhaps be led to suspect, that men who worship a God above them, may be as "earnest-minded" as those who worship themselves, the divinity within. While we say this, it gives us great pain to add, that there is not in the lobbies, nor always even in the house, that silence during the worship of God, which eminently becomes such a body of representatives of His people. The lobby nuisance will have to be abated, or there will be an end to all reverent worship or profitable debate.

One remark more of a general kind. No one could fail to be struck with the conservative temper of the body, in regard to the subject which is now agitating the whole country. Henry Clay is reported to have said, that he would never despair of the Union, until the Old School Presbyterian Church was rent asunder. And in this "deliverance" he showed more sagacity than in some others which have become more famous. Long may she be a bond of union to these States, and a blessing to the world!

#### THE OPENING SERMON.

The propriety of publishing opening sermons by the authority of the Assembly admits of serious question. It is often the case, that retiring Moderators make the sermon the vehicle of their own views, touching certain points which are subjects of debate between different parties in the church, or between the church and the world. The sermon of Dr. Boardman at the opening of the Assembly of 1855, was an instance of the former; the sermon of Dr. Rice, at the opening of the last Assembly, an example of the latter. The Assembly, as such, ought not to be committed before the world to certain doctrines, or to certain methods of handling doctrines, by a vote upon a mere complimentary resolution. No man likes



to refuse to join in a vote of this kind, and yet the effect of it is to commit him, as a member of the body, to the doctrines or methods of the performance proposed to be published under its imprimatur. If the theory of the church, propounded in Dr. Boardman's sermon, had been brought before the Assembly last year for discussion and formal vote, there would have been a large and respectable minority against it; and when it comes to be thoroughly examined, the whole church, we doubt not, will reject it. And yet the resolution to print, so far as we know, was adopted *nem. con.* In regard to Dr. Rice's sermon, we may say, that the impression made by its delivery was, upon the whole, a happy one and a wholesome one. But as a *discussion*, we think, it was defective even for a sermon. His text was, "Preach the Word;" his leading topics, the "matter" and "manner" of preaching. He professed his intention to say little or nothing about the "matter," and to devote himself chiefly to the "manner;" but, in point of fact, as it appeared to us, he said a great deal about the "matter," and comparatively little about the "manner." This, however, is a mere affair of arrangement and logical distribution. A large part of the sermon was occupied with defining the true position of the publick expounder of the word in regard to philosophy and science,—a very delicate point in the present posture of opinion. The prominent postulate here was, that, on all questions, science and revelation should each be regarded as supreme in its own sphere, and its decisions final. Sometimes, consequently, science must correct its conclusions by the voice of revelation, and, sometimes, the interpretation of revelation must be modified and corrected by the discoveries of science. But the preacher did not propose any criterion, by which we might determine to which of the two classes any given question is to be referred. The divine, Sumner for instance, will insist that it is in the last degree improbable, that there should be no authentick record of so stupendous a series of facts as are implied in a cosmogony; and if there be such a record, our whole business is one of interpretation: we are to interrogate the record, according to the established usages of language. This record having been made by the Creator Himself,—for, in the nature of the case, none other could be authentick,—its deliverances must be final, and the geologist must bring his facts into harmony with it. The geologist, on the other hand, maintains that the record he has found written upon the stony tablets of the earth, is equally authentick, and more prespicuous; and, therefore, Moses must change his voice. Now, will Dr. Rice tell us, how we are to arbitrate between the divine and the geologist; upon what principle, or by what criterion, we are to decide to which *sphere* these questions belong? If he can do this, he will impose a debt of gratitude upon Christian geologists and geological Christians, all over the world.

Again, in another part of the sermon, he justly defined the office of reason in respect to revelation to be two-fold; *first*, to examine the evidences of revelation, and *second*, to interpret it. But he did not tell us, what this term "evidences" includes. Are the *contents* of the record any part of the evidence? If so, then what are the limitations under which the reason of man is to judge of these contents considered as evidence, or, which amounts to the same thing, considered as determining the interpretation? The infidel geologist says, Moses, interpreted according to the laws of the Hebrew language, is wrong; therefore, he did not write by inspiration of God. The Christian geologist says, Moses, as commonly interpreted, is

wrong; therefore, we must seek another interpretation. The principle upon which they both stand is the same, the authority of reason. Now what are the limitations upon this authority? Will Dr. Rice tell us?

The truth is, we are too sensitive altogether about the pretensions of science; and especially, now, about the pretensions of geology. There is no contradiction among the *facts* of nature; the contradiction lies in the theories which men have framed to account for them. We may rest assured, that the Bible, which is even now necessary to reconcile the apparently contradictory conclusions of different sciences, geology and ethnology, for example, will ultimately be found to be in perfect harmony with the highest and maturest conclusions of them all.

If any apology be necessary for making these remarks, we refer to the fact already mentioned, that the Assembly has ordered the sermon to be printed, and thus made it, in some sort, a part of its proceedings. And we may add, that the reputation of Dr. Rice as well as his official position before the Assembly, gives weight to every thing he speaks or writes.

#### THE BOARDS.

These institutions occupied, as usual, a very considerable share of the attention and time of the Assembly. The address of the Rev. J. L. Wilson, one of the Secretaries of the Board of Foreign Missions, was listened to with great interest. No man who loves the Lord Jesus Christ can help rejoicing in such intelligence as the Report of this Board communicates to the churches. The Lord has demonstrated His faithfulness in performing His promises to His people; and it should have the effect of increasing their faith, patience, diligence and zeal. The resolutions reported by the various committees to whom the annual reports were referred, were adopted, as is generally the case, without discussion, and we may add, without examination. The only apparent exception to this remark,—and it was only apparent,—was a speech of two or three minutes in length by the Rev. Dr. Thornwell, of South Carolina, by way of protest against the control of the Board of Education over secular education, and against the assumed duty and constitutional power of the Church to exercise any control over this department of the interests of society. He insisted that the whole affair of general public education belonged to the State, and not to the Church; and that the Board of Education had been created for the sole purpose of assisting candidates for the Christian ministry, while engaged in the prosecution of the necessary course of study. He stated, that he did not intend to make an argument upon these points, though he was prepared to do so; and no argument was made. The resolution objected to is as follows:—

“5. *Resolved*, That while the Assembly continues to approve of the course of the Board in establishing schools, academies, and colleges on a definite religious basis, a sound discretion is necessary as to their number and location; and lest the observations of the Board in this relation should be exposed to invidious misconstruction, it should be distinctly understood that the Church does not undervalue the importance of any institution of learning, which, though not subjected to ecclesiastical supervision, recognizes the authority, and inculcates the principles of God’s written word; much less disparage the common school system, as adapted to useful ends, so long as the Bible is not excluded.”

It will be observed, that this resolution is so constructed as to be inca-

pable of division ; and the vote, therefore, was of necessity, a vote either for or against the whole. We do not know whether "the hand of Joab" was in it or not, but it marvellously resembles most of the statements of the Board of Education upon this delicate subject, mixing up the true and the false, the unquestionable and the doubtful, in one mass, and forcing the Church to the disagreeable alternative, either of accepting some error, or of rejecting some truth. We cannot understand these perpetual saving clauses in regard to common-school education, while the effort is systematically made to draw off from it the support of the Presbyterian Church. If all the evangelical denominations set up for themselves, and leave the common schools to the care of themselves, or to the care of the world and the devil, of course these common schools must become a curse. We cannot but hope, that our church will pause and consider the drift of this whole scheme, and will refuse to abandon the glorious mission which the past history of our country demonstrates that God has committed to her. Let her not cut herself off from the sympathies of the great American people.

We cannot pass from this subject without expressing our gratification with the remarks made by Dr. Dabney, of Virginia upon the low standard of qualifications for the ministry, practically established by too many of our Presbyteries, or, in other words, upon the easy admission of candidates to the privileges of the ministry. He showed that the effect of slight and merely nominal examinations, was to degrade the whole office in the eyes of that very class of young men, whom we should be most anxious to get into it. What any body can get, is not worth any body's striving for. The wider we open the door, the fewer men of generous minds will come in. In our anxiety to increase the number of ministers, we should beware of degrading the office in such a manner, as to discourage any but ordinary men from seeking it.

Dr. Peyton Harrison, of the same State, protested against the current notion, that only indigent young men are to be expected to offer themselves to the Lord, in the service of the ministry. And it deserves to be considered, whether we have not, in our plans and prayers, practically limited the Holy One of Israel, in choosing His ministers, to a certain class, to young men, and poor young men. The sooner we get rid of the idea of a class-ministry, the better. We cannot help thinking, that a large infusion of that sort of tone, which is acquired in the honourable practice of the other learned professions, would greatly improve the tone of the ministry, by counteracting the tendencies of the exclusively professional, we had almost said, monastick education, acquired in the Seminaries.

There was one circumstance connected with the operations of all the Boards during the last year, which will gratify all the "strict-constructionists" in the church, and that is, that they have dispensed, in whole, or in part, with paid collecting agents, not only without detriment to their revenues, but to the positive increase of them. The Assembly does some good things as well as bad, without knowing precisely at the time what it is doing. It has called attention by its action of 1854 and 1855 on Systematic Benevolence, to principles which will work an entire revolution, ultimately, in the plans and schemes of the church for sustaining and propagating the Gospel. These principles are very far from being fully comprehended as yet, but they are working. Let us have faith in God, and wait!

## INADEQUATE SUPPORT OF MINISTERS.

The Rev. Dr. Junkin offered a resolution, which the House agreed to, for the appointment of a committee to draft a pastoral letter to the churches, in reference to this subject. Dr. Dabney was made chairman of this committee, and reported a paper containing many hints and suggestions, which our congregations would do well to consider.

There can be no doubt, that the ministry is inadequately supported; but there is as little doubt, in our own mind, that the whole blame ought not to be laid upon the people. The first question in regard to any particular preaching is, whether it is worth paying for at all. There is not a little of what is called fine preaching, which is not worth the money expended upon the sexton, fuel and light, simply for the reason that it is not the gospel. Unfortunately, preaching of this sort is generally well supported; for the world loveth its own. There is very little of this preaching, we rejoice to believe, in our own church. But there is a kind of preaching, which is evangelical as to its matter, but any thing but that, as to its manner and form. It makes no impression upon the people, and they cannot be expected to value the truths it is designed to convey. There is no earnestness, no freedom, no urgency of exhortation or entreaty, nothing to make the people feel that they are in contact with a living soul. It is utterly idle to expect, that a genuine gospel ministry will be sustained, unless the people live and grow under it. A few men may be found, in almost every community, who are willing to contribute to the support of the church and its ordinances, from a general consideration of the happy influence of these institutions upon society; but such comprehensive views are rare. In the great majority of cases, all depends upon the man himself, first of all. Let him be baptized with the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and preach Christ, with all his heart and soul, and mind, and strength; give himself wholly to his work, and throw himself upon the people for his living. Next, let the people grow in grace; let them be "rooted, grounded, settled in the truth, *abounding therein with thanksgiving*,"—as they will be very apt to be under such a ministry,—and nothing can hinder them from coming up to the full support of the Gospel among themselves, but want of means, or want of instruction in regard to this particular duty. If they are poor, then the Lord accepteth according to what they have, and not according to what they have not. If they do not know that it is their duty to minister in temporal things, to those who minister to them in spiritual things; that the Lord has ordained, that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel; that contribution to the cause of God is a regular, stated, ordinance of worship, like prayer or singing; whose fault is it? Their own fault, no doubt; but the fault also of the preacher, who ought not to shun to declare any part of the Divine counsel. But it is a delicate matter, it is said. It might be so considered, if it were not a Divine ordinance, and designed fully as much for the edification of the people who give, as for the comfort and usefulness of the minister who receives. Even if a minister were able to live without a salary, it would still be the part of mercy to the people, to require them to give according to their ability. If a man, therefore, understands the spiritual relations of this ordinance of giving, and believes in it as a means of grace, provided by the "Author and Finisher of faith," there needs be no delicacy in the matter.

Let these conditions then concur: life in the preacher, and life in the people, along with proper instruction as to their duty, and a competent measure of pecuniary ability; and there will be no difficulty on the score of support. The great trouble is the want of life. We are expecting the grace of liberality to flourish, while all the other graces are languishing; we are looking for a vigorous arm, when a mortal paralysis has smitten the heart. Let us give up our galvanism, and pray for the Spirit of life. There can be no substitute for that. We need never distrust the grace of God in the hearts of His people; only let us appeal always to their *faith* in the word of Jesus, and their love to His Person. But if professing Christians believe not in Him, and love Him not, what right have we to look for any better treatment? The disciple is not greater than his teacher, nor the servant than his master. It is *enough* that the disciple be as his teacher, and the servant as his master. It would be a wretched thing for us and for the church, if we were allowed to ride in triumph upon our high places, while the honour of our royal Master was in the dust.

#### PROVISION FOR DISABLED MINISTERS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

Upon the reading of the annual report of the Trustees, to whom the funds contributed for the relief of disabled ministers and their families are entrusted, a Committee was appointed to prepare and present a plan to the Assembly, by which the wants of this class of sufferers should be provided for more effectually. Dr. Rogers, of Philadelphia, as Chairman of this Committee, made a report, in which, after setting forth the poverty and distress which actually exists, and arguing the right of worn out ministers to a competent support, and the corresponding duty of the Church to afford it, a plan was recommended for a permanent fund; this fund to be raised by a contribution of not less than five dollars from every minister, and one of not less than ten dollars from every church, annually for five years; and to be distributed according to certain rules laid down in the same paper. The plan was simply the constitution of an insurance company.

The report was adopted by parts, but when the question was about to be taken upon its adoption as a whole, the motion was made and carried to re-commit the paper to the committee. The committee reported the second time substantially the same plan, and, after very considerable discussion, the subject was committed to another committee, consisting mainly of Ruling Elders, to report to the next General Assembly. The only portion of the original committee's report adopted by the house, was the rhetorical preamble to the resolutions, and that not without some expurgation. We cannot refrain from expressing our surprise, that a paper of this kind should be ordered to be spread out upon the Minutes. It ought to have been put in the Appendix, if printed at all.

The whole discussion showed,—and there was more said upon this subject, first and last, than upon any other,—that a majority of the Assembly were afraid of *permanent* funds. Wherever the church has been, or is established, endowed by the State, no objection is made to such funds; but under any purely voluntary system, men feel, even when they have not the perspicacity to perceive, that they are foreign to the genius of the system, and are liable to great and dangerous perversion and abuse. It was indeed argued, that we must have permanent funds, that we could not have Seminaries, &c., without them; but it was conceded that they were danger-

ous; and the history of Seminaries is a signal proof of it. Dr. Thornwell argued, that a permanent fund ought always to be avoided, in providing for *contingent* wants; it ought only to be resorted to, in the case of wants or demands permanent in their nature, and existing and operating according to a settled law, capable of being ascertained and defined. He contended, that Seminaries belonged to this last class, and the wants of disabled ministers to the category of contingencies, to be met as they arose. He argued against such a fund, also, from the well-known principle of political economy, that a publick institution for the relief of poverty, has the effect of increasing the evil. And a fund of the kind proposed by the committee, would be apt to bring men into the ministry of our church, whom we did not want. It would be a great calamity to weaken that spirit of self-denial and of trust in God, which is now so honourable a characteristic of our ministry, and which contributes so largely to their respectability and usefulness. He conceded, it was conceded by all, that our brethren in affliction, their widows and little ones, ought to be and must be taken care of; but he held that the sympathies and charities of the people of God would not be found wanting, when the cases of distress became known. It was the duty of the church to provide for the poor saints, and this duty would be performed, without a permanent fund.

It appears to us, that a great many random assertions are made by our brethren, in discussing this subject. We do not believe it to be true, for example, that ministers, as a class, leave their families in a more helpless condition than any other class of the people of God; and the people of God are not, as a class, forsaken, nor are their seed, as a class, beggars of their bread. That they are not rich, is true; but that is no calamity. God, who loves them, does not intend that they shall have their portion in this life. He has a better and an enduring substance in store for them. They, who have their portion in this life, whose belly is filled with hid treasure, and who leave the rest of their substance to their babes, are "men of the world." Again, it is no disgrace to be poor, or to live upon the charities of the church, if the Giver of all has denied to us the privilege of working. If we are able to work, and do not, we have no right to eat. If we are able to work, and do work, we shall eat. If we are not able to work, then are we Christ's poor, and must live as He lived, upon the charities of His people. We must not fret against that sovereign, and, we doubt not, merciful constitution of society, which has made poverty a permanent element in it, especially since Jesus has made the poor the representatives of Himself, and has said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto these, ye have done it unto me." So long as it stands upon record, that the Son of Man had not, on earth, a place to lay His head, how can any child of God doubt his love, because he is poor? It is *enough*, that the servant be as his master. A great deal was said, in the debate in the Assembly, about ministers and their families being thrown upon "the cold charities of the world." This is not the true statement of the case. They are thrown upon the charity of those who love the Lord Jesus Christ, and that charity is not "cold." It was a charity, to which the Saviour was willing, amidst His dying agonies, to commit her who bare Him.

We think, therefore, that our chief concern, as rulers in the house of God, should be to have the living and working ministry adequately supported; and the rest should be willing to be numbered among the poor of the flock, and to be provided for as they are. At any rate, the plan of an

insurance company is not the thing. If a man has no conscientious scruples about insurance, he can be accommodated by others than the Trustees of the Assembly. One remark more, and we dismiss this subject. If any systematick effort is to be made for the relief of the class in question, it ought to be made by Synods or Presbyteries, and not by the General Assembly. The Church of Scotland is no model for us, in matters of this sort. It covers a territory not much larger than the State of Maryland, and may act as an unit in every thing. Our church covers a vast expanse of country, and the sentiment of sympathy operates with comparative languor and feebleness between the distant parts. It would be well, on this account, if, following the analogy of our political system, we relied more upon the energies of the local bodies, and less upon the Assembly. If, for example, the interests of education and of domestick missions were managed by the Synods for themselves, with some small central committees of the Assembly, to be the means of communication between the weak and the strong, the business would be much more effectually done, to say nothing of the great saving of expense. But, in the matter before us, in which so much depends upon the natural operation of compassion, the nearer the parties needing assistance are brought to the parties who are to give it, the more certain is the result. We do not believe that any *Assembly's* fund, of any kind, will ever answer the purpose.

**THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR VOTERS FOR CHURCH OFFICERS, AND THE RELATION OF BAPTIZED PERSONS, NOT PROFESSING FAITH IN CHRIST TO THE CHURCH.**

An Overture was sent up from the Presbytery of Londonderry, asking the Assembly to express its judgment in reference to these points; and the Committee of Bills and Overtures recommended, that the Assembly content itself with the following deliverances:—

1. That only communicating members have a right to vote for Ruling Elders.
2. That inasmuch as the Pastor sustains the relation of Teacher as well as that of Ruling Elder, there is no impropriety in the non-communicating supporters of his ministry voting for him, provided that no communicating member be excluded.
3. That a baptized person, not professing faith in Christ, stands in a relation to the Church, analogous to that in which a minor in the State stands to the State.

As the official Minutes of the Assembly have not yet appeared, we have been compelled to rely upon our memory for these statements, as for many others contained in this article. There can be no doubt, however, as to their substantial accuracy.

The report of the Committee was put upon the docket, and was not taken up until the last day of the sessions. It was evident, from the conversation which then took place, that there would be very considerable debate upon these propositions, and, as the House was not prepared at that late stage in the proceedings, to go into it, the motion was made and carried to lay the whole subject upon the table, with the expectation that it would come up again at the meeting of the next General Assembly. This fact, together with the fact that one of these questions was before the Assembly of last year, justifies us in throwing out some hints, which may contribute a little towards a final and satisfactory decision upon the subject.

1. In regard to the qualifications of voters for Ruling Elders, there is

scarcely any room for a difference of opinion. The XIII Chapter of the Form of Government provides, that "every congregation shall elect persons to the office of ruling elder, and to the office of deacon, or either of them, in the mode most approved and in use in that congregation." (Sec. 2) If nothing more were said, it might be supposed that "the mode," here, included the question of qualifications. But the form of installation in the 4th section, is conclusive in favour of the interpretation of the Assembly's Committee:—"The minister shall address to the *members of the church* the following question:—viz.—Do you, *the members of this church*, acknowledge and receive this brother as a ruling elder (or deacon,) and do you promise to yield him all that honour, encouragement, and obedience in *the Lord*, to which his office, according to the word of God, and the constitution of this church, entitles him?" Now independently of the express designation "members of the church," applied to the electors, the question itself is one which, by its very terms, is incapable of being properly answered in the affirmative, by any other persons. We wish this point to be remembered, as it is an important circumstance in the consideration of the question touching the qualifications of voters for Pastor, so far as that question is one of constitutional law. Let it be observed, also, that the terms "church" and "congregation" are used interchangeably in this chapter: The "congregation" shall elect; the "members of the church" shall answer. We do not intend to assert, however, that these terms are, either in general use, or in the use of our book, precisely equipollent. We think that the framers of the constitution intended to use them interchangeably, when they had reference to a *particular* society of believers; but that the term church, was used only of the whole body, consisting of a plurality of particular churches or congregations. Compare C. 8. S. 2. where it is said, that the governing assemblies "exclude the contumacious and impenitent from the *congregation of believers*." If the persons excluded be elders, deacons, or private members, then the congregation from which they are excluded, is of course a particular congregation. If they be ministers, then the congregation is the church represented by the Presbytery (not the Session :) and as this is an unusual sense of the word, our fathers thought it was well to add the epeexegetical clause, "of believers." The exception proves the rule. No instance, we think, can be found in our book, in which the term "congregation," without any explanatory phrase is used of the whole church, considered as a unit, or of any portion of it larger than a particular society under the jurisdiction of a session. But of such a particular society, the term is used interchangeably with the term "church." See the foot note to Form of Government, chapter XII.

But even if the constitution were less explicit than we have found it to be upon this question of the voters for Ruling Elders, we should still have no difficulty in settling it in the light of the great principles of our system and of the word of God. There is a broad distinction made in the New Testament, between the church and the world, the sphere of God and the sphere of Cæsar. Our Saviour makes the distinction so broad, as to exclude not only the interference of the State as such, but also the interference of the *world* as such, in whatever form that interference may be attempted. "My kingdom is not of this world." Any power or "patronage" exercised by those who are not subjects of this kingdom, citizens of this commonwealth, members of this household of faith, is an usurpation, a tyranny, incompatible, *de jure*, if not *de facto*, with its freedom and indepen-



dence. Let the history of all religious establishments, even that of Scotland, witness the truth of this proposition. It is nothing to the purpose to say, that this is State patronage, but, in this country, where no such thing is possible as usurpation by the State, there can be no harm in non-professing people voting for Elders. The ready answer is, that the latter sort of patronage is the more dangerous, because it is exercised wholly *without responsibility*; while patrons, under the authority of the State, are at least, in name, responsible to that authority; and further, because the State patrons *may be* God-fearing men, whereas these Church-patrons of ours, are, *ex vi terminorum*, without Christ and without God in the world. If then, a body of voters outside of the Church of Christ, which is his kingdom, a body of voters not subject to the jurisdiction of ruling elders, can *impose* a man, as a Ruler, upon the Church, where is its freedom? If one body of men are bound to obey a ruler, which another body of men have chosen to rule them, what becomes of the cardinal principle of liberty, that the ruled have the right to choose their own rulers? that the people are to be governed by representatives elected by themselves? Will it be said, that this argument proceeds upon an extreme case, and that in the vast majority of instances, the feeling of the outside supporters of a Church is not antagonistic to the interests of the Church members? The answer is, that these so called extreme cases are not infrequent in the choice of a Pastor; and extreme cases are the crucial tests of principles. Let us never forget, that our revolutionary fathers "went to war against a *preamble*." Death is preferable to the loss of a few shillings of ship-money, where the right to exact the payment, involves the right to make slaves of freemen.

The principles laid down in the chapter on the Civil Magistrate, (xxiii) in our Confession of Faith, are applicable to the whole subject of outside controul over the affairs of the Church. "As Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in His church, no law of any commonwealth should *interfere with*, let, or hinder, the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief." Any influence, any custom, operating, with the force of a law, upon the Church from without, most certainly comes under the condemnation of this sentence. Trustees exercising certain functions under a State law of incorporation, or pew-holders invested with certain rights of property under the same law, may imagine that they have a right to exercise certain privileges in a corporation existing under the law of the great King Christ, *qua* Trustees and Pew-holders; but if they have, then verily the people of God have no king but Cæsar, and freedom is "of all our vanities the motliest, the merest word that ever fooled the ear from out the schoolman's jargon."

We have dwelt the longer upon the first proposition of the Committee, because it afforded the occasion of calling attention to some of the great principles which controul the whole subject of the Committee's report; and because it will require us to say less on their second proposition, which is,

2. That as the Pastor sustains the relation of Teacher as well as that of Ruling Elder, there is no impropriety in the non-communicating supporters of his ministry voting for him, provided that no communicating member be excluded.

As the Pastor is a Ruling Elder, it will not be denied that the principles already laid down in regard to the election of that officer, apply, and apply with greater force, to him. Being generally superior, in point of educa-

tion and of knowledge of ecclesiastical law, to the other elders associated with him in the government of the congregation, and having greater advantages for the acquisition of personal influence among the members of the Church, than his colleagues and equals in authority, and being, officially, *primus inter pares*; it is of vastly more consequence to those who are subject to the jurisdiction of the session over which he presides, to have a free election, to resist all outside interference in choosing him as moderator, than in choosing the other members. And the more especially, as in the event of his malversation in office, he is to be tried, not by the session, like his colleagues, but by the Presbytery, a court in which only one representative of the aggrieved congregation can sit. Practically, in many cases, either through the modesty or neglect of the Ruling Elders, or the fault in some way of the Pastor himself, he is the session. If he should be a bad man, and yet with talents enough, and of the right sort, to secure the support of the worldly supporters of the congregation, it is easy to see what havoc he might make of the sheep. If it is said, that the remedy is in the Presbytery, without which body no man can be installed as Pastor in a Presbyterian Church; we answer, very true; but prevention is better and easier than cure.

Again, the ruling function of the Pastor's office is that in which, on many accounts, the people are more concerned, than in any other. It is this which gives him authority. It is this which places the character and happiness of the church-members, in a great measure, in his hands. Every body knows, what tremendous power an ungenerous, malicious man has to persecute,—and yet to keep clear of exposing himself to prosecution for transcending the legal bounds of his authority,—provided he be invested with the power of jurisdiction over any department of his victim's life. The history of the Pastoral office is not free from such examples. We are astonished, therefore, that men can be found, cautious, prudent, men of sense, to argue, that because, by the charters of many of the city Churches, the Pastor is, *ex officio*, a member of the Board of Trustees, none but electors of trustees have a right to vote for him! Surely, if there is any force in such an argument, it would conclude, *a fortiori*, that because a pastor is a Ruling Elder, none but communicating members should have a right to vote. The office of Ruling Elder is a Divine office, in which all church-members are deeply and permanently concerned; the office of trustee is an office of the State, in which the people are only slightly and occasionally concerned.

But the Committee base the assertion of the "propriety"—they do not say, *right*—of non-communicating supporters of the ministry voting for Pastor, upon the ground that they have an interest in him as a Teacher.

Upon this argument we submit the following considerations:—1. It is the relation of a Pastor, and not the relation of a mere Teacher, that is now in question. Nobody doubts, that a minister of the gospel might be invited by a number of persons, making no profession of religion, to preach to them, to instruct them in the plan of salvation. Each regiment in the Army of the United States, or each ship in the Navy, might be allowed to select their own chaplain, instead of receiving him, as they do now, by the appointment of the government. But the chaplain has no authority; he is a mere witness for the truth as it is in Jesus. In a settled church-state, the case is different; a Pastor implies the existence of a flock, he is invested with the function of discipline, *in order to* the more effectual exercise of the

function of teaching. Christ, the chief Shepherd, has two staves, the one of Beauty, and the other of Bands. "Blessed is the man, O Lord, whom thou *chastenest* and *teachest* out of thy law." These two functions are combined in all the institutions of God for the education of the race. The mere supporters of the ministry, therefore, refusing to submit to the jurisdiction of the Pastor, as invested with the power of discipline, cannot be said to have sufficient interest in him, even as Teacher, to entitle them to vote.

2. It is generally conceded, that church-members only should vote for deacons: and our constitution is perfectly explicit upon this point. But non-communicating supporters of the church contribute to its funds, some of them very liberally. According to the argument of the Committee, therefore, they ought to be allowed to vote for deacons. These same supporters are interested in the election of Ruling Elders, because the session regulates the whole affair of the distribution of the funds, the office of the deacon being merely executive; therefore, according to the argument, the supporters should vote for Ruling Elders. But the Committee say, no. 3. The Committee have not said what is meant by "supporters of the Pastor's ministry." It is not every man who hears him preach. Is it every man who contributes to his salary? What then shall we say of those, of whom there are very many, who pay their pew-rent or their annual subscription, and yet seldom or never attend church? And is the elective franchise in the church of God, then, a thing to be bought with money, and capable of being expanded and contracted, at the caprice, or by the ambition, of wicked men? Upon this view of the subject, we do not see that the franchise has any limits. A property-holder, in the neighbourhood of a city church, is interested in the teaching of the minister, and by the payment of a trifling sum, may exercise the privilege of voting, on the same footing with a church-member, albeit he never comes inside of the meeting-house! He is not subject to the session: he can not be disciplined for non-attendance. He has paid his money; and that is all that can be exacted. The conclusion seems to us to be monstrous. 4. Again, if we understand the doctrine of the Committee, baptized persons, who are neither communicating members nor contributors, have no right to vote for church officers of any sort, and yet they are subject to the jurisdiction of the session, and have an interest in the Pastor, as Teacher. Then we have, here, a discrimination made in favour of a class of non-communicating persons, who refuse to submit to the government of the Pastor and session, against another class of non-communicating persons, who do submit to that government,—both classes having an equal interest in the Pastor as a Teacher! This, also, to us, is a monstrous conclusion. 5. Once more we deny, that such a privilege should be allowed to unbelievers, for the reason that all power ecclesiastical, whether that which is exercised in office, or that of electing and setting apart to office, is "ministerial and declarative;" that is to say, is merely the power of servants to declare and obey the will of their master, Christ. The only rule, in which this will is expressed, is the word of Scripture: the only effectual source of the knowledge of this will is the Holy Spirit of God. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. Now, in the election of all church-officers, the process is a spiritual process, regulated by the law laid down in the word of God. The qualifications of officers are

described in the word; their existence in certain persons is an indication of the will of Christ, that those persons should exercise the functions of such offices; their existence in said persons must be discerned by the church, rulers and people, through the operation of the same Spirit, who bestowed them upon the possessors of them; and then acknowledged by a formal choice and formal ordination. But whether in the people who elect, or the man who accepts, or the court which ordains, the whole process is one of simple obedience to Christ, making known His will by His word and Spirit. Now, since, by the terms of the supposition, non-professing supporters of the ministry are "natural" men, "not having the Spirit;" have never acknowledged the authority of Christ and subjected themselves to His law; they are incapable of taking any part in this business; they are incapable of judging of a Pastor's qualifications as a Teacher in general, or of the suitableness of his ministry to a particular congregation. We do not see how these principles can be denied, without making the Church a human institute, or at least, the calling of her officers a human calling.

In the last place, the constitution of the church, as it appears to us, takes it for granted, that the members of the church only have a right to vote for Pastor. We have seen that, although the terms "congregation" and "church" are both used in the chapter (XIII) on the Election of Elders and Deacons, they yet mean the same thing, "*members of the Church.*" The chapter on the Election of Bishops or Pastors (XV) uses the term "congregation," in all cases, in which the people electing are referred to; but evidently in the same sense. To say nothing of the clause in Sec. 4, which is confessedly ambiguous, the language of the call in Sec. 6, and the questions propounded to the people, at the installation, are conclusive against the view of the Committee.

The people, in their call, say—"being well satisfied of the ministerial qualifications of you—and having good hopes, from our past experience of your labours, that your ministrations in the Gospel will be profitable to our spiritual interests, do earnestly call and desire you to undertake the pastoral office in said congregation; promising you, in the discharge of your duty, all proper support, encouragement, and *obedience in the Lord.*" Now let it be remembered, that in the case of a Licentiate, this judgment of the congregation as to his ministerial qualifications is an important element in the evidence that God has called him; an evidence without which, in ordinary cases, the Presbytery is not allowed to ordain him; and that it is important evidence, because regarded as the testimony of the Spirit in the people, concurring with the testimony of the Spirit in the Presbytery licensing him, and the testimony of the same Spirit in the man's own conscience, moving him to seek an opportunity to preach,—and we cannot avoid the conclusion, that the "congregation" of the call, is the congregation of believers. This is confirmed by the fact, that they promise him "*obedience in the Lord,*" which none but believers could properly do.

Then, at the installation, the "congregation" calling are required to answer questions, which none but believers can honestly answer in the affirmative. The second question, especially, shows that the people answering are members of the Church:—"Do you promise to receive the word of truth from his mouth, with meekness and love; and to *submit to him in the due exercise of discipline?*" In the next chapter, on the translation of ministers from one charge to another, the terms "church" and "congregation" are again used interchangeably. "Instalment" is defined to be,

"constituting the pastoral relation between the minister and the people of the particular church," over which he is to be installed.\*

Upon the whole, then, while there might be no impropriety in certain cases, in mere "supporters" of a church, sending up an expression of their judgment about a minister, in the way of memorial or petition to the Presbytery, they certainly are not entitled to vote in the election. And we think, that consistency, as well as truth, required the Committee of Bills and Overtures, to say so. The true statement of the case is, that inasmuch as the Pastor sustains the relation of Teacher to the non-communicating supporters of his ministry, their judgment ought to have some weight with the congregation, with the voters, in choosing a man for that office, and with the Presbytery in putting the call into his hands.

3. The last proposition of their report is, that baptized persons, not professing faith in Christ, are minors in the Church, and, as such, are not entitled to the full enjoyment of its privileges, though subject to its jurisdiction and protecting care.

This we believe to be a true statement of the relation of baptized children to the church. See *Critic*, vol. 1, p. 128. And we think, although some disposition to dispute it was shown in the Assembly, that when the terms are understood, it will be so acknowledged. Its bearing upon the subject of church-elections will, of course, be variously determined, according to the various judgments of individuals upon that question. Our confession (c. 25) makes the children of believers constituent elements of the Church visible and catholic; and the special privileges of this Church are defined to be (Larg. Cat. Q. 63),—"the privilege of being under God's special care and government; of being protected and preserved in all ages, notwithstanding the opposition of all enemies; and of enjoying the communion of saints, the ordinary means of salvation, and offers of grace by Christ, to all members of it, in the ministry of the gospel, testifying that whosoever believes in Him shall be saved, and excluding none that will come to Him." But in the actual participation of these privileges, the Presbyterian Church has always drawn a broad line between those members who make a credible profession of faith, and those who do not. See *Directory for Worship*, c. 9, s. 1., which lays down, very distinctly, the true doctrine, and the *Book of Discipline*, c. 1, s. 6, which is in entire harmony with it. Baptized non-professing persons are entitled to all the privileges of the other members of the Church, except those which presuppose the existence of faith, or, what amounts to the same thing as before the Church, a credible profession of it. It is this faith, or credible profession of it, that constitutes adulthood, that makes a person a full citizen in the Christian

\* For a summary of the historical argument upon this subject, the reader is referred to the article, in the July No. of the "*Critic*" for 1855, entitled, "Church Elections—Who shall vote for Pastor?" We have confined our remarks to the principles involved in this question; but if we chose to rest it upon considerations of expediency, the facts are unhappily abundant to show, that to allow the claim set up for non-professing persons, would be a fatal policy. And in this connection, as the question came before the Assembly by overture from a New England Presbytery, it is appropriate to refer to the fact, that Unitarianism was mainly indebted for its rapid progress in that region, to the old theocratic system under which multitudes of persons, making no credible profession of religion, were allowed to vote for Church Officers. It is very true, that the same thing would not have taken place so speedily, if the government had been Presbyterian instead of Congregational; but that even a Presbyterian government, with such abuses, is no effectual bar against corruption, the history of Moderation in the Church of Scotland, and of Socinianism in the Church of Ireland, bears melancholy testimony.

commonwealth; and, according to the principles already illustrated, none but such adults have a right to vote for Church-officers.

It will be observed that, in the whole foregoing discussion, we regard as believers, those who make a credible profession of faith, whether they have it or not. It is the prerogative of God alone to judge the heart; and in every question of right or privilege to be decided by men, the decision must be made upon what *appears*, not upon what *is*. We doubt not, that there are many unbelievers in the Church, and some true believers out of it. The latter are better qualified, morally, to vote for Church-officers, than the former. But this is not for us to judge.

#### SYSTEMATICK BENEVOLENCE.

The report of the Standing Committee upon this subject was, to those who have felt a special interest in the action of the Assemblies of 1854 and 1855, a very discouraging document. 1. In the first place, it appeared that the great majority of the Presbyteries had paid no attention at all to the injunctions of the above-named Assemblies, in the premises; at least, they reported no action. It is scarcely to be supposed that these delinquent bodies have declined to take action, because they object to the doctrine of systematick benevolence, or to that aspect of it in which it is presented by those Assemblies; and we are driven to the conclusion either that they do not know what the highest court in the Church has enjoined, or that they feel at liberty to disregard and set aside its injunctions. Upon either supposition, it is a very bad showing for a Church which has always been distinguished for its intelligence and its respect for law and order. We speak only of those Presbyteries who have taken no action: some of them have, doubtless, obeyed the direction of the Assembly, but, for some cause, have failed to report. It would be well for these last to bear in mind, that they are directed to report, as well as to act. 2. In the second place, the report of the Committee was discouraging, because it gave no evidence that they themselves fully comprehended the action of the last two Assemblies, or entered into its spirit. They insisted upon the duty of giving, and giving systematically; but did not present the duty in the relation of an act of worship or an ordinance of the Church. The habit of thinking too much of *measures*, and too little of *principles*, is a great enemy of real progress; and its mischievous operation is seen in the speeches and acts of all our deliberative assemblies, in Church and State. One of the most painful features of the debates in this Assembly, for the most part, was the absence of appeal to great principles, and the prominence given to considerations of expediency, and that too, a temporary expediency. The subject of systematick benevolence was taken up too late for discussion; but the mind of many in the house was indicated by two things, the report itself and the opposition which was made to certain amendments, the design of which was to make the report re-affirm the action of the two preceding Assemblies. The house, by a small majority, agreed to the first, which was to insert the words, "as an ordinance of worship;" but they rejected the second, which was designed to give an imperative form to the "request" sent down to the Churches: thus practically abandoning the doctrine, that contribution is an ordinance, the observance of which is to be enforced in every organized Church, in the same manner as the ordinance of prayer, or of singing, or of preaching.

A great deal of prejudice against this doctrine has arisen from misconception of its true bearings. We have heard some intelligent ministers

speak of it, as if it were designed to bring down the censures of the church-courts upon every church-member who does not give something to the general cause of religion; and they asked, how can the church-session know whether any member gives "as God hath prospered him," or whether he is able to give any thing at all? This is a very pertinent question, in their view of the doctrine; but it has nothing to do with the Assembly's view of it. Suppose that praying, as an ordinance of publick worship, was as much neglected among our three-thousand Churches as giving is, and the Assembly were to adopt resolutions, precisely like those of 1854-'55 upon the subject of giving, saying to the churches that praying was an ordinance, and enjoining upon Presbyteries and Sessions the regular observance of it, would it be pertinent to object, that prayer is a matter between the soul and God, that God alone can know whether any soul really prays, and that He has commanded us, when we pray, to do it in secret, and not before men; and therefore, that the Assembly and the lower courts were transcending their authority in issuing such an injunction? Certainly not. Such an objection would be, in the highest degree, impertinent. Obviously, it is not secret prayer in the closet, it is not the fervor or sincerity of heart of any individual, ostensibly engaged in the publick prayer of the congregation, to which the action of the Assembly would be construed to refer, but the ordinance of prayer as a part of publick worship, and as one form, in which the fellowship of the saints is made visible. The meaning would be, that every church-session is bound to give the people stated opportunities of joining in prayer with each other, and leave the question as to the real value and the true character of their worship to be settled between their own consciences and God. Is it not evident, that this is precisely the action of the Assemblies of '54 and '55, in regard to giving? The first two resolutions of 1854 are as follows:

"1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly hereby enjoin upon the Pastors of our Churches to give greater prominence, in the ministration of the word, to the doctrine of the Scripture, as interpreted and set forth in our standards, (more particularly in Chapter XXVI, Sec. 2, of the Confession of Faith; in Question 141 of the Larger Catechism; in Chapter VII, of the Form of Government, and in Chapter IV, Sec. 5, of the Directory for Worship,) viz: that "Saints, by profession, are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities, which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who in every place call upon the Lord Jesus," "giving and lending freely according to their abilities;" and, in conformity to this doctrine, recognizing as one of the ordinances established by Christ, in connection with the sermon, prayer, and praise, "a collection raised for the poor and other purposes of the Church."

"2. *Resolved*, That the Presbyteries which have not anticipated the provisions of this action of the Assembly are most earnestly and affectionately enjoined, 1st At their meetings following the rising of this Assembly, to take order that the ministers and church-sessions in their bounds shall be directed to adopt some practicable method by which an *opportunity shall be afforded*, and an *invitation given*, to all the members of their congregations to contribute regularly to the objects of Christian benevolence recognized by the Assembly in the organization of the Boards of the Church, and to such other institutions as to them may seem right. 2d.

And at every spring meeting to institute a proper inquiry into the diligence of ministers and church-sessions, in executing the provisions of such method."

The Assembly of the next year re-affirmed this action, by adopting the clear and able report of its Committee on Systematick Benevolence. We earnestly commend these papers (Min. for 1854, pp 37, 38: and Min. for 1855, pp. 294, 296,) to the careful study of the members of the committee of the Assembly of 1856, and to all who were opposed to amending their report.

A motion was made, in the last Assembly, to invite Mr. Cather of England to address the house, when the subject of systematick benevolence should come up. We confess, we felt inclined to protest against the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. listening to the instructions of an English Wesleyan, upon any subject, and especially, upon a subject, whose principles they understood, probably, far more thoroughly than he. The gentleman, however, did not make his speech.

There is one thing more to which we may refer, as at once an evidence of awakened interest in this subject, and of a very inadequate conception of the true doctrine concerning it. That is, the formation of a "Systematick Beneficence Society" in Philadelphia. We cannot, at this moment, lay our hands upon the circular we received, stating the objects and organization of this queer association; but we understood it to be a society for the diffusion of knowledge in reference to the duty of systematick giving. Surely, this is voluntary-associationism "run into the ground." In the name of common sense, where will this rage for societies end? Where is the use of the Church of the living God, with its divinely appointed means and ordinances of *instruction*, and its divinely appointed agencies for *doing* the will of its glorious Head? Are we to have a society for every commandment, for every promise, for every warning, in the Bible? a prayer-society? a singing-society? a preaching-society? a baptism-society? a Lord's-Supper-society? a justification-by-faith-society? an efficacious-grace-society? and so on endlessly? And are the agents of all these to go round, and instruct the ignorant pastors and flocks, each in his own department, at the church's expense? We ask again, where is this folly to end? It is somewhat discouraging that, at the very time when the Presbyterian church, moving in that path in which the great events of 1837 gave her such an impetus, is striving to disencumber herself of the burden of voluntarism, and to reach the platform of her Constitution and the Bible, by giving up extraordinary and extra-ecclesiastical agencies and measures, and doing God's work in God's way, this odd quiddity should arise to oppose and pervert her testimony. The very existence of this society is a protest against the doctrine of our Assembly; and we earnestly hope, that no member of our church will be seduced and entrapped into the support of it. We are far from believing, that the persons who originated this movement, meant to oppose the Assembly's action; we only repeat what we said before, that the rage for measures prevents even good men from looking at principles. They do evil that good may come, without knowing it. "In God's name," says the Proverb, "all mischief begins."

We are constrained to believe that the failure of so many churches to contribute to the general "schemes" of benevolence, commended by the Assembly to their liberality, is due, in a great measure, to causes which we have already indicated, in our remarks upon the inadequate support of



the ministry. It will usually be found, that a liberal support of the ordinances of religion in any particular congregation will be associated with liberal contributions to the general cause, provided the necessary instruction, as to their duty, has been given from the pulpit. The grace of God in the hearts of His people, is the primary and fundamental condition in the whole business of giving; for liberality is a *fruit* of the Spirit. When the pulse of life beats feebly in the church, every good work *must languish*: there can be no substitute for *life* devised by man. "That which is born of the *flesh*, is *flesh*," and can never be any thing higher or better. Nature cannot rise above itself. That alone is *spirit*, which is born of the *Spirit*. O that we were able to honour more the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus!

1. Let the pure Gospel of the Son of God be clearly, fully, earnestly and tenderly preached; the unsearchable riches of Christ, the free and powerful grace of the Holy Comforter, and, through these, boldness of access to the Father in the holiest of all. Let this gospel be preached with unceasing prayer to Him, who sends forth His seraphim to touch the lips of whom He pleases, that His word may dwell richly in His children; that they may be rooted, grounded, established, and abounding therein with thanksgiving; that they may know what is the hope of their calling, and recognize the great truth of their consecration to God; that they have been made a royal *priesthood*, and that, like as Christ, their great High Priest, came not into the world to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many, so also they ought, if need be, to lay down their lives for the brethren, and offer themselves a sacrifice for their sakes; that they are a *royal* priesthood, and that, like as Christ entered into His glory through suffering, was exalted because He abased Himself, conquered death by dying, was made a King through His sacrifice as a Priest, so also they, the members of His body, must suffer if they would reign with Him, must conquer the world by self-denial and self-sacrifice. If it be said, that such a condition of the church as this, is not to be expected—We answer, "Is any thing too hard for the Lord?" "Can these bones live?" "Ah! Lord God, thou knowest?" "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that *God* should raise the dead?" We are not straitened in him, we are straitened in ourselves. May He give us His Spirit, that we may know the things that are freely given unto us.

2. Let the people be instructed as to what God has done, is doing, and has promised to do. Let history and prophecy stand together, in the ministrations of the pulpit, as they do in the word of God, that His people may trust, with unshaken faith, in Him who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Let them be taught, that God has condescended to make them co-workers with Himself, in reaching the glorious consummation, for which they and the whole creation are travailing in agony; that, "though needing nothing at their hands, He has condescended, for the purpose of uniting their hearts to Him in profounder sympathy, to assume a position, in which He appeals to them as really and tenderly as if He needed all things; that though their alms and their righteousness extend not directly to Him, yet the Saviour is comforted and refreshed with the humblest ministrations to His saints upon the earth; that it is Christ whom they honour in the interests of His kingdom, or rather, that it is Christ *who honours them in thus permitting them to honour Him*;" that it is not God or his ministers who are "beg-

*gars,*" when contributions are solicited, but that "he is the beggar who *solicits the favor of having his gifts accepted, and he feels it to be a distinction that he can glorify God with the fruits of his substance; that having given himself to the Lord, all that he possesses is equally devoted, and what he uses for himself, is rather by permission than by right of property.*"

Let the Pastor and the church-session go before the people, with a firm conviction of these truths; let them feel, when they ask for a contribution, that they are really *conferring a favour* upon those from whom it is asked; and where is there any room for "delicacy?" Is this thing an ordinance established by the Saviour's wisdom and love for the *good* of His blood-bought people? Is it a privilege to give, as it is a privilege to pray or give thanks, because it brings us nearer to Him who is our Life, and likens us to Him? Why, then, should there be any shrinking from this duty? Instead of presenting the matter timidly, and almost promising the people that we will not do it again, we ought to tell them boldly that the Lord will deign to receive their offerings, and that, in proportion to His blessing upon the work in answer to their prayers, will the demands upon their liberality increase; that they must expect to give more and more. Casting ourselves thus upon the faith and love of God's children, we shall be surprised, perhaps, at the cordiality and promptness with which they will respond to our appeals: and, as it is the property of the "treasure of the heart," whether good or evil, to grow by all the drafts which are made upon it, or, in other words, as habit, which strengthens by exercise, is the great controlling law of human nature,—it will be found that the more they give the more they will give. If our ministers, who are inadequately supported, and who, on that account, decline to ask for general contributions, will give their people an idea of the vast communion of saints by such general collections, they will reap the advantage of a larger measure of liberality at home. It is not to people who never have given at all that we go, when we want money: it is to those who have been in the habit of giving freely. We say, therefore, to all:—try it! try it! try it! We could mention more than one instance, in which Pastors have resolutely, amid the most dismal croaking and the most confident vaticinations as to the consequences, begun the work: and their faithfulness has been rewarded by the most gratifying results. But we forbear.

3. Let the people be shown further,—for we would have nothing done without appealing to their *convictions* and *faith*,—that God has provided for the distribution of the funds, thus consecrated to Himself, by appointing certain officers, elected by the people, for this very purpose: that the church is fully furnished for her whole work, and that no extra-constitutional agencies are needed; and that the expensive apparatus, now commonly employed for this end, is not of God's devising, but of man's.

We offer no apology for the length of these remarks. The fact that, notwithstanding all the efforts which have been made to bring the church up to her duty, less than one-half of our congregations are reported as having contributed any thing to the most popular of all our causes, that of Foreign Missions, during the last year, is a very significant fact. The only reason we can imagine for this failure is, that Presbyterian people will not do any thing in the dark, and that they are still in the dark, to a considerable extent, in regard to the great privilege and duty of giving. Let us have more light.

JUDICIAL CASE FROM THE SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA—DOES THE PRESENCE OF A RULING ELDER, NOT REGULARLY INSTALLED, IN A CHURCH-SESSION, INVALIDATE THE COURT?

The Assembly was very fortunate in its Judicial Committee, of which Dr. Campbell of Albany was Chairman. These gentlemen deserve the thanks of the whole body, which was spared the expense of a great deal of time and patience, by their firmness and prudence. Some knotty cases were settled by themselves, with the consent of the parties in litigation; and in none of the cases, which they reported for the adjudication of the house, was it necessary to go into the "merits."

The only case of any great importance, was that named in the caption of this part of our review; and the Assembly's decision was so extraordinary, as to require some special notice. It appears, that a Mr. Petrikin was arraigned before the Session of the Church of Muncy, in the Presbytery of Northumberland, upon three charges, two of which the Session, on account of being personally concerned therein, referred to the Presbytery for adjudication, and the other of which, was issued by themselves. The accused protested against the court acting at all, upon the ground that one of the two elders sitting, though previously ordained and installed in another church, and re-elected in the Muncy Church, had not been installed in the latter, and therefore had no right to sit. The Presbytery of Northumberland took up the case, upon the reference, and rendered judgment against the accused, suspending him from the communion of the church. The suspended man then appealed to the Synod of Philadelphia, and the history of the case, in that body, is thus summed up in their own minute. (Synod's Printed Minutes, 1855, p. 16)—"The appeal of William A. Petrikin from the decision of the Presbytery of Northumberland was taken up, and after some progress had been made in reading the documents, it appeared that the Session in which the case originated was not a competent court, because one of the Elders of which it was composed had not been installed over the Church of Muncy; whereupon it was

*Resolved*, That the proceedings of the Session, in this case are null and void, *ab initio*, and the acts of the Presbytery of Northumberland, based upon those of the Session, are also null and void, and that the appeal be dismissed."

