

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC

AND
MONTHLY REVIEW,

CONDUCTED FOR
AN ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN,

BY
STUART ROBINSON AND THOS. E. PECK.

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

VOL. I.
FOR THE YEAR 1855.

BALTIMORE:—FROM THE PRESS OF MILLS & COX.
1855.

2
1873.3
V1 1855

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

No. 1.—January.

ART.	PAGE.
1.—“Our Idea.”	1
2.—Relation of Theological Seminaries to our System of Government.	7
3.—A Theodicy; or, Vindication of Divine Glory, &c.	13
4.—Hints for the Times.	21
5.—The Posture and Life of the Presbyterian Church, considered in relation to the subject of Ministerial Education.	26
6.—“The Great General Assembly of 1854.”	33
7.—Our Motto.	43
8.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Address of Baltimore Presbytery—Rev. J. C. Smith’s letter—Books from Mr. Guiteau—Pamphlets on the Education Question—Mr. Wilson’s sermon on Dancing—Brownson’s Quarterly Review—Presbyterian Quarterly Review for December 1854, on the Division of the Presbyterian Church, &c.	49

No. 2.—February.

1.—Temporalities vs Spiritualities.	53
2.—Relations of the Seminaries to the General Assembly.	60
3.—A Glance at the Present Position of the Eldership of the Presbyterian Church.	66
4.—Thornwell’s Discourses on Truth.	72
5.—The Issues Stated.	78
6.—Papal Organs in Congress.	83
7.—The General Assembly of 1854 as per the Southern Presbyterian Review.	86
8.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Our Enterprise—its Reception—our Prospects—“The Presbyterian’s” Discourse concerning the Critic,—Ignoring the Main Thing:—A Semi-Centenary Discourse, &c. Sermon to Young Men—Presbyterianism, as a Method for building up the Church—Discourse, the True Glory of a Nation—The Presbyterian Quarterly Review.—An Address, by the Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.	93

No. 3.—March.

1.—The Radical Difference: in the last analysis of the Church Question.	111
2.—Temporalities vs Spiritualities.	116
3.—Whose Children have a right to Baptism?	122
4.—The General Assembly and the German Reformed Church.	128
5.—Sabbath Rail-way Trains—to the Presbyterian Stockholders & Directors in Railway Co’s.	134
6.—Papal Organs in Congress.	140
7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—John Livingston and his American Portrait Gallery—Mr. Putnam’s Speech on Ecclesiastical Tenures—The Office of Deacon: its Nature and Importance, as taught in the Word of God, and the Standards of the Presbyterian Church: a Discourse—Political Religionism—The Presbyterian of the West and the Critic—The Presbyterian Quarterly Review for March—Historical Vindication of	

the Abrogation of the Plan of Union—Sermons and Addresses—Dr. McKinney of the Banner. 151

No. 4.—April.

1.—The Question of Ecclesiastical Property, and Franchises—in its Bearing on the True Mission of the Church.	149
2.—The Proof and the Holding Fast.	156
3.—Pastoral Letter on the Observance of the Sabbath—to the Congregations under the care of the Presbytery of Baltimore.	161
4.—Church Unity and the Episcopal Memorialists.	168
5.—Papal Organs in Congress.	175
6.—Who should be just and make the Amende?	185
7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—The Cant of Infidelity—An Historical Vindication of the Abrogation of the Plan of Union—Theatric Regeneration, Laudism and Ludism, Præcacy and Play—Speech about Colleges—A Sermon on the Romish Controversy—its Present Aspect, and the Duty of the Church in Reference to it.	193

No. 5.—May.

1.—More Boards in the Presbyterian Church—Some Inquiry into Fundamental Principles.	197
2.—A Diorama of the Churches.	204
3.—A Ruling Elder’s Views of Presbyterian Forms and Doctrines as Suited to the Masses.	211
4.—The American Party.	218
5.—The Mission of the Comforter.	222
6.—“Spirit of American Presbyterianism”—as per the Presbyterian Quarterly Review, 230	
7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Explanation—Catalogus Collegii Neo-Cæsarientis—Synonyms of the New Testament—Mr. Ramsay’s Discourse before the Lexington Presbytery—A Discourse delivered in the Leacock Presbyterian Church, Lancaster County, Pa.—Judgements, a Call to Repentance—The New School’s Second Appeal unto Cæsar.	238

No. 6.—June.