After stating that an appeal of John Smalley, covering the same or similar ground, was likewise dismissed, the Minute proceeds:—

"In this decision, Synod does not intend to imply that there may not be a legal Session when there is but one Elder; but simply decides that the fact that one of the two persons acting as elders in a judicial capacity for the trial of character and church position, not having been a competent member of the court, destroyed the legality of the court, and vitiated its adjudication of this case."

"The following resolution, supplementary to the above," the record proceeds,—"was then offered by the Rev. H. S. Clark, and adopted:—

→ *Resolved*, That Synod dismiss this appeal not only for the reasons already assigned, but also because both Elders were personally interested in the issue, as appears from documents presented to Synod."

It appears, further, from p. 20, of the Synod's minutes, that Mr. Waller offered the following preamble and resolution, which the Synod refused to consider, viz:—"Whereas, this Synod has decided that the action of a

church-court is void, *ab initio*, by reason of the non-installation of one of the elders, while there was a session without the said elder; and whereas, the said elder is found by the record to have been a member of the Presbytery of Northumberland, and that by undisputed assertion, other elders, in a like situation, were also members of the same Presbytery, at the same sessions; and whereas, the Rev. Wm. Life was ordained by that Presbytery at said sessions; and whereas the action of the Synod has been thought to bring in question the validity of said ordination, therefore,

*Resolved*, That Synod declare the ordination of the Rev. Wm. Life to be unquestionably valid."

Now, not to be tedious, the action of Synod was complained against to the Assembly; and the Assembly sustained the Synod by the following vote:—Sustain the complaint, 50; not-sustain, 100; sustain *in part*, 14. So, the highest court in the church has decided, by a majority of nearly two-thirds, that the presence of one incompetent elder in a church-session vitiates the whole court, and makes all its proceedings null and void, from the beginning; and, by parity of reason, the presence of an incompetent elder in *any* of the courts makes all the proceedings of such courts null and void; and by the same inexorable logick, that venerable body, which has so decided, is no court, and all its proceedings, which we have taken the trouble to discuss, are null and void! This is no caricature. More than one elder in this Assembly,—Judge Leavitt among them,—confessed that they had never been regularly installed in the churches in which they were then exercising the office.

This difficulty was suggested in the Assembly,—as it had been in Synod, in the above-cited paper of Mr. Waller,—and, therefore, in order not to make general havock of the lower courts, to say nothing of *felo de se*, a committee was appointed to prepare a minute explanatory of the Assembly's judgement. The minute, so far as it bears upon the decision, is as follows:—

"1. That any ruling elder regularly ordained or installed in one church, and subsequently elected to that sacred office in another church, and who has heretofore, pursuant to such election, served as a ruling elder in such other church, *without objection*, shall be presumed to have been duly installed therein, and his right to act shall not now be questioned.

"2. That when a ruling elder shall hereafter be elected to the same office in a church, other than that in which he has been ordained, the minister and Session are hereby enjoined formally to instal him."

It was suggested, that the first of these resolutions came in direct conflict with the decision of the Assembly upon the case; but Dr. Humphrey, who was of the committee which framed it, explained, that "in the case decided, the elder's non-installation was objected to at the outset; whereas the first resolution provides that he shall have served without objection." Dr. Humphrey, however, we ought to state, voted with the minority, and was not at all responsible for the inconsistency in the rendering of the court. That this inconsistency exists, no man can doubt who listened to the papers, arguments and opinions presented to the house, or who will read the records of the Synod. The lower court decided, that the Session was no session, not because an uninstalled elder was objected to by an accused person; not because one elder in a *vacant* church is not an *assembly*, and, therefore according to the fundamental principle of Presbyterian government, not a constitutional court; but because the fact of non-installation makes the elder incompetent, and his incompetency destroys the

validity of the court. For all that appears, the Synod would have decided the case in the same way, if the Muncey Session had consisted of five elders instead of two. If not, why did they refuse to consider the cruelly pertinent paper of Mr. Waller? Were they afraid to look their own decision in the face? They do indeed say, in their minute, that they did "not intend to imply that there may not be a legal Session where there is but one elder;" but simply decided, "that the fact that one of the two persons acting as elders in a judicial capacity for the trial of character and church position, not having been a competent member of the court, destroyed the legality of the court, and vitiated its adjudication of the case." If they mean, that the Session ought not to have issued any part of the case, but referred the whole to the Presbytery, it is an awkward way of expressing it, to say nothing of the injustice of censuring the Presbytery for deciding the points which were referred to them. If the obvious meaning of the words is to be taken as the true meaning, the explanation contradicts their whole action. They declare a court legal and illegal, in the same breath. As to the distinction about "judicial capacity for the trial of character and church position," it will not do. For this very session had already *admitted* certain persons to the Lord's Table, on *examination* and profession of their faith. Moreover the decision of Synod is, that there was not Session enough, even to make a "*reference*."

We do not wish, by any thing we have said, to be understood as sanctioning the practice of elders sitting in Sessions, without installation. We did not know, till this case came up, that it was ever allowed; much less that it was so frequent. But we object to making a single Session a scapegoat for the sins of all others, *in pari delicto*; and especially to doing it upon such grounds.

This case furnishes additional proof of the truth of what was said in the Review of the Assembly of 1855, in the "Critic," as to the adaptation of the Assembly to judicial purposes. And we may add one more remark in this connexion; which is, that there is scarcely any case of appeal or complaint before the Assembly, which will admit of being righteously decided, simply "sustain," or "not sustain." At least, there is always danger of misapprehension, in such a decision, unless a minute is drawn, in which the judgment of the court is carefully expressed. And such a minute should always begin with a short but clear history of the case. Otherwise, the true effect of the judgment cannot be generally understood.

But we must conclude. If any of our readers have had the patience to follow us thus far, from the beginning, we tender them our thanks. We hope that they have not altogether been disappointed. If it has been our misfortune to give them nothing for their pains, we are truly sorry for it, and beg them to forgive us.

[For the Critic.]

AN ESSAY ON LIBERTY AND SLAVERY: BY ALBERT TAYLOR BLEDSOE, L. L. D., PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA. *Philadelphia*, 1856, pp. 383.

The last and only time Mr. Bledsoe was introduced into the Critic, it was in connexion with his Theodicy. This work, which was a thorough-going assertion of Pelagianism, was perhaps the most honest sophistry we have ever read. It exhibited some premises so erroneous, that conclusions drawn from them could only be false, and displayed no little theological prejudice; but still the discussion was manly and vigorous, the style both nervous and rhetorical, and the love of truth apparent even in the advocacy of error. If a strong and energetic man start from the wrong point, and take the wrong direction, he will go only the father astray, because of his vigorous exertions.

The work named above possesses the same mental traits and characteristics of style with the former, with this advantage, that the subject is one which the writer approaches without prejudice, and which the nature of his previous studies has qualified him to discuss. Born in Kentucky, where, as is well known the emancipation feeling was almost as strong until the abolition excitement began, as in any of the free States, spending the earlier years of his manhood in Ohio, and then a few years in Mississippi, and at all times disconnected with those occupations which interest themselves in slave labor, the author may be regarded fairly, as a man who has seen both sides, and who stands in an intermediate post of observation. But the Abolitionists will probably say, if he meets the usual treatment from them, that his book now speaks the language of self-interest, because he holds office under the government of a "slave-breeding commonwealth." The common utterance of such charges is as offensive to public morality as to the individuals at whom they are hurled; for they seem to take it for granted that candour, public virtue and moral courage are extinct in the South; and since the accusers cannot know a community in which they have not lived, and which they so much condemn, the inference is, that they disbelieve the existence of these qualities at the South, because they are not accustomed to meet with them at home. This is as unjust to the country at large, as it is in this case to Mr. Bledsoe, and the community in which he resides. It should not be supposed, that because the people of Virginia would deal summarily with a hypocritical incendiary from abroad, who came with insolent malignity meddling with what does not concern him, they will, therefore, refuse the privilege of free discussion to her own honourable citizens.

Mr. Bledsoe's first chapter lays down first principles for his subsequent discussion, in a discussion of "the nature of civil liberty." It may be said in brief, that the theory of society which he advocates is the Bible theory; the one which is advocated by the Biblical Repertory and by Christian philosophers generally, in opposition to that infidel theory which ignores a Creator and moral Governor of mankind, the pet system of infidel French democrats and pseudo Christian Abolitionists. The author in substance describes liberty to be a *freedom to do what a man has a right to do*; and to define the extent of those rights, he goes to the law of God. This chapter is marked most favourably with the best characteristics of the author, freedom from prescription, boldness in attacking errors sanctioned by great names and vigorous scientific inquiry. It rises, indeed, very near the highest regions of ethical speculation, in the directness, simplicity and breadth of the thinking. The remaining chapters, on the erroneous positions of Abolitionists, the Bible argument for the lawfulness of slavery, the argument from the public good, and the fugitive slave law, do not quite fulfil the promise of the first in their philosophic method. This defect, if it is one, arises obviously from the author's plan of taking up and refuting the positions of Abolitionists in detail; so that the discussion, instead of being strictly methodized on a logical plan, is rather a series of refutations, each one indeed pungent and demolishing, but yet as a whole, partaking of the confusion of the errors which they explode. The author does not condescend to meaner antagonists, but grapples only with the Ajaxes of the opposite host, Drs. Channing and Wayland, and Messrs. Barnes, Sumner and Seward. The impression which many of these special discussions leaves upon the mind of the reader is, that of a strong man tearing away the defences of his helpless adversary, rending them into almost invisible shreds, and spurning them as the driven stubble before his bow, till they can be no longer found. We were peculiarly gratified with the thorough work which he makes of the criticisms of that most glozing and treacherous of commentators, Barnes, upon the epistle to Philemon. But while we would be glad that this book should be read, yea, studied by every man in the United States who is unsatisfied on the subject of slavery, we would not be understood as commending in every case the strength of its denunciations, or as approving all its positions. Pages 151—152, the author alludes to the familiar objection by which Dr. Wayland and others attempt to break the force of the unanswerable argument from the legalizing of slavery in the law of Moses; that in like manner the sins of polygamy and divorce are there permitted. Here Mr. Bledsoe makes the admission that the fact claimed is true; but that instead of proving slavery a sin, it only proves the two other practices innocent till they were prohibited by Christ.

This would indeed be the just inference, if we were compelled to make the admission. But we would by no means make it. We are by no means willing to surrender it as a settled question, that polygamy is in any sense allowed or legalized in the Pentateuch; and the scanty *permissive* legislation about divorce, explained as it is by our Saviour, is very far from placing that sin on the same platform with the ownership of slaves, which is not only limited and restrained, (the whole of what is enacted about divorce,) but authorized. Polemically it is a bad policy to seem to permit the Abolitionist to say; "Well, after all, your notable Old Testament argument only succeeds in placing slavery in the same category with the two Mormon abominations of polygamy and divorce." There is no logical necessity on us to allow even the pretext for such a repartee.

In commending this book, with these and a few similar exceptions, to our readers, we would avail ourselves of the occasion to make two important remarks. One is, that the political troubles in our federal relations growing out of slavery at the South, can never be permanently adjusted till the abstract question, "whether the relation of master and slave is in itself an unrighteous one or not?" is fully met, discussed, and settled in the national mind. There were two courses of conduct, either of which might have been followed by the defenders of existing laws. One plan would have been to exclude the whole question of slavery persistently from the national councils, as extra-constitutional, unprofitable and dangerous, and to assert this exclusion always, and at every risk, as the essential condition of the continuance of the South in those councils. The other plan was to meet that abstract question from the first, as underlying and determining the whole subject, to debate it every where, until it was decided, and the verdict of the national mind was passed upon it. Unfortunately the Southern men did neither steadily. They permitted the debate, and then failed to argue it on fundamental principles. With the exception of Mr. Calhoun, (whom events are every year proving the most far seeing of our statesmen, notwithstanding the fashion of men to depreciate him as an "abstractionist" while he lived) Southern politicians were accustomed to say that this whole matter was one of State sovereignty, according to the constitution; that Congress had no right to legislate concerning its merits, and that, therefore, they should not seem to admit such a right, by condescending to argue the matter or its merits. The premise is true; but the inference is practically most erroneous. If Congress has no right to legislate about slavery, then Congress should not have been permitted to debate it. And Southern men, if they intended to stand on that ground, should have exacted the exclusion of all debate. But this was perhaps impossible. The debate came; and of course the inferences of the



premises agitated, ran at once back of the constitution. Southern men should have industriously followed them there; but they have not done it; and now political agitation has gone so far, and become so complicated, that we fear the time has gone by, when the country will be willing to consider calmly the fundamental question.

A moment's consideration ought to show that that question is the abstract lawfulness or unlawfulness of the relation of master and slave. The Constitution gives to the federal government no power over that relation in the slave States. True, but that Constitution is a compact between sovereign commonwealths; it certainly gives incidental protection and recognition to the relation of master and slave, and if that relation is intrinsically unrighteous, then it protects a wrong. The sovereign States of the North are found in the attitude of protecting a wrong by their voluntary compact; and, therefore, it is the duty of all the righteous citizens of those commonwealths to seek by righteous means the amendment or repeal of that compact. They are not indeed justified to claim all the benefits of the compact, and still agitate *under it*, a matter which the compact excludes. But they are more than justified, they are bound to clear their skirts of the wrong, by surrendering the compact if necessary. There is no evasion from this duty, except by proving that the Constitution does not do unrighteously in protecting the relation; in other words, that the relation is not intrinsically unrighteous. Again, on the subject of the "Higher Law," our conservative statesmen and divines have thrown out a vast amount of pious dust. This may serve to quiet the country for a time, but it will inevitably be blown away. There is a *higher law*, superior to constitution and legislative laws; not indeed the perjured and unprincipled cant which has no conscience about swearing allegiance to a constitution and a body of laws which it believes wrong, in order to grasp the emoluments and advantages of those laws, and then pleads "conscience" for disobeying what it had voluntarily sworn to obey; but the law of everlasting right in the word of God. Constitutions and laws which contravene this, ought to be lawfully amended or repealed; and it is the duty of all citizens to seek it. Let us apply this to the Fugitive Slave Law. If the bondage is intrinsically unrighteous, then the federal law which aids in remanding the fugitive to it, legalizes a wrong. It becomes, therefore, the duty of all United States officers who are required by law to execute this statute, not indeed to hold their offices and emoluments, and swear fidelity, and then plead conscientious scruples for the neglect of these sworn functions, for this is a union of theft and perjury, with hypocrisy; but to resign those offices with their emoluments. It becomes the duty of any private citizen who may be summoned by a United

States' officer to act as part of a *posse*, guard, or in any other way in enforcing this statute, to decline obedience; and then in accordance with Scripture, to submit meekly to the legal penalty of such a refusal, until the unrighteous law is repealed. But, moreover, it becomes the right and duty of these, and all other citizens to seek the repeal of that law; or if necessary, the abrogation of the compact which necessitates it. But when we have proved that the relation of master and slave is not intrinsically unrighteous, and have shown that the fugitive slave law does but carry out fairly the federal compact, in this particular it becomes the clear duty of every citizen to concur in obeying it.

Since the slavery discussion has now become inevitable in our federal politics, it is absolutely essential that the mind of the nation shall be enlightened and settled on the abstract question. The halls of Congress should ring with the arguments; the newspaper press should teem with them; and above all, with the Bible arguments; for ours is a Christian nation in the main; and the teachings of the Sacred Scriptures are, after all, the chief means for influencing the convictions of the people. It seems indeed late in the day, to begin the popular discussion of first principles afresh, when the immediate questions have almost reached their crisis; but we are convinced, that if it is too late now to get the public ear for this discussion, it is too late to save the country. It is gratifying to notice that the political newspapers are at length awakening to the necessity of this discussion. A leading journal of the South a few weeks ago noticed, and lamented the policy on which we have been remarking; and said that since Mr. Calhoun died, not a single politician had been found to argue the abstract question of right on its merits, while all that had been done for the peace of the country since in this matter, had been done by divines and scholars. The work of Mr. Bledsoe is important and timely, as making an able contribution to this fundamental discussion.

The second remark which we would urge is, that if this debate is to produce any good to the country at large, the propositions advanced, must be marked by a wiser moderation, and the arguments by more soundness than have always been exhibited at the South. The Southern cause does not demand such assertions, as that the condition of master and slave is the normal condition of human society, in such a sense as to be preferable to all others, in all time, and under all circumstances. Certain it is, that the burthen of odium which the cause will have to carry at the North, will be immeasurably increased by such positions. Why array against ourselves indomitable prejudices, by the useless assertion of a proposition which would be unnecessary to our cause, if it were true? Nor can a peaceful and salutary purpose be ever subserved, by arguing the question in a series of comparisons of the relative advantages of

slave and free labor, laudatory to the one party, and invidious to the other. There has been, on both sides of this debate, a mischievous forgetfulness of the old adage: "Comparisons are odious." When Southern men thus argue, they assume the disadvantage of appearing as the propagandists, instead of the peaceful defenders of an institution, which is, and will continue very naturally distasteful to their opponents; and they array the self-esteem of those opponents against them, by placing the discussion in an attitude, where the acknowledgement of the Southern cause must be a confession of Northern inferiority. True, our Northern neighbours have often been only too zealous to play at this invidious game, or even to begin it in advance. They should not be imitated in their mistake. It is time all parties should learn, that the lawfulness and policy of opposite or competing social systems cannot be decided by painting the special features of hardship, abuse, or mismanagement, which either of the advocates may imagine he sees in the system of his opponent. The course of this great discussion has too often been this: Each party has set up an easel, spread a canvass upon it, and proceeded to draw *the system of its adversary* in contrast with its own, in the blackest colours which a heated and angry fancy could discover amidst the evils and abuses imputed to the rival institution. The only result possible is, that each shall blacken his adversary more and more, and consequently, that both shall grow more and more enraged. And this, though all the black shades of sorrow and oppression be drawn from facts in the conditions of the rivals. For, unfortunately, the human race is a fallen race, depraved, unrighteous, and oppressive, under all institutions. Out of the best social institutions there still proceeds a hideous amount of wrong and woe; and this, not because those institutions are unrighteous, but because they are administered by depraved man. For this reason, and for another equally conclusive, we assert that the lawfulness, and even the wisdom and policy of social institutions affecting a vast population, cannot be decided by this odious contrast of their special wrong results. The other reason is, that the field of view is too immense and varied to be brought fairly into comparison under the limited eye of man. First then, if we attempt to settle the matter by trying how much wrong we can find in the working of the opposite system, there will probably be no end at all to the melancholy discoveries which we shall both make, and so, no end to the debate; for the guilty heart of man is every where a *perpetual* fountain of wrongs. And second, the comparison of results must be deceptive, because no finite mind can take in both the endless wholes.

The policy of the South then is, to take no ultra positions, and to support herself by no unnecessarily invidious comparisons. It is enough for her to place herself on this impregnable stand;

that the relation of master and slave is recognized as lawful in itself, by the infallible law of God. That truth she can triumphantly evince; and from it she can deduce all that it is right for her to claim. There is no wisdom nor use in her asserting that domestic slavery is always, and every where the best relation between labour and capital, and should therefore be every where introduced; a proposition against which, to say the least, indomitable prejudices are arrayed. It is enough for her to say, (what is true and susceptible of overwhelming demonstration,) that for the African race, *such as it is in fact*, such as Providence has placed it here, this is the best, yea, the only tolerable relation. If it is lawful in the sight of God; if the Constitution of the Union does no moral wrong in recognizing it as lawful; if it is best for the interests of the African, of the white race of the South, and of the whole Union, that the matter should be left untouched by the meddling hand of federal legislation, (a hand impotent of good to it, and only mighty for mischief,) to develop itself under the leadings of Providence, and the benign influences of Christianity, then the South has all her rights asserted. If thus much is true, then the federal constitution, and the laws carrying out its provisions, only say what the Bible says, that the holder of African slaves does not necessarily live in the commission of wrong, and is not, therefore, to be disfranchised of any right which the law allows to any other citizen.

It is because Mr. Bledsoe's work is marked by this just moderation in its positions, that we are willing to commend it to the public. We have here none of the absurdities, of which the facile exposure has given Abolitionists the pretext to sing triumphs; such as the argument that African slavery is righteous, because Noah foretold it of the descendants of Ham. The author says, for instance, (p. 140.) "In opposition to the thesis of the Abolitionist, we assert that it is not always and every where wrong." "We only contend for slavery in certain cases." And in the argument from the public good, he says: (p. 228.) "We are not called upon to decide whether slavery shall be established in our midst or not. This question has been decided for us." \* \* \* \* "The only inquiry which remains for us now is, whether the slavery which was thus forced upon our ancestors, shall be continued, or whether it shall be abolished? The question is not what Virginia or Kentucky, or any other slave State *might* have been; but, what they would be in case it were abolished. If Abolitionists would speak to the point, then let them show us some country in which slavery has been abolished, and we will abide by the experiment." True, Mr. Bledsoe does not always speak of his ultra adversaries in sugared terms. But in our disapproval of the strength of his words, let us remember the outrageous provocation which has been given.

## CALVIN AND GENEVA; ACCORDING TO THE ADVERSARY EVIDENCE OF THE "JUDICIOUS HOOKER."

In our last number we presented a short summary of the argument derived from new sources of information, recently opened at Geneva, going to show how utterly groundless is the popular cant concerning Calvinistic rule in the civil, as well as the ecclesiastical policy of that little republic. The space then, at our command, forbade the still farther elucidation of the subject, by the citation of other testimonies of cotemporaries, and those nearly cotemporary with Calvin to the same general purpose. Many of our readers, will doubtless, be pleased at the opportunity of comparing in immediate connection, the facts as contained in the summary from Monsieur Rilliet's book, in our last number, with the following full summary view of Calvin in Geneva, by the great adversary of the Puritans—"the judicious Hooker;"—as it will be found in the introduction to the "*Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*," in which he proposes to "rip up to the very bottom how and by whom, the Puritan discipline was planted." Being the account of the matter given by an adversary; and that in an intensely controversial tract—we presume it will hardly be suspected of undue partiality toward Calvin or his opinions. We quote as it stands in the second paragraph of Hooker's introduction, under the side title of "*The first establishment of new discipline by Mr. Calvin's industry in the Church of Geneva*."

"II. A founder it had, whom, for mine own part, I think incomparably the wisest man that ever the French church did enjoy, since the hour it enjoyed him. His bringing up was in the study of the civil law. Divine knowledge he gathered, not by hearing or reading so much, as by teaching others. For, though thousands were debtors to him, as touching knowledge in that kind; yet he to none but only to God, the author of that most blessed fountain, the Book of Life, and of the admirable dexterity of wit, together with the helps of other learning which were his guides: till being occasioned to leave France, he fell at length upon Geneva; which city the bishop and clergy thereof had a little before (as some do affirm) forsaken, being of likelihood frighted with the people's sudden attempt for abolishment of Popish religion: the event of which enterprise they thought it not safe for themselves to wait for in that place. At the coming of Calvin thither, the form of their civil regiment was popular, as it continueth at this day: neither king, nor duke, nor nobleman of any authority or power over them, but officers chosen by the people yearly out of themselves, to order all things with public consent. For spiritual government, they had no laws at all agreed upon, but did what the pastors of

their souls by persuasion could win them unto. Calvin, being admitted one of their preachers, and a divinity reader amongst them, considered how dangerous it was that the whole estate of that church should hang still on so slender a thread, as the liking of an ignorant multitude is, if it have power to change whatsoever itself listeth. Wherefore taking unto him two of the other ministers for more countenance of the action, (albeit the rest were all against it,) they moved, and in the end persuaded with much ado, the people to bind themselves by solemn oath, first never to admit the Papacy amongst them again; and secondly, to live in obedience unto such orders concerning the exercise of their religion, and the form of their ecclesiastical government, as those their true and faithful ministers of God's word had agreeably to scripture set down for that end and purpose.

[2.] When these things began to be put in ure, the people also (what causes moving them thereunto, themselves best know) began to repent them of that they had done, and irefully to champ upon the bit they had taken into their mouths; the rather, for that they grew by means of this innovation into dislike with some churches near about them, the benefit of whose good friendship their state could not well lack.

It was the manner of those times (whether through men's desire to enjoy alone the glory of their own enterprizes, or else because the quickness of their occasions required present dispatch; so it was,) that every particular church did that within itself, which some few of their own thought good, by whom the rest were all directed. Such number of churches then being, though free within themselves, yet small, common conference beforehand might have eased them of much after trouble. But a greater inconvenience it bred, that every later endeavoured to be certain degrees more removed from conformity with the church of Rome, than the rest before had been; whereupon grew marvellous great dissimilitudes, and by reason thereof, jealousies, heart-burnings, jars and discords amongst them. Which, notwithstanding, might have easily been prevented, if the orders, which each church did think fit and convenient for itself, had not so peremptorily been established under that high commanding form, which tendered them unto the people, as things everlastingly required by the law of that Lord of lords, against whose statutes there is no exception to be taken. For by this mean it came to pass, that one church could not but accuse and condemn another of disobedience to the will of Christ, in those things where manifest difference was between them: whereas the selfsame orders allowed, but yet established in more wary and suspense manner, as being to stand in force till God should give the opportunity of some general conference what might be best for every of them afterwards to do; this I say had both prevent-

ed all occasion of just dislike which others might take, and reserved a greater liberty unto the authors themselves of entering into farther consultation afterwards. Which though never so necessary they could not easily now admit, without some fear of derogation from their credit: and therefore that which once they had done, they became for ever after resolute to maintain.

Calvin therefore and the other two his associates, stiffly refusing to administer the holy Communion to such as would not quietly, without contradiction and murmur, submit themselves unto the orders which their solemn oath had bound them to obey, were in that quarrel banished the town.

[3.] A few years after (such was the levity of that people) the places of one or two of their ministers being fallen void, they were not before so willing to be rid of their learned pastor, as now importunate to obtain him again from them who had given him entertainment, and which were loath to part with him, had not irresistible earnestness been used. One of the town ministers, that saw in what manner the people were bent for the revocation of Calvin, gave him notice of their affection in this sort. "The senate of two hundred being assembled, they all crave Calvin. The next day a general convocation; they cry in like sort again all, We will have Calvin, that good and learned man, Christ's minister. This," saith he, "when I understood, I could not choose but praise God, nor was I able to judge otherwise than that 'this was the Lord's doing, and that it was marvellous in our eyes,' and that 'the stone which the builders refused, was now made the head of the corner.' The other two whom they had thrown out, (together with Calvin,) they were content should enjoy their exile. Many causes might lead them to be more desirous of him. First, his yielding unto them in one thing might happily put them in hope, that time would breed the like easiness of condescending further unto them. For in his absence he had persuaded them, with whom he was able to prevail, that albeit himself did better like of common bread to be used in the Eucharist, yet the other they rather should accept, than cause any trouble in the Church about it. Again, they saw that the name of Calvin waxed every day greater abroad, and that together with his fame, their infamy was spread, which had so rashly and childlessly ejected him. Besides, it was not unlikely but that his credit in the world might many ways stand the poor town in great stead: as the truth is, their minister's foreign estimation hitherto hath been the best stake in their hedge. But whatsoever secret respects were likely to move them; for contenting of their minds Calvin returned (as it had been another Tully) to his old home.

[4.] He ripely considered how gross a thing it were for men of his quality, wise and grave men, to live with such a multitude, and to be tenants at will under them, as their ministers,

both himself and others, had been. For the remedy of which inconvenience, he gave them plainly to understand, that if he did become their teacher again, they must be content to admit a complete form of discipline, which both they and also their pastors should now be solemnly sworn to observe for ever after. Of which discipline the main and principal parts were these: A standing ecclesiastical court to be established; perpetual judges in that court to be their ministers; others of the people to be annually chosen (twice so many in number as they) to be judges together with them in the same court: these two sorts to have the care of all men's manners, power of determining all kind of ecclesiastical causes, and authority to convent, to control, to punish, as far as with excommunication, whomsoever they should think worthy, none either small or great excepted.

This device I see not how the wisest at that time living could have bettered, if we duly consider what the present estate of Geneva did then require. For their bishop and his clergy being (as it is said) departed from them by moonlight, or howsoever, being departed; to choose in his room any other bishop, had been a thing altogether impossible. And for their ministers to seek that themselves alone might have coercive power over the whole church, would perhaps have been hardly construed at that time. But when so frank an offer was made that for every one minister there should be two of the people to sit and give voice in the ecclesiastical consistory, what inconvenience could they easily find which themselves might not be able always to remedy?

Howbeit (as evermore the simpler sort, are even when they see no apparent cause, jealous notwithstanding over the secret intents and purposes of wiser men) this proposition of his did somewhat trouble them. Of the ministers themselves which had stayed behind in the city when Calvin was gone, some, upon knowledge of the people's earnest intent to recall him to his place again, had before hand written their letters of submission, and assured him of their allegiance for ever after, if it should like him to hearken unto that public suit. But yet misdoubting what might happen, if this discipline did go forward; they objected against it the example of other reformed churches living quietly and orderly without it. Some of chiefest place and countenance amongst the laity professed with greater stomach their judgments, that such a discipline was little better than Popish tyranny disguised and tendered unto them under a new form. This sort, it may be, had some fear, that the filling up of the seats in the consistory with so great a number of laymen was but to please the minds of the people, to the end they might think their own sway somewhat; but when things came to trial of practice, their pastor's learning would be at all times of force to over-persuade simple men, who knowing the



time of their own presidentship to be but short would always stand in fear of their ministers' perpetual authority: and among the ministers themselves, one being so far in estimation above the rest, the voices of the rest were likely to be given for the most part respectively, with a kind of secret dependency and awe: so that in show a marvellous indifferently composed senate ecclesiastical was to govern, but in effect one only man should, as the spirit and soul of the residue, do all in all. But what did these vain surmises boot? Brought they were now to so straight an issue, that of two things they must choose one: namely, whether they would to their endless disgrace, with ridiculous lightness dismiss him whose restitution they had in so impotent manner desired; or else condescend unto that demand, wherein he was resolute either to have it, or to leave them. They thought it better to be somewhat hardly yoked at home, than forever abroad discredited. Wherefore in the end those orders were on all sides assented unto: with no less alacrity of mind than cities unable to hold out longer are wont to shew, when they take conditions such as it liketh him to offer them which hath them in the narrow straits of advantage.

[5.] Not many years were over-passed, before these twice-sworn men adventured to give their last and hottest assault to the fortress of the same discipline; childishly granting by common consent of their whole senate, and that under their town seal, a relaxation to one Bertelier, whom the eldership had excommunicated: further also decreeing, with strange absurdity, that to the same senate it should belong to give final judgment in matter of excommunication, and to absolve whom it pleased them: clean contrary to their own former deeds and oaths. The report of which decree being forthwith brought unto Calvin; "Before," saith he, "this decree take place, either my blood or banishment shall sign it." Again, two days before the communion should be celebrated, his speech was publickly to like effect: "Kill me if ever this hand do reach forth the things that are holy to them whom the Church hath judged despisers." Whereupon, for fear of tumult, the forenamed Bertelier, was by his friends advised for that time not to use the liberty granted him by the senate, nor to present himself in the church, till they saw somewhat further what would ensue. After the communion quietly ministered, and some likelihood of peaceable ending of these troubles without any more ado, that very day in the afternoon, besides all men's expectation, concluding his ordinary sermon, he telleth them, that because he neither had learned nor taught to strive with such as are in authority, "therefore," saith he, "the case so standing as now it doth, let me use these words of the apostle unto you, 'I commend you unto God and the word of his grace;'" and so bade them heartily all adieu.

[6.] It sometimes cometh to pas that the readiest ways which, a wise man hath to conquer, is to fly. This voluntary and unexpected mention of sudden departure caused presently the senate (for according to their wonted manner they still continued only constant in unconstancy) to gather themselves together, and for a time to suspend their own decree, leaving things to proceed as before till they had heard the judgment of four Helvetian cities concerning the matter which was in strife. This to have done at the first before they gave assent unto any order had shewed some wit and discretion in them: but now to do it was as much as to say in effect, that they would play their parts on a stage. Calvin therefore dispatcheth with all expedition his letters unto some principal pastor in every of those cities, craving earnestly at their hands, to respect this cause as a thing whereupon the whole state of religion and piety in that church did so much depend, that God and all good men were now inevitably certain to be trampled under foot, unless those four cities by their good means might be brought to give sentence with the ministers of Geneva when the cause should be brought before them: yea so to give it, that two things it might effectually contain; the one an absolute approbation of the discipline of Geneva as consonant unto the word of God, without any cautions, qualifications, ifs or ands; the other an earnest admonition not to innovate or change the same. His vehement request herein as touching both points was satisfied. For albeit the said Helvetian churches did never as yet observe that discipline, nevertheless, the Senate of Geneva having required their judgment concerning these three questions: First, "After what manner, by God's cemandment, according to the scripture and unspotted religion, excommunication is to be exercised." Secondly, "Whether it may not be exercised some other way than by the consistory:" Thirdly, "What the use of their churches was to do in this case;" answer was returned from the said churches, "That they had heard already of those consistorial laws, and did acknowledge them to be *godly* ordinances *drawing towards* the prescript of the word of God; for which cause they did not think it good for *the Church of Geneva* by innovation to change the same, but rather to keep them as they were. Which answer, although not answering unto the former demands, but respecting what Master Calvin had judged requisite for them to answer, was notwithstanding accepted without any further reply: in as much as they plainly saw, that when stomach doth strive with wit, the match is not equal. And so the heat of their former contentions began to slake.

\* \* \* \* \*

[8.] We should be injurious unto virtue itself, if we did derogate from them whom their industry hath made great. Two things of principal moment there are which have deservedly

procured him honour throughout the world: the one his exceeding pains in composing the Institutions of Christian religion; the other his no less industrious travail for exposition of holy Scripture according unto the same Institutions. In which two things whosoever they were that after him bestowed their labour, he gained the advantage of prejudice against them, if they gainsayed; and of glory above them, if they consented. His writings published after the question about that discipline was once begun omit not any the least occasion of extolling the use and singular necessity thereof. Of what account the Master of Sentences was in the church of Rome, the same and more amongst the preachers of reformed churches Calvin had purchased; so that the perfectest divines were judged they, which were skilfullest in Calvin's writings. His books almost the very canon to judge both doctrine and discipline by. French churches, both under others abroad and at home in their own country, all cast according to that mould which Calvin had made. The church of Scotland in erecting the fabric of their reformation took the selfsame pattern. Till at length the discipline, which was at first so weak, that without the staff of their approbation, who were not subject unto it themselves, it had not brought others under subjection, began now to challenge universal obedience, and to enter into open conflict with those very churches, which in desperate extremity had been relievers of it."

---

REMARKS BEFORE BALTIMORE PRESBYTERY, ON  
ASKING A RELEASE FROM THE PASTORAL  
CHARGE OF THE CENTRAL PRESBYTE-  
RIAN CHURCH.

(We give a place here to the following remarks, not from any persuasion of their intrinsic value or importance—but simply at the request of several members of Presbytery and others, who have kindly suggested that the statements are of some interest as a portion of the Church History of Baltimore.—*Eds. Cr.*)

Having received the call, just laid before Presbtery, from the General Assembly, to take charge of the department of Church Government and Pastoral Theology, in the Danville Theological Seminary; and having concluded, after much painful and prayerful deliberation, that it is probably my duty to obey that call, I now ask for a dissolution of the pastoral relation between myself and the Central Presbyterian Church. And though the request is for the present action of Presbytery, yet for special reasons growing out of my present obligations to the congregation, I do not feel at liberty to ask that the dissolution take effect formally until the close of the present year. Aware of the very strong dissent from my judgment in this matter, existing in the minds of members of Presbytery and others, it may not be improper to suggest some views of the question, going to show that this dissent is founded upon erroneous and exaggerated notions of the facts in the case.

It is doubtless a sound general principle that a call to public service in the Church, by the voice of the Church at large, through the General Assembly, must take precedence over a call, either to go or stay, from any ordinary local interest. The mandate of the Church at large is, ordinarily, to be obeyed. Not indeed to be obeyed as though it were some command laid by a General of the order of Jesuits; for our constitution provides ample protection for the individuality of the minister—declaring that “No pastor shall be translated without his own consent previously obtained.” But the call of the Church at large is, of itself, sufficient reason to assign for asking a dissolution of the pastoral charge, unless there can be shown to exist some extraordinary reason for refusing the request, when made in obedience to such a call.

Do any such extraordinary reasons exist in the present case? I must be pardoned for entering into this inquiry in some detail, and in a manner seemingly egotistical, since views are entertained, and occasionally expressed in various forms, which, if allowed to pass unchallenged, tend to prejudice me, and worse still, to prejudice the cause of Presbyterianism here, in the

esteem of many worthy people. On the one hand, it is charged to be a violation of honor and good faith, personal or official, and on the other, a reckless imperiling of a great and important religious enterprise, for me to ask and receive this release. To this two-fold charge I shall chiefly direct my remarks.

Does this request for a release violate any obligations of honor and good faith, personal or official? If so, that finishes the question. No call involving violation of honor and good faith, can be a call of God, though it come through the combined Assemblies and Synods of the Christian world. But is there such violation in this case?

There are three aspects of my relation to this congregation, to one or other of which only such a charge can apply. Either—First, the business aspect of it, as an enterprise in which a company of citizens have invested funds in property for religious purposes,—or, secondly, the ecclesiastical aspect, as a combination to carry out some favorite church policy,—or, thirdly, the more strictly spiritual aspect of it, as a pastoral charge to which I may justly be supposed to be bound by peculiar ties.

Now in the business view of the matter, it is claimed that a body of people have with great zeal and energy, at great cost, built a house of worship specially for me; and, that having done so I am now bound in honor to remain with them. But whilst it is true on the one hand, that they have built a house for me, it is equally true on the other hand that I have in the same sense built a house for them. The fallacy lies here in the assumption of an implied contract, that in consideration of a house of worship furnished me to my advantage personal or official, I am in return to supply the pulpit permanently. Whereas, the matter of fact is that both they and myself united our exertions to build a church for the sake of a great cause. So far from an investment of money on the one side in consideration of services on the other, I have invested more largely than any other, and of course have more “sacrifice” to make—to use a business phrase, than any other by any depreciation of the property. Of the original subscription conditioned on getting \$25,000, I assumed and paid nearly one sixth of the whole;—and of the final subscription to clear off all remaining liabilities on the building, conditioned on getting \$12,500, I paid again about one-eighth. Of this whole amount—near \$5,900, some \$2,400 was furnished me by the kind and christian liberality of friends in the First Church and the Franklin Street Church. More would have been furnished, I doubt not, if I had asked it; but seeing that some of them had already subscribed directly to the \$25,000 fund, and feeling moreover, that our enterprise was in no such emergency as to justify a call upon those on whom so many more pressing calls were made, I did not ask it. For a large

part of the money furnished by these friends, pews were claimed at the sale of pews,—as by other subscribers of the \$25,000. These pews were in part for those to whom the subscribers of the \$2,400 had transferred their subscription claims, and in part taken by me, with a view to devote the proceeds of a subsequent sale of them to other church extension enterprises. To such enterprise on the score of these pews I had promised near \$1,000 in various amounts—and since paid some \$700 against some \$450 received for pews sold.

For the remainder of the subscription of \$5,900 paid by myself—say \$3,500—no pews, save perhaps to the amount of \$300, were taken in consideration—so that to that amount it is a clear contribution to the enterprise. I give these details here, thus plainly, in the presence of Dr. Backus, through whose great liberality and kind assistance, and Dr. Plumer, I obtained the \$2,400, rather by way of report of my agency to these liberal friends. I desired also to present these statements in this public and responsible form in order to correct and prevent, perhaps, some misunderstanding of the matter.

Now from this view of the facts it is manifestly wrong to represent this case as one of capital invested on one side against services on the other—which services must be continued, or good faith violated. The true state of the case exhibits an investment of both capital and services, jointly, for the promotion of a great religious interest, in which either party is free to judge for himself how far it is duty to go—and where to stop. I claim to have done fully my share, and to have fully discharged every reasonable obligation. For if it were proper I might also show that aside from much indirect loss to me, under peculiar private circumstances, I have not only invested more than any of the others in the property, say perhaps one-twelfth of the entire amount invested so far—but have contributed in the form of a difference between the actual and the formal salary promised and intended, about one-sixth of the expense for the three years before we became fully established in our house of worship. These facts are mentioned neither in the way of boast nor of complaint. They are nothing either to boast or to complain of. The offering was most cheerfully, though necessarily made to a noble cause, and would be made as cheerfully again. But it would be unjust to myself and the more to the great cause in behalf of which I have labored here, to keep back such facts, when from want of knowledge of them, many excellent people perhaps are disposed to entertain hard thoughts both of me and the cause. Whatever obligation of honor and good faith in a business sense I may have been under to see this enterprise through, I have more than discharged. It is now out of debt—save perhaps a mere nominal debt, and that in large part by my exertions, and too much at my cost to justify any such claims to my continuance.

In regard to the second aspect of my relations to this enterprise, I need say but a word. It was in the beginning a favorite idea with myself and some others embarking in it, to erect a building by contribution entirely, without a sale of pews and the creation thereby of those individual rights of property in the building which we regarded as inconsistent with the highest interests and the largest freedom of the Church, as a spiritual body.—That favorite opinion was waived in the beginning, at the urgent request of many warm friends of the enterprise—but with the hope on our part that after success had crowned our efforts to build, these friends and others might be induced to waive their rights of property. This request, when made, they declined—as they had a perfect right to do. Nor is there any ground of complaint in their so doing, however it may have disappointed my long cherished expectations. It is manifest however, that on the other hand, there is no ground of complaint, in so far as concerns this aspect of the question, if I shall claim my right in turn to a release from a work not embodying my views. This matter, however, has really nothing to do with my conviction of duty in the present request for a release—it doubtless had something to do indirectly with encouraging my friends at Danville to nominate me in the Assembly in spite of a previous remonstrance on my part against such nomination—though the friends here in declining to adopt my views of church policy, were of course not aware of this consequence, and not responsible for it.

As to the third aspect of the question—It is claimed that I am under peculiar and extraordinary obligation to my charge; nay, it has been claimed that I am under a sort of life pledge to remain with them. In this view I confess I feel the pressure of strong claim upon me—more even than pastors ordinarily feel. Surrounded by a devoted band of Christian people—to so many of whom the Lord has honored me, by making me the instrument of spiritual blessing,—and by parishioners, many of whom doat upon me with all the fondness of parents and family, for the petted child, it would be most unnatural not to feel bound to them by extraordinary ties. But in so far as any violation of pledge and honor goes, I must protest against any such statement of the case. Every one who knows any thing of a minister's ordination vows, will see that no such pledge *could* have righteously been given. But more than this, I happen not to have been left here to rest the proof merely upon the presumption that I probably *did* not do, what righteously I *could* not do. By mere accident, two days ago, I found, out of place, and where I never would have thought of looking for it,—the following manuscript copy of remarks introductory to the second discourse delivered in the New Assembly Rooms, and previous to the actual organization of the Church, in April, 1853.

From this it appears, that I not only did not pledge myself, contrary to my ordination vows, but actually expounded to the people at the start, precisely the nature of the proposed engagement between us. As these remarks are of the nature of contemporary history, publicly uttered at the time, and presenting the history of the enterprise at its very origin, I beg leave to quote this introduction just as it stands in the original manuscript—text and all:—

“We will rejoice in thy salvation, and in the name of our God we will set up our banners.”—Psalms 20 : 5.

“At a meeting of the friends of the proposed new enterprise, on Monday evening last, it was resolved, by way of testing the expediency of forming a new Presbyterian Church—to open a subscription forthwith. And in order that all friends of the measure might feel no want of confidence in the effort, on the score of involving themselves in a large debt—it was made conditional in the subscription—that it shall not be binding, until there shall be raised \$25,000. The committee, so appointed, reported last evening to an adjourned meeting held for the purpose—and with what was reported by them, there was secured on the spot a subscription of \$27,300. Encouraged by this gratifying success, the friends assembled resolved immediately to ask for the organization of a new church to be called the Central Presbyterian Church of Baltimore—appointed Trustees to procure a charter, and instructed them to secure the use of the hall where we are now assembled, as a regular place of worship until a church can be built—and such communicants as were present signed a request to Baltimore Presbytery to meet on Tuesday next. With two-thirds of the amount already obtained, and with additional aid of friends yet to join us, we start near even with the oldest churches. This result was gratifying and unexpected to myself—and at once cleared my mind of all doubt as to my own course of duty. I shall, without any hesitation, unite with you in this enterprise—and expect to cast in my lot among you. And disagreeable as it is to speak of myself in this touching—I may perhaps be allowed to make a single remark touching a subject which has been misapprehended, by persons who from want of reflection in regard to a minister’s obligations as such—have supposed my connection with such a work necessarily transient, as though I had some peculiar views opposed to permanency in the ministry. I have no such views beyond what every minister must of necessity have—namely, that he is not to forstall the leadings of Providence by saying I will remain three, or five or ten years, in any field. This no minister can do consistently with his ordination vows. Yet at the same time, both my views of duty and my natural inclinations are as strongly opposed as those of any other min-



ister to transient relation between pastor and people. Nor have I ever thought of anything else than just such a relation to my congregation here, as other ministers hold ; and at your invitation to become your permanent pastor, shall expect to be regarded as settled just as permanently, and in just the same sense that my friend Dr. Backus or Johns or Plumer or Atkinson are settled permanently.''

Thus it seems, singularly enough, that of the four pastors in the city, named at the time as illustrations of the degree of permanency of the relation I proposed to assume—two of them, (Drs. Plumer and Atkinson,) have already been released from their congregations. Nor have I heard that any violation of good faith was charged upon either of them for so doing. And this too, notwithstanding the fact that Dr. Atkinson's relation to the new enterprise which he had originated was so similar to my relation to this.

True enough, if there had been a design on my part speedily to leave the work, candor would have required an intimation of it ; but that there was no such design, is manifest enough from the fact that I have stood fast through all the difficulties here, refusing again and again even to entertain propositions most advantageous and every way desirable to me ; and from the additional fact that the present call comes altogether unanticipated and undesired by me ; yea, and up to the meeting of the Assembly remonstrated against. It is a very natural mistake, after a whole series of events have transpired in certain results, that men in contemplating the series backward from the results to which they have led, should attribute a degree of design and foresight to the actors in them, which never really existed. On this principle probably we are to account for most of the opinions entertained on this subject.

Having examined this more personal aspect of the case, let me briefly respond to the second inquiry,—whether there is anything so peculiar in the general character of my work here, as absolutely forbids this release? The impression seems to prevail in the minds of many, that this is a congregation, gathered under such peculiar circumstances around me, as to make its existence depend on my continuance with it. That it is only semi-Presbyterian—a sort of gathering together from *the outside*, to establish a congregation—nay, that the funds having been raised chiefly from the outside for my sake, only, the parties in disappointment, will break up and scatter. Now, a few very simple facts and figures will operate as the dash of cold water, in reducing down to very small tangible dimensions a vast volume of the steam generated by heated imaginations. As a matter of fact, you will find here as large a body of loyal and earnest Presbyterians as is ordinarily found in any of our large

city congregations. Even leaving out of the count, if you please, all that may be supposed to have united with us in this work, from other considerations than preference for our teaching and form of worship, there will be left as large a body as is usually found in our churches, of those who, from preference, are thoroughly Presbyterian in sentiment. This fact will be manifest to any one generally acquainted with the antecedents of our people, by an inspection of either the church roll, or the roll of pew-holders in the congregation. And it will be found to be expressed most significantly, even by an analysis of the congregation as represented by the property interest connected with it. Of the total amount paid on the property, say—at a general estimate—\$42,000 to \$45,000, it will be found, in the first place, that something over one-third has been paid purely as a contribution to the general cause, without consideration of pew rights, and is held and represented by the whole body of the people as a Presbyterian church—as a sacred trust for the promotion of the cause of religion. Of the other part, near two-thirds—say \$28,000—represented by pews purchased; over one-half, again, is represented by families, either by education or by profession of members of the family, committed to Presbyterianism elsewhere in other congregations, before this enterprise was inaugurated; and of the remaining one-third or less, which may be supposed to have been attracted here, without or against any religious preference or prejudice, largely over half again will be found to be such as have very strong preferences for our forms of worship generally, and who if not in all respects Presbyterians, yet cannot well be anything else. Which analysis, if correct, shows perhaps as small a fraction (less than one-sixth) of members of the congregation who may be thought to be lukewarm, or opposed in their preferences to the views of our church—as usually exists in any of our congregations. So in another view of the case, it will be found that the spiritual officers of the congregation, who have publicly adopted the standards of the Church, at their ordination, represent about one-fourth of the amount paid on the property: all going to show that this idea of our enterprise as not Presbyterian in the same general sense in which any other of our congregations are Presbyterian, is wholly imaginary. If so, then there are no such extraordinary reasons for a refusal of this release by Presbytery, as to forbid acquiescence in the call of the General Assembly. If the enterprise is imperiled by my leaving it, this can be true only in the same general sense in which the interests of any of our congregations are put in peril by their pastors leaving them. It will be the *occasion* not the *cause* of any serious injury that may follow. The *cause* of the injury, if injury follow, will prove to be the same as in other congregations in similar circumstances, viz: the unwise and reckless strife that an election of pastor may

gender, if entered into in a wrong spirit. With a noble structure, and a noble body of people gathered here, the congregation, if true to itself, and worthy of the triumphant success which has attended it hitherto, can hold out one of the most attractive fields of labor in the whole Church, to the most enterprising and efficient minister in the Church, who may be at liberty to enter it. If they shall succeed in procuring a pastor, who shall prove to be the equal of the other pastors in the city, what motive can the people have to leave this and go to another?

Why, then, you may ask, am I willing to leave this field? Simply because I conceive I am shut up by God's providence, to go and attempt another and more difficult work. Exigencies have arisen in the history of an enterprise which I have ever been compelled to regard as among the most important public interests of our church, that seem to demand imperatively my services. Not that there are not five hundred others in our Church, better able to do the service, intrinsically considered; but the difficulties of the case, in the opinion of those best qualified to judge, admit, just at present, of no other solution than calling me into the work. I have been saying much of the matter of the obligation of honor, as controlling such a question. If that obligation is of force in any such case, I conceive it to be in this, upon any minister who entertains the high sense I do of the importance of this enterprise at Danville. In that enterprise are embarked those whom I have been proud to number among the best friends of my ministerial life. To it, one among them, and he, the noblest among all the friends of the Presbyterian Church—as he is, doubtless, among the very bravest and noblest of the intellects of the age—has already offered up his health and strength, as a willing sacrifice. In his waning strength, he asks for help in his great work; and even if no higher and more solemn obligations of duty to the great Head of the Church compelled me, should I not feel pressing upon me every obligation of honor, to go and show—if not the ability to aid him, which his mistaken partiality may have attributed to me—then, at least, my willingness to render him any aid in my power, in doing the Master's work?

## EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

FOR MAY AND JUNE, 1856.

I. WESTERN AFRICA: ITS HISTORY, CONDITION AND PROSPECTS. *By Rev. J. Leighton Wilson. With numerous Engravings.* New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1856.

This volume has come to hand as the last pages of this number are going to press. We have read nearly one-fourth of it, and feel justified in saying that, as great as was our admiration for Mr. Wilson, and as highly raised as were our expectations in reference to his book, we have been somewhat surprised at the degree of interest with which we have followed him in his simple narrative. It is delightful to read a book by a man who writes because he has something to say, and something which he knows that he knows better than almost any other man. And no one who is acquainted with our friend's history can doubt that he is better qualified to give the world clear and well-defined notions touching the "interior life" of Western Africa, than perhaps any man living. We heartily commend this volume to all who are curious in regard to foreign countries, and especially to all who are fond of studying the wonderful dealings of Providence with our race.

The following extracts from the preface, will serve to indicate the character of the work:—

"The design of this volume is to give information about a portion of the world of which very little is truly known. There is no want of knowledge of the facts which led to the first discovery of Western Africa, the manifold efforts that have been made to plant European colonies along her shores, the scenes of violence that have been enacted there in connection with the foreign slave-trade, or the persevering efforts that have been made to put an end to it; but beyond these general facts very little is known, even at the present day, of the actual state of the country. The interior life of the people, their moral, social, civil, and religious condition, as well as their peculiar notions and customs, have always been a sealed book to the rest of the world. There has been no lack of books on Africa, but most of them have been confined, in the information they give, to single and isolated districts, or been written by transient visitors, who could see nothing but the surface of things. Little or no reliance could be placed on any information derived from Africans who were brought to this country in former years as slaves. They had no knowledge of the country, except of the particular district in which they were brought up. Besides, it was so long after they were brought to America before they acquired sufficient knowledge of the English language to impart what information they had, that all the freshness of their early recollections had passed from their minds, or were so mixed up with the bewildering associations of their new homes, that they could not give any reliable account of their native land."

“The writer has spent between eighteen and twenty years in the country. He has had opportunity to visit every place of importance along the sea-coast, and has made extensive excursions in many of the maritime districts. He has studied and reduced to writing two of the leading languages of the country, and has enjoyed, in these various ways, more than ordinary advantages for making himself acquainted with the actual condition of the people. He claims for his book, the merit of being a faithful and unpretending record of African society.”

The work may be had at the store of Cushing & Bailey, in Baltimore street, near Hanover.

[The following notices were deferred from the January No.]

II. *An Inaugural Discourse*: By Rev. B. M. Smith, Professor of Oriental Literature in Union Theological Seminary, Prince Edward county, Va. Delivered in the Seminary Chapel, September 12, 1855. Published by the Board of Directors.

Professor Smith discusses, in this Inaugural Address, “the relations of Biblical study to theological education and the work of the ministry.” His reputation makes it unnecessary for us to say anything of the ability with which his task has been performed. It is a timely plea for the study of the Word of God; a study, we grieve to say, too much neglected among the ordained expounders of the Word. Books about the Bible, we fear, are studied more than the Bible itself: we drink too much at the streams, too little at the fountain. The method of study is determined, no doubt, by the fashion of preaching on topicks (*loci communes*), rather than on the text of Scripture; a fashion which is likely to end either in lifeless essayism, or in mere pulpit polemicks. It is a pity, that the scholastick training which is so essential to a defender of the gospel, should so often betray him into the error of parading his armour before a popular audience. The best remedy for the evil, is the *exposition* of the word, or, as Cecil expressed it, “to make our observations in order to throw light upon Scripture, instead of quoting Scripture to throw light upon our observations.” The fashion of preaching from single clauses, or single words, *motto*-preaching, is every way detestable; leading more than any other, to the neglect of the Bible, on the part both of minister and people. Let us “speak as the oracles of God.” The very words of the Lord, which are the pillars of the soul in the hour of trial, ought to be kept before our faith as constantly as possible. “Paul, *as his manner was*, reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging, etc.” To walk in the footsteps of the great Apostle, we must study the Scriptures critically.

The address before us begins with an affectionate tribute to the memory of Prof. Sampson, whose lamented death was a loss.—as it seems to us short-sighted mortals,—to the whole Church.

III. *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation*. By Rev. James McCosh, L. L. D., and George Dickie, A. M., M. D. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1856.

This work is the expansion of an article which appeared in the North British Review, in 1851, and was generally, at the time, ascribed to the accomplished author of “The Divine Government, Physical and Moral.” We have not yet found time to read it; but the name of Dr. McCosh on the title page, renders any recommendation unnecessary.

We take this opportunity of expressing our regret that the orthography of Noah Webster, has been followed in the recent publications of the Messrs. Carter, for whose reputation, as publishers, we feel an affectionate jealousy. That orthography is wholly indefensible, either upon etymological or phonetic grounds. Noah's great namesake, Daniel, who knew something of English, would not admit his authority.

IV. *Miss Bunkley's Book. The Testimony of an Escaped Novice from the Sisterhood of St. Joseph, Emmittsburg, Md., the Mother-House of the Sisters of Charity in the United States.* By Josephine M. Bunkley. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1855.

This is a very different book from Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures;" albeit the disclosures are awful enough. It is written with great delicacy of feeling, and with an air of truthfulness that cannot be mistaken. The unsophisticated reader of the papers, who has been lost in admiration at the heroick devotion of the "Sisters of Charity" in times of pestilence, will feel, when he has read this book, that the poisoned air of a hospital-ward must be refreshing to these ladies just emerging from their cells; that any thing on earth is heaven, compared with the deep damnation of a convent life. How long will these horrible dens be tolerated in this free country?

THE  
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC  
AND  
BI-MONTHLY REVIEW.

---

---

No. 4.

JULY, 1856.

Vol. 2.

---

---

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW ON CHRISTIAN MIS-  
SIONS.

On the cover of the last No. of the Westminster Review, (Leonard Scott & Co's American reprint) we have a new variety of the *Macassar Oil* advertisement, for the special protection of unfortunate bald heads against "spurious, fraudulent, and highly pernicious counterfeits." We are notified that Messrs. Rowland & Son, with an ardor of benevolence for the afflicted bald, and a consuming zeal against impostors that stays not to count cost, have gone to the expense of a "New Label," rendered *unimitable* by reason of a curiously engraved magic circle, one hundred and thirty times repeated, "with an embossed profile of her Majesty Queen Victoria, *lately taken for the proprietors' special use*" (!!)

We wonder if the suspicion ever flashed across the mind of Messrs. Leonard Scott & Co., who continue to re-publish the Westminster as one of "*the four British Reviews,*" that Rowland & Son, under the guise of advertising, might be using their covers for the perpetration of a little malicious wit at their expense? If it be so important to caution the public against the rogues who counterfeit the "label" of some beneficent discoverer of a *guano for the hair*, what of those who counterfeit the beneficent provision made for the nurture of the brain? If they are rightly denounced as impostors, who have counterfeited Rowland & Son's old and well known label, and driven them to the expense of a new engraving, and Her Majesty to the trouble of giving a new profile, what epithet shall be devised for the rogues who by a bolder move *steal* the new engraving, and wrap in labels struck from it, their spurious and highly pernicious imitations?

Will not universal bald-head-dom grow even balder in its studious endeavors after some term of execration deep and damning enough for such a crime? And yet, *nomine mutato*, what better than this are Messrs. Leonard Scott & Co. doing?—who, if they do not appropriate another's label to cover their counterfeit oil, yet appropriate a counterfeit oil to filling bottles marked with their genuine label. The public is equally the sufferer. Twenty years ago, the American reading public were induced to extend a large patronage to an enterprise which proposed to reproduce, at a reasonable price in this country, the leading organs of the three phases of British politics—Tory, Whig and Radical. A "new label" for their invention was devised, marking this as "*the republication of the British Reviews.*" But now, for years past, the party represented by the Westminster Review having become defunct, their organ is turned over to the service of a coarse, canting, malignant deism, of that type which seems to have neither any self respect, nor "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind;" yet, under the original "label" Messrs. Scott & Co. continue to send forth this "highly pernicious mixture," giving it all the advantage of circulation which the genuine article had made for itself. Now, Rowland & Son have no more right to appropriate the mixture of the quacks, than these to appropriate the Rowland label. Certainly, so far as concerns that portion of the public who are in the habit of "top-dressing" the cranium with this "fertilizer," the breach of confidence is only the more gross, if the expensively engraved label, magic circles, profile of her Majesty, and all, become but expensive provisions for giving greater currency to imposture!

Whilst this our complaint might apply, with the fullest justice, to any No. of the Westminster for five years past, it has special application to the first article in the No. for July, 1856, entitled "Christian Missions; their principle and practice"—as a very few remarks will suffice to show. So far, indeed, as concerns the intrinsic merit of the article itself, it is hardly worthy such notice. It falls far below even the average of the anti-christian essays in this Review—which average itself is anything but respectable. It betrays an ignorance of the whole subject of Christian Missions, of which it treats, and of the most ordinary and current views of religious people, which is truly marvellous. It professes to discuss the principle of Missions, without apparently having the remotest conception of the true and universally recognized principle from which Christian Missions spring. It professes to exhibit as facts in the *practice* of missions that which is utterly preposterous in itself, and which even third rate infidelity no longer ventures to assert, outside the purlieus of a seamens' rendezvous. But, on the other hand, as being a sort of cyclopædia of anti-missionary falsehood; as



being the articulate voice of a phase of carping irreligion current in our streets ; as being an armory, whence the pusillanimous votaries of the dollar, may draw logical weapons in defence of their purse, against their own consciences, and the outward pressure of public opinion ; and finally, as being, from the reputable position into which it has here crept, likely to become a standing endorser for the cant of the miserly and vulgar scurrility that the Godless world, in its natural hostility to the Church of Christ, belches forth continually—we judge such a production should not be allowed to pass in silence.

The writer, whom we take to be of the utilitarian school of Ethics, undertakes, in the outset, to account for the marvellous pertinacity with which, in all times past, and the romantic enthusiasm with which, at the present time, the Christian world carries on Missions, on the following principle :

“Till lately the enterprise proceeded on the ground of saving souls from hell. All idolaters were undoubtedly supposed to be damned ; and to preserve as many as possible from perdition, was the simple object of the mission, from those of the Catholics, whose converts were baptized with a besom for the greatest happiness of the greatest numbers, to the latest expedition sent out by Exeter Hall collections. But American Congregationalists and English Unitarians, and some liberal German Protestants, who do not believe in the damnation of heathens on account of their ignorance, send out Missions too, with a wider view than the old Missionaries—with the hope of raising whole nations out of a state of idolatrous corruption of morals into a condition of Christian civilization.” \* \* \* “The distinction in kind being made between Missions undertaken simply to rescue by baptism the greatest possible number of human beings from eternal torment, and those which are to raise savages into civilization, it should be ascertained what permanent success has attended such efforts.”

It is needless to say that, setting out with such a statement of the fundamental doctrine of Missions—putting a mere incentive to duty, in the place of the ultimate ground of obligation to the duty—we may naturally anticipate some curious deductions in the sequel. It might have been supposed, that with the New Testament in every body's hands, there would have been little room for mistake, as to the ground and actuating cause of Christian Missions. That the commission given by the Great Founder of the Christian Church to be executed is, “Go teach *all nations* ;” “Preach the Gospel to *every creature* ;” that the most obvious construction of this commission requires the church to provide teachers for the islands of the South Seas, just as much as for the British isles ; that the very purpose of the church is to gather his elect from all the kindreds and tongues of earth ; that therefore the reason for preaching the gospel in Honolulu, is precisely the same as for preaching the gospel in London ; that the failure to convert souls, is no more reason for ceasing the work in Paraguay than in Paris ; that baptized, but Godless sinners in London—yea, even Westmin-

ster Review writers, with all their transcendent light and intelligence—will just as surely be damned for unbelief, as the most ignorant Hottentot in Africa ;—all these are matters so patent upon the surface of the gospel, and in the current thought and language of the Church, that it is amazing to find a writer undertaking to expound the theory of Missions on any other principle. It is true some nominal Christians have ignored the *per se* Missionary character of the Church of Christ. It is true that within little more than half a century, speakers on the floor even of the Scotch Kirk General Assembly, denounced the effort to raise funds for foreign Missions. It is true that Sydney Smith, in the *Edinburg Review*, though wearing the title of a Christian minister, denounced the work of Missions. Nay, it may be true that nominal Christians may yet be found still ready to oppose these efforts to “teach all nations ;” and it is unfortunately too true, that even a portion of the true Christians who engage in the work, may not either perceive or express very clearly the ground on which the church engages in it; and therefore may occasionally speak and write of the matter in a way to give color to the notion, that for the expediency merely of saving souls they labor. But at this day it is unpardonable for one undertaking to enlighten the world concerning Christian Missions, either to contradict or ignore the simple truth, that the Church, by her very Charter, is a Missionary Society—that her reason and warrant for preaching the gospel in Greenland, is precisely the same as for preaching the gospel in Scotland—that, in neither case, is success or failure in “saving souls” the measure of her duty—nor any thing else the prime reason for preaching the gospel either in Greenland or Scotland, than that her Founder hath not only commanded it, but to this one great end hath organized his church—that alway, to the end of the world “she may teach all nations and preach the gospel to every creature, for a witness against sinners, and to gather out of the nations his elect ones.” With this simple statement of the true ground of the Missionary work, we may of course pass by in silence all this writer’s facts and reasonings concerning the failure of Missions.

Nor is the evidence by which he would establish his facts more satisfactory than his theory of Missions. It is obviously easy to find witnesses enough against the Missions in foreign parts, if we are content to take the unfavourable impressions of irreligious seamen and voyagers, who may, in various ways, have come in contact with the Missionaries. But such evidence proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. From the well-known propensity of the unregenerate to vilify and accuse religious people every where, it is obvious, that should we attempt to form an opinion of the general character and labors of the Protestant ministers of London or New York by confining our

inquiries concerning them to witnesses of precisely the same class—worldly-minded commercial men, naval officers, especially that portion of them who rarely, if ever, attend service on the Sabbath,—ungodly and restraint-hating adventurers—we should doubtless form a wretchedly low estimate of the ministers at home. Why should we expect such men to bear a more impartial testimony to the character of ministers abroad? But it must be borne in mind, that over and above the ordinary dislike of such men to ministers and religion, in the case of the missionaries, this is increased immensely by the fact that in foreign lands, the restraint of the missionaries and their labors upon the vices of the viciously disposed, is felt far more powerfully than in London or New York, and therefore is far more likely to arouse the prejudices of such men. All things considered, the wonder is, that we hear so little to the disparagement of foreign missionaries, rather than that we hear so much. Among ministers abroad, as among those at home, there are doubtless some bad men, and more foolish men: but in any fair comparison, it will be found, that as a class, they are intellectually and morally fully equal, if not superior to the ministry at home. Of their intellectual ability, the evidences are on record in the contributions made by them to science in every department. Of their high moral and religious character, the testimony is far too abundant to justify any withdrawal of confidence from them as a body, on the score of a few incidents in individual cases—and these semi-apocryphal, culled from the leaves of a straggling journalist here and there. Of the general correctness of this view, we need no better proof than the result of this writer's efforts to array unfavorable testimony. Though making quite a parade of names, he cites to any purpose, only a single witness,—and this a roving young man, who according to his own account, if we remember rightly, (for it is a dozen years since we read his book,) belonged to that class of youths for whom the discipline of a whale ship was deemed much more suitable, than the discipline of the college; and who having deserted from his ship, played the part of a Don Juan for a time upon an island of the South Seas, to the captivity of the tawny Fayaway just entering her teens. It would indeed have been somewhat wonderful to hear such a witness testify formally for the missionaries and their work. As if doubtful of the character of his witness, this writer manages, by an adroit anachronism, to endorse him as “Mr. Herman Melville, now son-in-law of Chief Justice Shaw, of Massachusetts, (the judge who established in *Med's* case there, the law established by Lord Mansfield in *Summerset's* here.)”

Now we venture to suggest that there are several important slips in this evidence of the high character of the author and hero of *Typee* and *Omoo*, as a witness against the missiona-

ries. In the first place, there is no certainty that Chief Justice Shaw had the choosing of his son-in-law. In the second place, if he had, it does not follow that his judgment in the matter of a son-in-law is as reliable as his legal judgment in the Med's case. In the third place, he may have found himself very unfortunate in this acquisition to his family,—Or in the fourth place—a great reformation (which we hope is true) may have taken place, which might render the testimony of the son-in-law an altogether different testimony from that of the Hero of Typee. About as well might some one cite, in defence of kidnapping slaves in Africa, cursing the officers placed on the coast to prevent it, the example of John Newton, the outcast youth on the African coast, and cite it gravely, as that of Rev. John Newton, whose spirituality was so eminent, and whose evangelical labors were so remarkably blessed. With the present character of Mr. Herman Melville we have nothing to do, nor with his merit as a writer, which is considerable—all we ask is that he shall bear testimony in his true dress, as the rakish, restraint-hating sailor youth, not as Chief Justice Shaw's son-in-law.

Commander Wilkes, of the U. S. Exploring Expedition, is also cited as a witness, with the admission that his impressions are generally in favor of the Missionaries. As a witness to facts, we ask no better testimony than such official reports as those of Commander Wilkes. We have ourselves conversed with officers of his expedition, among other naval officers, making diligent inquiry as to their impressions of the character of our Missionaries abroad, and chiefly on the authority of their testimony, we have expressed the general opinion above given, of the character of the Missionaries as compared with ministers at home. It will be observed, however, that the passages cited from Commander Wilkes by this writer, contain not statements of facts, but the expression of that officer's judgment as to the proper method of evangelizing the heathen. The Missionaries, he thinks, proceed very unphilosophically, in "confining themselves so exclusively to teaching from the scriptures"—in not "providing *works of fiction* inculcating moral and religious lessons," as substitutes for the Pagan legends of their gods; and in "innocent modes of recreation" (something like King James' Book of Sports, we presume) "as substitutes for the amusements of debauchery." Now, while we have the highest respect for Com. Wilkes' official testimony as to facts, we are free to say, that we would much rather have his advice touching the best method of sailing a ship and managing refractory sailors, than his advice as to the proper method of evangelizing the heathen. And that the more, when as in this case, we have already for our guide the judgment of such Missionaries as the inspired Apostles, to the contrary of that of Com. Wilkes—de-

claring their method to be—to “preach Christ crucified, though to the Jew a stumbling block and to the Greek (Pagan) foolishness.” We cannot forbear to remark, however, how singularly unfortunate is this citation of Wilkes’ condemnation of the simplicity and impolitic want of craft in the Missionaries, for the writer’s own previous assertion that their policy is all craft and cunning. He has before informed us that:

“Wherever conversion is to be achieved, tattooed kings and cannibal princes of the Royal blood, are first sought, their vices veiled and their caprices borne with, that by their means the kingdom of heaven might gain some of their subjects.” \* \* \* Protestant sectaries from England have made much of a drunken Pomare, because she was a queen; and American Missionaries at Liberia have concealed the sufferings of the helpless imported inhabitants, at the bidding of those who sent them,” &c.

Now independent of the fact that Com. Wilkes’ impressions of the character of the Missionaries was very favorable, here is a difficulty that we know not how to reconcile—How men, whose fault in the Commander’s judgment, is their too guileless and craftless trust in the efficiency of teaching the scriptures exclusively as a means of conversion, should yet be men who, according to the writer, do not even pretend to work except by craft and hypocrisy! We should infer, and the impartial world will be likely to infer that such a writer talks rather loosely and unscrupulously about good men. And indeed, when further on we come to his denunciation of so well known a man as Henry Clay, as the very prince of hypocrites—projecting colonization and missions to Africa, to get rid of the more troublesome slaves at home—practising “a clever sham” through life, and writing himself a hypocrite in his last will and testament at death,—we cease to feel any surprise, at the brazen effrontery with which he has been assailing the humble Missionaries of the Cross throughout the world.

Our narrow limits absolutely forbid the execution of our original purpose, to notice in detail, the chief points, so far as we could find any points in this article. This, however, is of little consequence, since the essay is substantially but a repetition without either addition of substance or novelty of manner, of the two great staples of anti-missionary clamor. First, the cruelty of troubling the heathen at all with our Christian dogmas, and secondly, the absurdity of the methods used to enlighten them. To these stale cavils we need only repeat, in substance, the unanswerable argument already a hundred times repeated. It is the Church’s mission to teach all nations. Duty is hers—consequences God’s. But for the sake of argument, we may go beyond this and safely meet these utilitarian cavillers on their own ground. They say, “Let the heathen alone. You but destroy their old graces and virtues (says the writer) without introducing any virtue that can be relied upon. You are but

driving them on to utter extinction, for since your efforts began, the diminution of population is terrible!" We answer, they will not be let alone. The question is no longer between giving them the gospel and leaving them in the state of heathen simplicity in which they may have heretofore existed. The pursuits of commerce, the restless energy which characterizes this century, will not let them alone. The thousands of brutal seamen, scores of unprincipled commanders, crowds of commercial adventurers, and of avaricious traders in the instruments of crime, have already covered the realms of Paganism as the locusts of Egypt, and are daily spreading pestilence, both physical and moral, among the benighted thousands. We appeal to the common sense and the better nature of the infidel himself—shall the missionaries or the profane profligate have the sway? Admit all that is complained of; admit that the notion of teaching them the Christian Theology is but the dream of an amiable enthusiasm; admit that they are tormented with long prayers—are made passive tools of priestly rule—yet is all this as bad as that the foulest vices of the foulest refuse of civilization shall be transported thither to riot unchecked in one continued carnival of every passion? Is the tyranny of even the austere ascetic as intolerable as the tyranny of profligacy, drunkenness and lust? Are long prayers worse than obscene jests, or dolorous psalms than bawdy songs? Is the schoolmaster more likely to corrupt the simple virtue of the savage, than the drunken sailor? Surely it will be admitted, that if these missionaries, fanatical as you may esteem them, are not very good teachers, still they are better than the crews of whale ships. If the Mission Societies of Exeter Hall or the Tabernacle, are no nearer what they should be, than your meanest insinuations would make them—yet they are at least as pure and benevolent as trading companies, whose members, many of them, having life-long been engaged in retailing their souls to the Devil by the dollar's worth, are combining now to trade in the souls of the heathen thousands. Religion, even if not of the purest sort, is still better than unrestrained vice. A society of saints is at least as good as a society of blackguards! Here then is the true issue—not whether the heathen shall be let alone—but whether the heathen, whom the apostate children of Christendom have poisoned with their vices, and are fast hastening on to destruction, shall have the proclamation of the gospel made to them as they are thus passing on to national extinction.

We dare not insult the intelligence of our readers, and waste their time, by any argument to expose the absurd effrontery of this writer's attempt to lay the blame of the rapid diminution of the population in the South Seas, at the door of modern missions. He might have gathered much more marvellous statis-

tics from the Indians of North America. Have the few and feeble efforts of Missionaries among the American Indians, caused their extinction also?

In saying there is no novelty in this last diatribe against missions, we have overlooked one item, which is certainly a novelty, and we hasten to make the amende. In illustrating the usual objection to the mode in which the missionaries aim to evangelize the heathen, the reviewer denounces "the bigoted and conceited missionaries, who go to work to root out the faiths by which men have lived"—and among other things, for this unphilosophical blunder of theirs:—

"It does not seem to have occurred to these special friends of the heathen, *that there is a genuine religious faith at the root of the practice of cannibalism, and other Pagan observances.* It might do them good to learn that men being a supposed compound of body and spirit, and the gods having decreed that all things should return into their origin, *it may be a pious observance, however rude, to eat captives, or other resplendent offerings to the gods.*" (!)

We have studied this novel deliverance, with some care, not more from natural mortification at the thought of our missionaries having proved obtuse on so important a point, than with a view to devise, if possible, some suggestion of a reform in their method, which might secure for them the approval and patronage of the profound philosophers of the Westminster Review. We confess ourselves at a loss to understand what change the reviewer would have them make. Obviously he does not desire them to aim at the abolition of this *pious usage* of cannibalism. For, according to the Westminster theory of the "inner light" in every man's soul, which renders the conception of any "lip-revelation," or "book revelation," an absurdity; this fashion of roasting and eating men and women is but the development of this inner light or "religious idea" at the bottom of the souls of these South Sea Islanders. We take it for granted therefore, that the reviewer would have the missionaries, in some way, develop this religious idea into a civilised, if not a Christian form. But what change, precisely, would that involve? Suppose the missionaries should be prevailed upon to listen to the profound philosophical suggestions of the Westminster Review, and shape their instructions to the heathen accordingly? What shape should they give to the religious idea at the bottom of Cannibalism? We confess ourselves at a loss here. If our memory serves us, the Westminster in olden time, if not still, gloried in being the organ of the Malthusian theory of the relation of population to food—and the inevitable tendency of the population of a country to outgrow the means of subsistence. So also, if our memory serves, the Westminster was the organ of the Utilitarianism of the famous Jeremy Bentham—that what is expedient, is right. With these lights as his guide, in

addition to the pregnant hints of the reviewer, suppose the missionary shall honestly set himself to make the most of this "religious idea" which he finds among the Fejees. What shall he teach them in the way of reform of their religion? First, that he is glad to find them not without a "religious idea." But secondly, that they are wrong in its developments; for instead of their eating men and women at random in their uncalculating zeal for religion, they should govern their appetite by the great principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. That, therefore, obviously they should direct their religious eating so as to remedy, as far as possible, the evil of a geometrical increase of population, against a mere arithmetical increase of food for subsistence. Such would be the general tenor of the sermon. Next for the *uses*. First, it is manifest, that the appetite for eating human flesh ought to be restrained within proper philosophical limits. Secondly, that seeing the many evils arising from too many eaters, and too little food, it is the manifest duty of those of keener appetite to be eaten, by those of the less keen, since thereby the minimum of slaying and eating shall at once be attained—the greatest number happily fed, the fewest killed. Thirdly, it is plain, other things being equal, that the young, and especially young and fruitful women should devote themselves to be eaten—since consideration both of the quality of food and restricting population, combine to point them out as specially devoted to this religious service. Have we caught the idea of our reviewer? If not, will he condescend to bear a little with our "ignorant and bigotted missionaries," and inform them exactly what he thinks they ought to do with this latest form of religion, thus admitted into the philosophic Pantheon. In the mean time we would venture to suggest some surprise that one who can thus throw the mantle of his religious eclecticism so widely as to embrace and reverence even the religious idea of Cannibalism—should never seem to have thought, that possibly there might be a "religious idea even at the bottom" of this missionary-ism also. Or is it settled among the savans of the Westminster, that the religion of Jesus is the only religion in the world that is not true—and the preachers of his religion and the Exeter Hall Societies the only men who have no honesty—no "natural virtues?"



## THE NEW PHASE OF RELIGIOUS JOURNALISM AT THE NORTH.

In the very remarkable letter to Sumner, of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge—"that bold and earnest opponent of slavery"—so the Independent is pleased to style him,—in the Critic for July, 1855, the writer pointed out with singular sagacity, the inevitable logical results of the movement then first fairly inaugurated as the political *Anti-Slavery Enterprise*. He showed, that stripped of its rhetoric, the movement represented by Mr. Sumner is nothing more nor less than an arbitration by the edge of the sword, of the difference between the sixteen Free States and the fifteen slaveholding States which compose the Federal Union. That, let slavery be as bad as it may, the question of recognizing it as a part, and accepting it as one of the elements entering into the Federal Compact, was a settled thing from the very origin of the Union. That, therefore, whether free States and slaveholding States may tolerate each other in the same confederation, is no longer an open question, under the Constitution, nor can it possibly be opened save by a revolution involving a disgraceful breach of national treaty, disloyalty to every national act in our past history, and dishonor to plighted faith, sealed by the blood of the founders of this Republic. That, therefore the "movement"—proclaiming it as a national policy to make war upon slavery—is, of itself, and essentially, a declaration of civil war.

There were those in July, 1855, who were disposed to sneer at this as an extravagant statement of the case; if such will take the trouble now to re-read that letter in the light of the momentous events which have occurred, and are daily occurring since, they may perhaps find occasion now to admire the truly statesmanlike sagacity and foresight of its author, not less than his eloquence and power as a writer.

That, however, to which recent events have most forcibly recalled our attention in this letter, is the singular and speedy fulfilment of what it predicted, or rather pointed out as the logical result of this "movement" to religion, when the religion of Jesus shall have been preached "to advocate universal treason in order to redress partial oppression—or teach doctrines which lead only to universal rapine, in order to rectify partial injustice." We cite from this part of the letter a single paragraph:

"For myself, my natural heart would doubtless have loved the teachings of the Lord all the more, if He had preached a crusade for liberty, instead of a sacrifice for sin. But with His Gospel in our hands, we can no more keep an honest and enlightened conscience, and deny that his teachings tolerated human servitude as a condition compatible with salvation—than

we can make ourselves acquainted with the history of human affairs, and deny that His providence has tolerated human servitude as a condition compatible with the existence of society. What are we, that we cannot have a little patience with that, with which God has had patience since sin entered into the World? And how striking is it to behold the certainty with which men repudiate the power of the Gospel, as soon as they have fastened upon it a power of their own; how surely they become heretics, apostates or infidels, when they begin to teach Christ, instead of sitting down at his feet to learn of Him! What else can we say, but that such pretexts, whether for public wrong or for private iniquity, are neither true nor real?"

We have recurred to this subject at this time simply for the purpose of illustrating the great truth enunciated at the close of this paragraph, written in June, 1855, from the current tone of the religious press, in August and September, 1856, as a representation of the religious sentiment of that portion of the country in which this "movement" has taken place. Without designing to enter at all into the merits of the political issues which at present agitate the country, we may state in brief, by way of explanation of what follows, that the "movement" has embodied itself in a regular party organization, with a candidate for the Presidency,—for the first time in the history of the nation—an avowedly sectional candidate, pledged to carry on an aggressive movement of sixteen of the commonwealths of the Federal Union, against the other fifteen commonwealths, with a view to limit their political power, and the extension of their civil and social peculiarities over the common territories of all. That the method by which this limitation is proposed to be effected, is by act of the national legislature, exercising a power, which, in the opinion of a large portion of the wisest statesmen in the country, is unauthorized by the Constitution, and fatal to the rights of the several States, as Sovereign Commonwealths. That the "slave power," against whose aggression this formidable "movement" is made, is even theoretically confined to a minority of the States as States, and actually amounts to one quarter of a million, out of the twenty-five millions of the nation. That the system whose rivalry in the work of self extension in the new territories is so much feared, is not only in a minority of one to ninety-nine, but inherently a system tending to civil and political enfeeblement, and declared to be unable to cope with the opposite system in growth and rapid expansion; whilst all that the "slave power" demands is seemingly an equal chance for its enterprise in the common territories of this Union, to be tolerated or crushed just as the people themselves shall determine.

These, and such as these are the issues involved in this "movement," none of them, it will be perceived, involving directly any question of religion or philanthropy, but

purely questions of sectional power and of Constitutional law. And yet strangely enough, for the first time in the national history, religious bodies, as such, in whole sections of the land, by formal resolutions—ministers in their pulpits, to the exclusion of almost every other idea, and the religious journals, designed to reflect the true image of the Church, and to enlighten the piety of the people, have openly and formally given in their adhesion as partizans to the movement;—*stumping it* from the pulpit, *colporteuring* with political tracts, *resolutionizing* in public conventions, and *Buncumbeizing* through the religious press, in zealous advocacy of “Free-soil, freemen, and Fremont.”

Supposing that our readers may be somewhat incredulous, we subjoin here a few specimens of the tone of the northern religious press, selected not for any special peculiarities, but clipped from such of these journals for August and September as have fallen in our way. We believe them to be fair samples of the entire religious journals of the north, with scarce a half dozen exceptions.

The following is a specimen from the “Maine Evangelist,” a new Congregational organ :

“There are men in this American Republic who claim to be the especial conservators of the Union. Their motto is, ‘The Union, it must be preserved.’ They send it forth as upon the leaves of the forest—they write it upon banners and streamers, but the question presses up, *can* the Union be preserved by injustice, rapine and murder? First—by fraud, by covenant-breaking, by deserting liberty and espousing slavery, by public outrages and private assassinations; bring the Union to the verge of dissolution—and then *can* you preserve it by crime, though the wicked join hand in hand? Can you bleed a man to the point of death, and then save him by taking a little more blood?

“Can you derange all the functions of a man’s health by poison, and then save him by administering a little more of the same deadly bane? You say you will do it, but can you? Not until you can revolutionize the laws of the universe.”

The next selection we make is from the “Congregational Herald :”

“The hell-begotten seed of slavery was sown in the virgin soil of our Constitution, and we are now reaping the terrible fruits. The Slave Power shows itself in every part of our national system; every limb, nerve and fibre is filled with pain. And too late, we fear, a distressed people are awakening to the terrific fact that this overshadowing power has absolutely ruled the nation for more than half a century; that it has uniformly carried out its designs and aims at all hazards, and that the so-called free people of the North have only been free in name; because whenever the slightest wish inimical to the Slave power, &c. \* \* \* \* \*

Friends of God and of humanity! get ye up! Try to stir now, if ye will! Move if ye can! While ye have been so busily employed about your farms, your workshops and your merchandize, wielding the noble and ennobling implements of industry, the Slave Power has been stealthily

weaving its network of iron around you. Do you believe it? Then try to stir hand or foot and ye shall feel the invincible bands galling your already well-secured necks. If you are so unbelieving, just make one determined effort for Freedom, and ye shall hear the hideous yell of delight that will come from theimps of the Slave Power as you settle back again into terrified silence and servile submission."

Even this terrific specimen of the "Freedom-shrieker" surprises us less, when we consider the latitude from which it comes, than the general tone, even though the milder tone, of the "New York Evangelist," which has become of late the most powerful and efficient organ ever yet engaged in the service of New-School Presbyterianism. Considering that this journal is the mouth piece of "American Presbyterianism," the great National Presbyterian Church, south as well as north, we confess to some surprise at a score of things like the following regular drumming up of voters, within the last month or two:

"The only live question at issue in the present political canvass, is the question of the restriction, for all time to come, and as the rule of our future policy of Slavery within its present bounds, or the adoption of the principle of the perpetuity and indefinite growth of Slavery. Whether for good or evil, the last great struggle is upon us, and we can no more avoid the responsibility, the excitement and the consequences of it, than we can escape the Providence of God which calls us to the conflict. If not decided at the present election, it will continue to re-appear, like Banquo's ghost, till the policy of the country becomes settled—till it is finally determined whether of the two is to be the animating, guiding genius of the Republic—freedom or slavery.

"If now, the right of suffrage implies at all times, the duty of giving due attention to political concerns, it cannot be doubtful to what degree of interest and effort the present canvass is entitled at the hands of every conscientious citizen. Where so much is involved, it cannot be right for any lover of his country, of his children, or his kind, to be indifferent. It cannot be right for any Christian man to withhold, or to trifle with his vote. It cannot be wise to ignore and overlook the significance of the struggle in which we are engaged, nor honorable or just to seek to evade it. It is now the set time of Providence for the religious prosecution of political duties; and as at other times, it should be our paramount duty to open the hand of charity to the starving or pestilence stricken poor; or to contend earnestly for the faith, or to go forth with zealous words to warn the impenitent and to guide the inquiring; so now, if we discern the signs of the times, it seems to us to be the one call of Providence, and the uppermost duty of the Christian life, to understand the meaning of, and to engage manfully and heartily in, the conflict that is to have its decision at the ballot box in November. There ought to be the principle and the earnestness of a service rendered to God, truth and freedom."

We need not multiply these citations. It will be borne in mind that we have quoted only such religious papers as are of high standing as conservative organs, and supposed to be un-

tinctured with the old-fashioned Abolition Fanaticism. "If such things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" If in the judgment of these sober and moderate family and religious newspapers, it is time to raise from the dead all Bunker-hill-dom; if they declare it to be the "*uppermost duty of the Christian life*" to go to the polls and vote for Fremont in November; and the lowermost and basest religious apostacy to keep their hands off this monstrous "slave power," every single man of which is actually "surrounding a regiment of ninety-nine free soilers, capturing and fettering them"—what shall we expect to hear from the professedly radical journals? That "The Independent,"—with its boasted 25,000 subscribers,—the organ of "Young Independency"—a journal as respectable for its energy and genius, as it is dangerous—should contain some curious utterances about this time, is no more than our readers would expect. If, however, they have not read that journal, they can have no idea of the extent of its political partizanship. Not only does it announce that "with all the power God may give it, it will urge the Christian public," &c., and will advocate free soil, and Fremont for the Presidency; but, as we humbly think, with means and measures which God never gave any Christian men to work with, does it carry on its purposes. That we may do no injustice we select at random various specimens of its spirit and teaching. This then is the announcement to its readers of the passage of the Army appropriation bill;

"DEAR INDEPENDENT :

"Numbers have triumphed, and the hope of Kansas for immediate aid in her struggle for freedom from the curse of Slavery is now clouded. I know no way of escape from the curse which a maddened South is bent upon forcing upon her fair and virgin field, but in an overruling Omnipotence and the omnipotence of a united and outspoken people. The country must speak now in emphatic terms, or forever hereafter sit dumb under the coercive lash of the two hundred and fifty thousand slave-holders who believe themselves born to rule.

"I am sad and oppressed at heart. My pen refuses to indite the hot seething words of shame for my country, and indignity against many of her Northern sons, which gush up as from an agitated fountain from the depths of my soul. Slaveholders with lofty heads, strut exultantly, clanking imaginative fetters made to fit the wrists and ankles of freemen."

We cite next a specimen of the interpretations of the Constitution, which we suppose are to shape the Administration of Fremont, if successful :

"Now the time is undoubtedly at hand when this great truth must be established, that *the Constitution of the United States does abolish Slavery in all and every State and Territory over which its authority is rightly established.* For this we have not to thank any man or men, but that Divinity which guided our fathers to do that which was right in itself, and placed the law where it could be found when God's time for its execution arrived.

“The phraseology is most excellent. ‘No person,’ the very term used to refer to slaves, ‘or persons held to service.’ No State law can override this—no State can establish slavery.

“Slavery existed at the time the Constitution was adopted, and that was not interfered with. Those then slaves or ‘held to service’ were to be rendered up, even if they escaped into other States; but no State was allowed ‘to pass a bill of attainder’ to make their offspring slaves or to hold them to service; and ‘no person’ could be, thereafter, reduced to slavery or ‘deprived of liberty without the due process of law.’ Their progeny were free by the Constitution, and have ever since been illegally held in servitude, and are now entitled to their freedom by the laws of God and man.”

We add to this a specimen going to illustrate the new notions of active Christian duty. Was it to engage the Tract Society in a colportage of this sort, that the effort was made to reform it last Spring?

“We decidedly approved our correspondent’s proposal, and have opened an account for the ‘Pennsylvania Fremont Tract Fund,’ of which the ‘one dollar’ referred to is the first entry. We propose to apply whatever may be received—first—to the publication and circulation of an address to the Welch voters of Pennsylvania, to be written by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, who is himself of Welch descent, and translated into Welch by a competent scholar in that language. The books are open—send in your funds. We like the suggestion in the *Courier and Enquirer*, of the 22d, of which we copy:

“‘With such a cause to advocate before the people, away with all concealment. We want but the truth and the whole truth, placed fairly before the people of Pennsylvania; and to accomplish this, let men of character be hired as *Colporteurs* to visit every hamlet in Pennsylvania. Let money be raised for this purpose, openly and in broad daylight, and in our churches if need be.’”

But we have not yet reached the climax of this religious electioneering. What will our readers think of an effort for “the Catholic vote,” by the organs of ultra-Puritanism—and that too sought after in a method to put the old fashioned Buncumbe to the blush for its own timidity! And yet it is a serious fact—serious, we mean, as to the reality of it, though comic enough as to its character, that in the *Independent* of August 28, we have the following dialogue between a gentleman and his Irish servant, resulting in the demonstration by Paddy that “conscientious Catholics” who respect the Pope’s bull, must vote for Fremont, and what is still more comic, is the fact that for the benefit of that large class of Irish and Germans who cannot read except pictorially, there is paraded over the dialogue and the Bull, a wood cut representing the Pope seated in all his grandeur, with a little negro kneeling before him, receiving, as the representative of his race, the Pope’s Divine commission to be free!! Had General Scott but

consulted with the Independent, how much better he might have managed his strong affection for the "rich Irish brogue." But we give the dialogue :

"GENTLEMAN.—Well, Francis, we have to elect a President of the United States this year, whom do you mean to vote for ?

"FRANCIS.—For Colonel Fremont, sir, of course.

"GEN. (Surprised.)—How is that ? I always thought you were a Democrat. I supposed all the Irish Catholics were bound to vote for Buchanan.

"FRAN.—Very true, sir, we are all Democrats, indeed, but we are not in favor of slavery. No true Catholic can vote to support slavery. It is contrary to our religion, sir.

"GENT.—That is something quite new to me. I wish you would explain it.

"FRAN.—Well, sir, you see, we have a Bull of the Pope against it, and no conscientious Catholic will go against the Pope's Bull in such a case. He commands us not to buy and sell slaves, and not to support them that does it. It is very likely a good many who are not conscientious in their religion may do it, but those that are sincere in their religion will have to vote for Fremont.

"GENT.—I should like to see that Bull, as you call it ; I did not know there was such a thing. Can you get it for me, or tell where I can find it.

"FRAN.—Yes, sir, very easily ; for I have it myself in the house. It is in a prayer-book which I brought from Ireland, sir. You won't find it in the Catholic books published in this country ; they wish to keep it rather out of sight in this country. But it is the truth, and every good Catholic is bound to advocate it.

"GENT.—Are there many among your friends who know of this Bull, and mean to act upon it ?

"FRAN.—Indeed, sir, there are many who will do it, and if they could see the Bull, and read it for themselves, a great many more would follow the rules laid down by Pope Gregory XVI.

"So Francis brought his prayer-book, and lent it to his employer for the purpose of having the Bull published for a more general circulation in this country. The volume has been placed in our hands for this purpose, and we present below an exact transcript of the document, which we commend to the attention of every conscientious Roman Catholic who proposes to give his vote at the coming election."

It is impossible, contemplating all this from our stand-point, to speak or write of it without seeming levity and sport. And yet, we are free to say, we regard it as a matter of most solemn import, not more to the safety of our country, than to the hopes of the Church of God. The fact that so large a portion of, hitherto, the most zealous and active portion of the American Church, should have set itself so directly in antagonism to the example and instructions of Jesus Christ, in the matter of the relation between the Church and the State, is one of fearful significance. Is it a less dangerous heresy to ignore or to contradict His saying, "My Kingdom is not of this world"—than to

ignore or to contradict the saying—"He was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities." What He meant by the saying—"My Kingdom is not of this world," is manifest enough from his practice. When men would have him decide a question between political parties, He answered, "Render to Cæsar," &c.—in substance declaring that His mission and that of His Church, as such, has nothing to do with deciding on affairs of State. When one came to Him, declaring that a wrong had been done—which a word from him would set right—a brother had acted unjustly in withholding from his brother his portion of the inheritance; instead of endorsing the fallacious generalization of modern fanaticism,—“Religion must take cognizance of all wrong,”—His answer was in rebuke—"Man, who made me a judge and a divider over you?"

We have nothing to say here of the merits of the questions in issue between the advocates of this politico-religious aggression on the "slave power," and the advocates and promoters of the slave-power's aggressions upon the "free North." Slavery may be as bad as they declare it to be; the political acts of the "slave-power" as atrocious as they represent them to be—the design of the minority of 250,000 slave-holders upon the civil liberties of the majority of twenty-two millions of non-slaveholders may be as dangerous as they are represented to be. But the question is whether if all these calamities cannot be warded off in the exercise of the usual political and civil agencies, and without the interference of the Church, will the interference of the Church avail? Nay, another most important question is—if even certain political advantages could be gained by the aid of those agencies which Christ hath appointed in His Church, for building up His Kingdom, may the cost not be far too great? What must be the effect of thus absorbing the religious sentiment of the country in a matter of mere temporal interest. Of substituting for the Divinely appointed ordinance, discussions which have only indirectly even, a philanthropic interest? and involving the maintenance of fallacies in principle and falsehood as to facts? Of combining the Evangelical people of God in a union of effort with the vulgar infidel Philosophers of the New York Tribune, the ribald scoffers of the "New York Herald," the passionate foreign devotees of the Pope; the raving Atheism of Theodore Parker? And all these *against* another section of their common country, embracing in it a large portion of the Church of God? Will the evils remedied be commensurate with the evils inflicted by such a crime?

Those who are old enough to have taken an interest in the great Reform and West India discussions in Britain, will remember by what agencies, and at what cost the Reform Bill and the West India Bills were carried. Whatever high esti-



mate they may choose to put upon the blessings obtained, in either case, intelligent Christian men, who have observed the progress of religion in England since, will not fail to perceive that the cost of West India emancipation was infinitely greater than the twenty million of dollars. The union of evangelical Dissenters for political purposes, with Papists, Jews and Infidels, effected indeed the political triumph. But, at the same time it destroyed the spirituality, and degraded the religious sentiment, and set afloat after all manner of doctrinal opinions, and all manner of wild measures of philanthropism, the entire Dissenting religion of England. From the Independency of England, the same gross semi-political religionism, seems to have spread among the independents of New England, and from present appearances is likely to flood the land of the Pilgrims with a poor, piping gospel-ignoring pseudo-philanthropism, that may in process of twenty years make the churches of New England as really missionary ground as the seven churches of Asia.

The newspapers are full of the announcement—"The Charter Oak has fallen"—and many are the moralizings thereupon. To our minds—prone to superstition perhaps—the news comes as a solemn omen. For two hundred years the old tree has stood praised and admired, as the symbol of the Puritanism, whose very life once found in it a shelter. But all the while, with soundness and greenness externally, the process of decay was going on within—gradually widening outward, till but a shell is left—and when the storm comes it falls before it, a useless thing. Is there much more of Puritanism left in the land that bore it, than the outside shell? Has not all vitality already gone from the heart—and is this omen significant of danger, that in the next storm that sweeps over the spiritual and moral vineyard, the long cherished and applauded Puritanism of New England, has fallen and perished?

---

#### THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SLAVERY—TESTIMONY OF THE SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

[The following paper was reported by a Committee to the Synod of South Carolina, at its stated meeting in November, 1851, and adopted by that body as its testimony and appeal to "all the Churches of Jesus Christ, throughout the earth." It was soon after published by its order and circulated to a considerable extent. We republish it now for several reasons. 1. The signal ability of the argument itself entitles it to a careful study on the part of all who desire to maintain a good conscience, and at the same time to preserve the integrity of the Church in this crisis

of our national affairs, as well as to aid in resisting the counsels which threaten the existence of the Union of these States. 2. Some of the religious newspapers, even within the bounds of our own branch of the Church, seem to be itching to go into this perilous controversy, albeit the General Assembly has solemnly pronounced that the Church, being a spiritual body, has nothing at all to do with political questions. If the editors and correspondents of these prints will study this paper, they may be convinced that the Church is simply a witness; and a witness only of that particular system of truth contained in the written word of God; that she has no right to *speculate* about human rights or any thing else, but is bound to preach the preaching that God bids her. 3. The madness of many ministers and ecclesiastical bodies in the North, who have abandoned their peculiar mission, and preach Kansas instead of Christ, can hardly be expected to listen to reason; but we are persuaded that there are some of God's people in that region, whose cry is *not* for blood, and who are willing to give a candid consideration to this solemn appeal of a respectable portion of God's people in the South, pleading for the authority of His word, as well as for their own homes and fire-sides. 4. It will be seen that the great body of Old School Presbyterians in this country are at one upon this question, so far as it is a Bible-question of sin or no sin. The testimony of a Synod in South Carolina,—a State supposed to be extreme proslavery,—is in entire harmony with the testimony of the General Assembly, a body constituted of representatives from all the States of the Union, with the exception of two or three.

If the public Christian sentiment of the country, as was ably argued in the last number of the "Critic," were sound upon this question; if the Church, as such, would refuse to mingle in the agitation, our fears for the Union would speedily subside. If ministers would take the injunction of Paul to Timothy (1 Tim. 6: 1-5), as their guide, and stand immovably upon Bible ground, the disastrous eclipse which now casts its gloomy shadow across the land would soon come to an end, and the sun of peace and prosperity again gladden us with his beams. May God confound the machinations of the wicked, and not "grant their desires"!] ]

### REPORT ON SLAVERY.

It will be remembered that at the Sessions of this Synod in Columbia, in 1847, a series of resolutions was presented, setting forth the relations of the Church to slavery, and the duties respectively of masters and servants. After some discussion, it was deemed advisable to appoint a committee to take the whole subject into consideration, and submit a report, somewhat in the form of a circular letter to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth, explaining the position of Southern Christians, and vindicating their right to the confidence, love and fellowship of all who everywhere call upon the name of our common Master. The design of appointing this committee was not to increase, but to allay agitation. It was evident that a strong public sentiment, both in Europe and America, had been organized, and was daily growing in intensity, against institutions which we had inherited from our fathers, and against

which we felt no call, either from religion or policy, to enter a protest. We felt it to be due to Christian charity to make an effort, however unsuccessfully, to disabuse the minds of brethren, with whom we were anxious to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace, of prejudices and misapprehensions which we were confident had misled them. Events have taken place since the appointment of the committee, which invest the subject with additional importance. At that time the greatest danger immediately apprehended was a partial alienation, perhaps an external schism, among those who were as one in a common faith. But now, more portentous calamities are dreaded. The determined zeal, with which a policy founded, for the most part, in the conviction that slavery is a sin, is pressed upon the Federal Legislature, justifies the gloomiest forebodings in relation to the integrity of the Union and the stability of our free institutions. The question has passed from the Church to the State; it is no longer a debate among Christian ministers and Christian men, as to the terms of communion and the rights of particular communities to the Christian name. It is now a question as to the equality of the States which compose this great commonwealth of nations, and the obligation of the charter which binds them in federal alliance. The immense importance, which, in this aspect, is given to the subject, has induced the chairman of your committee to present, upon his own responsibility, the following thoughts. He has been unable to consult the brethren who were appointed with him. And as he is deeply convinced that the position of the Southern, and perhaps, he may say, of the whole Presbyterian Church, in relation to slavery, is the only position which can save the country from disaster and the Church from schism, he is quickened by the double consideration of patriotism and religion to record opinions which, however hastily expressed, have been maturely weighed.

I. The relation of the Church to slavery cannot be definitely settled without an adequate apprehension of the nature and office of the Church itself. What, then, is the Church? It is not, as we fear too many are disposed to regard it, a moral institute of universal good, whose business it is to wage war upon every form of human ill, whether social, civil, political or moral, and to patronize every expedient which a romantic benevolence may suggest as likely to contribute to human comfort, or to mitigate the inconveniences of life. We freely grant, and sincerely rejoice in the truth, that the healthful operations of the Church, in its own appropriate sphere, re-act upon all the interests of man, and contribute to the progress and prosperity of society; but we are far from admitting either that it is the purpose of God, that, under the present dispensation of religion, all evil shall be banished from this sublunary state, and earth

be converted into a paradise, or that the proper end of the Church is the direct promotion of universal good. It has no commission to construct society afresh, to adjust its elements in different proportions, to re-arrange the distribution of its classes, or to change the forms of its political constitutions. The noble schemes of philanthropy which have distinguished Christian nations; their magnificent foundations for the poor, the maimed and the blind; the efforts of the wise and good to mitigate human misery, and to temper justice with mercy in the penal visitations of the law; the various associations that have been formed to check and abate particular forms of evil, have all been quickened into life by the spirit of Christianity. But still it is not the distinctive province of the Church to build Asylums for the needy or insane; to organize societies for the improvement of the penal code, or for arresting the progress of intemperance, gambling or lust. The problems which the anomalies of our fallen state are continually forcing on philanthropy, the Church has no right directly to solve. She must leave them to the Providence of God and to human wisdom, sanctified and guided by the spiritual influences which it is her glory to foster and cherish. The Church is a very peculiar society—voluntary in the sense that all its members become so, not by constraint, but willingly; but not in the sense that its doctrines, discipline and order, are the creatures of human will, deriving their authority and obligation from the consent of its members. On the contrary, it has a fixed and unalterable constitution; and that constitution is the word of God. It is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is enthroned in it as a sovereign. It can hear no voice but His; obey no commands but His; pursue no ends but His. Its officers are His servants, bound to execute only His will. Its doctrines are His teachings, which He, as a prophet, has given from God; its discipline His law, which He as king, has ordained. The power of the Church, accordingly is only ministerial and declarative. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is her rule of faith and practice. She can announce what it teaches; enjoin what it commands; prohibit what it condemns, and enforce her testimonies by spiritual sanctions. Beyond the Bible she can never go, and apart from the Bible she can never speak. To the law and to the testimony, and to them alone, she must always appeal; and when they are silent it is her duty to put her hand upon her lips.

These principles, thus abstractly stated, are not likely to provoke opposition, but the conclusion which flows from them, and for the sake of which we have here stated them, has unfortunately been too much disregarded; and that is, that the Church is not at liberty to *speculate*. She has a *creed*, but no *opinions*. When she speaks, it must be in the name of the Lord, and her only argument is, *thus it is written*.

In conformity with this principle, has the Church any authority to declare slavery to be sinful? Or, in other words, has the Bible, any where, either directly or indirectly, condemned the relation of master and servant, as incompatible with the will of God.

We think there can be little doubt, that if the Church had universally repressed the spirit of speculation, and had been content to stand by the naked testimony of God, we should have been spared many of the most effective dissertations against slavery. Deduct the opposition to it which has arisen from sympathy with imaginary sufferings, from ignorance of its nature and misapplication of the crotchets of philosophers—deduct the opposition which is due to sentiment, romance or speculation, and how much will be found to have originated from the humble and devout study of the Scriptures? Will any man say that he who applies to them with an honest and unprejudiced mind, and discusses their teachings upon the subject, simply as a question of language and interpretation, will rise from the pages with the sentiment or spirit of a modern abolitionist? Certain it is that no direct condemnation of it can anywhere be found in the sacred volume. A social element in all states, from the dawn of history until the present period, if it be the crying and damning sin which its enemies represent it to be, it is truly amazing that the Bible, which professes to be a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path, to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work, no where gives the slightest caution against this tremendous evil. The master is no where rebuked as a monster of cruelty and tyranny—the slave no where exhibited as the object of peculiar compassion and sympathy. The manner in which the relation itself is spoken of and its duties prescribed, the whole tone and air of the sacred writers convey the impression that they themselves had not the least suspicion that they were dealing with a subject full of abominations and outrages. We read their language—cool, dispassioned, didactic. We find masters exhorted in the same connection with husbands, parents, magistrates; slaves exhorted in the same connection with wives, children and subjects. The Prophet or Apostle gives no note of alarm—raises no signal of distress when he comes to the slave and his master, and the unwary reader is in serious danger of concluding that, according to the Bible, it is not much more harm to be a master than a father—a slave than a child. But this is not all. The Scriptures not only fail to condemn—they as distinctly sanction slavery as any other social condition of man. The Church was organized in the family of a slaveholder; it was divinely regulated among the chosen people of God, and the peculiar duties of the parties are inculcated under the Christian economy. These are facts which cannot be de-

nied. Our argument then is this : If the Church is bound to abide by the authority of the Bible, and that alone, she discharges her whole office in regard to slavery, when she declares what the Bible teaches, and enforces its laws by her own peculiar sanctions. Where the Scriptures are silent, she must be silent too. What the Scriptures have not made essential to a Christian profession, she does not undertake to make so. What the Scriptures have sanctioned, she does not condemn. To this course she is shut up by the nature of her constitution. If she had universally complied with the provisions of her charter, the angry discussions which have disgraced her courts and produced bitterness and alienation among her own children, in different countries, and in different sections of the same land, would all have been prevented. The abolition excitement derives most of its fury, and all its power, from the conviction which Christian people, without warrant from God, have industriously propagated, that slavery, essentially considered, is a sin. They have armed the instincts of our moral nature against it. They have given the dignity of principle to the clamors of fanaticism ; and the consequence is that many Churches are distracted and the country reeling under a series of assaults in which treachery to man is justified as obedience to God. According to the rule of faith which gives to the Church its being, the relation of master and slave stands on the same foot with the other relations of life. In itself considered, it is not inconsistent with the will of God—it is *not* sinful. This is as much a doctrine of Christianity as the obligation of obedience to law. The Church, therefore, cannot undertake to disturb the relation. The Bible further teaches that there are duties growing out of this relation—duties of the master and duties of the slave. The Church must enforce these duties upon her own members. Here her jurisdiction stops. As a *Church*—as the visible Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—she must venture to interfere no further, unless it be to repress the agitation of those who assume to be wiser and purer than the word of God. Those who corrupt the Scriptures, who profanely add to the duties of the Decalogue, are no more entitled to exemption from ecclesiastical discipline, than any other disturber of the peace or fomenter of faction and discord. It is not a question whether masters can be received into the communion of the saints, but it is a question whether those who exclude them should not themselves be rejected. We are far from insinuating that abolitionists, *as such*, are unfit to be members of the Church. Slavery may evidently be contemplated in various aspects—as a social arrangement, involving a distinction of classes, like oriental caste, or European gradation of ranks—as a civil relation, involving rights, obligations corresponding to its own nature—as a political condition, bearing upon the prosperity,

happiness and growth of communities. In any or in all these aspects, it may be opposed upon consideration of policy and prudence, as the despotism of Asia, the aristocracy of Europe, or the free institutions of America are opposed, without the imputation of sin upon the nature of the relation itself. The members of the Church, as citizens and as men, have the same right to judge of the expediency or in expediency of introducing and perpetuating in their own soil this institution, as any other element of their social economy. But they transcend their sphere, and bring reproach upon the Scriptures as a rule of faith, when they go beyond these political considerations, and condemn slavery as essentially repugnant to the will of God. They then corrupt the Scriptures, and are exposed to the malediction of those who trifle with the Divine Testimony. The Southern Churches have never asked their brethren in Europe, or in the non-slaveholding sections of their own land, to introduce slavery among them—they have never asked them to approve it as the wisest and best constitution of society. All they have demanded is, that their brethren would leave it where God has left it, and deal with it, where it is found, as God has dealt with it. We insist upon it that they should not disturb the tranquility of the State by attempting to re-adjust our social fabric according to their own crotchets, when we ourselves, the only parties who have a right to meddle, are satisfied with our condition. We do not recognise them as political apostles, to whom God has transferred from us the right inherent in every other people, to manage their affairs in their own way, so long as they keep within the limits of the Divine Law. If we fail in our social and political organizations—if, by consequence, we lag behind in the progress of nations, we do not forfeit our right to self government and become the minors and wards of wiser and stronger States. It is as preposterous in our Northern and European brethren to undertake to force their system upon us, or to break up our own in obedience to their notions, as it would be in us to wage a war upon theirs, on the ground that ours is better. Slavery, as a *political* question, is one in regard to which communities and States may honestly differ. But as a *moral* question, the Bible has settled it; and all that we contend for is, that being a *matter* of liberty, we should not break fellowship for difference upon other grounds. If any man, however, is not content to stand by the word of God—if any Church will not tolerate the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free—that man and that Church cannot be vindicated from the charge of fomenting schism. They become justly exposed to censure. He who would debar a slaveholder from the table of the Lord, upon the simple and naked ground that he is a slaveholder, deserves himself to be excluded for usurping the prerogatives of Christ, and introducing terms of communion

which cast reproach upon the conduct of Jesus and the Apostles. He violates the very charter of the Church—is a traitor to its fundamental law.

We have been struck with three circumstances in the conduct of what may be called the Christian argument against slavery. The first is, that the principles from which, for the most part, the conclusion has been drawn, were the abstrusest of all speculations upon the vexed question of human rights, and not the obvious teachings of the Scriptures. The second is, that when the argument has been professedly taken from the Bible, it has consisted in strained applications of passages, or forced inferences from doctrines, in open violation of the law that Scripture is its own interpreter; and the third is, that duties which the Bible enjoins are not only inadequately recognized, but forced into a system of morals whose fundamental principles exclude them.

The argument from philosophy, if the dogmas of sophists upon the nature and extent of human rights can be dignified with the title of philosophy, a Church Court cannot admit to be authoritative, without doing violence to her own constitution. It is not denied that truth is truth, whether found in the Bible or out of it, and it is not denied that there is much truth, and truth of a most important kind, which it is not the province of revelation to teach. But then it should be remembered that this is truth with which the Church, *as such*, has nothing to do. Neither should it be forgotten, that if human speculation conducts to a moral result directly contradictory of the Scriptures, faith convicts it of falsehood, the word of God being a surer guide than the wit of man. When the question is whether man is mistaken or the word of God deceitful, the answer to the Church cannot be doubtful. And yet how much of the declamation against slavery, in which Christian people are prone to indulge, is founded upon principles utterly unsupported by the Scriptures? One man very complacently tells us that every man is entitled to the fruit of his own labor; and that the master, in appropriating that of the slave, defrauds him of his right. It is then denounced as a system of robbery and plunder, which every good man should labor to banish from the earth. But where is the maxim, in the sense in which it is interpreted, to be found in the Scriptures? Where, even in any respectable system of moral philosophy? Where are we taught that the labor which a man puts forth in his own person is always his, or belongs to him of right, and cannot belong to another? How does it appear that what is physically his, must be legally his? Another insists on the absolute equality of the species, and can find no arrangement in harmony with reason, but that which shall reduce the race to a stagnant uniformity of condition. But where do the Scriptures teach that an essen-



tial equality as men implies a corresponding equality of state? And who is authorized to limit the application of this sweeping principle to the sole relation of slavery? It is as much the weapon of the socialist and leveller as of the abolitionist, and the Church cannot accept it without renouncing the supremacy of the Scriptures; neither can she proceed, upon it, to excommunicate the slaveholder, without fulminating her anathemas against the rich and noble. Another insists upon the essential and indestructible personality of men, and vituperates slavery as reducing human beings to the condition of chattels and of things, as if it were possible that human legislation could convert matter into mind or mind into matter, or as if slavery were not professedly a relation of man to man. The arguments from this and all similar grounds can be easily answered. It will be found, in every case, either that the principle assumed is false in itself or distorted in its application, or that the whole discussion proceeds on a gratuitous hypothesis in regard to the nature of slavery. But whether they can be answered or not, no deductions of man can set aside the authority of God. The Bible is supreme, and as long as it allows the institution, the Church should not dare to rebuke it. In a court of Jesus Christ we would not think of presenting any consideration as conclusive, but thus saith the Lord.

But when the argument is professedly conducted from the Bible, it is in violation of the great principle that Scripture is its own interpreter. It is notorious—it is indeed universally conceded, that no express condemnations of slavery have ever been produced from the sacred volume. The plan is, in the absence of any thing precise and definite, to demonstrate an incongruity betwixt the analogy and general spirit of the Bible, and the facts of slavery. Some general principle is seized upon, such as the maxim of universal benevolence, or of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, and brought into contrast with the degradation or abuses of bondage. Or specific precepts, such as this in relation to the family, are singled out, with which it is supposed slavery renders it impossible to comply. The fallacy in these cases is easily detected. The same line of argument, carried out precisely in the same way, would make havoc with all the institutions of civilized society. Indeed, it would be harder to defend from the Scriptures the righteousness of great possessions than the righteousness of slavery. The same principle which would make the master emancipate his servant, on the ground of benevolence, would make the rich man share his estate with his poor neighbors; and he who would condemn the institution as essentially and inherently evil, because it sometimes incidentally involves the disruption of family ties, would condemn the whole texture of society in the non-slaveholding states, where the separation of

parents and children, of husbands and wives, is often a matter of stern necessity. But however the argument might be answered, it is enough for a Christian man, who compares Scripture with Scripture, to know that slavery is expressly excepted from the application of this or any other principle in the sweeping sense of the abolitionists. It is not a case left to the determination of general principles—it is provided for in the law. If the Scriptures were silent in regard to it, we might appeal to analogies to aid us in reaching the will of God; but as they have mentioned the subject again and again, and stated the principles which are to be applied to it, we are shut up to these special testimonies.

Those who have been conversant with works against slavery, cannot fail to be struck with the awkward and incongruous appearance which in these works the commands of the Scriptures to masters and servants assume. They lay down principles which make slavery an utter abomination—treason to man and rebellion against God. They represent it as an enormous system of cruelty, tyranny and impiety. They make it a fundamental duty to labor for its extirpation, and yet will not venture directly and boldly, at least Christian abolitionists, to counsel insurrection or murder; they will even repeat the commands of the Bible, as if in mockery of all their speculations. Now we ask if these commands are not forced appendages to their moral system? Are they not awkwardly inserted? The moral system of abolitionists does not legitimately admit them; and if they were not restrained by respect for the Bible, from carrying out their own doctrines, they would find themselves forced to recommend measures to the slave very different from obedience to his master. Those accordingly, who prefer consistency to piety, have not scrupled to reject these precepts, and to denounce the book which enjoins them. They feel the incongruity betwixt their doctrines and these duties, and they do not hesitate to revile the Scriptures as the patron of tyranny and bondage. Admit the principle that slavery, essentially considered, is not a sin, and the injunctions of Scripture are plain, consistent, intelligible; deny the principle, and the Bible seems to be made up of riddles.

Such is a general view of the Christian argument against slavery. We are not conscious of having done it any injustice. We have endeavored to study it impartially and candidly; but we confess that the conviction grows upon us, that those who most violently denounce this relation, have formed their opinions in the first instance independently of the Bible, and then by special pleading have endeavored to pervert its teachings to the patronage of their assumptions. They strike us much more as apologists for the defects and omissions of the Scriptures, than as humble inquirers, sitting at the feet of Jesus to learn His

will. They have settled in their own minds that slavery is a sin; then the Bible must condemn it, and they set to work to make out the case that the Bible has covertly and indirectly done what they feel it ought to have done. Hence these peculiar features of the argument to which we have already adverted.

To this may be added a total misapprehension of the nature of the institution. Adjuncts and concomitants of slavery are confounded with its essence, and abuses are seized upon as characteristic of the very genius of the institution..

If this method of argument is to be persisted in, the consequences must ultimately be injurious to the authority of the sacred writers. Those who have not a point to gain, will easily detect the sophistry which makes the Scriptures subsidiary to abolitionism; and if they are to receive it as a fundamental principle of morals that there can be no right to the labor of another, independently of contract, and this is the essence of slavery, they will be shut up to the necessity of denying the sufficiency and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. Like Morell, they will take their stand upon the defective morality of the Bible, and scout the idea of any external, authoritative rule of faith. The very same spirit of rationalism which has made the Prophets and Apostles succumb to philosophy and impulse in relation to the doctrines of salvation, lies at the foundation of modern speculation in relation to the rights of man. Opposition to slavery has never been the offspring of the Bible. It has sprung from visionary theories of human nature and society—it has sprung from the misguided reason of man—it comes as natural, not as revealed truth; and when it is seen that the word of God stands in the way of it, the lively oracles will be stripped of their authority, and reduced to the level of mere human utterances. We affectionately warn our brethren of the mischiefs that must follow from their mode of conducting the argument against us—they are not only striking at slavery, but they are striking at the foundation of our common faith. They are helping the cause of rationalism. We need not repeat that a sound philosophy must ever coincide with revelation, but what we insist upon is that in cases of conflict, the Scriptures must be Supreme. Man may err, but God can never lie. If men are at liberty from their own heads to frame systems of morality, which render null and void the commandments of God, we see not why they are not equally at liberty to frame systems of doctrines which render vain the covenant of grace. If they are absolutely their own law, why not absolutely their own teachers? It is, therefore, a very grave question which *they* have to decide, who, in opposition to the example of the Apostles of our Lord, exclude masters from the communion of the saints, and from the hopes of the Gospel.

The history of the world is full of illustrations that the foolishness of God is wiser than man. There is a noble moderation in the Scriptures, upon which alone depends the stability of States and the prosperity and success of the whole social economy. It rebukes alike the indifference and torpor which would repress the spirit of improvement and stiffen society into a fixed and lifeless condition, and the spirit of impatience and innovation which despises the lessons of experience, and rushes into visionary schemes of reformation. It is in the healthful operation of all the limbs and members of the body politic that true progress consists; and he who fancies that deformities can be cured by violent and hasty amputations, may find that in removing what seemed to be only excrescences, he is inflicting a fatal stroke upon the vital organs of the system. Slavery, to those who are unaccustomed to its operations, may seem to be an unnatural and monstrous condition, but it will be found that no principles can be pleaded to justify its removal which may not be applied with fatal success to the dearest interests of man. They who join in the unhallowed crusade against the institutions of the South, will have reason to repent that they have set an engine in motion which cannot be arrested until it has crushed and ground to powder the safeguards of life and property among themselves.

Deeply convinced as we are that the proper position of the Church in relation to slavery, is that which we have endeavored to present in these pages, we would earnestly and solemnly expostulate with those denominations at the North who have united in the outcry against us, and urge them to reconsider their steps in the fear of God and under the guidance of his word. We ask them to take the Apostles as their guide. We are solemn and earnest, not only because we deplore a schism in the body of Christ, but because we deplore a schism among the confederated States of this Union. We know what we say when we declare our deliberate conviction that the continued agitation of slavery must sooner or later shiver this government into atoms; and agitated it must continue to be, unless the Churches of Jesus Christ take their stand firmly and immovably upon the platform of the Bible. The people of the South ask nothing more—they will be content with nothing less. Let the Churches take this position, and the people of the North will find their moral instincts rallying to the support of our Federal Constitution, and will give to the winds a policy founded on the profane insinuation that slavery is essentially a sin. Free-soilism is nothing but the application to politics of this unscriptural dogma. If slavery be indeed consistent with the Bible, their responsibility is *tremendous*, who, in obedience to blind impulses and visionary theories, pull down the fairest fabric of government the world has ever seen, rend the body

of Christ in sunder, and dethrone the Saviour in His own Kingdom. What a position for Churches of Jesus Christ—aiding and abetting on one hand the restless and turbulent designs of agitators, demagogues and radical reformers, and giving countenance on the other to a principle, which, if legitimately carried out, robs the Scriptures of their supremacy, and delivers us over to the folly and madness of rationalism. Are our country, our Bible, our interests on earth and our hopes for heaven, to be sacrificed on the altars of a fierce fanaticism? Are laws to be made which God never enacted—doctrines to be taught which the Apostles have condemned, and are they to be propagated and forced on men at the peril of every thing that is dear and precious? We conjure our brethren—for such we shall still call them—we conjure our brethren to pause. We do not ask them to patronize slavery—we do not wish them to change their own institutions—we only ask them to treat us as the Apostles treated the slaveholders of their day, and leave to us the liberty which we accord to them, of conducting our affairs according to our own convictions of truth and duty. We ask it of them as Christians—as professed followers of Christ; and if this reasonable demand is refused, upon them and not upon us must rest the perilous responsibility of the disasters that must inevitably follow. We are not alarmists, but slavery is implicated in every fibre of Southern society; it is with us a vital question, and it is because we *know* that interference with it cannot and will not be much longer endured, we raise our warning voice. We would save the country if we could. We would save the Constitution which our fathers framed, and we would have our children, and our children's children, for countless generations, worship in the temple which our fathers reared. But this cannot be, unless our whole people shall be brought to feel that slavery is no ground of discord, and that in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free. Would to God that this blessed consummation could be reached!

In the mean time Christian masters at the South should address themselves with earnestness and vigor to the discharge of their solemn duties to their slaves. We would stir up their minds, not that they have been inattentive to the subject, but that they may take the more diligent heed. The most important and commanding of all their obligations is that which relates to religious instruction. Food and raiment and shelter their interests will prompt them to provide; but as the labour of the slave is expended for their benefit, they are bound, by the double consideration of justice and mercy, to care for his soul. We rejoice that so much has already been done in imparting the gospel to this class; and we hope that the time is not far distant when every Christian master will feel that he is somewhat in the same sense responsible for the religious educa-

tion of his slaves as for the religious education of his children. The Church, too, as an organized society, should give special attention to the subject. There are many questions connected with it, which ought to be gravely and deliberately considered. We have no doubt that much effort has been uselessly expended, because injudiciously applied. Of one thing we are satisfied—their religious teachers should never be taken from among themselves. There is too great a proneness to superstition and extravagance among the most enlightened of them, to entrust them with the cure of souls. Their circumstances preclude them from the preparation and study which such a charge involves. There was wisdom in the statute of the primitive Church, which allowed none but a freeman to be a minister of the Gospel. To say nothing of the fact that their time is under the direction of their masters, we would as soon think of making ministers and elders, and organizing Churches of children, as of according the same privilege to slaves. They would soon degrade piety into fanaticism, and the Church into bedlam. We rejoice that the Presbyteries of our own Synod have uniformly acted in conformity with this principle; and although our success may, by consequence, be slow, it will eventually be sure.

---

#### LETTER TO A PARISHIONER: THE PRACTICAL ISSUE BETWEEN PRESBYTERY AND PRELACY.

MY DEAR—: You inform me that since your determination to unite with us in worship—a determination to which you have been led, both from conviction of the general accordance of the Presbyterian system with the scriptures, and from your desire to unite in public worship with your family—you have been earnestly remonstrated with, and solemnly warned of the infinite danger of apostasy from the Episcopal, as the only true church, and persistently plied with books and tracts—some of which you send me, with a request for my opinion of the chief points contained in them.

You are, doubtless, already fully aware, that whilst we maintain, with all the ardor of deep conviction, that Presbyterianism is the true system of the scriptures, yet we do not deem it a duty to urge, or even to advise any one to renounce the fellowship of any other evangelical church, in favor of ours. You have doubtless observed, moreover, a marked difference between the pastoral instructions given and the books recommended by us to inquirers on the subject of religion, and the instructions given

and the reading recommended by that class of Episcopal ministers who have manifested so much zeal about what they call your apostasy, and so much sorrow for you, as one who has renounced the means of grace, and perilled salvation. You must naturally infer, therefore, some marked difference between our views and theirs, of the way of salvation, and what is essential to it. We hold that the essential conditions of salvation are so clearly laid down in scripture, so uniformly in the same terms, and are so simple in themselves, that there is no room for controversy. "Believe with thy heart in the Lord Jesus, and confess with thy mouth that Jesus is the Christ, and thou shalt be saved"—"whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved"—"whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." The conditions of salvation, therefore, remain not to be settled by the church, or to be amended or modified by the church, nor does it depend upon any "power of the press" in the church, to close the gate of salvation upon any one who thus "believes," and is, therefore, "in Christ," and thereby made a "new creature." You will understand, therefore, that in complying with your request for my opinion in this matter, I would not thereby have you suppose for a moment, that I take this trouble because I think the question of personal salvation to depend upon the holding certain views of the church, and the observance of certain ordinances. The conditions of salvation being clearly settled in the Word of God, and these conditions, as we have seen, involving no questions of visible church order and ordinances, the question, whether you peril salvation by giving up connection with one branch of the church, to connect yourself with another, is at once finished. This question of your personal safety, you can determine for yourself—better than any spiritual adviser can determine it for you. It is simply an appeal to your own consciousness:—Do you truly believe with the heart—truly receive and rest upon Jesus Christ, as he is freely offered in the Gospel? But if your inquiry is simply for your own comfort and satisfaction, as to the comparative scriptural validity of the two systems of ordinances, between which you have made a decision, your purpose is a very commendable one; for the inquiry is of the highest importance. For we are far from holding that it is a matter of indifference, whether Christians conform in worship to the Saviour's appointed method. Whilst intelligent Presbyterians utterly reject the idea of making one's salvation depend upon any question of external church relation, they are equally as earnest as Episcopalians, in asserting that Christ hath founded a church, and appointed a church order and ordinances, and in seeking to conform in all things to that order. Our objection to the theory of those who press upon you so zealously the question of church connection as an essential condition of salvation, is, not that it

magnifies the inherent importance of the church, but that it entirely reverses the order of the ideas in the revealed Word of God. This theory puts the church as the root, and salvation as the branch resulting from the germinal power of the root:—the Church *in order to faith in Jesus* and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; whereas, the scriptural idea is, that from faith in Jesus, uniting us to Him, and in Him to all that are His; and from the spiritual instincts thereby awakened in the soul, grows, necessarily, the visible church as the organized body of Christ on earth. Just as in the case of civil society: it is not that social organization and government *creates* the social feelings, the instinct of affection for kindred and neighbors, and the desire for order and government; but that God has created men with such instincts, and, therefore, wherever men are found together, they organize society, and constitute a government. Thus, therefore, it is not the church first, as the root, but the spiritual instincts of souls created anew in Christ Jesus, that, developing themselves, organize a spiritual society. Faith in Jesus, and the indwelling of the Spirit, is the cause, of which the church is the effect; not the church the cause, of which faith and the indwelling of the Spirit is the effect.

It is the more important to direct your attention to this point at the outset, because just here occurs the grand misrepresentation of Presbyterianism, by the writers of those books and tracts which you have sent me—and which is so constantly occurring in the arguments of those zealots, whose idea of the several churches, seems to be that of so many rival railroads; and whose idea of the duty of Christians, would seem to have been suggested by the runners employed by these rival lines. These would represent Presbyterianism as essentially a congeries of abstract doctrines—ignoring the idea of a ministry, ordinances and church order, as a matter of divine institution—and, therefore, failing to meet some of the plainest requirements of scripture, as well visible society and communion with the children of God. This as some of the strongest yearnings of the Christian heart, for mistake is perhaps not so much wilful on their part, as from the error of taking as Presbyterians, the loose and cloudy views of some, “who have gone out from us because they are not of us:” or from the more egregious error of confounding with Presbyterianism, the Independency of New England, with which, indeed, it has been our misfortune to have had too close an alliance in days past—but which is as antagonistic to Presbyterianism, as Episcopacy itself. It will be apparent, from the slightest examination of our symbols, that Presbyterianism, just as carefully as Episcopacy, develops the idea of “one Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church:” just as carefully insists upon a divinely appointed ministry and sacraments, as essential to the church: just as completely, and we think far more scripturally, provides for



that yearning of the Christian heart after fellowship and visible unity, among all "the families that call upon the name of the Lord."

It may be remarked, moreover, that so far as relates to doctrinal articles, the difference between the Episcopal and the Presbyterian Churches, is, for the most part, merely nominal. The thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, and the thirty-three chapters of the Confession of Faith, contain essentially the same system of truth. It is true that a certain class of Episcopalians, shrug their shoulders and express their abhorrence of Calvinism, and assert that the thirty-nine articles may be taken in an Arminian sense. It is equally true, that the Calvinism of the thirty-nine articles, is as clear and distinct as that of the Westminster Confession, and that an equal laxity of conscience might put an Arminian sense upon the thirty-three chapters of the Confession. Whatever doctrinal differences, therefore, manifest themselves in the practical teaching of the Ministry of the two Churches, arises, not from difference in the symbols, to which they oblige themselves to adhere, but simply from the greater laxity of the Episcopal Ministry, in adhering to their own articles.

It is needless to suggest to a person of your intelligence, that nothing essential to salvation can be involved in the difference, as to forms of worship between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism. To a large portion of the people indeed, this difference, being the most obvious, and entering more directly than any other question into their every day thoughts of religion, *seems* to be an important difference. Hence, for the most part, the expressions of preference for Episcopacy generally current, give great prominence to the beautiful and decent form in which religion then clothes itself—to "our excellent liturgy"—with many suggestions of difficulty with the nakedness of the Presbyterian service—the inability to unite in the extempore prayer. All this, however, is obviously a matter of taste and habit. It is natural enough, that one long habituated to the use of a liturgy, should wonder how others should worship without it. Or, that one long habituated to the use of extempore prayer in public service, should wonder how others should be able to worship with true devotion in the use of a liturgy. The law of habit obtains in our mental and spiritual, as in our material and physical constitution; just as one may form an artificial taste, which shall become as strong, in its control, as any original natural tastes; just as one long accustomed to the use of tobacco, or other narcotics, finds the use of the artificial stimulus, at length, an absolute necessity to his comfort; so may one—even a truly spiritual man—accustom himself to the use of artificial means of worship, until their use becomes an essential condition of his being able to engage comfortably in worship. As to the

common objection against the abuse or ill use of the Presbyterian modes of worship; the long and wandering, and perhaps oratorical or metaphysical prayer, which the worshipper cannot unite in—the violation of good taste which disturbs devotional feeling, &c.—the answer is very obvious. The abuse is not to be taken as an argument for the one mode against the other, unless it first be shown that the abuse is more apt to obtain in the one than in the other. But is not the use of forms in worship even more likely to lead to spiritless and undevotional service? Whilst we must truly regret that so often the Presbyterian service is liable to the above complaint, yet none who are in the habit of attending the Episcopal service, need be told, that as to the manner of its performance, good taste and true fervency of expression, are the exception, rather than the general rule. That a miserable drawl, or a wretched affectation, a careless perfunctory *saying*, or a solemnly ridiculous *singing*—according as the service is “said or sung”—but too commonly characterizes the manner of the Episcopal worship—quite as commonly at least, as coldness and irreverent heartlessness characterizes the Presbyterian.

In all this, therefore, there is no material issue involved—these are questions of manner and form, not of substance. Wherein, then, is the material distinction between these two views of religion? For that there is a material difference between us and those who warn you against us on peril of your salvation, is very obvious. It remains now that I point out to you, that the true issue between us and that class of Episcopalians who attach so much importance to a change such as you have made, grows out of the fact, that they teach a way of salvation which not only makes salvation ordinarily impossible to us, but makes any thing like a reasonably sure hope of salvation impossible to any one.

According to their theory of religion, the security for salvation in the Episcopal Church is in the fact that salvation comes from a participation in valid ordinances—and those ordinances alone are valid which are administered by a ministry of three orders who have received their commission from Bishops regularly descended, by a series of valid ordinations, from the Apostles. It will be needful then to illustrate this single point of validity of orders, since other questions in relation to the ministry are merely incidental to this. You are aware that Presbyterians not only accept the proposition of three classes of permanent ministers in the Church—Bishops or Presbyters who both teach and rule—Presbyters who rule, and Deacons who minister only in temporal things in the Church. That Bishop or Presbyter rules in one congregation, and the power of ordination is in the Presbyters. Episcopacy contends for these same officers in the Church, but as *three orders*. The Bishops having rule over many

Presbyters and congregations, and having alone, in virtue of their order, the power of ordination. Now that class of Episcopalians who warn you of the peril of participating with us in ordinances, hold that this is not difference of form and question of expediency, but a difference of substance, and involving personal salvation. It would be impossible, within the narrow limits of a letter, to go into a formal and elaborate demonstration of the Scriptural authority for, and the consequent validity of the Presbyterian, or of the unscriptural and preposterous nature of the Episcopal theory. Nor for any practical purpose—as against these theorists, is it important to do so. If it can be shown that by the admission of the ablest authorities of the High Anglican School, the essential elements of the Presbyterian theory have been not only endorsed, but advocated by the great lights of past ages in the so-called line of succession on the one hand, and if, on the other hand, it can be shown by similar admissions, that whilst the Anglican theory makes the validity of sacraments, and consequently personal salvation depend upon the validity of a series of ordinations, yet that validity itself cannot be demonstrated, but on the contrary, by their own principles, and by their own showing, the series has been fatally interrupted—then nothing further need be said to satisfy you of the preposterous absurdity of making that succession a fundamental element in saving faith.

Not to weary you with a parade of authorities which you have neither the time nor the means of examining, I select a single treatise, which you may have the opportunity to consult. This is the “treatise on the Church of Christ, designed chiefly for the use of students in theology, by Rev. Wm. Palmer, M. A.” And I make this selection because this production is pronounced by Bishop Whittingham “*the first complete treatise on the subject in our language, and among the best in any.*” In this judgment of the bishop, so far as relates to the ability of the work, we cordially concur; and when in his modest apology for differing occasionally from some more liberal incidental views of the author, the Bishop describes himself “*as the pigmy on the giant’s shoulders,*” —we are free to confess we do also concur with him. As to the fundamental proposition of Presbyterianism, that Bishop and Presbyter are the same order, and the Deacon but a minister of Church temporalities, it will be sufficient to cite a single paragraph:

“If we divide the sacred ministry according to its *degrees* instituted by God, and understand the word ‘order’ in the sense of ‘degree,’ we may very truly say there are three *orders* of the Christian ministry; but if we distribute it according to its *nature*, we may say there are only two orders; viz., Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons; for *pastors of the first and second degree exercise a ministry of the same order.* \* \* \* On the other, Deacons are plainly of a different order; *their ministry being according*

*to the Scripture, the practice of the Church generally, and the sentiment of the Church of England in particular, limited to duties of a temporal, or at least a very inferior character. They are only permitted to baptize and preach; the Church has before now given the same permission to laymen in case of necessity; they are not given the care of souls, or any of the higher offices of the ministry.*”—[Palmer on the Church, Part 6: ch. 1.]

As to the other fundamental point of difference—who is the proper minister of ordination? Mr. Palmer, though himself holding it to be the doctrine of the Church, that her chief ministers alone are empowered by divine right, at least in ordinary cases, to ordain; yet admits, that the opinion that Presbyters may ordain, has been maintained by the very greatest names in the Church.

“Several of the schoolmen hold that a mere Presbyter might confer every order except the Episcopate, by commission from the Church. Vasquez inclines to this opinion. Morinus refers to many of the schoolmen, and others, in proof of its truth. Of this opinion also, have been several writers of the English Church, whose orthodoxy is unquestionable. Amongst whom may be mentioned, Jewell, Hooker and Field.”—[Palmer on the Church, Part 6: ch. 4.]

I make these citations, not merely as admissions in favor of the Presbyterian theory—for we are accustomed to rest the proof of our theory on authority which we think far better than the opinions of even great men—but because of their obvious bearing on the other point proposed to be illustrated, to wit: that by the admissions of Anglicans themselves, it is impossible for any one to be confident that he is in the way of salvation, on the supposition that salvation is conditioned upon receiving ordinances whose validity depends upon the validity of a series of ordinations. For if, as we see, opinions have prevailed in the church, on the subject of the minister of ordination, which, put in practice, would invalidate ordination in their view—does not that give ground for alarming suspicion, that at some time or other, these opinions may have been put in practice, in the ordination of some one in the mystic line of succession? I might cite numerous other admissions in favor of the Presbyterian theory, from part 6th, chap. 2d, and part 6th, chap. 4th, showing that “there were several Presbyters in each Church, from the beginning.” “That from the time of the Apostles, the office of public teaching in the Church, and of administering the sacraments, was always performed by the Bishop,” &c. (See Palmer, part 6, chap. 2d.) But it chiefly concerns the point in hand, to show that, as has been said, in the second place, on their own showing, the theory of a succession of valid ordinations, as an element of christian faith, is practically impossible, since no intelligent mind can have any confident belief that the suc-

cession has never been invalidated ; nor can any impartial student of God's Word feel any sure conviction that the idea of such succession has any foundation there.

According to the most approved doctrine of Apostolic succession—to constitute a regular and valid ordination of a successor of the Apostles, it is necessary that it be done by at least three Bishops, each one of whom has himself been ordained as a successor of the Apostles ; that ordination is not a function of rule and government in the Church, as most Presbyterians hold, but a sort of sacrament which Bishops alone, as successors of the Apostles, have the power to administer. An Apostolical succession, according to this theory, is not simply an uninterrupted succession of the ministry in the Church, as a historical fact, in accordance with Christ's promise to raise up and qualify men, as Presbyterians hold, but an uninterrupted succession of valid prelatical ordinations, as essential to the administration of saving ordinances. It is the more important to observe this distinction, since just here lies the great fallacy of those lists of Bishops, from the present Bishops back to the Apostles, which are paraded in some of the tracts you brought me. To show an uninterrupted succession of incumbents in office, is one thing : to show an uninterrupted series of valid ordinations of these incumbents, is altogether a different thing. And yet, when we ask the advocates of Apostolical succession for the ground of their confidence that the series of ordinations, in no case, has ever been broken by an invalid ordination, they answer us by a parade of the series of incumbents of the office. Would it be a legal demonstration of the right of one of the numerous Smiths to inherit, as a descendant of Captain John Smith—should he establish a line of Smiths, from Captain John down to himself, residents in Eastern Virginia, without any evidence whatever of the legitimacy of either or all of them ?

But there is not only this negative failure. There are positive doubts, yea, strong presumptions *against* the validity of many of these ordinations—judging them by the stricter views of the Sacramentalists. We have seen, already, that it has been held as an opinion that Presbyters may ordain, and, therefore, it is probable such an opinion has, at some time, been put into practical execution. If, as Mr. Palmer says, “the validity of ordinations given by Presbyters, in case of necessity, has occasionally been supported by writers in the Church of England ;” if, as he thinks, furthermore, “we are not bound to condemn the appointment of ministers by the Lutheran party, in Germany, as many learned and orthodox writers have done ;” if, as he admits, “it is also true that Timothy was ordained by the ‘Presbytery,’” but as we do not know exactly the meaning of this term, which is understood by the Greek fathers to mean Bishops, and by the *Latin* fathers to mean the Presbyterate, or order of the priest-

hood," &c.—(See Palmer, part 6, chap. 4); then is there not a strong presumption that at some time in the 1800 years, this theory may have become actual fact, in some ordination, and, of course, vitiated all that succeed?

Again, if three Bishops must take part in an ordination—and without this “theologians of eminence regard such ordination *uncertain or null*”—nay, more, if the law and practice of the church, as well as scripture, requires “*that at least three Bishops should consecrate*;” then how sore a trial of the faith of Anglicans, to be told in the same chapter (part 6, chapter 5th) that “several theologians have been of opinion that in case of necessity, *one Bishop* was sufficient for this purpose;” nay, to find it asserted *as fact*, by the fathers, that ordinations have been performed by one Bishop;—nay still more, to find, according to the “venerable Bede,” that it was the custom in early times in England, for one Bishop to ordain—and that the missionary founder of the Church of England, St. Augustine, received formal instructions to that effect from Pope Gregory, and did himself alone perform ordination; nay, more, to be informed, (part 6th, chap. 2.), that “during the greater part, if not the whole of the last century, Popish Bishops in England and Ireland were consecrated by *one Bishop, assisted by two priests* instead of Bishops, as required by the canons”—yea, and that “what is worthy of remark, Dr. John Carroll, the first titular Bishop of Baltimore, in America, from whom the whole Romish hierarchy in the United States, claim their orders, was consecrated by Dr. Walmsley alone, whom we have no reason to think, was himself consecrated by more than one Bishop” (! !)

Again it has been a matter of gravest dispute, whether the ordination of one unbaptized is valid, and also whether ordination *per saltum*, that is ordination as Bishop, without having previously been priest, is valid. Learned theologians (see part 6th, chap. 7) have both affirmed and denied. Of course the probability is that the parties of the laxer opinion may have put in practice their doctrine, and thus, according to the stricter views, vitiated the mystic line, on whose purity the validity of the sacraments, and therefore the salvation of the recipients depends.

Now is it possible, that amid all these probabilities against the reality of such an unimpaired succession, any one can have a firm confidence of salvation, supposing the conditions of salvation to be participation in sacraments administered by such as can thus demonstrate their commission? Thus far you will perceive the argument is simply on their own admissions. If space and your patience permitted, it would not be difficult to prove, that as matter of fact, there can be, in the Anglican sense of it, no Apostolical succession. That as the Presbyter and Bishop of the New Testament are now generally admitted

to be identical—so there are no permanent officers in the Church but Presbyters and Deacons. That the Apostleship, as such, was in its nature a temporary office, and could not have been transmitted. That there were the twelve apostles of Christ, and never any other than the twelve. That it is involved in the very idea of Apostleship, that the office should be conferred directly by Christ himself, and that the functions of the office were simply to be personal witnesses of the life, death, and especially the resurrection of Jesus. That neither, according to Scriptural usage, nor the subsequent usage of the Church, can they justify the application of the name to any other—nor confer the office signified by the name on any other, than these twelve. That the very fact that the Eleven thought, (see Acts 1st), that one should be chosen to *fill up* the number, shows how they considered it extraordinary and temporary. That Paul's authority as an apostle was called in question—while it could have been on no other ground than the mistaken notion, that he had not been directly commissioned as the others:—and that so in fact we find him zealously defending his title as an apostle on the ground that he had “seen Christ”—that he was “called to be an apostle *not of men*, but by Jesus Christ.” That the functions of the Apostleship are plainly indicated in the saying of the Lord, “Ye are my witnesses”—“Ye have been with me from the beginning.” That inspiration is essential to the peculiar functions of the Apostleship, and also the special power of the Holy Ghost, whereby miracles are done, and the power to work miracles conferred on others. That whereas the qualifications of Presbyters and Deacons are distinctly laid down, and directions given for their appointment as ordinary and permanent officers of the Church,—yet no such qualifications are prescribed nor directions given for any other office. All these and a multitude of other facts go to make it clear, that this whole notion of any succession to the Apostles, save in the sense simply of a ministry in the Church in all after ages—is utterly chimerical. And if any thing farther is necessary to confirm this view of the absurdity of such succession, we have it in the fact that this theory of religion absolutely obliges you to believe, that there is no religion in the world outside the Roman and Anglican Churches: since if salvation is alone by sacraments, and those sacraments alone valid, which are administered by such a succession, then there is no other salvation. But on the contrary, experience shows that the spirit of God has been and is evidently present with other Churches, even in a far more eminent degree than with those who claim the succession.

But I fear to weary you. Enough, I trust, has been said, to put your mind at rest, as to your salvation depending upon any so flimsy a foundation.

Yours,

## THE LAST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY—DEVELOPEMENTS OF VOLUNTARY-ISM.

We had laid aside, for special notice in the Critic, the newspapers containing the detailed report of the very remarkable proceedings and debates at the annual meeting of the American Tract Society, in May last. Other subjects, however, crowded in upon us more to our taste, than criticisms upon an institution which has done much good hitherto, with some evil, and the intention of whose immediate friends and agents, we doubt not, is still to do much good and no evil; but whose chance for accomplishing their wishes, is manifestly growing more and more slender. Recent indications of a purpose to employ the methods and agencies of the Tract Society for political purposes, have recalled our attention to the subject. The very parties who labored so zealously for a revolution in the Tract Society, last spring, begin to develope more plainly the object of that revolution. An agency has been opened at the office of the "Independent," the organ of New England Congregationalism, of the movement type—and apparently now the prevailing type—for the receipt and disbursement of funds in aid of a colporteur effort to circulate in Pennsylvania, the "Life of Fremont," and the address in favor of the Free-soil ticket, by Henry Ward Beecher, (a Welshman it appears,) to his countrymen, the Welsh voters of Pennsylvania. Naturally enough this novel movement has not only recalled to mind the singular movement in May, but has also suggested to us some additional views touching the Tract Society and its prospective operations—in case the revolutionists succeed, as they will most likely do eventually, in getting a control of the Tract Society's affairs. Most of our readers have probably like ourselves, had their attention arrested by the proceeding to which we refer. We need therefore make only the most brief and summary statement of the facts in the case, preliminary to a statement equally brief, of the views which these facts suggest to our minds.

It appears then, that prior to the annual meeting, the suspicion got afloat among the old and tried friends of the Society, that a movement was to be made at the annual meeting, by the anti-slavery men, to oust the old, and put in a new administration, who should use the agencies of the Society to circulate anti-slavery doctrine. Against this formidable threat, the administration had no means of defence, except to get out a larger crowd to aid in shouting down the enemy. Dr. Tyng, and perhaps some others, gave notice of the danger, from the pulpit the



Sabbath before, and urged every one who had contributed to the Tract Society, to be at the meeting. When the time for action came, instead of the usual business meeting at the Tract House, so great was the crowd of members in attendance, that it was needful to adjourn to a large Church, where in a sort of mass meeting or mob, the great issues were tried—the best lungs and the greatest adroitness in getting the floor, being the chief means of success. Both parties having been heard by this multitudinous tribunal, a decision was made in some fashion or other, to refer matters to a committee to investigate and report, we presume, to a similar meeting, at some future period. Meantime, however, the movement men, though much distressed apparently, at the unkind suspicions of them by Dr. Tyng and others, kept up the war by a movement in the Massachusetts Tract Society, to displace and disgrace Dr. Adams, a gentleman of the highest standing, both as a minister and a man of letters, by way of warning to all New England men, who might dare even to look at “the South-side view of slavery.”

Such are some of the facts which have led us to the following memoranda of suggestions, on the subject of such voluntary societies in their present relations to the Church of Christ.

1. We see from this case what is the actual measure of control which can practically be exercised by the Church of God over institutions of this sort. In case a party of designing men wish to avail themselves of so powerful an engine for their own purposes, all that is needful is the packing of a mass meeting of as many out of the hundred thousand contributors, as a house will hold—put out by clamor the present administration, and put in an administration who will answer their purposes. The very fact that such a man as Dr. Tyng should feel it necessary to call upon the multitude to turn out for the protection of the society as it is, has a tremendous significance as to the power of others, by similar means, to make the society something which it is not. Need any man be told of the danger of an institution with an income of near half a million annually, under no better guardianship than the clamor of a mass meeting, self constituted out of a body perhaps of many thousand contributors?

2. For it is obvious that on the principle of this last movement against the present administration of the society, there is scarcely any limit to the demands which may be made on the society. If American slavery is one of the religious subjects which it is to discuss, then clearly it is bound to advocate practically all the means needful in the judgment of the movement men for the extirpation of it. At present, in their judgment, the first thing needful is the election of Fremont, with a view to put down the slave oligarchy in the Government—and therefore, it is as much a matter of Christian duty, according to the

Independent, (see Essays on "Praying and Voting,") to go to the polls and vote for Fremont, as to go to the Communion table. And as to the practical means—colportage in Pennsylvania for the circulation of the Life of Fremont—is probably just now the most important object of Christian beneficence. To this work the Tract Societies should therefore direct all its energies, at least till after the election. Or, to say nothing of this particular duty—as just at this time, in view of so large a portion of the Northern ministry, "the works of the Devil," against which the Church is to watch and strive, seem to have dwindled into insignificance in the presence of one stupendous work, the aggression of the slave-oligarchy, consistency would seem to require that the religious books of the Tract Society should reflect truly the religious views of the pulpit. And assuming the current preaching in the Churches as a fair standard of the doctrinal teaching of the Society's books, would it not be somewhat difficult just now to conjecture what should be the precise doctrinal type of the Society's new issues?

3. Independent of such positive considerations as these, it is a very grave question whether, in the present state of the Church, such a Society any longer embodies and represents any great idea. As a temporary and extraordinary expedient for arousing a sleeping and unfaithful Church to action, we doubt not it has done great service in times past. But now that the Church in all branches seem to have aroused thoroughly to the importance of the press as an agency for the spread of religious truth, it is surely a debatable question at least, whether there is any longer such use for this extensive machinery—especially when it may be so easily perverted into a tremendous engine of evil. The Bible Society embodies a great idea;—the essential unity of Protestantism in a common Rule of Faith. But the Tract Society now, so far as it embodies any idea at all, is the representative of the false idea of a latitudinarianism in doctrinal teaching, which permits and encourages the trimming and garbling of doctrinal statements by the Church. And perhaps if we take the trouble to look a little more deeply into the matter, we should find that the profoundest significance of the Tract Society as a permanent institution, is that of no-Church, as a witness-bearing Church—and therefore its tendency is even more strong than the ordinary tendencies of Independency toward first an ignoring, then a corruption of Evangelical truths, and lastly Socinianism.

4. If as Presbyterians—even mongrel Presbyterians—now hold, it is consistent neither with true doctrine nor sound policy, to depend upon mere voluntary association to carry on the Church's work of preaching the gospel to the destitute, by educating a ministry and sending forth a ministry to the destitute;—then is it consistent with either true doctrine or sound

policy to commit to the hands of an irresponsible voluntary association, the tremendous power of selecting a religious reading for the Church and the world? If any say, in response to this, let the Church provide her denominational literature and the voluntary society her general evangelical reading—the very obvious objection to this is the very dangerous practical heresy involved in it. This presumes to put asunder what God hath joined together. Experimental truth cannot be separated from doctrinal truth, nor can the Church afford to aid in promoting the too current popular fallacy that for real practical religion, we must look to the voluntary societies; for barren unspiritual dogma and controversy to the Church.

---

## EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

FOR JULY AND AUGUST, 1856.

---

I. TO ROME AND BACK AGAIN; OR, THE TWO PROSELYTES. *Adapted from the German.* By John G. Morris, D. D. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurts, No. 151 Pratt street, 1856.

We have no great admiration for that class of books to which this volume belongs, and we cannot regard it as a first-rate specimen of its class. To make fiction a profitable vehicle of truth; to combine successfully the elements of fascination inherent in a well-conceived and skillfully executed story with the substantial value and serious purposes of religious truth,—requires extraordinary ability. The parables of Him who “spake as never man spake” still stand, and will forever stand apart in their unapproachable and inimitable perfection. And even the mantle of the solitary prisoner in Bedford jail does not seem to have fallen, in the lapse of two centuries, upon any of the sons of genius. The work before us is inferior, in point of dramatick interest, to many of the polemical novels of the times; and, indeed, we do not see why a plain dialogue between A, B, C and D, or a plain monologue might not have answered the purpose as well. From what we know of Dr. Morris, we think that he would have been more successful if he had tried his hand upon an original story, instead of “adapting” one from the German. In ch. 6, for example, the argument

is made to hinge in part, upon an illustration drawn from the rules of trade-corporations in Germany, which would scarcely be intelligible to common readers in America. The theology of the narrative is sound—as far as we have examined—and the points are put with tact and cleverness.