1.—“The Church Question.”	245
2.—Who are the Revolutionists?—The new Crusade against the Synod of Baltimore.	249
3.—Abstractionists.	257
4.—The great need of the Presbyterian Church at this time.	262
5.—The Office of Deacon.	271
6.—“The American Party.”	277
7.—Suggestions touching a Union Protestant Infirmary, addressed to Evangelical Christians of all Denominations.	286
8.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Music, Man-millinery and Meekness—The Papal Council—Adam & Christ—Reformed Dutch Church—The Philosophical Tendencies of the Age—Advertisement.	289

No. 7.—July.

- 1.—Letter of Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge to Hon. Charles Sumner. 293
- 2.—Church Elections—Who should vote for Pastor? 301
- 3.—The Wisdom of Man vs. the power of God. 307
- 4.—The Gospel Idea of Preaching. 315
- 5.—Brownsoniana for April, 1855. 320
- 6.—The Critic and its Censors. 329
- 7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—"Which: the Right or the Left?" Garrett & Co's. "Card (Confidential.)"—Some objections to the Episcopal Church, reconsidered and others stated.—Semi-Centennial Celebration of South Carolina College.—Note. 336

No. 8.—August.

- 1.—The General Assembly of 1855. 341
- 2.—Christianity, its Essence and Evidence; or an Analysis of the New Testament into Historical Facts, Doctrines, Opinions and Phraseology. By George W. Burnap, D. D. 354
- 3.—Suggestions touching the Presbyterian System for spreading the Gospel. 361
- 4.—State Education Radically Wrong. 370
- 5.—Letter to a Kentucky Lawyer. 376
- 6.—Papal Philosophism.—Balmes. 380
- 7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—The Biblical Repository for July, 1855.—Discourse of Rev. B. M. Palmer.—Prof. Hitchcock's Dedicatorial Sermon.—Alumni Address, by Rev. Wm. T. Richardson.—Southern Baptist Review and Eclectic.—Christian Union Magazine. 384

No. 9.—September.

- 1.—The General Assembly of 1855. 389
- 2.—The Chamber of Imagery in the Church of Rome. 403
- 3.—The Latest Theodicy. 411
- 4.—Report of Board of Education for 1855. 417
- 5.—Sacred Architecture and Spiritual Religion. 423
- 6.—The Victory of Faith. 437
- 7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Questions of the Soul.—The Golden Reed; or the True Measure of a True Church.—Notes of a Theological Student.—Modern Light Literature: Theology.—Le Cure Manque; or Social and Religious Customs in France. 436

No. 10.—October.

- 1.—The General Assembly of 1855. 437
- 2.—The Presbyterian Quarterly Review on the (N. S.) General Assembly of 1855. 450
- 3.—The Gospel Preached to the Poor. 457
- 4.—Historical Facts and Documents relating to the Origin of the Central Presbyterian Church of Baltimore. 464
- 5.—Statistics of Baptism in the Presbyterian Church. 471

- 6.—Mission of the Presbyterian Church—Dr. Breckinridge's Missionary Sermon. 476
- 7.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Brownson's Quarterly Review, for October, 1855.—Rev. Aaron L. Lindsley's Sermon, on The Days of Old. Catholic Interests in the Nineteenth Century.—A Dedication Sermon.—A Review of recent Publications on Human Ability and Inability.—Remarks on the Provision that should be made for the Children of Missionaries.—The Antidote of Care.—Why will you Die? Or Divine Solitude for the Perishing. 480

No. 11.—November.

- 1.—Popular Lectures and Lecturers.—Necessity of Reforming both. 485
- 2.—Trustees of Church Property—their Functions and Relations to the Deacon of the Church. 490
- 3.—Letter of a Virginia Pastor to an Inquirer concerning the proper subject of Baptism. 497
- 4.—The late Meeting of the Synod of Baltimore. 505
- 5.—Formalism, Puritanism, and Rationalism—the Three Religions, as developed from their Germinal Principle. 509
- 6.—Second Volume of the Critic—Our Plans and Purposes. 517
- 7.—Liturgies, Instrumental Music and Architecture. 521
- 8.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Episcopal Impertinence.—Our neighbors of the "Metropolitan" and the New York Freeman's Journal.—Correspondence between Com. R. T. Stockton & C. Van Rensselaer, D. D. in relation to the Camden and Amboy Rail Road accident.—Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical, by Rev. Dr. Foote. Alleghan: a Poem in Nine Books, by N. Gordon. 526

No. 12.—December.