II. **THE WEDGE OF GOLD; OR, ACHAN IN EL DORADO.** By the Rev. Wm. A. Scott, D. D.

**THE WORLD AND ITS INFLUENCES.** Written for the Board of Publication.

• **THE SOWER AND THE SEED.** By John Hall, D. D.

**ELLEN SINCLAIR; OR, THE EARNEST INQUIRER.**

We have received from the Board of Publication, and read with pleasure these little volumes. We presume it would be deemed a work of supererogation, for us to add our endorsement to that which such receive, in the very fact of their publication by our Board. Dr. Scott's book pleases us much; for we are exceedingly partial to that method of teaching by popular illustration and exposition of the Word of God. We rejoice to see that fashion set in the new empire on the Pacific. Dr. Scott's book is a little more diffuse than we should consider expedient for the impatient people of San Francisco.

"The World and its Influences," is a perfect model of style—and an excellent book of its kind. We have no special admiration, however, for that kind of book as an instrumentality for inculcating Evangelical truth. It is true there are readers who will not receive such truth at all, except it be sugared with most exquisite skill, and administered in homœopathic doses at that. But we have quite as little faith in spiritual, as in physical homœopathy. For such as fancy the Gospel according to Principal Blair, however, here is a specimen that, as to style and thought, Principal Blair never excelled.

"The Sower and the Seed," is a most simple and beautiful exposition of practical religion, as presented in the parable of the sower.

The narrative of Ellen Sinclair will be found to be a very attractive and useful little tract to young inquirers. Just such a tract as a pastor often feels the need of in his visits among the youth of his charge.

III. **MEMOIR OF REGINALD HEBER, D. D., BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.** By his Widow. Abridged by a Clergyman. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., 1856. (From T. N. Kurtz's Book Store, 151 Pratt street.)

We are generally opposed to abridgments, and especially American abridgments; but we cheerfully submit to them in the department of biography. "Art is long and life is fleeting." Would that biographies were generally as short as the lives they commemorate! Heber was one of those happily endowed men whom, if the government of the world were in our hands, we would not let die, at least so prematurely. His memory has become so associated with some of the noblest and most sacred purposes and impulses of Christians throughout the world, that it can never die.

We judge this book, without having read the whole of it, to be a worthy memorial of such a man.

IV. SELECT REMAINS OF REV. JOHN MASON. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. (From Kurtz's Book Store.)

Mr. Mason "was by principle a Conformist to the Established Church of England," and died in 1694. These remains are full of Christ, and will therefore be edifying to those who love Him. Many of the sayings here recorded, are the results, in a compact form, of many years of experience and observation, presented in the quaint style of the author's day.

The typography of the book is as "quaint" as the matter. It is an almost perfect reproduction of the letter-press of a century and a half ago. The *antique*, however, is almost too modern for the whims and humours of this generation.

V. From the Presbyterian Board of Publication, we have the following:

1. PLANTATION SERMONS. By the Rev. A. F. Dickson.
2. LIZZE FERGUSON.
3. AN EXPLANATION OF THE ASSEMBLY'S SHORTER CATECHISM. By Thomas Vincent.

Vincent's catechism was recommended for distribution by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1772. It was then a hundred years old. The Board have printed a contemporary recommendation signed by forty names, of which the first is that of John Owen. Such a book needs no commendation from us. The author calls his age "a whiffling age." What would he say of ours?

In the "Plantation Sermons" we have a fine model of the style of address best suited to uncultivated minds. It is simple and familiar, without being tame or low. We are glad that South Carolina has such missionaries.

VI. OBITUARY. We have received from a friend, and with pleasure give place to the following tribute to one of the noblest men we ever knew:

Died, at Oswego, Ill., 20th July, 1856, at the house of his son, where he had gone on a visit; REV. SAMUEL CROTHERS, D. D., of Greenfield, O.

The deceased had nearly completed the 73d year of his life, and the 47th of his ministry; being born in Pennsylvania in Oct. 1783, and licensed to preach the Gospel by the Ass. Ref. Presbytery, of Kentucky, in 1809.

After spending a short time missionating in the almost unbroken wilderness of the West, he was ordained pastor of the united congregations of Chilicothe and Hope Run. The Ass. Ref. Church was shortly afterwards greatly agitated by the new position assumed, on communion, by the late celebrated Dr. Mason. Mr. Crothers having embraced the views of his tutor, (for he studied theology under Dr. Mason,) resigned his charge, and connected himself with the Presbyterian Church. After remaining some time in Kentucky, he accepted a call in 1821 from the Presbyterian Church, Greenfield, O., the pastorate of which he retained at his death.

As a "Bible Theologian" he, we think, had few if any superiors in this or any other country. The Bible was his text book on metaphysical and moral, as well as on theological subjects. His chief characteristic, however, was his deep toned piety; by its attracting power he made and retained many ardent friends.

His usual mode of preaching was that of lecturing on a part, or the whole of a chapter of some book, in regular order; a mode very valuable

for imparting information, but one which very few can make interesting to a large congregation; he, however, was one of the few. We have never heard another, (and we have heard nearly all the noted preachers both in Britain and America,) who could preserve so much unity in that kind of a discourse, and in so few words hold up before you the various thoughts which must have been agitating the writer's mind, and which resulted in the subject under consideration.

His literary works are "The Life of Abraham," "The Jubilee," and numerous fugitive pieces, including reviews, essays and sermons. He died as he lived, "in faith," beloved by all who knew him living; in his death he was deeply lamented by the whole community. But we rejoice in the assurance, that he now rests with him whom he so long proclaimed as the "only and all-sufficient Saviour."

A. R.

---

### NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Before this number reaches our more distant subscribers, the Senior Editor of this journal will have entered upon his duties as Professor in the Seminary at Danville, Ky. On account of his removal, and for other reasons which it is not necessary to mention, the two numbers still due will be issued in *one*; the one, of course, to contain as much matter as subscribers are entitled to, according to our terms, in two.

THE  
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC  
AND  
BI-MONTHLY REVIEW.

---

Nos. 5 & 6.      SEPTEMBER & NOVEMBER, 1856.      Vol. 2.

---

IDEA OF THE CHURCH—AS DEVELOPED FROM THE  
RECORD OF THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN  
CHURCH, IN ACTS, CHAP. 2-5.

A very simple, direct, and satisfactory method of treating the question of the Idea of the Church—a question which we rejoice to see exciting some attention—is found in the form of an answer to the inquiry: “What do we gather, from the record of the origin of the Christian Church, to have been the Idea of the Church, as it existed in the minds of the inspired agents in these transactions, and of the historian who records them?”

Now a diligent exegetical examination of that record, as we have it in Acts, chap. 2-5; inclusive, will be found to suggest the natural arrangement of all the facts, material to this one point, into these five classes, viz:

I. As to the ideal conception of the Church in its origin.

II. As to the *manifestations of this* ideal, in actual, visible form—and the relation of this Apostolic, to previous forms of its manifestation.

III. As to the constituent elements of the *ecclesia* now manifested.

IV. As to the ordinances, through which the life is first communicated to the Church, and afterward sustained.

V. As to the authority, by which it is organized first, and subsequently administered.

Following then, in this order, these five branches of the question, we find:

I. That in the minds of these men, the idea of the *ecclesia*—the body gathered under their preaching and labors—universal-

ly connects back, with all the attendant circumstances, with that of an ideal *ecclesia* in the eternal purpose of Redemption.

(1.) In their preaching of God's love—they refer all the amazing events now transpiring, with all their antecedent events of the death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus, back to the "*orismene Boula kai Prognosei tou Theou*"—"the definitive purpose and fore-knowledge of God;" and explain all as but the development of that purpose. (Acts II: 23.)

(2.) As in their preaching to men, of God's love; so in their praying to God, of men's hatred, they conceive of all the hostility toward Christ, and toward themselves as his representatives, as but the development of what "*He Boule sou proorisei genesthai*"—"thy counsel determined to be." (Acts IV: 28.)

(3.) So again in their minds, Jesus is conceived of as "*ton prokecherismenon*"—"the before appointed one—(i. e.) if we adopt the now most approved reading, instead of "*prokecherugmenon*"—"the one before preached." (Acts III: 20.)

(4.) And so in like manner, his true people, whom he added to the visible *ecclesia*, daily, are conceived of, and spoken of as "*tous sodsomenous*"—the appointed to be saved—(Acts II: 47)—which we take to be parallel with "*tetagmenoi eis zoen*"—"ordained to life. (Acts XIII: 48.). For, comparing Acts II: 47 with Luke XIII: 23, 1st Cor. 1: 18, and 2nd Cor. II: 15, it will be seen that this title is applied when the purpose is to denote "the saved" *ideally*, in the purpose of God, rather than either historically or prophetically.

II. As to the manifestation of this ideal *ecclesia*; and the relation of this to previous forms of the visible *ecclesia*. The conception in the minds of these inspired men is obviously, that, in accordance with the ideal, in the eternal covenant of Redemption, an *external* covenant had been made with a representative man—Abraham: under which covenant, as a charter, the "*kletoi*"—"called"—should be organized as a community *separated* from and out of the race at large; and by the terms of which covenant, after the full development of the scheme of Redemption historically, and the work of atonement finished, the "*ecclesia*" should extend its privileges, and gather its members alike from all nations: and that all the things now done, with all their results, were but in accordance with the stipulations of that original covenant—with the provisions of the Mosaic constitution, established under it—and with all the successive developments of its meaning, in subsequent revelations, till the coming of Christ. That, therefore, the gathering of this new community under their ministration, as Apostles of Jesus, so far from being in antagonism to the *ecclesia* already established under the covenant, were the natural outgrowth of it—the flowering out of the original stem; an engrafting upon a well set root, not the planting of a new germin-



al seed: a reform of the Church already existing, not a destruction of it.

(1.) These men being Jews, reared in the Jewish faith, and devout observers of its ordinances, addressing Jews like themselves, and evidently employing arguments adapted to convince and persuade Jews, not only refer incidentally to a covenant of God with Abraham, and by way of figure and rhetoric; but they quote the covenant in its very terms; expounding it as made with *their Fathers*, through Abraham—as representative—and also, *with them*—“*Umecis este uoi tes diathekes, es die-theto o Theos pros tous pateras hemon legon pros Abraam*”—“ye are *children* of the *covenant* which God made with *your Fathers*, saying to Abraham,” &c. (Acts III: 25.) Thus these Apostles, their audience, their Fathers—the Prophets—all are conceived of as bound in one, as a party to that covenant which God made with Abraham. Now, the blessing spoken of in the covenant is expounded to be, that “God, having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities.” (Acts III: 26.) And again this *turning away from iniquities*, is the title to membership in the new community. For the terms are, “*Repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus*,” (Acts II: 38;) and those *baptized*, are said to be “*added*”—(v. 41)—that is, *added* to the *ecclesia* (v. 47.) Thus, by an unbroken succession of this inspired logic, are we led from the “*diatheke*”—the *covenant*—with Abraham, through the Prophets, and the Fathers, and these children, and their repentance, and their baptism, into the *ecclesia*.

(2.) This *ecclesia* is now to modify its form; but that modification is shown to be in accordance with the stipulations of the original charter. “Unto you *first*, hath God sent his son Jesus, to bless you. (Acts III: 26.) But, though to you first, yet not to you alone, for the promise is to you, and to your children, *kai pasi tois eis makran*—“and to all that are afar off, whomsoever the Lord our God shall call”—(II: 39)—that is, *to the Gentiles*; as we see in Eph. II: 17.

(3.) Neither is this great change in the *ecclesia* in any fundamental opposition to the constitution of Moses, organizing the Church under the charter given to Abraham. For as they understand it, provision was made in that constitution for this amendment. For, they argue (Acts III: 11) that Moses in the Law (Deut. 18: 15) expressly declared the coming of another Prophet “*os eme*”—like unto me. That is, one of authority, as a lawgiver to the covenant people. For, the distinguishing feature of Moses, is *this*: and the prophet was to be “like him,” therefore, in this. And Moses himself adds, “him shall ye hear as to all things,” as by way of defining the sense in which he shall be “like him”—that is, “hear him,” as ye hear me, your Lawgiver.

(4.) They furthermore declare this Reform to be in accordance with the entire administration under the charter and constitution of the covenant people for successive ages. First, generally; as Acts III: 24—"Yea, and all the Prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days." Then, also, in detail, this principle is assumed in every argument. (Acts II: 16.) "This is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel"—So. II: 25—"For David speaketh concerning him:" and verse 34, "David saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand." "*Therefore* (v. 36) God hath made this same Jesus, both Lord and Christ." To the same import is the implied argument in III: 13. "*The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus.*" Thus they reasoned, not only quoting in aid from the Jewish scriptures; but they never moved a step, in their logic, beyond!

(5.) As there is a perfect accord in theoretic views, so also in practical feeling and action, between the new and the old. "They continued daily with one accord in the Temple"—that is, attending worship there. Acts II: 46. Peter and John—their prominent leaders—"went up together into the Temple, at the hour of prayer." (Acts III: 1.) And at another time they were found in numbers, of one accord, in Solomon's porch. (Acts V: 12.) Also at first, even those who did not believe, were favorable to them. They had "favor with all the people." (Acts II: 47.) Hence, it is plain the people regarded the new as no fundamental change of the old.

III. As to the constituent elements of this community; they were,

(1.) The one hundred and twenty, of the apostles and disciples: of those, who had been gathered into a band by the preaching of Jesus himself—on whom the Holy Ghost descended.

(2.) To these were added three thousand, on the day of Pentecost, who had "gladly received the word, and were baptized." (Acts II: 41.) Then others, whom the Lord added to the Church daily—II: 47—till the number of men was about five thousand. (IV: 4.) To whom we must add again, the "believers" who were "added to the Lord, multitudes, both of men and women." (Acts V: 14.)

(3.) From what has been demonstrated under the second head, touching their view of the relation of the new to the old organization, both in theoretic views and practical feeling, we are obliged to presume that the same principle, as to constituent elements of the community, obtained in the reformed, as in the old: unless we find something set forth to the contrary. So far from this being true, the principle of the old covenant is de-

clared still to hold. The most eloquent appeals, in the way of encouraging these sinners to hope for a participation in the blessing, sent by Jesus—even the “turning them from their iniquities,” is grounded on the *family* nature of the covenant. “Ye are the children of the covenant made with your Fathers.” (Acts III: 25.) “For the promise is unto you and your children.” (Acts II: 39.) And of course, that same promise, carries with it the same extent of blessing, when it is added—“and to as many as are afar off.” The whole conception of these men, is of this blessing of salvation, as through the *covenant* with Abraham; and that carries with it—unless something should expressly contradict—the general principle of that covenant, as it is a general principle of every form of public covenant, which God ever made with men: namely, that its blessings attach to their children. As every human creature comes into being under the full operation of the covenant with Adam—“in the day thou eatest, thou shalt die.” As every human being is under the full operation of that covenant with Noah, as second head of the race—namely, “I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and *thy* seed after thee, in all their generations”—as that is the principle ruling in all other such public covenants; namely, that the relations and benefits of the covenant, are the *birth right* of every child, born of parents who are themselves “of his seed.” As, moreover, that principle is again expressly asserted in the ecclesiological covenant with Abraham, it would be an utter anomaly in the dispensations of God, if this covenant, merely because extended to those “afar off,” should therefore change its principle. And therefore, no such change being indicated, though these inspired men argue so largely from the covenant, this fact constitutes a perfect demonstration that no such change was made. Nay, without saying any thing of this, can it be conceived as possible, that a new community could have been organized out of a people, such as we have already seen this to be—their minds thoroughly imbued with this idea, by every act of worship and of government—and yet, from this community, organized in conformity, as they showed, with the ancient covenant, exclude this principle of the *birth right to the privileges of the covenant blessing*. without some call for explanation? Or if the apostles and their followers, could have thus ignored the principle, would their enemies have allowed them quietly so to do? Watching, as they were, for every opportunity to break their influence over the people, would they have let slip such a chance to play upon the popular prejudice? We cannot, therefore, avoid the conclusion, that the constituent elements of the *new*, as of the old structure, were “all those who profess the true religion—together with their children.” *Families*, not individuals; believers, not only as persons, but as representing families, were the constituent elements of this new ecclesia.

IV. As to the ordinances in this community, they were,

(1.) Baptism. (Acts II: 41.) "They that gladly received his word were baptized:"—evidently, in obedience to the instruction of Christ, "Teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This was the application of water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. We would naturally infer, as to its mode, that it was by applying water in the manner of *pouring out upon*, from the assurance, "be baptized, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." Elsewhere it is said, "ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire." Now, as *pouring out* from Heaven, is the form of that gift—"Pour out my Spirit," (Acts II: 17—Joel II: 28)—the natural association of Symbol and Idea lead us to infer that this is the form of the baptism; unless something to the contrary is plainly said, or plainly inferable. But nothing is said, and the inference is, therefore, all the other way. This again is confirmed by the fact of there being no such water privileges about Jerusalem, as would account for the ability to baptize three thousand persons in one day: nor can we suppose the authorities, who were no friends to the new community, would have suffered the pools, from which the city was supplied with water, to be appropriated to such a use, even supposing they were sufficient to account for the immersion of so great a multitude.

(2.) Stated Instruction. "They continued steadfastly in *"didache ton Apostolon"*—"the teaching of the Apostles," after "*being added:*" showing that the matter of teaching, ceased not with the call to repent, but became an ordinance to edify. What the *didache ton Apostolon* was, we have full specimens of here; namely, simple exposition of the word of God. Outside of this their logic never traveled. Within that circle they found all needful material for discourses as eloquent and powerful as was ever spoken.

(3.) "*Koinoneia*"—"the act of fellowship"—Acts II: 42: which, from the catalogue in which it stands, we must enumerate among the ordinances. This act, or religious rite, as to the ground of it, was intended generally as a confession of the second table of the law—love to men. As to the practical truth symbolized in it, it was, that the Christians "*eichon apanta koina*"—"had all things common." (Acts II: 44.) As to its nature, it was an act of worship. This appears from the reason already assigned, but still more clearly from the case of Ananias and Sapphira; who are said to have "lied unto the Holy Ghost," when, professing to perform the "*koinoneia*," they did not sincerely do so. (Acts V.) If this was not such an act of worship, then the story of Ananias and Sapphira is one of the most singular riddles in the New Testament. Why, in the midst of the story of so stupendous events, introduce a mere

childs primer story, of how a naughty man and woman were punished, for doing what naughty children are apt to do, and even multitudes of grown up people do every day—tell a lie of action? Why this tremendous doom, for such offence? But if this act of *koinoneia* is one of worship, which they performed hypocritically, all is clear.

(4.) The Eucharist. “Klasei ton arton.” That this was an act of worship, the administration of the Lord’s Supper, we infer, first, from the place it holds in the list of acts—between the “preaching” and the “prayer.” Secondly, from the phrase itself: which may be seen from the use of another phrase in connection with this, elsewhere in the chapter, as denoting something distinct from it, as in II: 46; where “Klontes arton”—“the breaking of bread,” is used again, evidently as a religious act—and the taking of ordinary meals is described by, “metelambanon trophes”—“taking nourishment.”—Thirdly, from the fact that, as will be seen from Acts, XX: 7—11, and 1st Cor. X: 16, this phrase is used for the act of taking the Lord’s Supper. That this use, in II: 46, indicates very frequent communion is nothing against the argument.

(5.) “Prosuche”—“prayer and praise;” as the usage would seem to indicate, especially when taken in connection with verse 47. They continued daily “praising God.”

V. As to the agents and administrators of ordinances, organization and government in the Church. It is a significant fact that there is utter silence, as to any formal organization whatever, up to the period when the community numbered perhaps over ten thousand: multitudes, both of men and women, having been added, after the number was five thousand men. If this is a new, and entirely independent organization of a Christian Church, the silence is strange and unaccountable. But if it is simply, a gradual reform and modification of an ecclesiastical system already long established, all is plain enough. That the latter is the true view, is proven by several considerations.

(1.) The only agents recognized as an authoritative power, as yet, are the Apostles. Indeed the term “ecclesia” would seem rather to have been applied by the historian, in the way of using a term, current at the time of writing—for the sake of avoiding a circumlocution—to describe a thing not so named as yet, at the period of the transaction. Now,

(2.) When these Apostles are called upon to say “by what power or by what name, they do these things?” They answer, “by the name of Jesus of Nazareth,” whom ye crucified. (Acts IV: 7—10.) And the rulers inferred, it is said, from all they saw of these Apostles “that they had been with Jesus.” Thus their authority is declared to be directly from Christ. They represented him in all this; as we know from his commission to them—“as my Father sent me, even so I send you.”

(3.) But, as in their discourse to the Sanhedrim, they thus expound the source of their authority, thus to teach, as from Jesus; so again, in their discourses to the people, they expound also the source of the authority of Jesus, to modify the old system—as being formally promised in the old system itself. (Acts III: 22.) For Moses truly said, “a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up”—“like unto me”—that is, a *law-giver*, as has been already shown; “him shall ye hear.”

Their authority then is in Jesus; and the authority of Jesus is in accordance with the provisions of the old system.

(4.) In precise accordance with this exposition of the theory of the source of power—as in the old covenant—are all the facts, as to their actual procedure; as we have already shown. Instead of an independent organization, they continued in the Temple, and made so little change, apparently, as not even to stir up the prejudices of the masses—for they are said to have had favor with all the people.

The obvious inference from all this is, that for the organic principles of the organization of the Christian Church—for the sources of its principles of government and administration, we are to look back to the older constitution. If this involves, as we admit it does, that either the Church organization is not *jure divino*, or else we must find an ecclesiastical system, distinct from the civil, in the Jewish system, ordained of God by Moses; we are willing to accept the latter alternative of the conclusion. It is admitted by Stillingfleet, Whateley, and all authors of that phase of Episcopacy, that the Christian Church had its model from the Synagogue, and *therefore*, they argue Church government is not *jure divino*—for the synagogue belongs to the era of her captivity—and has no Divine warrant. If, however, Jesus and the Apostles *sanctioned* the synagogue, that of itself must be an overwhelming presumption, in favor of its *jure divino* authority. Starting with such a presumption in favor of this view, it might not be so difficult a matter to show that the synagogue as an *ideal*, at least, existed in the constitution of Moses—and that a distinct Church constitution must be supposed to have been a historical fact, if we would explain satisfactorily the Old Testament history. A more cogent argument, however, to logical minds, is derived from what we have seen of the conception of the Church, in the minds of the Apostles. If the primary idea of it is in the Eternal purpose to gather out and organize a *Kingdom of Messiah*—and all revelation is but the manifestation of that purpose—then a Church as an essential element of the Divine plan, must have an existence co-ordinate with the Revelation itself—and, therefore, must have existed as an organization from the first.

[For the Critic.]

## CHURCH MUSIC.

The worship of God is the most exalted and the most exalting occupation in which a creature of God can possibly engage. It is angelic to adore and praise God. To those who put their trust in God, it is indeed befitting, that they commune with Him in every way that He permits, in every aspect of His character in which He reveals Himself, and in reference to all their interests. It is befitting, that God's people "pour out their hearts before Him," and "praise is comely for the upright."

It is the will of God that His people meet for His public worship. And, accordingly, throughout the Christian world, God's people have their sanctuaries and their frequent assemblies. And in almost all these sanctuaries and assemblies, we find God's people attempting His high praises with the aid, and through the medium, of music—singing His praises in sacred songs.

Now there is a warrant for attempting God's praises in and through music. We have the warrant of Scripture exhortation and example. We find in different parts of the Old Testament, and especially in the Psalms, such exhortations as these: "Praise the Lord, sing praises unto His name"—"Sing unto Him, sing psalms unto Him"—"Sing unto Him a new song; play skilfully with a loud noise." Such praise was to be public as well as private. Says the Psalmist, "I will praise the Lord with my whole heart, in the assembly of the upright, and in the congregation." In the New Testament, while we have no set directions upon the subject, we yet find the Apostle Paul, in writing to the church at Ephesus, as also to that at Colosse, exhorting the Christians of those churches, "to speak to themselves in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in their heart unto the Lord."

Then we have the warrant of Scripture example. David wrote psalms for the public service of the temple, and these psalms were sung, and the singing was accompanied by instruments of music. Also we have the high example of Christ and his Apostles, who, at the close of the first celebration of the Lord's Supper, "sung a hymn, and went out into the Mount of Olives." If we conceive of the institution of the Lord's Supper as the act, of all others, in which our Saviour organized the New Testament Church, then the singing of a hymn in connection with it, would intimate very strongly the propriety of sacred song, if it does not make the demand for it, in the public services of the New Testament Church.

Accordingly, in all ages of the Christian Church, there has been an almost universal concurrence, in all branches of the Church, in the practice of singing in public worship.

Nor need we wonder that God has warranted us, or even required us, to sing His praises. When we consider the constitution of our nature, we see that God has so made us, that singing is a most natural and effective method of expressing our emotions of divine praise. Music has immense power over the human heart. It is everywhere used for exciting and expressing emotion, and that with uniform and eminent success. And music is attractive as well as powerful. Even if we do not ourselves engage in singing, the singing of others compels us to listen; and listening, not an emotion of our nature can slumber on, beyond the reach of some combination of harmony, or variety of melody, to call it forth. God would have us "praise Him with our whole hearts." He would have "our souls and all that is within us bless His holy name." Hence, He would have us praise Him in song.

The praise of God in song being thus warranted and encouraged, and being thus extensively and systematically attempted throughout the Church, it is very evident that great care should be taken by the Church to secure for her service the most suitable and edifying music. Here, at once, the question arises, what sort of music is most suitable and edifying? Is it that which merely yields the greatest amount of noise? Or is it that which exhibits the highest degree of artistic excellence? Such questions have received various answers at various times, but in order to a right answer, it is necessary to look at the one great object which church music properly has in view, which is this: to aid the devout worshipper in expressing his emotions of praise to God. Church music, then, is not properly a thing by itself, to be simply listened to as an entertainment. Taste and skill may be required properly to execute it; yet it does not have in view the exhibition of taste and skill. No; taste and skill are to be lost sight of, *and that church music is the best which most moves the hearts of true worshippers while they contemplate the truths expressed in the words sung, and which affords them the easiest and most perfect vehicle for uttering their devout feelings.* Why should important truth be thrown into the form of hymns, and then be sung? Why is it not enough that we simply read the truth as written in prose? Is not the object in view a more ardent and intense expression of feeling in connection with the truth? And is not music properly used to gain the same object? Then, of course, that church music is the best, which loses sight of everything else but this, or which subordinates all else to this, and aids the true worshipper in "making melody in his heart unto the Lord."

This ideal of church music and public praise, demands that not merely a few sing—as a choir—but also, that all the people sing—tastefully and heartily. Good congregational singing is that which is most desirable. Not to speak of what the Scrip-



tures intimate on this point, let us consider some of the obvious arguments in its behalf, suggested by the very nature of the case.

In the first place: As the heart is more deeply moved by hearing devotional language sung, than it is by hearing the same language read; so, in general, the heart is more deeply moved when a person himself sings, than when he simply listens to the singing of others. Surely this will not be denied. It is true, we may listen with great admiration to the skilful singing of others—our *taste* may be gratified; but when we directly engage in uttering for ourselves the words of praise, in familiar, sacred song, the *heart* is much more frequently, and much more deeply enlisted in the exercise. If this be so, it is desirable that each worshipper, for his own sake, engage in the public singing—or, that all the people sing.

But another reason may be given why all should sing. If the heart be at all moved by hearing a few persons sing the words of devout truth, it will, in general, be more deeply moved by hearing many persons thus sing. And when the singing in a congregation is general, and hearty, and intelligent, the influence of devout sympathy is most fully felt. Each person aids all the rest, and in turn is aided by all the rest; and thus, the ends of social worship are most fully gained. It is desirable, then, that every person in the congregation sing, not only for his direct personal benefit, but for the general good. Just enter one of our German Protestant churches, and hear one thousand voices of the old and the young, singing in lively concert, and say, if, for all devotional ends, the effect, on each, and on all, is not far superior to that of a few voices, however well trained and managed.

It might be added that congregational singing is especially desirable in our Presbyterian churches. It is so for this reason. Without it the people have no part which they can outwardly and actively take in our public services. They are passive in these services. The minister reads, and preaches, and prays, and the choir sings, and the people have nothing to do. And for this reason our services want life and spirit. The people ought to take some active part in the worship. Our Methodist brethren have their voluntary responses, and it is stirring to hear these ascending from this and that quarter of the assembly. It shows that an interest is taken in the service. And our Episcopal brethren have their Scripture selections, and the alternate readings of the people and the minister; and they have responses provided for, and brief prayers in concert—and this has its advantages. It is true, there are drawbacks in each of these cases. The voluntary responses often violate decorum; and the arranged and set readings and prayers sacrifice a desirable freedom of worship. None of us may wish to see either

peculiarity adopted by our Church. Yet who does not wish for more vivacity and activity in our worship, on the part of the people? But this might be had, without any drawback, in hearty and intelligent congregational singing.

But now we come to the question—what is necessary in order to such singing? Very much has been written and spoken, within a few years past, on this question, as we suppose most of our readers can testify. A great proportion of what has thus been written and spoken, has been in the way of complaint, and railing, and accusation, against what is conceived to hinder congregational singing. And when this has not been the case, it yet has been very seldom that we have had any full and sensible view of the question taken, and any intelligible and practicable plan proposed for the attainment of the desired end. We have in general merely had, here and there, a valuable hint or suggestion. It is not without hesitation that we attempt a somewhat full answer to the question proposed. Yet we invite our readers to consider well our answer, and improve upon it as best they may.

Three things are necessary in order to hearty and intelligent congregational singing.

1. The people must be disposed and prepared to engage in this part of public worship. This statement is very indefinite, but we proceed to say, that the matter of church music must be brought to secure the attention of the people. Then, their attention being had, their minds must be filled with right ideas, and their hearts be imbued with right sentiments concerning the duty and the privilege of sacred praise. The desire to praise God in song being excited, and some assurance being given of the practicability of this desire being fully gratified, the people must next have the opportunity of some actual *practice* in singing such tunes as are generally familiar, under a competent leader, and in circumstances which admit of faults being indicated and corrected. No large number of persons can do anything in perfect concert at the first attempt. Soldiers march with perfect step only after patient drilling. And there must be some drilling of a congregation, if they would sing well together. It is not necessary, by any means, that they learn to sing from books. To attempt this would be vain. If singing ever becomes universal, it will doubtless become so through imitation, as in the case of language. And congregational singing, in all ordinary cases, must be mainly a singing by ear and rote. The first requisite, then, for congregational singing is this: the spirit of singing generally excited among the people, and some practice in singing by ear together the familiar tunes of the church.

2. But supposing the people disposed and reasonably prepared to unite in singing, a second thing, which yet is absolutely

necessary to their success, is this : the systematic selection and use in ordinary worship of simple and familiar tunes. Now here a great mistake is very often made ; and very often, perhaps, it is unwittingly made. That music may be very suitable for a choir, which is wholly unsuited to a congregation. Choir music is distinctively one thing, and congregational music is distinctively another thing. The members of a proper choir are acquainted with music as a science, and as an art. They sing by note ; they can sing a new piece of music together with very little practice—watching the notes. The piece may be a complicated one—some of the parts may rest at intervals, while others move on ; solo passages, duetts, fugues, running passages, chromatic passages, *accelerandos* and *ritardandos*, *crescendos* and *diminuendos* may occur ; yet a good choir will soon master the piece ; and it may be an excellent choir piece ; the difficult passages may constitute so many several beauties—but such a piece is wholly unsuited to the congregation when they would join in the singing. They sing mainly by ear and rote ; and there being so many of them together, with only a small amount of training possible, it is out of the question for them to sing together any other than simple and familiar tunes, with an even and easy movement. Now such tunes may be had, and that in sufficient numbers. In their place, too, they are as beautiful as any. They admit of a most pleasant melody, and a most delightful choral harmony. We do not mean that new tunes should never be introduced into the church. All tunes were once new. Each generation must have, to some extent, its own music. But a new tune should be introduced rarely, as occasion really requires, or as the superior excellence of the new tune demands ; and then, if it be really excellent, it will possess those popular attributes which will enable the people soon to catch and use it, and thus no serious embarrassment will follow. Probably not one half the tunes found in our ordinary collections of church music, however suitable they may be for choir singing, are of such a character that it would be possible for a congregation ever to learn them thoroughly, and sing them well together, however diligently and perseveringly they might make the attempt. Choir music and congregational music are now mixed and confusedly attempted together. The two ought by all means to be separated. Let the choir sing a choir piece of music, of their own selection, by way of introduction to each public service, and let the people devoutly listen to that ; but let the choir sing congregational tunes to the hymns announced from the pulpit, and let the people unite with the choir in singing these. It is absolutely essential to congregational singing, not only that the people be disposed and reasonably prepared to sing together, but that easy and familiar music be afforded them.

3. But further than this: a congregation must be *suitably led* in singing. This is another essential requisite. Great diversity of opinion exists in regard to the leading of church singing. Some advocate the leading by a single precentor. Others prefer choirs. And others, still, prefer choirs with instrumental accompaniments. We know not why a small assembly may not be well led by a single precentor. One strong and prompt voice, taking the leading part—the person occupying a central position in the assembly—will be sufficient. Such leading seems very appropriate in the weekly meetings of the lecture-room, although even here, as we incline to think, several voices together would lead the singing better than one precentor. But a large congregation cannot be for a long time well led by a single precentor, unless they have already an admirable training, and unless they preserve that training by an unheard of attention and diligence. A single voice is not sufficiently commanding to lead a large assembly. Those remote from the leader will go astray in time and tune. A choir of voices is needed, to bind in one, all the different sections of the assembly, causing them to move together. The musical arrangements of a congregation, too, may be much more uniform and permanent under the leading of a choir, than is possible under the leading of a precentor. The occasional absence of the precentor from his post, or his entire removal by any of the numerous providences which may at any time occur, will throw the singing of the congregation into great confusion; while a well constituted choir can sing in the absence of their leader, or in the absence of some of their number, and can repair the losses made by removal or death, without any breaking up of their organization.

Just here it may be observed, that a choir of voluntary singers is far preferable to a choir of paid singers. A choir constituted out of the members of the congregation, will more fully sympathize with the people, and more readily and cheerfully enter into arrangements made to secure congregational singing. And a choir largely made up of professing Christians, will have in view the true objects of church music, and will not be guilty of performing the part of mere functionaries personating devotion, but will themselves devoutly praise God in song, while seeking to aid and guide the devotions of God's people.

Concerning the vexed question of instrumental accompaniments, it is not now proposed to say anything. The discussion of this question is by no means vital to the objects we have in view. Yet it may not be amiss to observe, in this connection, that the opinion, extensively prevalent in the Christian community, that choirs and instruments are naturally and necessarily hostile to congregational singing—an opinion, the correctness of which, has seldom been questioned—is utterly without foundation. We may be pointed to frequent instances, it is

true, in which the introduction of choirs and instruments has been followed by a cessation of congregational singing. Yet the only satisfactory way of accounting for the fact, is this: the choir and musicians, having had the responsibility of conducting the music devolved on them, without instructions in regard to the needs of the people, very naturally have conducted the music with a view of pleasing themselves; have introduced new music, and choir music, such as the people could not sing. The fault has been the sort of tunes selected by the performers, and not the fact that such performers have conducted the music. This fault might readily be prevented. A properly constituted choir, if permitted to sing one choir piece of their own selection, at each public service, by way of introduction, will willingly sing familiar tunes, in which the congregation may unite, in the other parts of the service. If any one supposes that instruments are peculiarly hostile to congregational singing, how will he account for the fact that in Germany all the people sing, while, in every church, an organ leads the singing?

These three things, just specified, we regard as essential to hearty and intelligent congregational singing. And these seem to us all that are essential. We do not mean that these will secure perfection. Nothing can compensate for the want of early individual instruction, and continual exercise in singing. Without this the ear will become dull, and the voice intractable. And in the general neglect of musical cultivation in our land, there will be found in every congregation, where general singing is attempted, only a partial approximation on the part of many toward correct or tasteful singing; while, with a few, the case may be even worse—the voice hopelessly harsh and discordant. Yet, in every congregation, we would encourage all to sing to the best of their ability, believing that in the power of united song, the minor inaccuracies and discordances will be so far overborne, as by no means to hinder the general edification. Yet it is not always easy to secure all the requisites named, and hence the possible failure to obtain the desired end, even when a vigorous effort is made. But, now, how often is no attempt made to provide or preserve good church music. How often is the music just left to take care of itself. The whole subject was sadly neglected in our churches, in the early history of our country, and the fruits of that neglect are abundantly and sadly visible at the present time.

The following sketch will, we believe, be found correct: Our churches formerly insisted on having their music led by a precentor. The natural tendency of such leading, as might be shown, is backward. Under this leading, the people neglected to cultivate music, and it degenerated until it became intolerable. A reaction from this condition followed. A few persons in each church would be found, who, with strong natural tastes

for music, desired to cultivate the art. Music teaching then became a profitable business, as also the manufacture of church music books. The few in each church who cultivated music, were deputed by the congregation to lead the singing, which they did under the guidance of their hired teachers, using the newly manufactured tune books and tunes. These choirs, aiming to please themselves in respect to the character of the music sung, the people were generally unable to unite with them, however imperfectly, until at last the semblance of congregational singing disappeared in a great proportion of our churches. And, at the present time, what do we see as the fruits of this process? Look in on our churches. The congregation praises God through a delegated committee. New tune books have continued to flood the land. Some of these are used in one church, some in another; and many are used in rapid succession in the same church—new music being introduced to supplant that which is not yet old, and introduced for no other reason than that it is new. And the people—the music being removed out of their reach—have, in general, apparently lost all sense of responsibility toward it, and all interest in it. They have become dumb to God's praise. Some try to follow the choir in the words sung and use their hymn-books for the purpose, while others, without hymn-book, and apparently without occupation during the singing, sit gazing at the choir, or gazing at their neighbors, or gazing into vacuity, as the case may be. All this is particularly true of our city churches, and it is further true of many of our city churches, that not being able to secure a choir from among themselves, who can execute music respectably, they feel compelled to resort to professional musicians, not only to play their organs, but also, to perform their singing. And thus it frequently comes to pass, in our churches, that a few paid singers mock God, for the professed benefit of his people, seeking to display themselves and please critical ears, while the organ finishes the farce with almost interminable voluntaries, and preludes, and interludes—all as much out of character as a wretched ingenuity can devise. It seems to be more and more the case, that the opera gives tone to church music. Things are perhaps not quite so far gone, in this direction, here in Baltimore, as in some of our sister cities. Yet it is very easy for the practised ear to perceive, that the highest achievement of our fashionable and fancy choir-singers is a peculiarity of operatic slurring and whining, governing all their tones, evidently supposed to be very pathetic and affecting, but which really is very grotesque and ridiculous.

This state of things ought surely to be a great grief to those who have any desire for God's true worship. With all our resorts to expedients, and our determination to have good music, even though upon a basis of very doubtful propriety, and by

means not unlikely to provoke God's sore displeasure, we yet have failed to obtain good music. Very few of our churches afford even tolerable music. And shall this state of things be quietly endured? Shall we continue to miss the benefits of true sacred praise, and go on from worse to worse in our wretched substitutes for it, without an effort in the right direction? Most persons are ready to complain of the existing evil, but few seem ready to try any remedy. Indeed, perhaps most are hopeless of the success of any proposed remedy. The evil has no remedy; its continued existence is inevitable. Thus they seem to think. Some churches have tried to profit by past experiences, and have sought to improve the condition of their music. And, what is more, instances are not wanting, in which churches have succeeded in their efforts beyond expectation. Instances might be named, in which well-directed effort, commonly beginning with the pastor, and heartily seconded by the people, have brought the music to a condition of real excellence. No: it is our shame, if we appreciate the evil and complain of it, yet are not ready to co-operate with others for its removal. We may be sure that if God has appointed the singing of sacred song as an ordinance of His house, there is a way in which such singing may be performed, so as to please God and profit our own souls; and we are verily guilty before God, if we do not seek to know and pursue that way.

Whatever others may think, it is our abiding conviction that much might be done, in most of our well-established churches, for the improvemet of the singing. The case is very rare, we suppose, in which any one of the requisites for good congregational singing before named, is really beyond attainment. All might be had, in most cases, if diligently sought after.

Pastors might do much in drawing the attention of their churches to this subject, and in inciting the desire to praise God by united singing. Then, in most cases, it would not be difficult to procure the services of a competent and devout professional singer for forming and training a suitable choir, and for drilling the congregation in the singing of the familiar tunes of the church. A half hour might be profitably spent in this general exercise every week, for any given length of time, at the close of the weekly lecture. Then this person, or the leader of the choir, in concert with the pastor, might carefully select a sufficient number of tunes, suitable for congregational singing, adapted to the hymns in most frequent use, and already more or less familiar to the people, with the understanding that these would, for a time, be exclusively used in the ordinary services of the church. By such simple means, the general desire being excited worthily to celebrate the praises of God, and a perfect understanding being had between the pastor and choir and congregation, a few months' trial would witness, we are per-

sued, the inauguration of a new era in the music of many of our churches. The choir being invited to sing a piece of their own selection, as introductory to each of the Sabbath services, would have continued occasion for a weekly rehearsal, and by means of this rehearsal they would preserve whatever vantage ground they had obtained under the temporary and special instructions of the musical professor; and possibly the singing of the congregation, under the guidance of a choir preserving its excellence, might improve rather than decline.

It ought also to be observed, that, in most of our established congregations, there are many young persons who have some knowledge of the rudiments of music, whose knowledge yet does not avail them much for church purposes. They have learned music in connection with instruments, and for drawing-room purposes, and they sing and play well for their friends. Yet they do not read church music, and scarcely attempt to do so in church. And by the by, it is a very significant fact, that the little of the actual cultivation of music, even in Christian families, has any reference to the praises of God as sung in the sanctuary. But now, with the aid of a competent instructor, these persons, meeting together in a class, might readily bring their taste and cultivation into the region of church music, and make them available for church purposes. And how much would it aid the singing of the congregation, to have a number of such singers scattered through the house, not merely following the leading of the choir, but singing promptly with the choir. From these, moreover, the choir could draw its recruits as occasion demanded.

We are strongly inclined to believe that the prime responsibility for the continued deplorable condition of our church music generally, rests upon our pastors. We believe that if our pastors could be brought to take a lively and intelligent interest in the matter, they could readily secure the necessary co-operation of their congregations in executing those plans, which would radically improve our church music. To pastors, especially, we commend the foregoing very imperfect observations.

In every organized church, it is surely desirable, that every department of duty and privilege be so cared for—so ordered and conducted—as to perform its full share in glorifying God and promoting the Church's prosperity. No church should be willingly suffered to fail in any respect of her full duty, her usefulness, her full beauty. Her services should be such as most fully to edify her own members, and to attract and profit the occasional worshipper. And why should we not, in the fear of God, seek to have our churches discharge their full duty and enjoy their full privilege, in the department of sacred praise? God has called us, as Christians, out of the world, and has gathered us into churches, with the object prominently in



view of our publicly worshipping Him with our praises and our songs of praise. And this service, if properly considered, is one of the most reasonable, and one of the most delightful, as well as one of the most dignified and becoming, in which we can possibly engage. When we consider what God is, in all his glorious perfections; when we consider what He has done for us, in Creation, in Providence, in Grace—forming us, upholding us, blessing us—aye, in his wonderful mercy, saving us; O how can we help praising God? How can we help calling upon our souls and all that is within us to bless and magnify His great and holy name? And when, as God's people—as the children of his mercy in Christ Jesus—we assemble for His worship, how can we help unitedly thus praising His name? Will not each of us cry to all his Christian companions, "O magnify the Lord *with me*, and let us exalt His name *together!*" God is preparing us here for serving Him hereafter. But in what services shall we engage in Heaven? Shall we not with the Angels stand before God's throne, and *praise Him* day and night? And shall we not *sing the new song*, which even Angels cannot sing—the song of our redemption? Ah yes: the most we know of heaven is *its music!* Should we not desire, as in our earthly assemblies we sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, to sing the songs of heaven in heavenly music? Would that our sanctuaries might be found none other than the house of God and the gate of heaven! Would that by God's own Spirit our hearts might be inspired and our tongues unloosed, to give Him worthy and noble praise!

---

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

### PARLIAMENTARY RULES.

The general tendency of the human mind, is to undervalue every thing of which we are profoundly ignorant. This is asserted notwithstanding the familiar adage, *omne ignotum pro mirifico*; for while there are certain subjects and certain classes of minds to which the maxim is applicable, yet the great majority of men are disposed to depreciate all knowledge which they do not possess. No man speaks lightly of any art or science of which, he has made himself master. But most men regard as trivial, and unworthy of their attention, every practical science concerning which they know nothing, or next to nothing.

The truth of these remarks has been fully exemplified with respect to the laws and customs, that govern parliamentary proceedings—the rules of order which regulate the course of business in deliberative assemblies. It is certainly the case, that the ministers of the Presbyterian Church know very little of parliamentary usage, except as they pick it up, in the course of their attendance upon the Judicatories of the Church; and they have but a confused and indistinct recollection of what they have seen and heard. Every one who has been conversant with the proceedings of Presbyteries, and even of the General Assembly, can bear witness to the truth of what is here affirmed.

This ignorance certainly does not arise from any intrinsic difficulty in the subject, nor from the want of adequate means of information, and surely not from want of capacity to learn; must therefore be due to the light esteem in which the whole subject of parliamentary law is held; and this false estimate of the value of the science, can have no other source than want of acquaintance with its character and design.

It seems to be the general opinion, that every man of ordinary information, and good common sense, is fully competent to guide a deliberative assembly, through all the intricacy of business that may arise, without having given one hour to preparation for so arduous an undertaking. According to the prevalent opinion, the whole subject of parliamentary order may be reduced to the simple elements of motion, debate and question with which all are familiar; and any more extensive acquaintance with rules or principles, is deemed altogether unnecessary. It is enough to qualify a man to preside over the deliberations of all the church courts, from the Session to the General Assembly, if he be acquainted with a few of the most simple and elementary rules; such as are most frequently required in practice. These, which distinguish an orderly assembly from an ungoverned mob, are learned because of the frequency of application in all public bodies met for deliberation; nothing beyond this is regarded as valuable or desirable, not known, or not remembered, that these elementary principles belong to a compact and beautiful system, which is the growth of ages of experience; and which has been altered and amended, condensed and reduced to scientific arrangement, beyond which says Mr. Jefferson, little is to be desired or expected.

There are other parts of this system almost as important as necessary to be known as the most common and ordinary rules.

Ignorance of these would stop the proceedings and clog the wheels of business quite as effectually, though not quite so speedily, as was said to have been the case, in one of the large cities some years ago.

The story goes, that at a public meeting of the descendants of

Ham, a well known and highly esteemed boot-black in one of our largest colleges, was introduced as Professor ———, of the said College; and in consideration of his distinguished position, in a renowned literary institution, he was called to the chair. Whereupon the business of the meeting began. A resolution was offered, and debated with great spirit, and at great length; and after every body had spoken their mind, and the assembly were wearied with the debate, there was a general call all over the house for the question. The chairman sat immovable, with a placid smile beaming from his benevolent countenance. Again, question, question, resounded through the house, but still the chairman remained unmoved; when the mover of the resolution arose and said, Mr. Chairman, will you be pleased to put the question? O yes, O yes, gentlemen, replied the chairman, and continued to preside with great dignity and urbanity; but the question was as far off as ever. Again he was urgently entreated to put the question, when he replied, certainly, gentlemen, certainly. After repeated efforts to induce the distinguished Professor to fulfil the functions of his office, it was ascertained, that he had not the least notion of what was required of him; and some member was obliged to usurp the office of chairman, and take the sense of the meeting upon the resolution. The assembly then adjourned with a great opinion of the politeness of the Professor, who presided with such admirable dignity and such wonderful simplicity.

Precisely such a case is not likely to occur in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, nor even in one of the Presbyteries. Yet all who have attended frequently the meetings of these bodies, have seen things scarcely less vexatious, and having almost as much influence in retarding the progress of important business, and exhibiting almost as much ignorance of some of the plainest principles of parliamentary law. And what is worse, this ignorance is often found in men who have attained great eminence in the pulpit, and as debaters even in the Church courts. It is, therefore, evident that the cause must be sought, not in the abstruse and recondite nature of the rules of order; but in the low estimate which they have placed upon the whole science, which has prevented them from giving it much attention, or devoting even a small portion of time to the acquisition of its principles.

It may here be asked, what authority have the rules and precedents of the British House of Commons, or of the Congress of the United States, in the Judicatories of the Presbyterian Church? When did they acquire any binding force in Ecclesiastical Assemblies? The General Assembly of the Church has adopted, and recommended to all the other Judicatories, a set of general rules for their guidance. Now, if any certain and definite code is needed, why are not these general rules all-

sufficient? To these inquiries it may be answered, that the "General Rules" are themselves borrowed from that great system of parliamentary law. They are good as far as they go, and would be sufficient if they provided for every case that might arise; or were anything else than *general* rules. Moreover, difficulties arise in the application of these rules, and terms are used in them, the signification of which, can only be learned by a recourse to the system or science, from which they were borrowed, and to which they belong.

As to the authority of these rules, it rests upon the same basis as that of the whole law of parliament, so far as it is applicable to ecclesiastical assemblies. The General Assembly does not enjoin the observance of the "General Rules," but only recommends them as convenient, and adapted to the wants of the Judicatories. The sanction of the General Assembly only serves as evidence of their intrinsic excellence and utility. The binding force of the principles of the parliamentary law is found, not in any authoritative enactment, but in their applicability to the circumstances of all deliberative bodies. Some rules of order, and some general principles are essential; and no better can be found than those which have been tested, and established by the experience of many generations. It is in this simple fact that they are the best within reach, and better than any which the wisdom of any one man or any body of men of one generation could devise, that we find all their claim to be regarded in our ecclesiastical courts.

It follows from the very nature of free deliberative bodies that they have the right to frame their own rules, to regulate their own proceedings; and that no other power has the right to dictate to them in this matter; provided, always, that they establish no rule in contravention of the authority to which they owe their existence, or their right and power to assemble.

Upon this foundation, the whole structure of parliamentary law has been erected. One stone after another has been placed, and its strength tried, and then laid in its place upon the building. The erection has occupied a space of several hundred years, and has been re-adapted to the varying circumstances of successive ages; until now, it is as perfect an edifice, and as well suited to the wants of deliberative bodies, as any that the skill of man can devise.

It is not the product of the wisdom of one man, nor of the wisdom of wise men of one generation; but it embraces the experience of the men of many generations, who, by their position were best qualified to develope such a system.

Every body of men which assembles for the purpose of deliberating and debating, is obliged at the out-set to determine the question, whether it will construct a code of laws for its own government? or whether they will be directed by the parliamentary

rules already in existence? and every such body, which meets either in Great Britain or America, does, in fact, tacitly agree to be governed by these rules wherever they are applicable to their condition and circumstances. This is proved by the fact that they never do more than provide a few general rules, which are intended merely to adjust the system to their necessities.

The ends aimed at, and secured by rules of order are, in the language of Mr. Jefferson, "accuracy in business, economy of time, order, uniformity and impartiality." He also, in the very first sentence of his celebrated Manual, quotes Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons as saying: "It was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons than a neglect of, or departure from the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check, and control on the actions of the majority; and they were in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power." These results so far as they are attainable in any assembly of erring men, have been attained by strict adherence to the "rules of proceeding." With respect to accuracy in business, economy of time, order and uniformity, a mere glance at some such body as the Senate of the United States, when the chair is occupied by a parliamentary veteran, thoroughly conversant with the rules, will show that they are effectually secured. The body appears like a machine, with all its parts nicely adjusted and well oiled. The business moves on with perfect order and regularity; and even when efforts are deliberately made to confuse or to delay the proceedings, they can be only partially successful. The machine moves on without jar or disorder when obstructions are designedly thrown among its manifold wheels. On the contrary, in some of our Church Judicatories, a large portion of the time is often taken up, with vain wrangling about points of order, where neither the presiding officer nor the body itself, are familiar with any standard by which they can be settled; but all are vainly striving to recall some modern precedent established by a single instance within their own memory. The recollection of each man may be very accurate, and at the same time vary very much from that of all the others. The whole presenting the appearance of a machine out of gear, that grates and shrieks, and jars and jolts, rumbles and bounds, a thing very painful either to see or hear.

It often happens also, that church courts are obliged to do a thing over several times, before they accomplish their intentions; and such is the intimate connection between form and substance, that injustice is sometimes done, and errors are committed, sim-

ply from not knowing the effects of certain proceedings. Examples of such inaccuracy, of grievous waste of time, and confusion and diversities of practice, must occur, at once, to every one at all familiar with the doings of Presbyteries and Synods; and instances are not wanting in the history of the General Assembly.

In order to make the necessity more apparent for an accurate acquaintance with parliamentary precedents, let us suppose that the "General Rules for Judicatories" are formally adopted by every Presbytery and Synod, and that every member has conned these rules until he is perfectly familiar with every one of them. Cases will still arise under the rules themselves, concerning which they afford no information as to their own bearing and effects; as for example, a motion is made, that the subject before the body lie on the table; now what is the effect of this motion, if carried, upon the whole subject, original resolution, amendments and all? what the effect upon the general interests under discussion? Concerning these, and several other questions that might be raised, the rule gives no information, and it has happened, that some of them have received contradictory solutions, on the very same day, in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, when the chair was occupied by different persons.

Besides, there are multitudes of cases constantly arising for which the "General Rules" make no provision. By what rule shall these cases be governed? The answer to this question is in the breast of the majority of the house. The question must be determined as it arises, or the business of the meeting stops then and there. The only point to be settled is, shall the case be decided by the capricious judgment of the presiding officer, subject to corrections or reversal by the equally capricious judgment of the majority of the body? or shall it be referred to some well known standard, which has stood the test of time and experience, and commanded the assent of all who have fully studied its principles? In the determination of this point, ignorance of the law, and the total absence of any standard, practically amount to the same thing. The result in either case is that the law governing the case, and affecting often very important interests, is made after the case has actually arisen, and is to all intents an "*ex post facto law*," and it is in almost always influenced by the feelings of the majority, with reference to the main subject under discussion. The question of order will then be determined by the effect which it is perceived that it will have upon the final issue of the matter in hands.

It will thus be seen at a glance, that in addition to the delay of business which must be occasioned by the time necessarily taken up in deciding on the method of proceeding, there is the

inevitable danger of conflicting decisions of precisely the same questions ; and a wide door opened for the exercise of tyranny on the part of dominant majorities. Every principle, therefore, of equity demands that whatever rule may be adopted, it should be definitely settled beforehand, and not left to the caprice or passion of the moment.

As this matter actually stands in our Church Judicatories, it is not quite so bad as the case supposed, so far as relates to danger of oppression on the part of accidental majorities ; because both the presiding officer and the members of the body always do have some standard, to which they refer such questions. That standard, however, is not a well digested, compact and certain system of rules and precedents, but the dim and doubtful apprehension of certain half remembered instances, which have occurred under the observation of the individual, in that, or some other Church court, or in some legislative hall. This standard, although very uncertain, is not capricious ; and while the danger of oppression is not so great, the certainty of confusion and delay is precisely the same as though there was no recognised law or rule of procedure.

Admitting then, the absolute necessity of some known and acknowledged system of rules, the only choice is between a new code, adapted to every possible emergency, enacted by authority as well as constructed by the wisdom of the body to be governed, and a resort to well established historical precedents. No wise man can hesitate between the two ; not because of the venerable antiquity of the latter, but because to reject the historical is to throw away all the lessons of experience.

So far as it relates to the mere deliberative capacity of Church Judicatories, the great store-house of rules and precedents is the law of Parliament. This is the tried and proved basis of every system of rules of order in use among the Anglo-Saxon race.

But when the Church courts sit in their strictly judicial character, for the trial of offences, their methods of procedure have, to some extent, a different historical origin. They are derived, not from the law of Parliament, nor from the common law of England, but from the civil law, i. e. the law of the Roman Empire. Perhaps they have come in some measure through the municipal law of Scotland, but more probably directly from the civil law.

Both of these historical elements are of course modified, and adjusted to our somewhat changed circumstances, by well established modern precedents settled by instances which have arisen among ourselves.

This is not the place for a detailed analysis of the principles of parliamentary law. That would require more space than we can devote to the subject, and more research than we can now afford to bestow. We, therefore, conclude this article,

already too long, by suggesting that the Professors of Executive Theology, in the Theological Seminaries, give to their pupils a brief course of instruction on these subjects, and direct their attention to the sources of information. If they will do so, we can predict with confidence, that there will be soon apparent much greater "accuracy in business, economy of time, order, uniformity, and impartiality," in the proceedings of the Judicatories of the Church. Surely these are results by no means to be despised.

---

#### RECENT DISCUSSIONS AND DELIVERANCES OF THE CHURCH COURTS, TOUCHING THE QUESTION OF MINISTERIAL SUPPORT.

In the discussions on the subject of Ministerial Support, which, for three years past, have been had through the Journals of our Church, in official papers from the Boards, and official acts of the various Judicatories of the Church, we have felt a lively interest, and also a strong sympathy with the results sought after by this agitation—viz: a more adequate provision for the ministry. We are fully persuaded, that looked at merely in a human and business point of view, as a compensation for intellectual labor, the provision made for the ministry, generally, whether in large or small fields of labor, is a disgrace to the people. That probably not one in ten of our ministers, receive such compensation, in return for his pastoral labors, as such amount of education and ability he could provide for himself by bestowing, as a teacher, half the amount of toil as a score or two of the children of his charge, to say nothing of what the same amount of character, qualification, and energy might accomplish in other departments of labor, private or commercial.

Feeling this thorough accord in this general view of the subject of which complaint is made, and in the purpose aimed at in these discussions, we feel the more free to give utterance to our suggestions of objection to the *manner* in which this subject has been presented—as overlooking an important limitation in the discussion of the support of the ministry in the Word of God. Our aim shall be to show that according to the inspired teaching and example, whilst as against the people, the ministry has all the claim which has been urged with so much force



yet, on the other hand, there is set a very clear limitation as to the extent to which the ministry may go in urging this claim.

Perhaps the clearest as well as the briefest method of illustrating the principle here suggested, will be to examine the teachings both by word and example of that very apostle who more fully than any other of the inspired writers has exhibited the obligation of the Church to support her ministry. In the first place then, there can be no doubt that Paul has most explicitly given utterance to the very principle which the discussions alluded to have urged with so much zeal and force. "If we have sown unto you spiritual things," he argues, "is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple, and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so the Lord hath ordained, that they which preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel." (1 Cor. 9: 11-14.) "Let him that is taught in the word, communicate to him that teacheth in all good things."—(Gal. 6: 6.) "Let the Elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine; for the Scripture saith, thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, the laborer is worthy of his reward."—(1 Tim. 1: 17.) Nothing can be more clear and decisive in so far as concerns the obligation of the Church in this matter, and as against that miserable hypocritical nasal whine against a "hireling ministry," of which we hear so much in our times from certain sections of immersed and unimmersed mammonisers bearing the Christian name.

But the point which we have now to urge is, that whilst all this is well enough and true enough, there is also another view of the whole matter in Scripture, presenting another side of the question, and which lays down a certain limit, within which alone, the minister himself shall assert this claim, and by which he shall conduct himself towards the people in regard to his right to a support. One of the most remarkable instances of this, is the case of Paul himself, who while at Corinth "reasoning in the synagogue every Sabbath," supported himself by a secular occupation,—“abode with Aquila and Priscilla, because he was of the same craft and wrought with them; for by their occupation they were tent makers.” And what will strike the thoughtful reader as one of the most remarkable passages in Acts, is the closing paragraph of his farewell address to the Ephesian Church:—“And now brethren I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified. I have coveted no man’s silver or gold, or apparel—*yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered to my necessities, and to them that are with me.* I have shown you all things,

how that so laboring, ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."—(Acts 20: 33-35.)

Now at first sight, and according to prevalent notions, does there not seem to be a *jar* here, between the first and last portions of this closing paragraph of a farewell address? Is there not some strange want of harmony, we are ready to say, between the tone of the solemn commendation to God and the word of his grace—suggesting that God, rather than Paul, is after all the true guardian of the Church, and God's Word, rather than the eloquent preaching of Paul, the true means of the edification of his people; and this sudden descent to the matter of his support while among them? Why, just after so lofty and beautiful a reference of them to God's care of the Church still, though Paul leave it; and to God's Word as of itself the true spiritual sustenance, though Paul no longer preach it, why this abrupt transition to his personal and pecuniary relations to his late charge? Now losing sight of the great principle which it is our purpose here to develope, and regarding this as simply the utterance of a personal feeling, and the exhibition of a sensitive, personal pride—the criticism is well founded. But a little farther reflection, and especially on comparing this with similar protestations of the Apostle in the Epistles, we discover that so far from being the expression of a personal peculiarity of the Apostle, it is the enunciation of a great principle which others before Paul had enunciated at various eras of the Church. That principle is, that aside entirely from any personal feeling and sensitiveness on the subject, any man who is commissioned to speak and act for God, is to guard, with intense jealousy, against giving the least color of suspicion for the charge, that in executing his commission as God's ambassador, he may be seeking selfish and personal ends. The reason for this jealousy, if it were no higher, may be found in the propensity of sinners in all ages to imitate their father, the Devil, in asking, "Doth Job serve God for nought?" The current popular opinion concerning the ministers of Jesus, as selfish salary-hunters—that too in face of the fact, that scarce one in one hundred of the educated ministers of the land, but can make better provision for himself with the same means and industry in any other calling,—may of itself suggest a reason for the stress laid on this point by the Apostle, and by the Scripture generally. This case of Paul at Ephesus, will be found, on examination, to be by no means a singular one. We find this sensitive jealousy of any imputation of selfish and personal ends in executing God's commission, in the case of Abraham, when God had employed him to deliver Lot and the King of Sodom, and chastise the enemy that had captured and spoiled them. When the King of Sodom in gratitude offered him all the spoils, which he

had re-captured, reserving to himself only his people, the half indignant answer of the Patriarch was, "I have lifted up my hand to the Lord, the Most High God, the possessor of heaven and earth, that I will not take from thee a thread, even to a shoe latchet, lest thou shouldst say I have made Abraham rich." (Gen. 14: 22.) To have taken any reward for the noble service which Jehovah had honored him by enabling him to render, would have obscured the testimony for Jehovah thus offered to the wicked around him, and put Abraham, his representative, on a level with the marauding freebooters of his generation. He could take no spoil as a reward, just for the reason that to take the spoils of the Canaanites in after times was forbidden to the Israelites; since by so doing their triumphs in Canaan would be no witness that God was there, and had employed them as the ministers of his vengeance and judgment, upon these high-handed sinners. The principle has its illustration again in the case of Moses—when, with warm resentment he repelled the insinuation of Korah, that he was selfishly putting himself in high and honorable position—lording it over God's heritage. "Moses was very wroth and said unto the Lord, I have not taken one ass from them."—(Numb. 16: 15.) So again in the challenge of Samuel to Israel, in his old age, "Witness against me before the Lord and before his anointed—whose ox have I taken, or whose ass have I taken, or from whose hand have I received a bribe to blind mine eyes."—(1 Sam. 13: 3.) This principle lies at the foundation of the fact, which has so often excited remark, that of all the miracles of Jesus, not one was done to promote any personal end, or satisfy any personal want; a fact which is true of every true miracle-worker in every age of the Church. And the same truth again has its illustration in the case of Simon Magus, who thought to purchase of Peter, for money, the power to give the Holy Ghost by the laying on of his hands; but who was met with the stern rebuke, "thy money perish with thee." The idea in all the cases cited is, that one directly commissioned to speak and act for God, must, with a holy jealousy, guard against making the impression on the minds of men, that they have any selfish end to accomplish by the exercise of the power conferred upon them, or any other end than simply to witness for God to men, by showing God's power among men.

Now the principle thus governing in the case of extraordinary ministers—exercising marvellous powers—is equally applicable to every sort of ministry for God, committed to men. The same reasons for the jealous watch against the imputation of selfishness, exist in the latter case as in the former, viz: to give full force and effect to the message as from God, and without impairing the effect which it is calculated to produce among men. Accordingly we find in the New Testament the same

doctrine as applying to the ordinary and perpetual ministry of the Church. In each summary of the qualifications of a gospel ministry, in the pastoral Epistles, it is required that he be "Not greedy of filthy lucre, but given to hospitality."—(Titus 1: 7-8 and 1 Tim. 3: 2-3.) And hence, not only in this speech to the Ephesians, but in his Epistles to all the Grecian Churches, we find Paul re-iterating the same protestation of his unselfishness in his labor among them. Thus, to the Corinthians, "In all things have I kept myself from being burdensome to you," and so will I keep myself. As the truth of God is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in all the region of Achaia (2 Cor. 11: 9-10.) And again in each of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, "Laboring night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you, we preached unto you the Gospel of God."—(1 Thess. 2: 9, and 2 Thess. 3: 8.)

Now, it must be borne in mind, that this is the constant protestation of that very Apostle who argues elsewhere more largely and fully than any other of the writers of Scripture, in the right of those who preach the Gospel to live of the Gospel, and asserts his own right in that regard. Nor is this to be accounted for on the score of something peculiar in the natural temperament of the man,—some sensitiveness of feeling on the subject, and dislike of the thought of depending on others for support. For this is the same Apostle who, with a full heart, says to the Philippians, "No Church communicated with me, as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only. I rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at last your care of me hath flourished greatly, ye have well done that ye did communicate with my affliction." (Philip. 4: 10-15.) "I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odor of sweet smelling savor, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." It is Paul also, who, on receiving the noble missionary contributions of the poor Churches in Macedonia for the relief of the Synagogue in Judea, exclaimed—"Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift," and who, over and over again in Epistles to other Churches, dwelt with delight upon the liberal spirit of these Macedonian Churches.

This review of the general teaching of Scripture, fully explains now the apparent want of harmony in the last paragraph of the farewell address at Ephesus. After recounting his labors among them, this is the crowning evidence of the truth of the doctrine which he had preached, that he could have had no selfish object to accomplish in them all, but showed himself a true God's ambassador. And not only has the declaration of his unselfishness, in this very close logical connection with what he had said before, but in a peculiarly close connection with what follows,—"*I have showed you all things how that so laboring, ye ought to support the weak,*" &c. It is but saying in effect, I have not only preached

the doctrine of generosity as taught by Jesus, but have endeavored to set you an example, that ye might "be followers of me, even as I am a follower of Christ."

This, then, is the result which we gather from the combined forces of these several illustrations. That whilst, as against the people, the minister who is invested with Divine authority to speak as for God to men, is entitled to an ample support; and whilst an enlarged liberality is the genuine work of Christian character, yet the minister of God, whether called to the extraordinary, or to the ordinary service of God in the church, must cultivate a delicate, sensitive honor of feeling, which shall forbid him ever so to claim and exercise his right to support, as to give any plausible color to the suspicion that selfishness mingles as an element in his service of the Church of God. Rather than run the risk of such suspicion, he will let "these hands minister to his necessities, and they that are with him," while he preaches the Gospel as he can, or suffer injustice and want for Christ's sake. And this the more that he may be able by example as well as precept, to teach in imitation of Jesus, who said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Better that the minister labor with his own hands, or suffer want, than give color to the charge, that under guise of speaking for God, he is seeking as a hireling, the good things of this life. It is no abatement of the force of this view of the case, that it seems to encourage the spirit of covetousness, which so sadly prevails in the Church. That spirit shall far more likely be exorcised by the cultivation of more elevated feelings and views in the ministry on this whole subject, and the courageous imitation of the Apostle, than by a continual bargain-driving, and continual arguing the ministers' rights from any mere mercenary, commercial stand point. There is reason to fear that from overlooking this peculiarity of the ministerial claim, as a right—but yet a right not to be pressed, as against the higher right of Jesus, to have a true and unobscured witness borne to men by his appointed representatives—we have admitted among the ministry, and into the courts of the Church, a style of speech and argument on this subject, which, whilst it will surely fail to produce much permanent good to the ministry, may do much injury by seeming to bring the matter down to the coarse and earthly level of a covetous and unfaithful Church—rather than elevate the Church to the higher tone of feeling and speech on this whole subject, which characterises the scripture.

We may derive from the view here presented, several practical conclusions, as to the difficulties which have led to the recent discussions in the Church—and the methods taken for a more adequate support of the ministry—we have space, however, for a single passing suggestion from what has been said. It is indeed, a thing in itself generally undesirable, for a min-

ister to be driven to any secular calling, for the means of support. Is it, however, more injurious to the interests of religion that a minister shall avail himself of his education to support himself in part by teaching, than that he shall be compelled continually to press his claims for support, or be harrassed continually with fears of debt or suffering for his household? Will the amount of four or five hours a day, five days in the week, really interfere with his duties as a minister, more than the burden upon his mind all hours of the day, and all days of the week, of that terrible problem, how to make the bed long enough, or the cover wide enough—in the case where the bed is shorter than a man can lay himself on it, and the covering narrower than he can wrap himself in it? Paul thought it best, in certain cases, to labor with his own hands. Dr. Alexander the Elder, thought with Paul on the question as applied to the country.

---

## THE RATIONALE OF PREACHING AS RELATED TO THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH.

The Church, in the primary idea of it, is that community which Jesus undertook to gather out of the race of man, and purchase with his own blood, in the eternal covenant with the Father. In the process of revealing the covenant of redemption through outward and visible manifestation, the elementary idea of it necessarily develops itself in the outward and visible church; the ideal “*κληροι*”—the “*ones*” of the secret purpose of God, develops as the “*εκκλησια*”—the “*called*” externally by the word. And in the covenant of redemption, the form which the idea of the community to be purchased assumed, was that of a kingdom under the government of a mediatorial king,—so in the outward manifestation of the purpose of redemption the “*εκκλησια*” body of the externally called, takes a formal organization and government.

An essential idea, again, entering into this general conception of a government and administration of the external kingdom, is the idea of the *ordinances*—the word, sacraments, and prayer—as means through which men shall continually be called externally;—agencies committed to “*earthen vessels*;”—and

men employed to call men, and to edify the body of Christ. Thus through men, to whom he has committed the ministerial office, and on whom he has bestowed grace to discharge it, the Great Head of the Kingdom dispenses and distributes his gifts to the Church, and even affords some manifestation of his own presence, by exerting the power of his Spirit that the means may not be vain and ineffectual. Christ alone must really reign and rule in the Church. But as it is not part of the plan that he shall dwell in it by a visible presence so as to make an audible declaration of his will to men, and an audible call, he instead employs men as his delegates—not to transfer his honor and right to them, but that he may do his work by their lips, as Calvin expresses it—“Just as an artificer makes use of an instrument in the performance of his work.” Hence, therefore, they may say to men, “We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us,”—“we then are co-workers with Christ.”

Why it was important to make the application of the benefits of redemption in this way, rather than directly himself by an audible voice speaking from heaven, or by the ministry of angels, it is aside from our present purpose to enquire. We are satisfied with knowing that he has chosen to send men forth, saying, “He that heareth you heareth me.” If this be the true aspect of the case, we can readily see how intimate is the relation between the idea of the Church as a government and power on earth, and the ministry of the word, as an essential ordinance in that Church.

It is manifest also from this view of the case, that what is termed “preaching the Word,” “preaching the Gospel, preaching Christ,” that particular ordinance which we now discuss, becomes a peculiar form of public teaching in the world, and generally a different thing from the various analagous things with which it is oft confounded; yea, from every other form of communicating thoughts from men to men; and just because of this essential relation of the idea of preaching the word to the idea of an external church and kingdom, it has this generic difference. As an instrumentality to work upon the minds and hearts of men, it has of course in form much that is analagous to the usual methods of reaching the minds and hearts of men. But yet, in its nature, it is essentially different. To preach is to *teach*, but teaching is not all of it, nor the fundamental idea of it. It is to reason and argue, but reasoning and arguing is not all of it, nor the fundamental idea of it. It is to speak earnestly—to persuade; but eloquent speech is not all of it, nor the fundamental idea of it. It is to expound a record—the language of a book—that still is not all of it. It is to labor for the salvation of souls, but even that is not all of it, since it is not only a possibility but an actuality, that the preacher shall discharge

his office and no souls be saved. We may prove to have been merely a witness for God against the stubbornness and rebellion of men.

But the essential element in the idea of preaching is that of uttering the message of Christ the Mediator to men. The taking of that Word which Christ as the prophet of the Church, has uttered, and through the usual and proper modes of operation upon the human soul, bringing it to bear upon the understandings and hearts of men. The office of the preacher is thus distinguished from all other offices of public teaching and speech among men. It is an essential element in the constitution of Christ's kingdom that in the assemblies of the citizens for the transaction of the peculiar affairs of the kingdom, there shall stand up one to speak for men to God in prayer, and in preaching speak for God to men. And it is this prominence of the word in this sense which gives the Christian public worship its distinctive character, and which, above all else, gives a distinctive character to the external Church itself. In no other form of worship known among men, are worship and instruction co-ordinate, and made to interpret each other. Nay, this is as yet a strong enough form of expressing it. For the preaching of the word connects back in idea, as we have seen, with that peculiar feature of the plan of redemption by which provision is made for manifesting the call of his people in the eternal purpose, by the external call of the word through which the spiritual life shall be first created in them, and afterwards sustained in them. Just as in the natural world, having endowed the creature with the principle of life, the Creator makes provision for the sustenance of that life, in the external world around him; in the spiritual world, man having a spiritual as well as a natural life, "cannot live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God;" and, therefore, the necessity of pastors "to feed the Church of God," "henceforth the word of life."

It was from this view of the organic relation of the minister of the word to the visible Church, that Calvin was led to regard "the administration of the pure word and sacraments" as the distinguishing mark or note of the true Church. For what he says he, (Inst. Book 4, Sec. 9,) we find the word of God, preached and heard, and the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, there, it is not to be doubted that the true Church of Christ; for his promise can never deceive, "two or three," &c. And again, (Book 4, Sec. 10,) "what are stated that the marks by which the Church is to be distinguished are the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments." But a higher authority than Calvin sums up in this single saying, the duties of the minister,—I charge thee in the name of the Lord Jesus—"Preach the Word." And



shall find in the brief paragraph of which this saying is a part, if we will study it in its logical connection, perhaps a fuller and more complete view, than could be given in any other way, of the idea, the nature, the object and the method of gospel preaching.—See 2 Tim. 3: 16; 4: 4.

This general view of the relation of preaching to the Church of God, and the consequent distinctive peculiarity of the preacher as being the mouth piece of God—runs counter to the too current notion of the office, in two very opposite directions;—on the one hand, in that it seems to exalt the office too greatly, bringing it too near to that of “the holy men of old who spake as moved by the Holy Ghost;” on the other hand that it seems to reduce the office too low—contracting and limiting too much the scope of the preacher’s office to a mere expounding of texts, with little room for the exercise of those means of persuasion wherewith man controls man. In regard to the first, it is only necessary to say, that a diligent study of the history of the revelation of God’s word and of his Church will most likely lead any one to make the difference between the preacher of the last dispensation, under a completed revelation, and the prophet of the former dispensation, under which revelation was in process of its completion, far less than is commonly supposed. Christianity is as old as creation, and the Church as old as Christianity; so again the ordinances of the Church, in principle the same, are as old as the Church. Men began to “call upon the name of the Lord” in the age of Seth. Noah was a “preacher of righteousness” when there was yet no Bible, but preached the word just as he received it direct from God. Solemn assemblies of the people—and in them the speaking for men to God, “calling upon the name of the Lord,” and speaking for God to men—“preaching righteousness.” And in all the subsequent ages, while the revelation was but partially made in the Gospel, according to Moses—that Gospel was to be expounded by the mouth of the priest in solemn assembly of the people. But more than this, the prophet’s work essential was preaching the word. Samuel, Elijah, Elisha and Nathan, were preachers of the word. Schools of the prophets were established for the training of men to this work. And this is true, not only of those who have been termed the *prophets of action*, who spoke for their own age only, but equally true of the prophets of revelation who spoke for all ages, and therefore wrote what they had spoken. The slightest analysis of the books of the several prophets in the old Testament will show them to be in large part *sermons* delivered on certain occasions, together with speeches delivered at special times to rulers and public men. If we will study the history of things in the reign of Uzziah, till we have thoroughly comprehended the condition of the Church—the corruptions that had mingled themselves with the worship—the

consequent decay of morals—and the wasting of the foolish war with Israel, and imagine the prophet standing before a public assemblage, in Jerusalem at the temple, engaged in the great pomp in worship—then the first chapter of Isaiah will be perceived to be one of the most eloquent and effective good sermons ever delivered: (compare 2 Chron. 26 ch. with Isa. 1st chap.,) and then by turning to the reign of Jotham we will find the *effect* of such preaching, viz:—Revival and great prosperity. And generally we will find prophets the key to the significance of the facts in Kings and Chronicles. What then is the distinction between the prophet of the old, and the preacher of the new dispensation? Chiefly this—then, as the revelation was in process of unfolding, in addition to the word already given, God gave from time to time the further word by special revelation—through the oracle when they enquired of the Lord—the vision of the seer—or the special movement of the spirit. But now that the revelation is complete, and God has said all that it is his purpose to say, and caused it to be written—that word stands to the preacher in lieu of the oracle and the vision. He opens this book and enters, as it were, into the hallowed audience chamber of Jehovah—and then inquires of the Lord under the guidance of the Spirit—and gathers up the message for each time and place—then goes forth—precisely as of old, to say to men: “Thus saith the Lord of Hosts.” The only difference is that the preacher and prophet get the word in diverse manners. In other words, the ministry of the word in the Church, under a completed revelation, consists in making a living and breathing reality to the consciousness of men that word spoken for all ages;—in making it to this age just what it was to those to whom it was first spoken—God’s word spoken *to us*. And when we study the nature of the book itself, we shall find that its capacity to be so made is its distinguishing glory above all books.

Thus it will be perceived that “the preaching of the Word” is the true description of the work, and that “preaching” is no very limited field. It is the effort to make that living breathing word—all that God hath spoken.

But on the other hand, as this word is to be adapted and applied to human souls, there is full room left for the exercise of all the skill that eloquence can bring to the work. It does not follow that because the preacher is restricted to the simple message of giving utterance to God’s word, that therefore there must be an unvarying uniformity in the dispensation of the Word. On the contrary, even in the case of those who went forth to preach the message directly communicated—or those who wrote their thoughts under the direct inspiration of God—there is exhibited every variety of genius. The word, though the word of God, takes the form of the peculiar human mould—the earthen vessel.

sel in which it was deposited—and thus there is just as great varieties found in the writings of the Prophets as those of any other class of men. And it is neither more so nor less so with regard to different ministers in the ministry of the same word. Each has an opportunity to give full play to all the peculiarities and idiosyncracies of his talent—and still declare the same word of God. The people of Geneva were wont to compare together their three great preachers. Farel, is a storm of thunder and rain; Vinet, a gentle rain distilling as the dew—Calvin, a hard steady rain all day—every man takes still his own way, yet all three equally preach the word in the Gospel sense.

Nor again, does this view of the ministry of the word preclude the idea of training in all knowledge and discipline, the use of every established and proper means. The true logic of the case is not—man is but the means through which God communicates truth to men—therefore man has nothing to do. But this rather as Vinet puts it, “if God uses means to attain his ends, surely men ought to use them.” Our faculties are no more unworthy instruments to us, than we are to God. Nay, if God condescends to honor us as his instruments, we should make it our endeavor to employ the whole instrument perfected to its highest capacity. The preacher’s work is not, by any originality of genius, to add some new thing to the truth of God, but to deal with men, before whose minds a veil hangs that obscures the vision of the truth of God. All, therefore, that eloquence and art can accomplish, he must endeavor to accomplish. God sends the sunshine and shower as a sovereign, yet it is the diligent farmer who turns them to the products of industry. God sends the winds and governs the tides—but, therefore, the sailor is most diligent to watch. As a general rule in nature, it is the men most directly dependent upon sovereignty, who most diligently use means. “Who is Paul? who Apollos? but ministers?”—and yet there is a sense in which the same Apostle can say to the Thessalonians, “*I have begotten you, &c.*” So far, then, from any tendency to undervalue knowledge and training as means, this idea of the ministry of the word, as but the continuation in the Church under a completed revelation of means of communicating his word from God to man—is that which offers the highest incitement to the free use of all the faculties wherewith man is endowed. All other knowledge is auxiliary to this. Nay, of all knowledge, from that of the hyssop upon the wall to the cedar of Lebanon—from that of facts which relate to the meanest insect to that which transcends suns and systems—the great key-stone fact is that in the depths of eternity past—“God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son to die for it,” &c. This fact is the grand propelling power which gives life and motion to the machinery of the universe. And this is the every day theme of the ministers of

the word. And so contemplated, in the aspect of a work for the soul, the ordinary occupation of the preacher of the gospel—the calling into play the emotions, and inspiring volitions which shall be followed by the eternity of shame—or an eternity of glory. Shall we say that such views relax energy and cut the nerves of exertion?

If then training is needful to such an office—what should be the method of it? If a science, where is it to be learned? what shall be the text book? We answer in a single word—generally the Bible;—and a diligent study of the models of preaching in the Bible. If ministers of the present day are indeed the successors in office to the preachers who spoke direct from God to men—and hold the same relative position to the Church and to the outworking of the plan of Redemption—they had better get their first notions from them. And obviously for this very reason, in the inspired record we find sermons with a statement of the occasion and circumstances—and prayers with the occasion and circumstances.

This, at first sight, may seem to be a too contracted view of the matter, but it will improve and enlarge wonderfully on examination. As a practical experiment, the preacher will find—that just then he is most successful in bringing the word of God in contact with the minds of men—when he prepares his message just on the themes suggested—goes and inquires of the Lord—and we doubt not, that in large part this accounts for the failure of a practical man to derive much aid from books of Homiletics—from books of Skeletons. No true preacher ever preach another man's sermon; no true preacher meets with a sermon, that he feels he would be satisfied to deliver as a message from God to men. Each must consult the oracle of himself—each must get his own peculiar message for the occasion as it arises.

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

THE FEARLESS INCULCATION OF SCRIPTURE  
TEACHING THE GREAT DEMAND OF THIS COUNTRY AT THE PRESENT TIME.

The condition of things in the United States of America, at this time, is very remarkable. The public mind is in one of those stages of progressive development, produced by a long and powerful series of causes, all tending to the excitement of the general intellect, in every direction of action and of thought. All the tendencies of the times, are to vigor and progress of mental activity. The demands of trade, the perpetual excitement of a press which sweeps the entire circle of the world in its current reports, the acceleration of speed, the increase of travel, the wide expansion of the means of intelligence, the perpetual accession of fresh territory, the discoveries of science, perpetually advancing the domain of man over material nature, have all contributed to rouse the energies of a people naturally energetic and powerful, into an activity which often seems to indicate as much of disease as of health, and to promise as much of ruin as of benefit, in its results. Trade is pursued with a vehemence and absorption which leaves little or no room for the culture and development of the individual man, either physical, social, moral or intellectual. Cities spring up in a day. New territories are over-run and filled up almost as soon as they are opened for emigration. Old ideas are submitted afresh to the testing tap of investigation, with a perfect contempt for prescription; and so morbid has grown this thirst for novelty, in many places the age and established acceptance of a maxim, are taken as *prima facie* evidence of its falsity, or at least of its incompleteness and need of improvement. This spirit has proved most disastrous in its tampering with the great maxims of both political and mental philosophy, and especially in its daring invasions of the sanctity of religion. No subject will ever suffer as much as the great system of the Christian religion, in the prevalence of such a spirit as this, unless the proper means of counteraction are adopted. Men are naturally impatient of its doctrines. They will rejoice to be free from its restraints; and there is an inexpressible charm in the early stages of *free thought*, as it is termed, where a bold and energetic nature casts off all law, and riots over the field of speculation unrestrained by fear of consequences, or the memory of a responsibility to be met. In this universal movement of the mind of a community, where the example of one kindles the spirit of progress in another, until the whole mass becomes animated with this delicious desire for advance from old to new positions,

in every avenue of human employment, it is to be expected that the natural enmity of the carnal heart will assert itself, and seek to gain release from painful obligations of opinion and of a sense of duty, by rejecting the elements of belief, which are found to be oppressive. Hence, doctrines will be at first cautiously modified in their statement, or questioned as to their truth. Precepts will be undermined; statements of fact will be sifted with malignant severity—and as the current sweeps on, still augmenting the tendency to change, the final issue is the bold and scornful repudiation of old and established principles, as unsuited to the demands of the time, and the more enlightened spirit of modern inquiry. This has been the process by which New England has been warped from the just and conservative principles of former days, until both in religion and politics, it has become the most radical and unsound portion of the whole population of this country. This is the process by which New York and Ohio have become renowned for their political profligacy, and the dangerous looseness of their social maxims and convictions of duty. This is the process by which every wretched ism which has been hatched in the moody and distempered humors of discontented and unprincipled French and German infidels—men to whom a just idea of political prudence is as utterly unknown as is any just conception of moral obligation—finds a ready reception on American soil. This is the process by which every sober and moderate construction of the maxims of republicanism seems to be about to be discarded, for constructions which render them not only incompatible with free institutions, but with the very existence of society itself, under any form of organization. In communities in which this desperate depravation not only of the moral powers, but of the understanding has been permitted to reach anything like a maturity of influence, there is an absolute demand for prompt and effectual remedies. The elements of social ruin are there already compounded, and the cause requires a firm and radical treatment. It is useless to temporize with any such condition of affairs. No mere palliations, no simples of the remedial science of organized society will answer: the searching and thorough action of the master agents will alone meet the demands of the exigency. When public sentiment is becoming radically corrupt; when a false philosophy is debauching the public conscience; when heresy and false moral perception are distracting the minds of the people with views at war with the laws of the land, as well as with the Word of God: it is time all friends of conservatism and true religion were beginning to meet the propagators and champions of error, with a spirit as stern and resolute as their own. The country has just passed through the most momentous crisis in its history. It is unquestionably true that the Union of the States never has been in such peril as it has

been for the last twelve months. The result of the election has been of inconceivable importance. The majority of the American people have spoken out for the equality of the States, and the preservation of the Union on its original basis. But there are circumstances connected with the issue, as antecedents and attendants, which are well calculated to excite the anxious forebodings of a patriotic heart, as it turns its gaze to the future. The intense excitement in all parts of the country; the deep and perverted moral perceptions which are involved; the anxieties of a debauched conscience on one side, the anxieties of a thoroughly roused and determined spirit of self-preservation on the other; the immense sectional majorities on both sides; the powerful religious convictions enlisted, the wide and disastrous embarkation of the pulpit and the religious press in the sea of politics; the excitable nature of the population; the large number of unquiet spirits which infest every part of the land, ripe for any mischief; the scorn of all conservative ideas, too greatly prevalent in some parts; the rapid spread of heretical doctrines and irreligious tendencies: all combine to constitute the elements of a problem which must embrace the highest interests of this great people in its solution. The question of slavery is not the only one involved: questions of morals implicated in matters of property, legislation, marriage, wages, the discipline of prisons, and the care of the poor—all are involved. Nay, the fundamental maxims of society and government are all in issue, as if the experience of the past had settled no truth, or was unworthy of the consideration of the progressive present. The old and cherished maxims of the Christian faith are in issue, under forms which seem to take for granted the utter impossibility of determining anything whatever as definitely true as pertaining to the ancient faith of the Apostles and Prophets. The great question of this day is how to encounter the distempered action of the public mind, which is issuing so disastrously on such immense public interests.

The answer which we give to this question, is intimated in the caption of this article: the remedy is to be found in a bold and stringent utterance of the mind of God as expressed in the Holy Scriptures. The great mischief to be reached is in the disordered moral and religious convictions of the people. It is impossible to control these except by going to the source of their moral and religious convictions. If they are believers in the Word of God, manifestly, their religious convictions are to be controlled by a plain and conclusive display of the teachings of that book. If they are infidels, they are still to be met, if wisely met, not by philosophical argumentation mainly, but by the fearless and pointed statement of the truth as it is in Jesus. It ought never to be forgotten in all attempts to regulate the disordered views of all classes of men, that the gospel is not

merely a *doctrine*, but a *power*: it is a thing not merely to be believed, but a power *to be felt*: and that consequently, it is not dependent for its success on a previous candid and voluntary action on the part of men, but *on a power*, which, exerted by the sovereign God, subdues the pride of man, and makes him willing in the day of God's power. The very best way to meet an error, is to make up, directly and with a stringent clearness of opposition which cannot be mistaken, an absolute issue, plain, bold, and unsusceptible of compromise, between it and the Word of God. There is a power about that word which will insure the victory. It is the sword of the Spirit, and the more naked its edge is brought upon the head of error, the more speedily will the issue be determined. It appeals to an existing conviction in the moral susceptibilities of the soul, which no skepticism can resist. Let the voice of God be heard in all collision with his enemies. And let the issue be between them alone.

Let us take for example the question of slavery. Let us look to the past and present posture of the mind of Christendom upon it. Forty years ago there was scarcely a division of sentiment in relation to it; all Christendom was united in the opinion, that slavery was a relation involving an essential criminality, some holding to one degree of it, and others to another, but all agreed in the opinion that it involved some degree of the nature of sin. At the same time there was a painful and somewhat embarrassing recognition of the fact, that slavery was so treated in the word of God, as to render the recognition of it, as an essential criminality, a problem of some difficulty in connection with the admitted inspiration of the Scriptures. It was placed on the whole, in the same category with the polygamy of the patriarchs, and explained under that general feature of Christianity which making a gradual war upon all human infirmities necessarily allows during the *process* of purification, of the existence of sins in the character and conduct of its subjects. In other words Christianity never engages to make a saint absolutely perfect from the moment its efficacy begins to work upon him, and consequently sins continued to mar the character of its subjects, sins co-existing with grace in a state of perpetual opposition, yet by no means ceasing to be sin, and as such involving guilt and responsibility. Among these sins slavery was placed in this universal conviction of the world. The agitation of the question however, began to change the position of affairs. Some became more and more heated against slavery, and began to consider it as of the same class, with murder, piracy and the highest crimes of the decalogue. Others still recognizing it as a sin, yet did not regard it as incompatible with Christian character, or as involving a breach of communion with the church of Christ, but still recognizing it as a *sin*. Such was the position of affairs some *forty* years since in this country, when the seri-



ous investigation of the subject may be said to have commenced.

Look at the facts. On one side we see the universal and undisputed conviction that slavery was a sin per se. On the other, we see that the Word of God does recognize the existence of slavery as a lawful relation. We see that it does not recognize it on the same footing with polygamy or other sins of the patriarchs. On the contrary, it stands in the category of other and confessedly lawful relations. God is represented as the original former of it between the sons of Noah. He rewards Abraham by giving him gold and silver, camels and asses, men-servants and maid-servants, some of whom were born in his house, and some bought with his money. Nay, more, slavery was recognized in the very letter of the tenth commandment. It was incorporated into the laws and social structure of the Jewish people, the only civil order ever directly organized by God himself. When we reach New Testament times, we discover the apostles organizing the church in the midst of slave-holding communities, giving multiplied and specific rules for the regulation of the relation, sending back a fugitive slave with an inspired letter in his hand, recognizing the rights of the master, and never once giving the remotest intimation that the relation itself involved an essential criminality. Put these facts together; first the universal and profound conviction of the essential sin of slavery: and second, the fact that it is so recognized in the Word of God as to render the apprehension of it as a sin absolutely incompatible with the inspiration of the Scriptures. In this condition of things, what might have been expected? Is it possible that it can continue? Will God suffer his word to be so dishonored? Will he permit the public sentiment of the world to impeach the morality of the tenth commandment, and to overwhelm the teachings of his word, and the action of his apostles, with so gross a contumely? It was impossible. It might have been expected, what has actually happened, that the Providence of God would arouse a controversy, an agitation, an investigation of every element of this question, and that he never would suffer that agitation to cease until he had urged back the corrupt and disordered sentiment of the world, until it rested simply upon the teachings of his Word. That controversy has begun: it has made material progress: but the great work is yet to be done. The Southern States of the American Union have been placed in the position they occupy by the Providence of God, for the purpose of fighting this great battle for the vindication of the law and Word of God. This is one among the great ends involved in the providential disposition of the African race on this continent. *Nor is it possible for this agitation to cease until this end is attained.* God's Word is to be vindicated. As yet the great issue stands disputed. All Christendom is alive on the subject. Every part of our own

land especially, is convulsed. Churches have been broken to pieces: the laws have been defied: the fundamental principles of the Federal Government, the equality of the States, and the most elementary maxims of public justice have been assailed: armies have been already in the field, and the whole land held trembling on the brink of civil war for months. All the arts of detraction and abuse, the press and the pulpit, the pen of the poet and the tongue of the orator, fiction and fact, declamation and statistics, every weapon of intellectual strife has been brought into requisition. In the mean time the clear light of revelation has been breaking upon the minds of thousands in the South, and is now beginning to fall upon the more thoughtful and reverent minds in the North. The publications of Dr. Lord of Dartmouth College, Dr. Adams, of Boston, and a most remarkable pamphlet from Samuel Nott, published by a Boston house, are each an indication of the inevitable change. A reaction over the whole North and over England, is as certain as God reigns and as the Bible is the work of his wisdom. God will not suffer things to remain as they are. For the present the South stands almost alone. Of all the various branches of the Church of Christ, but one has had the boldness and the clear vision to come out with plain public documents vindicating the Word of God and the morality of the tenth precept of the law. The paper adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in 1845, stands among the very grandest of all the testimonies ever borne by the Church of Christ in vindication of his despised and insulted word. Alone, amid a world shaken by the storms of fanaticism and folly, calmly putting aside the remonstrances of her mistaken sister churches, at home and abroad, she stands simply and inflexibly on the teachings of God's Word. God bless the noble witness. Ever foremost in defence of her Master's truth, no matter how despised or derided among men, she knows not how to reconcile a veneration for his word with an unbounded abhorrence of what he has been pleased to inculcate. She stands alone for the present, a unit in all parts of the nation, united in her testimony and prompt to defend it.

There is but one policy to be pursued. The Church is a witness for the truth of Christ: she is set to teach what is in the Bible, not her own discoveries or speculations in truth. Let her set forth boldly the testimony of the Word of God on this and its affiliated truth. Let her denounce, as the enemies of the Word of God, all who dare to pronounce a sin, that which is recognized in the law of God. Let her study the directions of the Holy Ghost as contained in the first five verses of the last chapter of first Timothy: where the positive command is given to teach and exhort masters and servants to mutual fidelity, and where the equally clear and positive order is given to withdraw from those who are described in terms which mark

with the intent of a likeness, the modern abolitionist, with his strife of words, and his perverse disputings on the abstract maxims of freedom and equality. The teacher of the Word of God has no option: he is bound to give the mind of God, and to make unsparing war upon all who refuse to obey the truth. It is a fact that slavery is recognized in the Scriptures, and the Church is bound to reiterate its teachings. The Christian abolitionist denies that slavery is recognized as lawful in the Bible. This is a simple question of fact, on which we make a plain and positive issue; and woe betide the man, who mistaking an issue of *fact* as to the teachings of the Scriptures, denounces as an essential wickedness, that which is declared of God to be lawful.

Many excellent people are misled as to the real teachings of the Word of God on the subject of slavery, as on many other questions in issue before the public, by not comparing Scripture with Scripture, and consequently getting only partial views of its real doctrine. It may be a matter of surprise to some of our readers who have gone thus far with us, in our strong assertion of the recognition of slavery in the Bible, to hear us admit that the Word of God does, with equal distinctness, recognize slavery to be *a curse upon man, as a fallen being*. In the first mention made of it in the Bible, God himself subjects Ham and his family to servitude to his brethren, as a curse for his sin, and a reward for their filial fidelity. The essential lawfulness of the relation is proved by the fact that God himself constituted it. It is shown to be a curse to those who are to serve, by the very fact that it was ordered as the punishment of sin. It is shown to be a blessing to those who receive the service, by its being made a reward to the faithful sons of the sinning, yet repentant patriarch. The Bible recognizes *all servitude* to be a part of the curse—an accident and a symbol of a lapsed condition of humanity; not merely *slavery* as such, but *all forms of servitude*. Here has been one of the points of departure from the truth, in modern speculations on this great question: the general character of all forms of servitude as a curse on humanity, has been specifically confined to the relation of slavery, when in fact the Word of God extends it to all forms of servitude. The necessities for servitude, the demand for labor, the menial, yet necessary offices of life, are all the incidents and symbols of a fallen condition of humanity. Poverty and labor are both parts of the curse of God on a rebellious world; and these are the great material grounds upon which all the relations of servitude rest, no matter whether they are relations of hired or heritable service. It is in one most important sense a curse upon an individual to be compelled into a condition of servitude, whether as a hired servant or a slave, although, blessed be God, in the wise orderings of his Providence, absolute evils are made relative good; and the relations of servitude are made to minister

powerfully not only to the general good of human life, but specifically to those who sustain them. Nor is there anything paradoxical in such a condition of affairs. Labor is a part of the curse—an incident of the fall; yet it is the source of innumerable blessings to those who endure it. In like manner civil government is an absolute evil and a relative good, demanded by the exigencies of a lapsed condition of human nature, and, as such, an incident and a symbol of God's curse upon the world; yet it is the fountain of inconceivable benefits to the race; the foundation and necessary condition of the arts and ameliorating advances of human life. In like manner, while all forms of servitude, including slavery, but not excluding other modifications of the necessity, are pronounced to be part and parcel of the curse upon man; yet *they all*, including slavery, are fountains of inconceivable good to those who sustain the relations involved. Here is another point of departure from the truth as laid down in the Word of God. The Bible discriminates clearly, between the general *condition of servitude*—which it pronounces a part of the curse upon humanity—and *the relations which spring up under it*. Thus, war is an incident of a lapsed condition of affairs—a fearful curse upon the world; yet *the relations* created by it—the military and diplomatic offices—are not essentially immoral. Civil government, as we have seen, belongs to the same general category—a supply for an exigency created by the fall; yet the relations and offices it creates, are not sinful and accursed. The practice of physic and surgery are likewise incidents and indexes of the curse on the world; yet the relations that spring up under them, the offices of physician and nurse are not wrong in themselves. In like manner the condition of servitude, in the necessities which demand it, in the offices it involves, and in the losses which it implies, is a clear incident of the fallen estate of the human race; yet the relations it creates, are by no means necessarily immoral, nor is the general condition of such a course incompatible with great happiness to those who sustain those relations. While, therefore, it is a blessing to be raised above the condition of servitude, while it is a curse to be involved in it: it by no means follows that those who are blessed with the one, or are cursed with the other, are necessarily placed in essentially wicked relations to each other, or are involved in a condition incompatible with as much of happiness as is usually allotted to man.

These conclusions indicate to us one more point of departure from the truth, in those who have been engaged on the abolition side of this question. The modern reformer, starting from the false conclusion that slavery was essentially a sin, has gone for the immediate and complete abolition of the existing relations between the master and his servants. The Bible deals with slavery, as it deals with all similar incidents and results of the

fallen state of the human family ; not by an instant and revolutionary destruction of them as *crimes per se* ; but by gradually removing the general causes that originated and necessitated these relations. Thus, the military offices will be abolished, not by a peremptory prohibition of them, as essentially wicked, but by gradually removing the causes which demand war and all its relations. In like manner it would be greatly desirable to abolish all the agencies of surgery and physic, if you could remove the evils which create a demand for them ; but it would be the worst philanthropy in the world, to abolish these agents before the evils which demand them are effectually removed. This would be true of civil government itself. It is equally true of servitude in all its forms, and of slavery specifically. Remove the demands for these relations, and then the relations themselves may be abolished ; but until this is done, it is moon-stricken madness in the summit of its phrensy, to talk of their abolition. As long as the present conditions are found attaching to the African race in this country, it would be inconceivably disastrous, to alter one iota their existing relations in society. The Word of God is full of a far-sighted wisdom in its dealing with all such issues. If God is wise, the modern abolitionist is a most consummate specimen of a fool. In the case of those who are animated by modified anti-slavery views, and who do not deserve so harsh a title as we have bestowed on the more rampant of the class, we have only to say, go study the Word of God, and endeavor to remove all morbid misconceptions of what He recognizes as lawful. There is no sense in attempting to be holier than the Lord himself. Learn from the Scriptures to discriminate between a general condition of human affairs, and the relations it creates ; between what is essential to those relations, and evils circumstantially attached to it.

There is in this last suggestion a lesson for the South as well as for the North to learn from the Word of God. The Bible does recognize the relation of slavery to be lawful in itself ; but it discriminates between what is of the essence of that relation and what is merely circumstantial to it, and consequently susceptible of modification, without assailing the essence of the relation itself. Moreover, it places the relation just as it places every other relation of life, under the protection of the unchangeable principles of justice, humanity and benevolence, and all violations of these principles, in the conduct of all the relations over which they preside, will be held to a strict account. That the institution of slavery, as it exists in this country, has no objectionable peculiarities about it, is what no Southern man has ever desired to affirm. It is no more a perfect thing than anything else in which sinful and imperfect men stand related to each other. If it were free from all objections, it would be the only thing on earth that is so. But it is, nevertheless, a

fact, that well-nigh every peculiarity, against which the world has been raised, is to be found among those circumstantial features of slavery, which do not touch the essence of the relation, and which are susceptible of modification without injury; nay, to the manifest improvement and benefit of the relation both to the master and the slave. It is not the unalterable features of the relation, that the minds of slaves themselves often become uneasy and imagine them to be necessarily due to the relation itself, and are only to be removed by the absolute abolition of it. The laws regulating slavery are confounded frequently with slavery itself, while, in fact, the laws are alterable without touching the institution; in many cases, they ought to be changed. The regulation of the marriage relation among slaves; the limitation of a wise and salutary power on the power of the master to sunder families unreasonably; the removal of restrictions on the education of slaves wherever the villainy of the abolitionist will render it expedient; these are samples of these separable features of the relation of slavery which may be, and ought to be modified. When all these things are done, when the Bible theory of slavery as a relation of the family is realized, when all the protection and ameliorating influences of which the relation is susceptible, are brought around it, it will be seen and confessed by all candid men that slavery is a relation of human life susceptible of the very best results of progress and improvement to all parties concerned in it. The South is beginning to move on these collateral features of her peculiar institution. She would have moved long since but for the insane folly of the Northern abolitionists. She stands on the defensive, sternly meeting the tempest of abuse and abhorrence from every civilized portion of the globe; she does not to be expected that she would have either time or inclination to engage in any wide or thorough attempt to correct the alterable evils of her institution. If the fanaticism of the North would subside and give peace and a sense of security to the country, no doubt everything which can be done, will be done by the South. For the present, let all be done that can be done; but let us stand to our arms, our assailants are responsible before God and man for evils remaining unamended, because of the necessities of self-protection created by their own aggression. In the name of all that is sacred, give us peace, and an opportunity to look within. If, however, the North will persist in the course it has pursued for years past, prominent among a thousand reasons why the South should break up the government of the Union, will be her duty in ameliorating all the separable adjuncts of slavery that are susceptible of improvement. If not permitted to do it in the Union, it is her duty to do it, and herself to do it *out of it*. Let the South do her duty to the Word of God in the resolute maintenance of its teaching.

and second, in modifying the alterable evils of the institution of slavery ; and she may leave her safety and her good name with unshaken faith in the protection of the God of the Bible.

This question of slavery, however, is only one among others, on which there is no safety to the country, except in the fearless and stringent utterance and enforcement of the mind of God as displayed in his word. The Land Monopoly movements of New York, the Working Mens' Conventions, meeting to complain of the inequality of mechanical to professional wages, the theories of Womens' Rights, boldly claiming a right to enter all professions and pursuits of life, and even the ministry of the gospel, in open scorn of the explicit voice of the Holy Ghost, the infidel theories of marriage and public charities, all spring from one source, and are only to be encountered by the stern fidelity of a living Church, giving voice to the authoritative teachings of God in his Word. Legislation based on unscriptural views of temperance, legislation based on unsound and unscriptural views of the end of civil government and the uses of society, perverted views of public education, and above all, the utter pollution of the pulpit, the desecration of God's house, prostituted by clerical ruffians, cursed with judicial blindness into engines of political warfare of the wildest and most revolutionary description ; all these evils cry aloud, that the holy and terrible voice of Jehovah should be heard amid the roar and clamor of the frenzied hour. We cannot go into the discussion of these things ; we have already consumed too much time. It is enough to say, that God is master of this world and he means to rule it ; the rage of man and the frenzy of devils combined, cannot stay the steady advance and final supremacy of his Word. The day comes when science will correct her conclusions by the teachings of the Bible ; when political philosophy will defer to its doctrines in the development of its theories, after borrowing its fundamental maxims in the outset from its principles ; when all questions of social reform, all theories of charity, all schemes of education, all principles of legislation, not less than the great inquiries touching the issues of eternal life to the individual soul, will be determined by the voice of God in his invincible Word. He will glorify his word above all his name. He has thereby made known the riches of his wisdom for the guidance and protection of man, both for this and for the life to come. Let his Church give wider utterance to the teachings of his Word, and all error will go down before the keen edge of the sword of the Spirit. It is necessary to the salvation of this country. Unless the perverted conscience of the North is purged of its false convictions by the authority of the Word of God, it will be impossible to prevent the repetition of the mad attempt to destroy the equality of the States under the Constitution, or to induce them to fulfil the

obligations of the Constitution as to the rendition of fugitive slaves. The perverted moral perceptions of the people, misled by a false philosophy, are at the bottom of the whole difficulty. The evil must be reached in its source: the voice of God must be heard; or the government of the United States will cease to be a living power on the earth. The baffled enemies of the constitution are already organizing for a renewal of the strife; they boldly proclaim the inflexibility of their purpose; and the friends of the country, and the friends of the Word of God must meet them as promptly as they attack. The only effective weapon is the Word of God.

---

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

### THE EDUCATION OF OUR MINISTERS.

“It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.” So wrote the Apostle Paul 1800 years ago.—Whatever subsidiary means may be employed, the divinely appointed instrumentality for dispensing the Gospel is preaching. This has God as signally honored by His Providence, as by the emphatic declaration of His Word. Following the track of history, we shall find that as other means for the propagation of Christianity have been devised and permitted to supersede preaching, whether in themselves legitimate or otherwise, they have either failed, or been converted into hindrances, and scandals. Where the divine Institution has been most honored and its simple power trusted, there true piety has most flourished, and the Church grown in spiritual strength, and thence in outward power. Where this Institution has been laid aside or subjected to some dishonored or insignificant position, piety has declined. The devices of men, papal or protestant, which have sought to enlarge the church by addressing men’s senses, or working on their imaginations, or appealing to their taste in the fine arts, have had a temporary success in multiplying professed adherents of the cause; but such have often proved its real enemies or fatal apostates. And even while God has honored with His blessing a kind of preaching, as it is a real *publication*, the books and tracts, which inculcate His truth, He has still by his providence, continued mainly to bless the preached word. No organization for dispensing the Gospel or maintaining the Insti-



tutions of religious worship among men have ever succeeded, unless they have recognized and provided a living ministry. Even the Papacy, with its "lying wonders," its pictures and processions, its chambers of imagery, and its compact, well ordered and powerful hierarchy; its absolutions, penances and indulgences; its inquisitions and rackings and burnings; has not succeeded in the actual propagation of its semi-religious faith, without the aid of this potent engine for persuading men.

In our time, too, we find that those who aim to disseminate any system of truth or error, whether in the sciences, morals, or in partisan politics, have found it necessary to resort to the services of the living ministry, and Lecturers on almost every subject pervade the land. During the last quarter of a century, the truths of some of the most recondite sciences have thus been brought down to the people. The principles of a technical temperance have been unfolded every where, and every important popular election calls forth speeches, by hundreds, in every city, and town and village. And all this is true in an age, when the physical and moral power of the press, is far in advance of what the world has ever known; when books are multiplied with a facility, and circulated with a rapidity never before witnessed, and when the art of reading is possessed by millions, instead of the thousands, of a few generations past.

In common with all other reformed churches, ours has ever held the institution of preaching in the highest honor. Provision for the training of men for the work of the ministry was, from the first organization of the church, incorporated in its constitution.

In order to provide, at least, in part, the requisite means for conducting such a training, the founders of our American Church established the best classical schools, possible in their circumstances, which were the germs of colleges.

In the want of better facilities for theological study, candidates for the ministry sought the aid and instruction of such "approved divines" as they could. They were encouraged also, to resort to the old and fully equipped literary institutions of Great Britain, to prosecute more fully both academical and theological studies. As the colonies emerged into States, and States grew in population and resources, the means for a more extensive course of secular instruction were provided, and as long ago as the close of the last century, the plan of some separate course of theological study, to be appended to the college *curriculum*, was considered. After some years of careful thought and under the most solemn conviction of the propriety of such an Institution, a theological seminary was established. The matured counsels of some of the wisest and best men of the church could devise nothing better. Not only was it determined to establish a

*theological seminary*, but the manner in which the details of the whole matter were presented for settlement by the Presbyterian vote, evinces the existence of a preliminary conclusion in forming this mode of securing the training of ministers demanded by our constitution, as the best mode. For the question submitted to the Presbyteries, was not whether there should be any theological school, but how many, whether one or two, or as many as there were synods.

Cotemporary with the enterprises of our own church in this important department of Christian effort, were those of the New England Congregationalists, and during the last half century, all the leading churches of the country have adopted the same policy. Even those bodies whose ministry at first, not only rejected, but even ridiculed the plans of theological education adopted by Presbyterians, have now come to approve and adopt them, and we learn while writing these pages, that our Methodist brethren, who have longest withheld their approbation, are taking measures for establishing a theological school of high rank.

Excepting the means adopted for the circulation of the Bible by the institution and support of the American Bible Society, and the organizations of the various churches for Missionary enterprises, there is no subject on which the churches of our country are more fully settled in opinion than that for the proper education of ministers. Theological seminaries afford the most desirable facilities. That the sentiment of our church on this subject has not been mis-stated is evident from the fact, that since the establishment of Princeton Seminary, in 1812, five other theological seminaries have been founded, not reckoning three more now in operation, under New School auspices. These five together represent every portion of the church. Of the propriety of each individual enterprise, or the methods by which each has been brought into being and is now conducted, it is no part of our purpose to speak here; that the church should voluntarily invest nearly one million dollars in endowment of these institutions, and surrender the services of more than twenty among her best ministers for their instruction, speaks as clearly as can be done, her commitment to this method of training her ministry. Whether this general sentiment of the church, a sentiment growing stronger with every year's experience and observation, is of sufficient weight to bear down the influence of cavils and objections, remains to be seen. But of this there seems no room to doubt, that such is the sentiment, and that the Presbyterian church, in all her borders, is committed to its practical exhibition.

During the ten years succeeding 1844 the solemn attention of the whole church was arrested by the development of the painful fact, that with all the increased means of theological educa-

tion which had been provided, and the increased facilities for aiding the indigent student, which had been devised, the number of candidates was *relatively* and often absolutely decreasing. With a rapidly increasing population of the country, and with the average increase of church members, the number of candidates, reported in the minutes, fluctuated between 339 and 390 and the number reported by the Board of Education, between 342 and 403, and that during several years of this period, there was an actual decrease annually reported by both authorities. It was found too, that we were not singular in this lamentable state of things. Other churches published similarly gloomy statistics. The American Education Society, representing the N. S. Presbyterians and the Congregationalists, reported only 300 candidates in 1846, a decline of 200 in five years.

Some beheld in these facts and in some other aspects of the interests of piety in our land, evidences of a general decline. It was thought that the prevalence of error in some Churches, divisions, both sectional and doctrinal, in others, and great apathy and indifference in most, if not all, augured a time of yet greater declension,—that the “power of the pulpit” had declined, and that of the Gospel was consequently on the wane. Connecting these discouraging views with the facts now presented, as to the history of Theological Seminaries, and not remembering that every consequence is not a cause; or that *post hoc* is not always *propter hoc*; they reached the conclusion, that seminary education was sapping the vitals, or at least greatly impairing the energies of the Christian Church.

We have other topics in view in this discussion, and do not feel called on to consider, very minutely, the objections to Theological Seminaries just brought forward. Those who wish to examine the matter fully, may find an article in the Princeton Review for July, 1848, which leaves but little to be said. One or two suggestions may not, however, be out of place in this connection.

Admitting that the Church had declined in all the prominent marks of prosperity, not only did the great bulk of ministers and people fail to coincide in the view of the cause assigned, but manifested the very opposite conviction, and coincidentally with the mode in which that conviction was manifested, we find a very singularly marked providential intimation that the objection was ill-founded. With the pious determination of our Church, as a whole, and in all its parts, in view of the decrease of candidates, to pray more earnestly and fervently to the Lord of the harvest for more laborers, was the renewal of efforts to increase our means of theological education, both as to the number and character of our seminaries. The endowment of Princeton had just been completed, and the decision to provide a full faculty, put into execution. Alleghany, Union and Co-

lumbia, have since been placed on the same footing; Danville has been founded, and in part, endowed. With these demonstrations of awakened interest and zeal in the matter of seminary education, a decided increase of candidates has been reported. Just now, we read of the spirited efforts of the brethren in the Northwest, to resuscitate and enlarge New Albany Seminary, and place it in a new position, on equal footing with its sister institutions.

It is, perhaps, not too much to say, that during and about the period of this decrease of candidates, the endowments of our seminaries have been increased twenty-five per cent., and the work is still prosecuted. We learn too, that no subject is brought before our people more acceptable than that of endowing these institutions of sacred learning. But some, who are so peculiarly, *acti temporis Laudatores*, in alleging the deterioration of the ministry and ascribing it to the influence of seminaries, have omitted to furnish any proof of the fact. To the able and conclusive paper already alluded to, let one statistical illustration of the contrary position be added. The large number of *vacant Churches*, and of ministers *without charge*, reported in our minutes, is adduced as an evidence that our seminaries not only fail to provide a sufficiency of ministers, but that those supplied are, in a large number of cases, so defective in qualifications, that they fail to find employment. Now, not to dwell on the facts that seminaries are not designed to *call*, but to qualify, and that there may be, in the majority of cases, other causes than that assigned for the failure to obtain employment; let us examine the statistics. In 1829 there were 507 vacant churches out of 2070, or about *one-fourth*; and 294 ministers *without charge*, out of 1393, or a little less than *one-fifth*. In 1846, of 2297 churches, 462 were vacant, about *one-fifth*; and of 1647 ministers, 256 without charge, more than *one-sixth* or nearly *one-seventh*. In 1856, the proportion of vacant churches was between *one-fifth* and *one-sixth*, and of ministers, without charge, nearly *one-eighth*. There has thus been a diminution of the evil since 1829. Though our population has doubled, we have but 100 more vacant churches, and with nearly twice the number of ministers, only 6 more without charge. Now, in 1829, the bulk of ministers in the field, about three-fourths, had been educated under the old regime, not fifteen years having elapsed since the first class was graduated in Princeton, and other seminaries having, as yet, not sent out a dozen. Now, the bulk of our ministers are the alumni of our seminaries.

Still, there are some painful facts in the present state of our Church, connected with the subject of the education of our ministers, and some of them, with this special mode of conducting that education, which we do well to ponder most carefully. However well satisfied we may be that the method we have

adopted is superior to that formerly pursued, and, however clearly convinced that our seminaries are not chargeable, as a system, with the evils whose existence may be admitted, with entire consistency, it is not wise to shut our eyes to those evils, and withhold our hands from their correction. And this is all the more important, inasmuch, as whether for weal or woe, it is very clear, we are, as a Church, fully committed to the system in question, not only as against all others, but as part of our established ecclesiastical arrangements.

There has, perhaps, never been a time when the demand for a supply of ministers was *absolutely* more urgent, and that supply, prospectively, more difficult. To say nothing of the scores of churches, of ordinary size and attractions, both moral and pecuniary, or of the scores of others, which are hardly self-sustaining, and of yet others, which are not self-sustaining; there are, at this time, among our vacant churches, at least twenty, which are earnestly calling for pastors. A dozen of them are among our city churches, ranking among the strongest and best in all the elements of church prosperity. Deaths and removals to other spheres of labor have made them vacant. They want, at least, as worthy men as they have lost, and yet some of them have been vainly seeking such for years. Then there are vacancies in less important posts, equally pressing. A Southern newspaper gives us a curious call. A church in S. C. in utter despair of success in the ordinary method, publishes its ability to sustain a pastor, and addresses this public call to any who will answer and visit the church. Now, it is true, that the number of vacant churches is not relatively so great, whether as compared with the whole number of churches, or the number of ministers without charge; but while, as already seen, this fact tends to relieve our seminaries of all implication in the premises; there is another aspect in which it occasions a reflection of mournful significance. The demand has gone on increasing with the increase of population, and though the supply has increased, it has not overtaken the demand; and then the demand has increased in *kind*, with the increase of intelligence in the community, and of intellectual qualification in the ministry of other churches, once averaging a far lower grade than our ministry, but now pressing up to them. We are far from believing that pride or vanity or commercial speculations, in which pulpit power is a commodity to be sold for cushioned pews and frescoed walls, and turrets and cornices, and mahogany and rosewood, create the demand in our cities for pastors of a high order of fitness. It may be true, that there are some qualifications peculiarly demanded in ministers, whose services are desired for the purposes intimated, but such are more easily had than men whose moral and intellectual abilities will sustain the constant demand made on them in such positions. And not

only in cities, but all over the country, the people want ministers so thoroughly furnished, that they can *preach* as well without notes, as with them; whose minds are so disciplined that they can think out of their studies as well as in them, and so stored with divine knowledge, that they can bring forth things *new* as well as old.

Now, it is patent to all men, that we are *needing* such. And when a college wants a president, or a seminary a professor, how hardly can it be supplied. Say some, take a man who cannot preach. We have many good scholars, who are poor preachers. But common sense puts in a caution in the way of suggestion, that the *faculty* of teaching is as necessary as the possession of learning, and that this faculty and that of preaching, if not the same, are very near of kin. So the best pastors are demanded, and the training of youth under decided Christian influence is felt to be so important, to our welfare as a people, and so necessary for raising up candidates, that the demand of the college must be gratified. And the training of ministers is so necessary to our very existence, (morally,) and to the perpetuity of the church, that the pastor must become the professor.

Why is it, then, that this pressure is not relieved? Passing over all mediate causes, we say, clearly and decidedly, *because the churches and parents have not cultivated high views of the ministry. The youth have not been taught to regard the office as a privilege. Low views of duty have prevailed.* But there are mediate causes, to whose illustration and exposition and removal, the whole Church should be aroused.

1. Our grade of ministerial scholarship has not been raised, as was demanded years ago. This is not the fault of seminaries, whose course of study is virtually fixed by the Church, both as to matter and quality. What would it benefit, should one or all of the seminaries, (and much less if one,) at once elevate the grade of qualification for obtaining a certificate, never so much higher than the present, when young men can leave the seminary, half furnished, at present grade, and obtain license? The examinations for licenses are often deplorably cursory. A few questions in theology and church history, fewer on interpretation and criticism, the hearing of parts of trial pieces, and all is over. The motion for sustaining is made, and though half a dozen or more faithful men would desire more time, it cannot be had. One brother "has an appointment to fill, and must soon leave;" another "hopes the young brother will improve;" another "has no doubt he has studied well at the seminary," or perhaps will go back and study again—[The blushing maiden in the corner of the pew, knows better]—and so he is licensed. Now, what any one can get is cheap, and this cheapening the qualifications for the ministry is disastrous every way. It is true, a young minister *may* study and improve

after licensure; but will he? For one that will, you will find twenty that *will* not, and for one of those that *will*, who *can*, you may find ten who cannot. Not only will the pressure of making sermons, if he *can* make them, even one a week, prevent general study, but then he has interruptions and visiting, and long rides, and perhaps, by too early marriage, has the cares of a family, and the multiplicity of little vexations, more easily imagined than named, all tending to prevent the execution of his good resolutions. But further, unless his mind has been properly disciplined, and he has *learned to study*, all the opportunities which may be enjoyed, will be of no avail. He has quit his preparatory course before he has fully learned the nature of the work required to be done. How often do young men find on taking up their books after leaving the seminary, that they hardly know how to begin. They do not even see the difficulties of the passage they undertake to interpret, and when some inkling of them has been obtained, they do not know how "to use the tools" with which they had been furnished, in order to develop the truth, and set aside difficulties, and refute error. The correction of all this is only in the hands of our Presbyteries. As some are disposed to do their duty, we would respectfully suggest the application of the rule for the examination of ministers to licentiates also.

2. This last remark suggests another great hindrance to professional advancement, which indeed is rather a specification under the last. A custom has grown up in contradiction of the letter, or certainly of the spirit of our Form of Government, according to which, a young man places himself under some Presbytery near to the Seminary, where he purposes to study, instead of retaining a connexion with that, to which he naturally belongs, described in our Form, as that "within the bounds of which *he has ordinarily resided.*" Candidates have been permitted to crowd into the Presbyteries alluded to, till the evil has become glaring. It is a difficult matter to secure a thorough examination in any case, and much more so, by a great deal, when not only the number to be examined is so much out of proportion, but the interest felt is less, as being an interest for men, hardly personally known, just seen perhaps for the first, to be the last time, by the members of Presbytery. No diligence of Professors, no legislation of Directories can cure this evil. It is vain to say the young men will be conscientious. The best men need the restraints and guidance of law.

3. While to some there seems too much of the college form of life in our seminaries, to us there is too little. The analogy of other professional schools is pleaded, in vain, in justification of the virtual relaxation of all police arrangements. If schools of law and medicine are conducted improperly, it is no reason for conducting theological schools improperly. What is there in

the change of the candidate's position from college to seminary, which should exempt him from the oversight of his teachers, or release him from a responsibility? In college he must attend chapel, and be accountable for absence from recitation. Let him escape the college examinations by absence at home or on a pleasure trip, and he will be held to a strict account. Now, why not in the seminary? The church places the professors in the seminary to teach her candidates. She gives them no authority in form to license, and plainly says, "whether you recommend young men or not, they shall be licensed." And yet if the fruits of her own handy work prove deficient or incompetent, the seminary is to blame. Now had she given them, not the power to license, but the power to honor or dishonor the candidates, as their conduct deserved, she might hold them somewhat responsible. Let the professor then be required to send circular statements of the behaviour and progress of candidates to their Presbyteries, and let the candidates be required to hold the proper natural connection with their Presbyteries, and the evils complained of will be greatly remedied. The alleged inconvenience of holding a natural connexion, by reason of the distance of Presbyteries is more easily removed than supposed. Let no young man be permitted to matriculate till he has placed himself under care of a Presbytery, and passed his initial examinations, say on experimental piety, the evidences of a call and his literary course. Then let the Presbytery *send him* to a seminary, and require of the professors a report of his demeanor and diligence, in default of having *itself* opportunities of observing him. If compelled to remain all the course, out of its bounds, the Presbytery is thus still exercising proper oversight, and on his return, can examine him on his Seminary studies. We would have the Seminary entrusted with no authority to judge of the qualifications of young men to enter its halls; but this should belong strictly to Presbyteries. Nor should the Seminary in fact, as forbidden in form, have any voice in licensing a candidate. Let there be no certificates given except of each Professor as to the student's diligence and success in his particular department. These, with the reports, would be all the Presbytery would need as data on which to found an examination, which should then be *rigid and thorough*.

4. Much has been said of the evils of too much study. Our candidates are represented, often, as mere *book-worms*, pale, emaciated, stooping, abstracted, profound on Etymologies, but ignorant of common matters, able to discourse learnedly of Hebrew roots and Greek idioms, but unable to converse fluently and profitably with the masses; competent to prepare thorough discussions of points in theology, but incompetent to condescend to men and women of weak estate. Now it is possible, that now and then, some injudiciously trained young man, whose recluse



and unsociable habits had been already formed, and who would have been dissociated from his fellows any how, may come forth from our seminaries. But, the arrangements of our church for the education of ministers, are, by no means, the cause or even occasion of such results. It must be remembered by those who are ever harping on the want of *common sense*, displayed by these, so called, profound scholars, that the article is not to be had at seminaries, or in other literary institutions. A pious worthy lady once heard a seminary complained of, because a certain young man had left it, sadly deficient in common sense. Her reply was apt and prompt: "He did not go there to learn common sense." The truth is that the social life at our largest seminaries is any other than faulty. Students can associate with each other, with neighboring families and those of the Professors, as much as they ought, and the long vacations give them abundant time for cultivating manners. The difficulty is to secure proper attention to study. And it were amusing, were the matter less grave, to look at the contrast of fact and fancy. While the wise public are mourning over the poor cloistered recluse, poring over books, and exhausting his bodily energies, in mental toil, the professor is mourning that with all his labors and earnestness he cannot wake up some of these recluses to a proper sense of their responsibility. By cultivating habits of physical indulgence, lolling and lounging, smoking and *loafing* generally, they are becoming pale, and dyspeptic, and feeble. For one man hurt at our seminaries, by hard study, we dare say twenty are hurt by hard sleeping, hard eating, hard smoking, or hard idling. These are painful facts. They do not exist because we have seminaries, but because our Presbyteries are leaving to Seminaries their own solemn duties.

5. In the public clamor, which has risen in some parts of our Church, respecting our deficiencies, many elements of dissatisfaction have been included. By some, the complaint is that our young ministers read their sermons; others, exactly opposite, find an evil in the evidences of inadequate study, furnished by the sermons of extempore speakers. Some judge that if our ministers are trained to more social habits, and would accordingly mix more with the people, they would be able to do more good; and others that they are too much in public. Whatever the nature of the *complaint*, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that there is *complaint*. And we have constantly offered various remedies for the alleged short comings of our Church. Some one proposes that the General Assembly shall prohibit the reading of sermons; others insist that the ministry would work better if better paid; others again aver, that in the want of sufficient ministerial employment, pastors ought to teach; while others again tell us that teaching is, in all cases, utterly inconsistent with ministerial duty; and so judges our "Board of Mis-

sions," as we humbly submit, very improperly. Says the Edinburgh Witness, "when men have recourse to some patent medicine, we may, as a general rule, take it for granted, not at all that they have selected the drug proper in their circumstances, but that there is really something the matter with them—their diagnosis may be a very erroneous one. On a similar principle we may infer, that there is something the matter with the churches, who are agitating this question: (of reading sermons) they feel themselves to be mysteriously unwell, and are attempting to legislate themselves into health, by putting down the practice of reading discourses, somewhat in the way that our ruder ancestors, when affected by some pining sickness they could not understand, attempted to set all right by cutting suspected old women across the forehead." These complaints and proposed remedies may all be resolved into one statement of the former, and one kind of suggestion as to the other. The statement is that our ministry are not adapted to the instruction of the people—the suggestion of remedy is in a *cure and not a prevention*. Now without granting the full measure of truth predicated of the statement, we admit there is enough to justify enquiry. While we humbly and thankfully acknowledge God's great grace in conferring on our Church the measure of success she enjoys; her inward unity and peace, and her large measure of external prosperity, it is lamentably true, that considering the means employed, the real talent of her ministry, the piety of her members, and the energy which the execution of her benevolent schemes display, the measure of success falls short of a reasonable expectation—a nett gain of about 10,000 members for over two thousand ministers, is a small result.

We submit whether we have gone far enough back for the origin of the evil. The remarks already made suggest our view of its locality. Our candidates are not *thoroughly* trained. We do not mean that, fresh from the schools, they may not answer a given set of questions—questions too, of whose general character they have already formed a shrewd and tolerably correct guess; their qualifications are not *rightly tested*. A critical exercise is demanded. It has been prepared in the study, with lexicons and grammars and commentaries at hand. A popular lecture, or exposition of scripture for popular services, is required; and it has been prepared in the same way. Now these are all very well, and great accuracy and lucid exposition are to be expected. Suppose instead of this, or rather in addition, the candidate should have assigned him, when he comes for examination, a few passages, not of the most difficult kind, and passages which had already been studied in his class room at the Seminary. Let him have a day for reflection and then come, first with his Hebrew Bible or Greek Testament, and give a critical exposition, involving of course the usual elements of such

an exposition, though we would not expect as minute criticism as in a written performance. So let him give a specimen of popular exposition, a specimen of skill, in forming the brief of a sermon. Let it be understood, that when he applies for licensure he shall also deliver an extempore sermon, as well as read a written sermon, and so when he comes for ordination. Now we take it for granted, there would be some difficulties in carrying all this into practice in those Presbyteries, where men meet one day determined to adjourn at a given time, and to neglect everything except their own pre-arranged plans. But the effect of such examinations would be to bring young men to more and better Bible study at the seminary, and prepare them to *know* what they learn. Any man may *cram* for an examination, or a sermon, but it is only one who has been thoroughly furnished, who will be a wise master builder in Zion. Farther, there are parts of study in the seminary, which are too much neglected in Presbyterian examinations. Suppose a candidate asked to give some general analysis of an Epistle or other portion of Scripture, or some general introduction to such portion, there would be a very satisfactory method of ascertaining his meetness for his office, in a most important particular.

In short, let Presbyteries keep before them the scripture account of preaching in Ezra's days. "So they read in the book, in the law of the Lord, *distinctly*, and gave the *sense*, and caused them to *understand the reading*." We are no advocates for one kind of pulpit performance alone. Davies and Chalmers and Edwards were men of great power in the pulpit, and they wrote and read or recited. Others have been equally eminent, who never wrote and never read, and some have succeeded admirably, by committing to memory unwritten compositions. Neither the excellence nor the defect has been owing to one manner or the other, but the excellence to the fact, that an earnest man with something he desired to say, said it to the people, and the defect that another has come forward with something, (prepared by some special *filling* for the nonce) about religion, and delivered *for* the people and *not to* them—or, with nothing prepared and nothing out of which to draw a preparation, has come forward to say many words, but present few thoughts.\*

\*The relations of the Board of Education to the education of our ministry, present much matter for reflection, and some solicitude. Under present management, we have no fears and no suspicions that the Board will ever occasion any difficulty by reason of the very liberal grant of power with which the Church has endowed it. On the contrary we are free to express our belief, that the entire policy of its present administration, has been such as to inspire entire confidence that the Board will not interfere between candidates and Presbyteries—still we think—and for the reason that *now* the subject can be discussed with no personal reflections whatever, the time is auspicious for expressing our thoughts—we think there need be some enquiry on such topics, as

1. Is there any necessity that the Disciplinary relations of the Board to candidates should be continued? It strikes us that the "Rules" for receiving and watching over candidates may suit well enough for a voluntary society having to do

We believe that a more thorough preparation for the ministry is demanded, so that when young men come to our pulpits, truths which have now to be first conned over and over, and matter which has now to be toilfully dug out of books, will fill their minds and fire their hearts, and with clear and accurate conceptions of what they wish to say, they will find no difficulty in so saying it, that men shall be interested and understand them.

We have left much unsaid which we designed presenting, but have already said much more than we intended. We would like some changes in the course of study in our seminaries. It is greatly to be desired, that the Hebrew language could be learned before coming to the seminary, or that the first year should be given up mainly to that study, and a fourth added to the course; that the arrangement of studies should be by departments and not classes, and that the present mere sham examinations, should be done away, and a more thorough course introduced. We would much relish the *temporary* licensure of candidates at the close of the second (or if *four*) the third year—an assignment of three months active service, and then a requisition to return to the seminary and a final examination for licensure after the close of the whole course. If the rigorous methods suggested should throw out any, it would not perhaps be an evil. “Rejected metal for swords, may make carving

with Congregational bodies. How far the principles of the A. E. Society were copied in the formation of the “Rules,” we know not. But for our part, we submit, whether the Board has properly any responsibility farther than to make a judicious disbursement of funds. The Presbytery is the proper body and the only body to attend to the qualifications of candidates. The Board should be strictly prohibited (as we believe is the case) from aiding other than candidates, and these the Board should aid as long as the Presbytery says so. The Faculties of Colleges and Seminaries, should be under no temptations to keep unsuitable young men in their ranks, by making up good reports to the Board. It is true, they might be entrusted to do the same for Presbyteries. But then Presbyteries would still have an after judgment.

2. We believe the plan suggested by the Secretary in 1849 or '50, ought to be fully carried out as to scholarships. The Board however need not be the organ for their establishment or disposition. Let each Presbytery agree to be responsible, and some of our churches also—for the income of such a number of scholarships, the proceeds of collections paying such income. Then, whenever the body subscribing the scholarships has no need for the proceeds—let them be turned over to the Board for its disposal. In this way the Board would constitute a kind of brokerage between Presbyteries with scholarships and Presbyteries with scholars. On this scheme the desired end of keeping the whole matter of training and providing for candidates in the hands of the Presbyteries, to which they “naturally belong,” would be better attained.

3. It strikes us that no relation should be constituted between indigent candidates and their Faculties, other than exists between other students and the Faculties. The Board of Education should only know that a candidate needed or deserved aid by the Presbytery.

The tendency of our present mode of operations is, by degrees to take out of the hands of Presbyteries into those of the Faculties and the Board, the entire conduct of young men, through their preparatory course. The Faculties have enough to do to teach—the Presbyteries have their part to examine. The Board should have no more to do than to receive and pay.

knives." One deficient or inefficient minister is often the means of more evil than several good ones will repair.

What we have thus given in the way of desultory hints, we trust will be taken into thoughtful consideration by our readers, and may God give us all grace to know and do all His holy will in increasing the means for extending His praise in the earth!

---

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

### THE CARTESIAN PHILOSOPHY—AND ITS AUTHOR.

RENE DESCARTES, was born in Touraine, France, in the year 1596, of an ancient and distinguished family. He died at Stockholm, in Sweden, in the year 1650, having nearly completed his fifty-fourth year. Seventeen years afterwards, his remains were removed to Paris, and deposited in the church of *Sainte Genevieve*. It was not until 1765, one hundred and fifteen years after his death, that his public eulogy was allowed to be pronounced in the French Academy. Time, the great judge of Philosophers as well as of Rulers, often destroys the opinions of the former and the work of the latter, while it scrupulously respects their glory. They often appear more illustrious amidst the ruins of their systems and their empires, than they would have done if time had respected both. This is true, in a remarkable manner of René Descartes. At the end of two centuries since his death—there are very few indeed who can be said to be his disciples, in a strict sense: and yet, perhaps, no great thinker can be found, who will not admit that but for the labours of Descartes, Philosophy could not have been what it is, and that without the knowledge of what he has done, no one can be truly said to cultivate Philosophy.

During thirty centuries preceding the era in which Descartes and so many other illustrious men appeared, we can count five or six men who thought—who created ideas. All the rest worked upon these ideas, like artisans who labour upon metals which the mines furnish them. From the age of Aristotle to the age of Descartes, two thousand years of sterility produced almost no fruits. Those immense and arid plains, even when scrutinized by such men as the prince of modern philosophers—Sir William Hamilton—hardly yield to Philosophy materials enough for land-marks across its deserts. Original thought

seemed lost, like a river swallowed up in the sands—or buried under the ground to rise again to the surface in some distant land, and beneath new heavens.

In such a condition of the human mind, there needed, once more, a man who could think: a man who could perceive what had been done,—what remained to be done—and why all progress had been suspended for so many ages. A man who had sufficient boldness to subvert—genius enough to re-construct—wisdom enough to lay sure foundations. A man able to rouse his age from the enchantment of centuries, and gathering up all that the sciences had discovered and organized in past ages, direct all their scattered forces into one single force for so great an end. A man who could see where others were blind, who could perceive the end and the way which led to it—who alone and without a guide, could pass over the vast interval in which original thought had been lost—and could carry the human mind along with him. That man appeared in a form every way unexpected. It was Rene Descartes, than whom few of the most highly gifted of our race, have had more personal reasons to lament, that the good of mankind condemned them to be illustrious.

Undoubtedly the career of this great genius was influenced, if not controlled, by the immense fermentation of the human mind—into the midst of which Providence had cast him. A great era had fallen upon the human race. Every thing was in agitation; everywhere the ancient land-marks were broken over; everywhere the sphere of human intelligence and activity was extended. The Indies and America had been discovered: Drake had circumnavigated the globe: Cortez and Pizarro had conquered new and immense countries, fabulous alike in their boundless riches, and in their strange civilization. A spirit of discovery pervaded all things and all nations; and the most prodigious changes in religion, in knowledge, and in the very structure of society, agitated and convulsed all countries. The sciences felt the shock imparted to all things. Copernicus had restored the system of Pythagoras—and taken that immense step in the system of Nature, involved in demonstrating the motion of the earth. Tycho-Brahe had perfected the theory of the planets, determined the places of a great number of fixed stars, and demonstrated the region of the comets in space. Kepler had confirmed what others had discovered, and had pointed the way to new discoveries. Galileo had made his great discoveries. The motion of the earth had been confirmed by the phases of Venus: Geometry had been applied to the doctrine of motion: the accelerated force of moving bodies had been measured: the Atmosphere had been weighed. The great Bacon had enumerated, distributed, determined the sciences themselves; and full of the instinct of genius, had felt and predicted the great future

of thought. Every thing was disposed for a great revolution in Philosophy. And when the time had fully come—then came the man also.

The training of Descartes was every way peculiar—as his endowments were every way remarkable. His earliest passion was for truth: his ruling desire, to be useful, by its dissemination. He possessed from childhood a most unquiet activity, those strange torments of genius, that void of a soul which nothing as yet satisfied, and which sought eagerly around it, for something on which to fasten. He wandered over Europe—now a soldier—now a student—now an explorer of nature. Politics, religion, philosophy, morals, pure science, medicine—every thing occupied his thoughts. He would see—he would know—he would embrace all! There are points in which all truths touch each other; he would possess these. Universal truth is but the chain of all truth as related to all; he would grasp this. He would analyze the human Spirit itself: he would follow all those elements, outward and inward, which make up the reason—the life—of man—and of peoples. And then his mood changed, and he would appropriate all his knowledge, all his meditations. He would retire from what was external—and dwell with his own soul. He would repress all the activity of sense, to augment that of thought. He would concentrate upon one point all the force of his spirit. From his youth he had eagerly pursued the mathematics—because they alone seemed to him to have adequate evidence. And upon them he rested again for a moment. But disgusted with purely abstract speculations, he returned again to the study of men and of nature. Still, in all the sciences, this great geometrician moved forward with the certitude which he derived from the science of his first love. Step by step as he advanced, he felt the necessity of emancipating himself before he could emancipate human thought: the necessity of destroying in himself, what it was his mission to destroy all around him. The revolution was at last accomplished within him—and he was trained for his work—and ready to commence it with the whole power of his vast intellect, and the immense stores of his boundless attainments.

The collected Works of Descartes, published by *Victor Cousin*, the only living name that fairly competed with Sir William Hamilton—fills eleven volumes, 12mo. They embrace an immense variety of topics; every thing, however, bearing in the same direction—pregnant with his ruling conceptions—and tributary to the great ends contemplated in his Philosophy. God, Nature, and Man, are the great objects which occupy his thoughts: thoughts perfectly free—as he supposed and designed—of all influence but that of truth reached through personal, independent, and incessant researches, pushed with all the ardour

of a sublime genius, into every department of knowledge which appeared to him to bear immediately upon those great topics. A clear history of the thoughts of this extraordinary mind, would be the outline of a history, in some sort, of whatever exists, reduced into logical order—and systematised with great simplicity and force.

His Philosophy begins by rejecting every thing—considered as positive—and in this condition of perfect emancipation and perfect freedom from bias, authority, or foregone conclusion, seeks some unquestionable basis of knowledge—some absolute starting point of all philosophical enquiry. In this universal *doubt*, where could any certain *point d'appui* be obtained? What *first truth* can be found, which may be made the foundation of all truths? Descartes found this first and undeniable truth, in the *doubt* itself. I doubt; therefore, I think; and since I think, I must exist. But by what work is this, and all subsequent truth to be recognized? By the evidence of distinct conception: since nothing can be true which is not evident—that is, which is not contained clearly, in the object we contemplate. Such is the famous *philosophic doubt* of Descartes: the first step he took to extricate himself: the first rule he established—a rule which has made a revolution in human thought. He joined analysis to doubt: decomposed questions, and divided them into different branches: advanced by degrees, from objects more simple to objects more complex; from those well known to those less understood: filled up by intermediate ideas, the interval between widely separated ideas: connected these ideas by clear and simple deductions, so as to make their mere statement serve as a demonstration. All these statements contain additional rules, which directed all his enquiries; and combined, they express the movement of his Philosophy. Logic, as he found it, he considered a mere affair of words. That of Aristotle, seemed to him, merely to define and to divide—rather than to know: that of the schoolmen, to be merely subtle—dealing in abstractions, instead of realities. He sought to create a new and interior logic, by which the understanding would be able to explain to itself its own ideas—to assure its own progress—to command, at once, the point from which it started, and the end to which it tended: which, in short, should regulate reason—and not exhaust itself in reasoning—and thus be applicable to all the sciences,—to every subject and object of knowledge. Such is a brief statement of his method.

When men know but little, they invent signs to represent ideas which they do not possess, and then call these signs knowledge. At a single *coup d'œil* Descartes saw what Metaphysics should be, according to his method. God, the soul, and the general principles of the sciences, were its objects. Newton sought for the first cause in creation: Descartes sought for it in



himself. He who came short, as a geometrician, of no man that ever lived, thought that he had found a way to demonstrate Metaphysical truths, more evident than the demonstrations of geometry. Beyond a doubt he was the first to develop perfectly the distinction between spirit and matter—and to array clearly the philosophic proof of the spirituality of the soul. And nothing in the history of modern philosophy is more famous or more acute, than his demonstration of the Being of God, from the existence of the Idea of God. Thus: we perceive in ourselves, an existence which thinks, that is, which doubts, which denies, which affirms, which conceives, which wills, which errs, and which yet combats errors. This intelligent soul is, therefore, subject to imperfections. But every idea of imperfection, supposes the idea of a being more perfect. The idea of the perfect, springs from the idea of the infinite. But whence comes this idea of the infinite? How could man, whose faculties are so limited, whose life moves in a circle so narrow, whose being is so feeble—how could such a creature embrace and conceive the infinite? Is not this idea foreign to man? Does it not suppose the existence, out of him, of a Being who is the model and fountain of it? All other clear and distinct ideas which man possesses, involve in their own existence, the possible existence of their object. The idea of one and a single perfect Being, necessarily involves the existence of its object. Our idea of God, therefore, proves that there is a God. These reasonings conducted the great thinker to other vast results, according to his method. If all created beings are an emanation of the first Being,—if all the laws which constitute physical and moral order, are but certain relations which God saw as necessary, or which he freely established: then in knowing those things which are most conformable to his attributes, we know the primitive laws of nature. Thus the knowledge of all existence is involved in that of the First Cause. It is it which gives strength to the movement of the human soul, and serves for the base of all evidence. It is it, which making us apprehend that eternal truth cannot deceive us, compels us to regard as true, all that our reason presents to us as evident.

In analysing the human soul, he observed that in his *doubt*, nothing existed but *thought*. Extension, figure, motion—had no place: *thought* alone continued unchangeably attached to our existence, in a manner absolutely inseparable. We can distinctly conceive that thought exists, without the necessary existence of anything around it. The soul conceives of itself, without conceiving of the body. Here is the insuperable distinction between a thinking being, and a material being. The universal property of the latter is extension: the universal property of the former is thought. From extension, come figure and motion: from thought, the power to perceive, to will,

to imagine. Extension, is by its nature divisible: thought is simple and indivisible. How can that which is simple, appertain to that which has innumerable parts? or how could a body composed of millions of elemental parts, form an uncompounded perception, or a unique judgment? Yet the secret union between the soul and the body, is most intimate; and it is in this strict union of principles so different and yet so connected, that the extraordinary correspondence between the movements of the one and the sensations of the other, finds its explanation. And what are all the sensations of the soul, but so many proofs to it, of its own existence? In effect, Descartes held that there was more proof of the existence of the soul than of the body. In pursuing this immense analysis,—which our limits forbid any attempt to make intelligible in a popular way—all the vast questions which have occupied the thoughts of the greatest succeeding philosophers, are treated with the clearness, the vigor, and boldness which characterize all the works of this great genius. Amongst the rest, the question of innate ideas, upon which *Locke* put forth all his strength: and the questions of the existence of matter, the manner of our knowledge of it, and the relations of our sensations and perceptions to it—which so many philosophers have considered since, and, for the most part, to so little purpose. Whoever is familiar with the speculations of *Cousin* himself upon these subjects, and with the criticisms of *Sir William Hamilton* upon the doctrines of the great French scholar, will easily admit the obligations of both of them to Descartes—even in matters touching which his own labours enabled his great successors to see more clearly than he saw himself. That, however, is nothing strange. For the principle on which *Locke* has apparently demonstrated the question of innate ideas, was well known to *Bacon*, and was perceived even by *Aristotle*. So slow is the progress of Philosophy: and so immense, for that very reason, are the claims of Descartes to be considered one of the noblest masters of that great science.

From the contemplation of God, and the analysis of the soul, the next step brought Descartes, according to his own conception of the true objects of Metaphysics, to the consideration of the general principles of all the sciences. It is here, perhaps, that this great philosopher has shown the most distinctly, how great he was. He had need almost to construct the sciences themselves, that he might subject their general principles to scrutiny, and that he might possess instruments with which those principles might be adequately tested. He may be said to have achieved both works—either of which should have made his name immortal—and both of which were undertaken merely as incidental to what he considered his higher and proper work.

Algebra had been created for many ages: but notwithstanding the progress that had been made in the cultivation of this

metaphysical geometry since its first invention by the Arabs, there remained very much to be discovered. This was the part of Descartes, who—by a kind of inspiration of genius—perfected this beautiful science—by discoveries which, even to this day the bulk of mathematicians comprehend with difficulty, if they comprehend at all. Under the analytical powers of Descartes, geometry itself made more progress than it had made from the foundation of the world. An instrument was provided, and its use pointed out, by means of which all the greatest modern discoveries have been made: by means of which in the hands of Leibnitz and Newton, and after them an illustrious band of successors, a new and sublime geometry is competent to reduce infinity itself to calculation. His treatise on *Method*, his *Geometry*, his treatise on *Meteors*, and his *Dioptrique*, appeared together in 1637, and unitedly formed his *Philosophical Essays*. He knew, in all Europe, three or four French mathematicians, two Hollanders, and two scholars in the Spanish Netherlands, who could follow him through his Geometry! The greatest of his achievements, perhaps, was his grand conception and effort towards uniting all the sciences, and making them serve to advance each other. He transferred into his logic the method of the Geometers; he used analytical logic to perfect algebra; then he applied algebra, thus perfected, to geometry; then geometry and algebra, to mechanics; then geometry, algebra, and mechanics, to astronomy. It was he who first applied geometry to physicks—and thereby created another new science. In all this immense work, he was only clearing the way, and perfecting instruments—for his proper enquiries as understood by himself: and thus armed he moved forward to explore nature and unfold the system of the universe.

It is not possible to follow his steps, through a field so vast. Give me *matter and motion*, said he, and I will calculate the universe. He began with a *coup d'œil* of the universe, and an attempt to reduce to order its inconceivable masses and quantities of matter and motion, by making some disposition of *centres*: a particular centre to each body in motion; a general centre for each system; a universal centre, around which all systems range themselves. He placed in the sun, the centre of the system to which we belong; a system with a circumference of eight hundred millions of leagues, as he calculated—counting only to the orbit of Saturn. This one great wheel of the universal system, with its centre in our sun—communicates with another, perhaps still greater,—and that with a third—and thus infinitely with the farthest bounds of space! All balance themselves and counterbalance each other, by the communication of motion—all act and react upon each other as weight and counter-weight; and the result is, the equilibrium of the universe—the equilibrium of each system—the equilibrium of our world. Then he essayed

to establish the general properties of *space*, of *matter* and of *motion*. Touching *space*, he held that, properly, there was no such thing as empty space; that matter only could act on matter; that motion communicated through void space, was impossible: and that therefore the horror which nature had of a vacuum, was real, not metaphorical, and that the universe was boundless, and every part of it filled with matter. The idea of space is necessarily connected with that of extension, and Descartes had shown that extension is the peculiar characteristic of matter; therefore, he easily concluded that matter is space—matter in some form or other—and that the universe is boundless. It remained for Newton to correct this grand error of Descartes, an error most rigorously deduced from the scientific reduction of all physical knowledge as it then stood; and which Europe received with rapture, as a solution of questions till then inexplicable. Newton saw, that the movements of the universe could not be calculated, except upon the hypothesis that they occurred in *free space*: the great law of *gravitation* was the result to which—from a different point of view from that of Descartes—his sublime genius conducted him: and he has given us a simpler—a purely mathematical, instead of a physical method of calculating the universe. Descartes was misled: nevertheless, he may be considered the author of the laws of motion, about which for thirty centuries, philosophers had hardly thought, and concerning his speculations, though his speculations were not exact—they led to such as were. Of all natural phenomena, perhaps the greatest and the most obscure is, the passing of the motion of one body into another: and before Descartes, no one had endeavored to ascertain all the laws by which motion is distributed, preserved, and destroyed—much less to generalize the phenomena, to compare the results and effects, and to extract from all the true laws. As to *matter*, he satisfied himself, upon a subject so incomprehensible as to its essence—that there existed a primitive, elementary, unique, infinitely divisible element, which is the source and principle of all beings; which is modified by motion; which may be compounded and decomposed; which vegetates and organizes itself; which becomes fluid, by the activity of its particles,—and by the repose of its particles becomes solid; whose molecules circulate incessantly, and by combining into forms, constitute all things. These conceptions of space, motion, and matter, lay at the basis of all his speculations concerning that part of his Philosophy, which embraced the third object of Metaphysics—to wit, the *general principles of the sciences*; God, and the soul, being the first two objects. In developing this third grand object—his labours were immense, and were diverted on all sides, to every department of knowledge. Often mistaken—always clear, striking, and original. His works—even where subsequent progress in knowledge and

in philosophy greatly diminishes their value—are, in every part, models of acuteness, of power, and of grasp.

There is no philosopher whose steps it is easier to follow, and whose system is easier to grasp,—wonderful as those steps all were, and vast as that system was. He began by destroying everything, in order to reconstruct everything. Then he assured himself of the nature of evidence, and of the means of recognizing it. Then he penetrated his own soul, in order to ascend to God: and from God descended to all created things: attaching to the first cause all the principles of our knowledge; simplifying those principles, to give them greater fecundity and extent; and applying them to the theory of the planets, the movements of the heavens, the phenomena of the earth, the nature of the elements, the effects of the motion of light, the organization of inanimate nature, the active life of living creatures, and ending with man, who was the object and end of all his labours. He developed everywhere those mechanical laws, he had been the first to discover: descended constantly from causes to effects; connected every thing by necessary consequences; often uniting experience to speculation, but as often supplying experience by the instincts of genius; explaining physics by geometry, geometry by algebra, algebra by logic, medicine by anatomy, anatomy by mechanics. Great, even in his errors, methodic even in his aberrations, and useful even in his mistakes, it is impossible to withhold from him the highest admiration, as one of the greatest thinkers the world has produced—or to deny to him the great glory of having exercised the greatest and the most beneficent influence upon the human mind, and upon the progress of all knowledge.

The private life of Descartes, was full of trials, cares, afflictions, disappointments, calumnies and persecutions. But what of that? Some men are born to think—not to be happy. Truth is their recompense. They live, not for themselves, but for the human race. And all generations will repay, what any generation, in its madness, may withhold, or inflict.

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

## POPISH LITERATURE AND EDUCATION.

While the Roman Empire continued, it may be said that Latin was the common tongue of the whole Western Church. But after the empire fell, the modern languages of Europe gradually formed themselves and displaced the Latin in popular use, until it remained only the language of courts and scholars. But Rome, in her fear of change and blind fondness for prescriptive things, persisted in retaining all her creeds, hymns and liturgies in the old tongue, as well as the only version of the scriptures accessible to Europeans. From Gregory the Great, near the end of the 6th century, a continued warfare was waged, until Gregory 7th, in the 11th century, finally triumphed by driving all the vernacular languages from religious worship, and imposing the formularies, with the dead language of Rome, on the whole Church. The Scriptures could only be read, even by the clergy, from the Latin vulgate. Even to this day, the prayers in which the priest leads the aspirations, or presents the wants of his people to God, are in words unknown to them. No hymn echoes through "fretted vault or long-drawn aisle," which does not hide its praise in a tongue barbarian to those who join it.

The constant policy of Rome has also been to exalt this liturgy at the expense of the preaching of the Gospel in vernacular languages. The mass is long and pompous; the sermons few, brief and trivial. The very structure of her churches betrays her contempt for this potent means of enlightening and arousing the popular mind; for they are not auditories in which to hear the words of instruction; but ghostly theatres for the display of superstitious pantomime. The altar and the chancel, the stage of the sacred mummeries, are the centre of all eyes; and not the pulpit, the pillar from which shines the lamp of life. Now the formation of a cultivated vernacular tongue is absolutely necessary to national improvement. The reason is obvious: there cannot be diffusion of thought, unless there is a language refined enough to be its medium; and the bulk of a people can never know two languages, one living and common, the other dead and learned, so well as practically to use them both. The consequence is, that when the literature of a people is in a dead tongue, knowledge is not the inheritance of the masses, but the distinction of the few; the native language of the people is left in its rudeness, and they remain as uncultivated as their speech. Hence, those who have first taught their countrymen to employ the native language of their homes and their daily life in literature, a

*Boccaccio* and *Petrarcha*, in Italy, a *Luther*, in Germany, a *Wickliffe* and *Chaucer* in England, have ever been regarded by thinking men, as high in rank among the fathers of civilization.

But what ideas and topics so kindle the activity of the mind, and crave for its teeming productions the fitting dress of a cultivated language, as the religious? Among every people, the first sentiments which attune for themselves the voice of eloquence, are the aspirations of the soul towards its God. The oldest regular compositions in the world are the inspired books of the Hebrews. The first poem in Greece was probably the *Theogony* of Hesiod. And there are no sentiments so potent to unloose the stammering tongue of an awakening people, and to form its utterance, as those proceeding from man's relations to his Maker. It is hard to conceive how Rome could have devised a more ingenious and efficient mode to prevent the cultivation of the modern languages, and thereby, of the mind of Christendom, than when she compelled all people to retain their worship and religious love locked up in a dead language. Let us suppose that she had done for every tribe to which she gave Christianity, what the primitive and Protestant Missions have done, had seized their barbarous tongues and ennobled them by making them the vehicles of holy truth and sacred worship. Europe would scarcely have known the dark ages; but the glorious day of the 16th century might have followed the declining light of the Augustan era, without an intervening night. It may be, indeed, that when the Popes thus postponed the dawn of civilization, "it was not in their hearts, and they meant not so." When they commanded all people and tongues to speak to their God and to listen to his words only in a dead language, it was in their hearts to magnify the venerable age and hoary unity of their communion. But the result is one among the numerous instances of that guilty fatality, which seems to make Rome, in all her plans and policies, the instinctive and unerring enemy of all human welfare.

She has always been the enemy of a free Bible. What Chinese, Indian, Hindu version of the Scripture, have her missionaries ever given to those on whom they conferred the fatal gift of Romish dogmas? Her priests import cargoes of relics and rosaries, puppets and pictures, missals and vestures, but no Bibles. From that day when the language of her Latin Vulgate became a dead one in Europe, to ours, in which we have seen her convulsions of helpless rage and storms of curses against the present glorious diffusion of God's Word, Rome has never willingly given to the world a Bible in a vulgar language. She has permitted a few versions, as the French of *Lefebvre*, of *Etaples*, and the English *Douay*. But it was only to countertermine the influence of Protestants. Her people are only permitted to possess these partial versions, because else they would

persist in reading the Protestant; and even her own are circulated as reluctantly as possible. No layman may read them without a license from his pastor, and no priest except at the will of his superior; and then none must dare to think on them for himself, or have an opinion of their meaning, except as his soul's masters dictate. In all her processes of education, her forms and "*fathers*" are taught in preference to the Bible; and no religious literature is desired, except the literature of superstition. The thinking man cannot but see how hostile all this is to mental improvement. The Bible is the great school-teacher of mankind; its truths are of all others the most stimulating and fructifying, and its presentation of them the most successful. They move the secret foundations of man's soul, stirring the mightiest of his hopes and fears, filling the mind with vast and ennobling conceptions of an infinite God, a perfect holiness, an immutable truth, an immortal destiny. The Scriptures present examples of the most forcible reasoning, the grandest eloquence, the most burning animation, the sweetest poetry, the most tender pathos, and instances of most admirable virtue and goodness. In one word, they bring the mind of their reader into contact with God's, not mediately, as Rome would have it, through the dim, deformed transmission of a murky, human soul: but face to face. What education can equal it? In opposing an open Bible, Rome shows herself the great enemy of popular intelligence. The results of the Reformation illustrate this charge, by contrast. Wickliffe, "the morning star of the Reformation," introduced the dawn by his English New Testament. One of Luther's first acts was to give the Scriptures in German to his countrymen; and this great work, with the attendant discussions, gave form to that language, as a vehicle for literature, and generated a nation of readers.

But more, while Rome makes religious discussion the privilege of the hierarchy, Protestantism makes it the right and business of every man. Hence, its very nature is an appeal from the ghostly throne beneath which the conscience and reason lay crushed, to the great tribunal of the common understanding. The audience to which it speaks, is the whole race. It restores to every man his spiritual liberty, and thereby his responsibility; it urges upon him the great issue between his soul and his God, and in urging, it elevates every man who will hearken, to the level of his immortal destiny. Hence, the first work of the reformers, was to throw open the Bible, create a popular religious literature, and invite all Europe to the work of examination, and thereby of self-education. To see how much the popular intelligence owes to this; imagine that our venerable English version were blotted out of existence, and along with it, all the noble thought which it has stimulated in Britain and America: and that in its place we had the corrupt, cunning Douay version of



a corrupt Latin translation, only here and there in the hands of a priest or layman, whose superstition was known to be so dense as to permit no risqué of its illumination.

The Popish prohibition of free enquiry and private judgment in religion is, if possible, still more fatal to the mind. The Council of Trent ordained that no one should presume to understand the Scriptures, except according to the doctrines of Rome, and the unanimous consent of her Fathers. Rome enjoins on her children an implicit faith, which believes on authority without evidence. The faith of the Protestant is an intelligent conviction, the result of the free and manly exercise of the faculties God gave him, guided by divine fear and help. The Papist collects the *dicta* of Fathers and Councils, only to wear them as shackles on his understanding. The Protestant brings all *dicta* to the test of reason, and still more, of that *Word*, to which his reason has spontaneously bowed as the supreme and infallible truth. Rome bids us listen to her authority and blindly submit; Protestantism commands: "Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good." Happily the prohibition of private judgment is as impossible to be obeyed as it is absurd. In the very act of commanding us not to think for ourselves, Rome invokes our thought to comprehend the proofs of her command. In the very breath with which she tells us not to reason, she calls upon reason to understand the justice of the prohibition. In truth, the exercise of private judgment, is the exercise of thought; for if the mind is to think at all, it must be its own free thoughts which it produces. If I see at all, it must be with my own eyes: and in such shapes and colors as they of themselves reveal to me. To command me to see only with the eyes of another, is to make me blind. And so, the attempt to banish private judgment from religion is an attempt to make man cease to think, or in other words, to reduce him on that subject below the level of a rational being. If it were successful, man would no longer be a religious being, but a clever brute. And this is indeed, the very ideal of that result in which Rome would most delight; to make men a docile herd of human beasts, incapable of insubordination, yet apt and skilful above other animals to toil for the pampering of her lordly luxury and pride. Nor is this mental bondage limited to sacred learning; it is also inculcated in secular studies, lest perchance the habit and spirit of free thought formed in the domain of human science, should invade that of theology. The confines of every realm of thought are overspread with darkness, lest some side light should gleam upon the foul delusions of her spiritual tyranny, revealing them to her victims. By how many odious restrictions, censorships, inquisitions and tortures, is this despotism over thought sustained? How many prisons, racks and faggots, have been employed to crush the freedom of the mind?

To Rome belongs the diabolical pre-eminence above all pagan priesthoods, and political despots, of punishing with the direst death which the human frame can endure, the crime of being too wise and truthful to believe all her absurdities. The Index of Prohibited Books, a stout volume composed of the mere titles of the works she has proscribed, gives curious evidence of her instinctive hatred of all human intelligence. For we find there, not only all the great works of her assailants, as we would expect, but of nearly all the great masters who have extended the domains of knowledge. Whether they wrote of Philosophy, Geography, History, Poetry, Rome could not forgive them the attempt to ennoble the minds which it was her purpose to enslave. When we read in the Index such names as these, which a few minutes search has collected, Bacon, Cudworth, Descartes, Hume, Kant, Villers, Malebranche, Leibnitz, Locke, Bentham, Grotius, Bayle, Basnage, Burnet, Hallam, Mosheim, Brucker, Robertson, Selden, Sismondi and MILTON, does it not seem as though Rome had designedly proclaimed herself the patroness of ignorance, by arraying against herself all that is most glorious in human intellect? To repress the free activity of the mind in religion, is the most effectual mode to curb all expansive thought in every department. The truths of religion are the most pervasive and stimulating of all others. Christianity sits as queen and directress of all man's exertions, controlling ever duty, modifying every relation, influencing every interest of humanity, ennobling and fructifying every speculation. The conscience is the central power of the soul, so that he who is fettered there, is a slave in his whole being. When the conscience is chained, there can be no free development of the faculties by bold and manly exercise. The Reformation, says Guizot, was in its mental character, but the insurrection of the human mind against the mental oppression of Rome which had weighed so heavily on the irrepressible activity of thought, as to provoke a resistless reaction. How beneficent the impulse which every science and every institution received from that great movement. Roman Catholicism itself was roused by the collision into a reaction, to which is due nearly all the subsequent activity, which has rescued it from stagnating into barbarism. The attempt may be made to refute these conclusions, by pointing to the many illustrious men, who, living and dying in the Romish communion, have helped to adorn every department of knowledge, human and divine; or by boasting of a few great *entrepôts* of science in the old foundations of Popish Europe. "Was it not a son of the Holy Mother Church," it may be asked, "who first taught us the true theory of the stars? Was it not a Papist who gave to Europe a new world? Were they not Papists who exhumed the Greek and Latin Classics out of the dust of the middle ages,

and who have since produced the best editions of all the works of Christian antiquity? Did not Papists invent gunpowder, the art of printing, the mariner's compass, the galvanic machine? Yea, were not the very reformers themselves, in whose pretended light and learning Protestants so much glory, reared in the bosom of Popery; and did they not acquire in her schools the knowledge which they ungratefully turned against her. How then can that system be justly charged as the mother of ignorance, from beneath whose patronage have proceeded the most glorious elements of human progress?" This is our reply: True, the human mind, thanks to its benevolent Creator, has a native activity which despotism cannot crush, however it may curb it. It may be that Rome has been so far aware of this as not to attempt an impossibility, (except once, when her judicial blindness provoked the triumphant insurrection of the Reformation). It may be that she has permitted or encouraged certain forms of mental activity, even to a high degree of cultivation, as a safe outlet for the indomitable elasticity of man's spirit, selecting those forms which were least important to his true welfare, in order that she might be able to suppress the more precious and fruitful exertions of the mind with sterner force. But these instances of mental activity in her subjects have not been because of, but in spite of her influences. But for the baleful paralysis of that system they would have been a hundred fold more; and Papists have usually made their happy exertions just in proportion to the weakness of the hold which Romanism had upon their real spirit, and modes of thought.

It is true again, that the innate energies of some great souls among Papists have prompted them to attempt and accomplish mental exploits of high emprise, but Rome has usually resisted their exertions, and punished their success. *Roger Bacon*, the inventor of gunpowder, *was* a Papist; but the reward which his Church apportioned him for his chemical knowledge, and spirit of free enquiry, was a long imprisonment in a monastery on the charge of magic. *Reuchlin*, another son of Rome, introduced to Europe the long lost treasures of the Hebrew literature. This is true; and his Church so appreciated his labors as to prompt the German Emperor to order the burning of all the Hebrew books in the realm, and the great scholar's pupils were nearly all found in the next generation among the Protestant reformers. *Erasmus*, also was a nominal Papist, who published the first critical edition of the Greek New Testament. But his work provoked a general howl of contumely and curses from the priests and monks of all Europe, some of whom charged him with committing thereby the sin against the Holy Ghost. Columbus did indeed "give to Castile and Leon a new world," but his theory of geography was the mock of all the Popish clergy and doctors of Ferdinand's court, so that it was impossible

for him to secure patronage for his enterprise, till the womanly piety of Isabella was moved in his behalf. *Galileo*, also was a son of Rome, that great man, who revolutionized astronomy and mechanics, who first made the telescope reveal the secrets of the skies, and thus prepared the way for that wondrous science which, among its other beneficial results, has taught the mariner to mark his beaten track across the pathless ocean, thus making possible the gigantic commerce of our century. How did Rome reward him? She made him languish in her inquisition, till he was bowed to the shame of denying the truth, of which the demonstration was his glory.

And this Index of prohibited books, is found crowded with the names, not only of heretics, but with a part of the works of nearly all Rome's own sons, whose genius or learning has illuminated her history: a proof that their improvements were the offspring of fruitful nature, borne in despite of the novercal envy of Holy Mother Church. Upon the fact that so many of the benefactors of human knowledge, including even the reformers, were reared under Rome, it may be said, so have the greatest liberators been ever reared under despots. Harmodius and Aristogeiton under Pisistratus, Brutus under Tarquin, the Maccabees under Antiochus, Tell under Rudolph of Hapsburg, Hampden, Pym and Cromwell under the Stuarts, and our own Washington under George 3d. With as much reason might we argue hence, that despotism is the proper soil to nourish liberty, as infer from the instances of freedom of thought under Rome, that they were her proper gift to the human mind. And finally, it is not a handful of particular cases, which proves a general law,—“One swallow does not make a summer.” When we inquire for the general influence of a system, we consider not the few exceptions which exist under it, but the condition of the masses.

We trust this discussion has educed principles which, among other valuable applications, will enable us to value at their proper worth, the merits of Roman Catholic education and scholarship. Ever since the Reformation urged the human mind forward on its great career of improvement, Rome has perceived that Christendom will no longer endure the shackles of ignorance in which that tyrant church would be best pleased to bind the mind, and that men will no longer permit the boon of knowledge to be plucked openly away. Hence she has adopted the policy of *countermining* the intelligence which she fears, by becoming the patroness of a pseudo-education. And she has committed the management of this policy especially to the Order of Jesus, the most slavish, and most thoroughly popish of all papal societies. Hence, the eager activity of this order in the establishment of colleges, especially to catch the children of Protestants; hence, the boasts of superior scholarship, which

have deceived many unthinking and ill-informed men. The treachery of all their pretended zeal for letters is betrayed by this question even. Why does it exhaust its efforts on providing for the education of *our* sons, and the sons of other similar Protestant States, who least need their help, while the benighted masses of Ireland, Spain, Italy, the Danube are left unenlightened? Why expend their exclusive exertions to educate Heretics, while so many of the sons of their own Church sit in Bœotian night? We *suspect* this over-generous zeal: we fear lest this education which they offer be the gift of another Trojan Horse.

Our good, unsuspecting Protestants have especially been gulled by pretensions of peculiar classical and linguistic accomplishments. It is claimed that their Latinity for instance, is to the best attainments of Protestant Schools, as Hyperion to a Satyr. "Their pupils do not merely stumble through a slow translation of a Latin sentence: they can talk Latin. So thorough is their learning that the higher classes actually receive lectures in philosophy in that learned tongue." But look beneath the surface; that fluency is but the recitation of a parrot, accompanied with no thorough apprehension of grammatical principles, and leading to no awakening of thought. These Latin lectures on Philosophy are but the slow mechanical dictation of some miserable syllabus of the contracted antiquated bare-bones of scholastic pedantry. It does not suit the purpose of Rome or Jesuits to do that which is the true work of mental training: teach the mind to think for itself. That habit, so deadly to the base-pretensions of the hoary deceiver, once learned in the walks of secular literature, would be too probably carried into the domains of theology. Hence, the Jesuits policy is, to form in secular learning the desired mental temper of servile docility, inordinate respect for authority and impotence of independent thought, so that even Mechanics, Optics, Chemistry, must be taught by the memorizing of *dicta*, not by the exercising of the understanding in their investigations. Then, if to this servile temper there can be added any accomplishments, by which the bondage of the mind can be concealed, and a false éclat thrown upon the church, they think it is very well. The policy of Rome in her education is that of the lordly Roman slave-owner towards his bondsmen. To promote the amusement, the interest, or the pomp of their lords, slaves were trained to be masterly musicians, scribes, rhetoricians and even poets and philosophers; but still they must exert their attainments only for their masters. And so would Rome lay hold on our children, the sons of freemen, of free America, and make them only accomplished slaves. But above all does their system sap the very foundations of virtue and nobleness. It substitutes an indolent and weak dependence on authority, for honest convic-

tion, and policy for rectitude. It poisons the health of the moral being. He who is spiritually enslaved, is wholly a slave: every noble faculty is benumbed by the incubus of spiritual tyranny, and the soul lies prone in degradation.

---

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

### PARADOXES OF THE GOSPEL.

---

There are two elements in religion, both of which must be constantly cultivated, if we would have clear views of its nature, or habitual satisfaction of mind in resting on the whole compass of its truth. On the one side, is God himself;—that perfect, divine and all-pervading element, infinite both in truth and force, and infinite also in incomprehensible mystery. On the other side, is man,—ourselves—that frail, and erring element, which it is our first necessity to comprehend, not only of itself and positively, but also relatively to God, and so to the very object of religion itself,—as God is its very source. These two elements are to be admitted in every part of every practical view of religion: and every theoretical view of it, must bring its results into some form that will bear to confront the settled truths of each of these elements, considered both jointly and separately.

It is the extreme difficulty of doing this,—indeed in some most important respects the apparent impossibility of doing it, which begets what we call, for want of a better name, the *Paradoxes of the Gospel*. Those double results, which are so numerous and so capable of perplexing us; some of which, God has solved and united with such sublime light; some of which men dispute over interminably; multitudes of which superficial minds never trouble themselves to consider. Two things appear to us to be clear concerning all of them. The first is, that they are all to be found located along that line, in which the divine and the human elements in religion, at once unite and are separated; and therefore all belong, not so much to a separate consideration of any particular part of religion, as to a general estimate of religion as a system. The second is, that the only method of their solution, is the application to them of a simple evangelism—and a thorough philosophy, combined: for the lack of which, on the one side or the other, there is some-

times found so much extravagance, and at others so much shallowness, in the mode in which the most important truth is stated.

It is extremely obvious that the success of our attempts to solve these Gospel Paradoxes to our own satisfaction, must have a controlling influence upon the tenor both of our systematic belief, and of our spiritual life. For, on the one side, it is an inexorable demand of the human intellect, that there must appear to it to be a pervading order and coherence in all that it recognizes as truth and knowledge; to effect which, it will steadfastly labour upon all the parts and proportions of all truth; and till it has accomplished what satisfies it, is only the more eager and anxious, in proportion as its love and pursuit of truth are the more thorough and absorbing. And on the other side, the inner life of man cannot be nourished with inconsistent and contradictory, with empty and inconclusive things, any more than his poor tabernacle of clay can be fed by husks; any more than it can be fed by jewels: but the soul lives by a nurture, various and deep in its exquisite assimilation—and it pines when its heavenly food is heterogeneous, either in itself, or with regard to it.

We often speak of the difficulties of religion as presented in the works of infidels and heretics. But they are not worthy to be so much as once thought of, when placed by the side of the difficulties which the soul of the true believer has mastered. Satan does not reveal his strength to his willing followers. The spirit which rests in the shallow doubts which outlie the wide frontiers of divine truth, never approaches the real problems over which the heart agonizes, and before which the intellect recoils. If the inward struggles of any earnest Christian spirit in the progressive development of its divine life, were distinctly recorded, so that they could be carefully considered by others; they would show nothing more clearly than the utter insignificance and hollowness, the pitiable ignorance and baseness, of the common pretexts of unbelievers. These great spiritual battles are fought around and within these citadels,—these strongholds of God, in each one of which is entrenched one of these great Gospel Paradoxes. And if our eyes were opened so that we could see at one glance the whole van-guard of the church militant, we should behold encamped around, or lodged within these very battlements, the chief captains of the army of the Lord; some safely and serenely reposing on the bosom of Christ, having won the great victory; some discomfited, yet still renewedly girding themselves for the life battle; some calmly watching and pondering, till the signal falls for a new onset; some in the very heat and desperate grapple of the imminent, deadly breach! Who can pass his eye, even in thought, around their glorious works, without wonder, and love, and joy; with-

out perceiving, under a new aspect, the high communion of the redeemed of God—in this form of their union with, and in Christ!

It is a fatal error to imagine, that we gain anything, either in the power or the distinctness of our spiritual experience, by avoiding these sublime meditations. And it is another error not less fatal, to suppose that the Gospel is commended to the soul of man, by our poor attempts to lower the terms of these grand paradoxes, on one side or the other, or on both. The difficulty is not created by the Gospel; it lies in the infinite nature of the case—and in the eternal nexus wherein God stands related to his own universe. As we have intimated before, so much of the difficulty as can be solved at all, can be solved only through the most intense application of the plan of salvation, to the most profound realities of the case: a result to which all superficial philosophy and all shallow evangelism, unitedly or separately, are utterly incompetent. Open them, as bottomless chasms, across the pathway to eternity; pile them up as impassable mountains, in the way toward the New Jerusalem: and then you will not only tell the whole truth,—but you will so tell it, that the soul of man can both understand and believe it. It is after that, only, we can know,—or that we care to know, how these mountains can be brought low, these vallies be filled, these rough places be made smooth, these crooked ones become straight, and a highway be made for the Lord and for his redeemed!

And after all, it is not by means of the reasoning faculty, that man escapes perdition. Our faith does not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God. It is with the heart that man believeth unto righteousness. It is not merely—nay it is not even chiefly—upon the understanding of man, that the power of God's grace manifests itself, in the new creation; and so it is not mainly, much less merely, by means of philosophy,—no matter how pure and deep, that God can be fully comprehended, much less embraced. How do men blush, when they know God, at the bare thought of the unspeakable folly and littleness,—of their former cavils against the grand truths of the Gospel,—nay, against the Gospel itself—when they were spiritually dead? On the other hand, how many are there, who never questioned a single one of those glorious truths, nay, who saw and received them all separately in their power and their simplicity, as a mere light, but who, at the same time, did not, and knew all the while that they did not, receive a single one of them, in the divine love, and the divine power thereof—much less in the unction and fulness of the divine proportion of them all? The things of the Spirit, must be spiritually discerned, if they are to produce any spiritual effect. And we must content ourselves to accept only the sense of the letter that killeth, and perish therein;



or we must be born again. And then we must content ourselves, again, with such growth as is possible from the nourishment of each simple truth accepted by itself; or if we would go on to perfection, we must be strengthened with might in the inner man. The power in the understanding, and the power in the soul,—the philosophy and the evangelism, by which the proportion of faith itself becomes the grandest of all powers, next after the immediate power of God's Spirit; these are all spiritual powers—in the absence of which all the Paradoxes of the Gospel—must remain utterly incomprehensible to man. In their presence, most of them are capable of a solution *felt* to be complete, and generally capable of being clearly expressed. And such as are not yet mastered by us, are *felt* to be, not contradictions, but the sublimest truths; whose reversal would disorder the universe, and derange the very foundations of universal knowledge; but whose solution lies in some exalted generalization, higher up in the bosom of God, than our poor measure can yet attain.

---

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

## THE LAST PROPHECY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

---

The Christian who looks for his Lord to come again, dwells with peculiar interest upon the vision of the Seer of Patmos, so full of promises, to have their fulfilment in, and after His coming. Especially does he delight to meditate upon the closing chapters, the glorious description of that wonderful City, "coming down from God out of Heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband;" and if he has not suffered all the meaning to be spiritualized out of these passages, they are to him as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. Above all, the last words of the great King, "Behold, I come quickly: and my reward is with me: surely I come quickly"—are the grand climax of all prophecy, and the ready utterance of the Christian's heart, is "Amen! Even so, come Lord Jesus!"

So the Jew doubtless, found peculiar comfort and consolation in the last words of Malachi. The promised advent of a glori-

ous Messiah, was also the promise of their triumph over His enemies, and theirs. "And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet, in the day that I do this, saith the Lord of Hosts."

The consideration of the last two verses of this book, is the purpose of the present article. These contain a remarkable prophecy concerning the Prophet Elijah. "Behold I will send you Elijah, the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord; and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse."—Malachi IV: 6. This prediction, so suddenly announced, reminds us of the first mention of this wonderful man, in I Kings, XVII: 1. "And Elijah, the Tishbite, who was of the inhabitants of Gilead, said unto Ahab, as the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew, nor rain, these years, but according to my word!" Thus, abruptly, is the very most remarkable man of Old Testament history, brought upon the stage, charged with a tremendous message to the wicked king—and from this announcement, to the date of his translation, we find all his acts and words manifesting the same stern, uncompromising spirit;—the spirit of a man, "very jealous for the Lord God of Hosts." And although his history is so short, and so meager, yet the mighty power of God is more strikingly shown, in the doings of Elijah, than in those of any other man since Moses. Fed by ravens by the brook Cherith, and drinking its waters until the dreadful drought he had threatened, dried up the brook, then sustained by the widow of Zarephath, until the three and a half years of drought were past. He destroys the priests of Baal, and takes that miraculous journey to Horeb, where God talks with him. Years afterwards, in the reign of Ahaziah, we find him calling down fire from heaven to consume the king's messengers, then after rebuking Ahaziah for his impiety in enquiring of Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, and predicting his death, he is taken into heaven by a whirlwind.

We have been particular to enumerate all the acts of this prophet, because we do not believe that this prediction of Malachi was fulfilled in the coming of John the Baptist; and although we may not be able to throw much light upon this obscure and very difficult prophecy—we think we *can* show that its fulfilment is still future.

I. The very terms of the prophecy forbid its application to John the Baptist. The coming of Elijah, is apparently immediately to precede the "great and dreadful day of the Lord"—the day which shall burn as an oven, and in which, all that do wickedly shall be burned up;—perhaps the day so often promised in the New Testament, when the King of Kings shall come with clouds, and when all the wicked shall be destroyed by the

brightness of his coming; or more probably, a still later day—"after the thousand years are finished, and the books are opened," and the dead, small and great, stand before the great white throne.

Will any one say that the day whose dawning was announced by a multitude of the heavenly host, singing that great new song "glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men"—the day in which was "born in the city of David, a Saviour, who was Christ the Lord"—was this great and dreadful day of the Lord? and if it was not, then John the Baptist, who was the forerunner of Christ, was not Elijah.

II. Accordingly, when the Pharisees ask John, "art thou Elias? he saith, I am not." John I: 21. He denies it, as emphatically as he denies being "the Christ." Shall we say that John was ignorant of his mission and office? or, that he whose illustrious testimony concerning Jesus was, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," should have borne false testimony concerning himself? Or, that he, who our Lord says, was "*more than a prophet*," should have been the only man in Israel, who did not know that the Scripture said "Elias must first come?" He knew what Isaiah said about the announcer of the Messiah, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord." And he distinctly claims to be the fulfiller of this prophecy, and nothing else.

III. There is no correspondence, either in character or works, between Elijah the Tishbite, and John the Baptist. As we have already seen, the life of the former, so far as recorded, was a succession of miracles, whereas, "John did no miracle." John X: 41. John was sent to bear witness of the Light, to preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Elijah's mission seems to have been mainly, to call down fire from heaven to destroy his enemies—to slay four hundred and fifty priests of Baal, to predict the most terrible judgment from God upon sinners, but never to preach repentance—never to promise remission of sins. Elijah's testimony is "the dogs shall eat Jezebel by the ditch—Him that dieth of Ahab in the city, the dogs shall eat, and him that dieth in the field, shall the fowls of the air eat"—John's testimony is, "Behold the Lamb of God!"

It is a little remarkable that in all our Bibles furnished with marginal readings and references, the only passage in the history of John, which in the estimation of the reference makers seemed to resemble the history of Elijah, is Matt. III: 4. "And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins." The corresponding passage in the Old Testament is II Kings I: 8. "He was a hairy man, and girt with a girdle of leather about his loins—and he said it is Elijah

the Tishbite." We suppose this is hardly sufficient to establish the identity of the two persons.

IV. In the last place, in the way of direct proof, our Lord himself during the time of His ministry upon earth, and after the death of John the Baptist, distinctly asserts that this prophecy in Malachi should *be* fulfilled: "and Jesus answered, and said unto them, Elias truly *shall* first come, and restore all things," Matthew XVII: 11. We have the same words in Mark, "Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things," Mark IX: 12. This "restitution of all things," whatever it may mean, is undoubtedly the work ascribed to Elijah the prophet, in the last words of Malachi; because the *coming* of Elijah is predicted nowhere in the Old Testament, except in these last two verses of Malachi's prophecy, and therefore, the Scribes *must* have referred to this Scripture, when they said "Elias must first come." It is also undoubtedly the same "restitution of all things," predicted by Peter, in Acts III: 21, where it is evidently associated with the second coming of Christ; an event which *most* Christians think is still future.

From the foregoing, we might infer that the question was settled, and if there were no other Scriptures upon this subject, we might rest the case here. But there are three texts in the Gospel which apparently apply this prophecy to John; and we propose to consider them in order.

The first is Luke I: 16, 17, "and many of the Children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God, and he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient by the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." This text is a portion of the address of the Angel Gabriel to Zacharias, foretelling the birth of John, and is certainly the *most* formidable objection to the theory we have advanced. The heavenly messenger, not only mentions the name of the prophet Elijah, but uses the identical words of Malachi, "to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children." If we were arguing merely for victory, we should probably make it convenient to ignore this passage; but as our only object is the discovery of the truth, we will candidly admit all its difficulties and only endeavor to show that it does not necessarily disprove our deductions in the former part of this article.

In the first place, therefore, the Angel does not assert that the son of Zacharias should fulfil the prophecy in Malachi. He was to "go before him, in the spirit and power of Elias;" but the conditions of Malachi's prophecy cannot be met except in the personal appearing of Elijah himself, any more than the conditions of the prediction in Malachi IV: 2, could be fulfilled without the personal appearing of the "Sun of Righteousness himself." We cannot say that John, upon whom rested the

spirit and power of Elias, was *therefore* the Elijah of Malachi, any more than we can say that Paul, who was led by the spirit of Christ, and who raised the dead by the power of Christ, was "this same Jesus who should so come in like manner," &c. Acts I: 11.

In regard to the second part of this verse, "to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children," &c., the reference undoubtedly seems to be to this identical passage in Malachi; and we confess in advance, our want of *entire* satisfaction with the explanation we offer. Indeed if it were not for John's positive and reiterated denial of his own identity with Elijah, and for the promise of our Lord, that Elijah should indeed come, (after John was beheaded) we should be absolutely *compelled* by this text, to accept John as the Elijah of Malachi. To reconcile these apparent contradictions, we offer however, the following considerations:

Whatever may be included in the "turning of the hearts of the fathers to the children," John did not, in fact, do the thing. It was his work, just as it was his mission to preach repentance and remission of sins, but there were multitudes, doubtless, who heard his preaching and who did *not* repent, and whose sins were *not* remitted. Malachi says, when Elijah comes "he *shall* turn the hearts of the fathers to the children." He is not only to proclaim his mission but to accomplish the work. During our Lord's personal ministry, how few in number were His disciples, yet it is recorded that He made more than John. It cannot therefore be said, that John did, in reality, "turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, or did restore all things" as prophesied of Elijah.

The Angel's announcement to Zacharias seems to have direct reference to the prophecy in Isaiah. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord," &c. Isaiah XL: 3, as well as to the prediction in Malachi—the last clause of Luke, I: 17, being apparently a reiteration of the passage in Isaiah, "to make ready a people, prepared for the Lord." It is worthy of notice that the prophecy of Isaiah, which is so full of "predictions concerning the Messiah, and which so particularly and circumstantially describes His birth and office, His life and death, does not in any place mention the name of Elijah. The text in the 40th chapter, which we have just quoted, was undoubtedly fulfilled in the coming of John the Baptist, and is applied to him in all the Gospels.

The other texts which seem to apply the prophecy to John are Matthew XI: 14, "and if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come;" and Matthew XVII: 12, "But I say unto you that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, &c.," and the corresponding passage in Mark's gospel IX: 13, "Elias is indeed come," &c. In all these places, our Saviour is

speaking of John the Baptist, and we will confine our remarks in the remainder of this article to the consideration of these only, with their immediate contexts.

So much has been written and said during the past fifteen or twenty years, about the meaning of the phrase "Kingdom of Heaven," that we will not weary ourselves and our readers with a repetition of the various and conflicting views, which have been expressed on the subject. Perhaps we may say, that none of them have been entirely satisfactory. For our present purpose it will be sufficient to assert, that there are *some* places in the New Testament, where these words refer to a dispensation which is still future, and we suppose this fact will be admitted by disputants at both extremes of the Millennarian controversy.

If this be true, we may confidently affirm that three of these passages, are the texts and contexts, to which we have just referred, viz: the 11th and 17th of Matthew, and the 9th of Mark. In the first of these, we have an account of the interview between our Lord and the messengers of John the Baptist, and the subsequent discourse of our Saviour to "the multitudes concerning John;" and we think we shall be able to shew, that this remarkable chapter furnishes, not only the proof of our theory concerning the prophecy under consideration, but also a triumphant vindication of the general doctrine of the Millennarian.

That the universal expectation of the Jews, during the interval between the last predictions of the Old Testament, and the death of Jesus, was the coming of a great temporal Prince of the House of David, is so manifestly true, that we will not stop to argue the point. Indeed, those of us who venture to think that our King will surely one day occupy the throne of His father David—according to the Scriptures—are accused of "Judaizing" all the Gospel away. It is not probable that John was an exception to the rule. Languishing in his prison, and "trusting that Jesus was He which should redeem Israel;" and knowing that his prison doors would be opened so soon as this "Reign of Heaven" should be set up on the earth, and the glorious predictions in reference to this kingdom immediately accomplished. What marvel that he should send two of his disciples with the question which expressed the longing desire of his heart: "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" As if he should say: "Did I not see the Spirit descending from Heaven like a dove, and abiding upon Thee, and seeing this, I bear record that Thou art the Son of God; and as Thou art the Son of David—the Son of Abraham,—(Matthew II: 7)—and therefore the inheritor of David's throne—and that seed in whom all nations should be blessed—and as Abraham's seed, the rightful possessor of this goodly land. Oh, why dost Thou not take to Thee thy great power and reign!"

And the reply of our Lord corresponds with John, V: 36. "I have greater witness than that of John." He tells the messengers to "go and show John these works of mine, which ye do hear and see,—the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the vile are evangelised;" as if He should say,—"Tell John that these mighty works of mine do more manifestly proclaim my kingly power than any testimony of his can do. Bid him remember that I have to accomplish the redemption of my elect, before I ascend my father David's throne; and, therefore, now, I am meek and lowly, despised and rejected, and doomed to die an accursed death; but tell him that day shall verily come when I shall reign gloriously, and *in* that day he shall know the blessedness of him, who is not offended in me *now*."

As the messengers departed, Jesus begins the discourse to the multitude concerning John, and applies to him the prophecy in Malachi, III: 1.—"Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee;" which prophecy, by the way, seems only to be a renewal of that in Isaiah; and then, as if His interview with John's disciples had furnished the occasion of the remark, He immediately speaks of this "Kingdom of Heaven," and declares that, illustrious as was John the Baptist, who was a "burning and shining light," greater than any born of women, yet the least illustrious of those glorified Saints who should be included in that kingdom, should be "greater than he." The translation of the 12th and 13th verses, in our version is, perhaps, not free from error. Might not the passage be paraphrased thus? "Concerning this Kingdom of Heaven the law and all the prophets prophesied; and since the days of John the Baptist, (who continually cried, repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven *is at hand!*) this kingdom preseth violently upon you; and if ye will receive it, (this kingdom,) this John *is* Elias which was to come;" or, "if ye had received it, this would have been Elias which was to come."

And how royally does He conclude his discourse—how like the terrible King of Kings, the Lion of Judah,—"But whereunto shall I liken you. John came, neither eating nor drinking, and ye say of him—He hath a devil. I came, eating and drinking, and your testimony concerning me, is—behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber. Oh, deceitful and rebellious cities, who have rejected your rightful Prince, though He came accredited with mighty works—works which would have brought Sodom and Gomorrah, Tyre and Sydon to repentance, know ye, that it shall be more tolerable for these desolated monuments of my waked wrath, in the day of judgment, than for you! Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida!"

It has been often said, that the holy angels must have been filled with wonder at the rejection of Jesus Christ, by the men of

that generation; and but for our familiarity with the story of His life, we also should doubtless be at a loss to account for the blindness which prevented the Jews from recognizing their King. The majesty of His person could not be hidden by the circumstances of poverty and humiliation that surrounded Him. The key to the mystery is furnished in the 26th verse of this chapter, "even so Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight."

How infinitely precious are the concluding sentences of this chapter, to those who love His adorable name: "Come unto me all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Gracious words! to proceed out of the mouth of the King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

The only other texts which apparently apply Malachi's prophecy to John, are in the 17th chapter of Matthew, and the 9th of Mark. Both of these contain an account of the Transfiguration, and both agree substantially with the description of the same event in Luke, 9th chapter. The latter, however, contains no allusion to the question and answer respecting the coming of Elias.

A cursory examination of these three portions of scripture, will reveal two facts of considerable importance to the right understanding of the words of our Lord in Matt. XVII: 12: "But I say unto you that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed; likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them." In the account given by Mark, the same things are stated, but in a different order; "and he answered and told them, Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things; and how is it written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at nought; but I say unto you, that Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him." Mark IX: 12, 13.

The first fact that we notice is this; the immediate *occasion* of this scene on Mount Tabor, is the noble confession of Peter, "thou art Messiah, the Son of the living God." As we have already seen, the Jews obstinately refused to accept Jesus as their Messiah, because they knew no Messiah, but a great Prince, who should deliver them from all their enemies, and reign personally over them; and there can be no doubt but that Peter himself expected the Lord Jesus to set up His throne *then* upon the earth, for he cannot endure the words of Christ, that he must go to Jerusalem, suffer many things, be killed, and be raised again the third day. "Be it far from thee Lord!"

Now that He had formally accepted the illustrious title, He begins to instruct His disciples as to the great characteristics



from all the rest of their race: "It is true that I am He—which should distinguish them under the present dispensation, wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God—the Prince of the House of David; yet for all this I must accomplish my present mission, which is to die in the room and stead of my people; and as for you, know ye that I shall come again, and if you would enjoy all the delights of my glorious kingdom, your business in this present dispensation is to deny yourselves, take up your Cross, and follow me. Be ye not ashamed of me in my present humiliation, and in my coming sufferings and death; lest I also be ashamed of you, when I come again in the glory of my Father with my angels; and that I will come again, be assured. Verily some of you shall not taste of death until I show you in a figure, the glory that shall surround me at my second coming."

Accordingly He takes Peter and James and John into a high mountain, and was transfigured before them; and behold there appeared unto them Moses, the representative of all those who sleep in Jesus, and who shall rise from the dead at his second coming; and Elias, the representative of all those who shall be alive and who shall be changed, and caught up to meet Him in the air.

Thus they were "Eye witnesses of His majesty," as Peter writes in his Second Epistle, in which he describes this wonderful scene; and they hear that voice from the "excellent glory, saying, this is my beloved Son, hear ye Him!" And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them that they should tell the vision to no man until after His resurrection.

The other fact that we notice, is the marvellous blindness of these apostles—and the inveterate obstinacy, with which they repudiate and ignore, not only the old prophecy concerning our Lord's sufferings and death, but the plain and direct teachings of Jesus Himself. Nay more, we are told that Moses and Elias talked with him "of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem"—and yet the very first question they ask Him, as they came down from the mountain, shows that they expected Him then to set up His Kingdom—the figure of which they had just seen. "Why then, say they, do the Scribes tell us that Elias must first come?"

Perhaps the only parallel, that the history of the Church furnishes, is found in the conduct of those Christians of our own day who err at the other extreme. As the Jews knew of but one coming of the Messiah, and that a glorious one—so these are content to know, that He hath appeared once to atone for their sins. He tells the apostles plainly, that he would go up to Jerusalem, be delivered into the hands of His enemies, slain, and would rise again—and they question among themselves, "what the rising from the dead should mean." His angels tells us that "this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven,

shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven" (Acts I: 2.) and we either forget that there is such a promise in the Bible—or else think it fulfilled in the conversion of sinners by the power of the Holy Ghost.

But behold the patience of our glorious Lord? He tells them it is true—"Elias shall come, before my glorious appearing, of which you have just seen the figure. But do you not know how it is written of Me, the Son of Man, that I must suffer many things, and be set at nought? Even so have they done whatsoever they listed unto him, who would have been the fulfiller of this prophecy, which the scribes quote—if they had accepted Me."

The truth of the proposition with which we set out, has seemed to us, more and more manifest as we progressed with our task. It may be said, that we have failed to establish our point—and many objections may be raised against each proposition we have advanced. We have only to say in conclusion that we have thrown these considerations together in great haste—and that we offer them with great modesty. If a more satisfactory solution of the difficulties that surround the subject, can be given, we will be very thankful to him who will furnish it.

A LAYMAN.



## EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

FOR SEPTEMBER AND NOVEMBER.

I. THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMS. *By Rev. George D. Armstrong, D. D.,  
Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Norfolk, Va.*

Among all the volumes which have been called forth recently, by the impertinencies of the Modern *Hydropathic School* of Theology, we have seen none in which genuine criticism and logic is so successfully popularized, as in this volume of Dr. Armstrong. He seems to have written under the conviction that the best preservative of the great body of the people, against the tricks and the demagoguery of quacks and empirics, is the plain teaching of positive truth, rather than endless wrangling with, and exposure of pious knavery. Hence, his book will be found to be just such a repository of true expositions of all the important passages in Scripture—many of them difficult—bearing upon the question of Baptism—as an intelligent Sabbath School or Bible Class teacher often feels the need of. It will be found that in addition to the two questions of the *mode* and the *subjects* of Baptism, heretofore the topics of such volumes, Dr. Armstrong has given a large space to a third question—recently mooted—the “*translation question*.” We regard it as evidence of high attainments in grace, that a Christian scholar and gentleman, should with so much kindness and patience, as Dr. A. has done, deal with such folly as this modern revision movement. For ourselves, we confess we never could regard in any other light than as an exquisite piece of solemn fun, the fact, that in the year of Grace, 1840, men should have “*Resolved, That by the fact that the nations of the Earth must now look to the Baptist denomination ALONE, for faithful translations of the Word of God, a responsibility is imposed upon them,*” &c., &c. Nor have the practical results of this bombastic “*Resolve,*” been of a character either to give sobriety to our views of the matter, or to impair the excellence of the original joke. Not inaptly has some orator described this ambitious effort as “*an attempt to hatch the eagle in a duck’s nest.*” The result surely seems to justify the comparison. When the world is all agog with expectancy, to see the aspiring chick soar to the empyrean, and gaze upon the sun—behold, true to the instincts of his nature, he waddles with noisy gabble to the barn-yard puddle!

And yet, we are constrained to admit, that Dr. Armstrong has judged more wisely than we, in “*answering not a fool according to his folly,*” but patiently and kindly setting forth the truth on the subject, as gathered from a careful comparison of the teachings of God’s Word.

In the third part of his work, we are glad to find Dr. Armstrong bringing out, in a popular form, the true foundation on which this whole ques-

tion of infant membership in the Church rests—namely, the very idea and nature of the Church of God. It would have pleased us better, had he more largely set forth the Calvinistic idea of the Church, as an essential element of any revelation of God's eternal purpose to redeem, not individuals of the race merely, but a *kingdom—a society of men*; and not a visible Church as an arrangement of expediency—as a school, or nursery,—but we cannot expect an author to say everything, in one little volume. So far as Dr. A. goes into the question of the Church—his views are of the right sort. As a clear, logical, popular, and yet unanswerable statement of the truth on this subject, as against either Romish or Baptist Sacramentalism, we commend this book to the attention of all candid inquirers. As a model of popularizing the most technical of all doctrinal discussions—even the most accomplished of the ministry may study it to advantage.

II. STATE EDUCATION NOT RADICALLY WRONG: *Being a reply to an Article in the Presb. Critic, 1855.* By a Friend of Education.

Some one has sent us a pamphlet of 30 odd pages, bearing this title, and prefaced with a letter to "Hon. John R. Kelso," President of the Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore. There was such an article on State Education, from one of our Virginia correspondents, who probably did not know that there were public schools in Baltimore—in the *Critic* for August, 1855; but marked as a communication, by the words "*For the Critic*"—which mark had been explained before—as meaning that the *Critic* gave such article circulation, *without being farther responsible for it*. What views the article set forth, we do not remember, nor could we or any one else ever guess, from this pamphlet. When it is considered that the article on State Education, like articles on both sides of the American question, and other articles which the Editors had no responsibility for, was thus carefully marked—what but the combined action of impotence and malignity could have generated the twaddle of this pamphlet, concerning the *Critic* as an organ of Presbyterianism, aiming to reflect upon and injure the local institutions of Baltimore? We notice the thing here, not by way of defending the *Critic*—but rather of defending the Public Schools of Baltimore from the disgrace of such English, and such nonsense as this pamphlet afflicts the world with, in their name. We take it for granted, that the man who can deliberately write such stuff, read it, print it, and proof-read it (amid the sly grins of Typo,) will be silly enough to send it to sensible men out of Baltimore; we desire to assure all such—and especially our correspondent in Virginia—that the Public School system of Baltimore, must not be judged of by such "friends of education" as this writer—that our old friend Mr. Kelso, is a gentleman of intelligence, as well as of high public spirit—and not to be judged as having any responsibility for such writing—that we have never yet met with a boy, in any department of the schools, above the primary, who would not make himself merry over such a specimen of writing as this pamphlet—that in Baltimore, as in other large towns where printing is easy, there are as usual, men whose aversion to the sort of labor God made them for, leads them to mimic men who think—and whose invincible ignorance—and self-conceit equally invincible—leads them to the folly of inflicting their nonsense upon the public—the shame of it, upon their friends—and the injury of it, upon the good cause which may have the misfortune to attract their friendship.

III. SACRED PRAISE: *An earnest appeal to Christian Worshippers, in behalf of a neglected duty.* By Thomas Hastings.

SELAH: *A collection of Psalm and Hymn Tunes, Introits, Anthems, Chants, Motetts, Choruses, &c. Adapted to the use of Classes, Private Circles and Worshipping Assemblies.* By Thomas Hastings.

The multiplication of church-music books has of late been so rapid, as to defy the efforts of the miscellaneous reviewer disposed carefully to inspect them. Were this rapid multiplication of books indicative of a corresponding growth of an intelligent interest and taste, we should of course welcome the omen. But such, we fear, is not the case. So numerous are the evidences of mere trade-driving attending these multiplied issues, we confess that we have, in general, felt little disposed carefully to inspect them. No such evidences, however, attend the publications of Mr. Hastings, and we are always sure of an ample reward for any examination bestowed upon them.

These recent publications are doubtless the most valuable for immediate and practical Church purposes, of any of their venerated author. The former is not a book of tunes, but an earnest, close, compact discussion of the subject of Sacred Praise, both in its theoretical and practical bearings. It is enough to say of Mr. Hastings' theory, that it is eminently Scriptural. It is enough to say of his practice, that it is the result of such observations, so long continued, made from such positions, and made by a person of such excellent Christian judgment as well as cultivated musical taste, as entitle his views to a deference which probably is not due to those of any other man in the American Church. We could wish that this little treatise were well pondered, not only by every minister, but also by every private Christian in the land.

The latter book—the "Selah"—is, as will be seen above, "a collection of Psalm and Hymn Tunes," &c. The collection is voluminous; yet it will not be found that any tune has been inserted merely to swell the volume. The collection is by no means a wholesale importation from Germany, or from anywhere else, and circulated in the original packages with only a new label. One will look in vain for meaningless tunes,—whether cantering melodies, or straightforward chorals, without beginning, middle or end. In two respects this book has particularly pleased us. In the first place, the preliminary discussion of the elements of vocal music, and especially the discussion of "style in execution," is more to the purpose than anything we have elsewhere seen in the same compass. In the second place, the author's intimate acquaintance with Hymnology has enabled him to furnish, in the best manner, the "countless varieties of musical adaptation, which are called for by the varied sentiment, and diversified structure of the best hymns in circulation." We would earnestly commend these two books to the study of those who are truly desirous of advancing the cause of God's Public Praise.

These books are for sale in Baltimore, by J. W. Bond & Co.

---

ERRATA.—In the article—"Paradoxes of the Gospel,"—beginning on page 304—through the great carelessness of the printer in correcting proof—an error occurred in the 2d line—for "cultivated," read "estimated."

## VALEDICTORY NOTE.

With the present double number, having filled the engagement with our subscribers, we conclude the Second Volume of the Critic, and with it our editorial labors. To this course we have been led neither by any abatement in our convictions of the importance of such discussions, nor any change of opinion as to the necessity of such a Journal in the Church. But, one of the editors having been called by the General Assembly to the position of a public teacher in one of the Theological Schools of the Church, feels himself thereby precluded by his sense of propriety, from further connection with a Journal which had its origin, and its chief distinction in the desire to open a channel for the free expression of individual opinion, unembarrassed by any fear of compromising public interests in the Church, with which the authors might have official connection. The other editor, being unwilling to assume the sole charge of the paper, no other course is left but to suspend its publication.

In taking leave of their readers, the editors desire to express their thanks for the many tokens of approbation with which their humble, but well-intended efforts in behalf of a pure, honest, outspoken Presbyterianism, have been rewarded. They feel constrained in looking back upon these two years of editorial labor—to regard them, as perhaps the most efficient two years service they have yet been able to render to the Church. A series of Essays, many of them from the most competent pens in the Church and of no mere ephemeral value, have thus been collected; and they will be consulted by multitudes of busy office-bearers, who are often times compelled to act in cases involving important principles, with little opportunity for study and deliberation.

In so far as they have encountered opposition in their work, they are comforted with the reflection that better men and more efficient labors have fared far worse; and upon the whole, perhaps, the measure of disapprobation has been less than their deserts. At all events, they are disposed to consider themselves amply rewarded for all their toils, by the reflection that their good intentions towards the Church of their love, however poorly executed, have not been wholly in vain.