- 1.—Sweat of the Brow—the Brains—the Heart. 533
- 2.—General Principles touching the Worship of God. 538
- 3.—Prerogatives of the Presbytery in the translation of Ministers. 545
- 4.—Formalism, Puritanism and Rationalism—the Three Religions, as developed from their Germinal Principle. 553
- 5.—Letter of a Virginia Pastor to an Inquirer concerning the proper subject of Baptism. 560
- 6.—What are the Constituent Elements of the Church of God as Organized & Visible? 566
- 7.—The New Philosophic Presbyterianism—Presbyterian Quarterly Review. 574
- 8.—EDITORIAL EXCHANGE:—Rev. S. G. Baird's Collection of Acts of Assembly.—Bayne's Christian Life.—A Memoir of S. S. Prentiss. My Father's House.—Readable Bible.—Southern Presbyterian Review. 579

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 1.

JANUARY, 1855.

Vol. 1.

“OUR IDEA.”

“THE Presbyterian Critic and Monthly Review” owes its origin to the want, practically felt by its projectors, of some available channel for a fraternal interchange of views, touching the many important questions of church order and policy, which they, as members of the church Judicatories, are called officially to act upon—often without either the means or the opportunity for that mature consideration so necessary to wise and efficient action.

They suppose the same difficulties to have been felt by others, extensively enough to create a demand for some such journal as is now proposed. Nor will the supposition seem extravagant when it is remembered that in the (O. S.) Presbyterian Church—numbering some 250,000 communicants—there must be not far from 10,000 office bearers: Ministers, Elders, and Deacons; and, in addition to these, an unusual proportion of thinking, working, private members—intelligent and inquiring—concerned, not merely for the interests of the one congregation to which they belong, but also in whatever relates to the honor, efficiency and zeal of the whole church. It is not presuming very largely to expect that among such a body of office bearers, and such a membership, a journal efficiently conducted, and in the right spirit, having as a prominent object the elucidation of the principles involved in the acts and measures of the church, shall not lack patronage.

If, in some of its aspects, our plan seems to be a novelty, it is to be borne in mind that the immense expansion of the Presbyterian body, and of the country at large, has placed the church in this country in novel circumstances. The necessity for a fuller and more general understanding of our principles, as a church, must obviously increase, and the proper application of these principles must become more and more important as the field of the church widens and embraces new and diversified interests.

Of the religious journals now circulating in the Presbyterian church—some, as the *Quarterly Reviews*, taking for their prominent object the discussion of themes for ministers, as theologians ; others, as the *Weekly Newspapers* and *Monthly Magazines*, aiming chiefly at the wants of families and private christians—none have given distinctive prominence to the subject which this paper proposes to make prominent. They are doing their work—many of them doing a great work, and doing it well, in their several spheres of labor. We offer our paper by no means as the rival of any of them for public patronage, but contemplating Ministers, Elders, Deacons, and working members of the church in their common character, as leaders and co-laborers in the great work of adapting our Presbyterianism to the new field and the stupendous work opened and still opening in this country, we propose a journal, which, whilst it shall aim to occupy, in common with others, the general field of doctrinal truth and religious literature, shall be more distinctively for the discussion and elucidation of the principles of Presbyterianism, as they bear upon the efforts and measures of the church for her own expansion.

Of the necessity of such discussion, little need be said. With all the advantages which our system of Judicatories theoretically affords for the examination of questions, every one knows how the rapid increase of routine business, the pressing claims of practical and local questions for immediate decision, and the indisposition to prolong the meetings of such bodies, operate as an effectual exclusion of any full and thorough consideration of general principles. That such consideration of general principles should be had, is imperatively demanded by the peculiar posture of our church in this country. Perhaps never before has Presbyterianism had so fair an opportunity for developing its peculiar excellencies, and by practical demonstration make manifest that it is the true system of the Scriptures. Untrammelled by any connection with the State ; under a Government whose civil and political ordinances conform to her ecclesiastical polity more completely than those of any other government since the Christian Era ; and among a people distinguished for the activity of mind and the intelligence of the great mass, the providence of God calls loudly upon the leaders of "the Sacramental Host of God's Elect" to study their position ; and with a watchfulness as untiring as their zeal, to shape the policy of the church in her new circumstances, so as to develope truly her life and spirit.

It may be suggested further, that the region of inquiry, which it is a prominent object of this paper to aid in exploring—whether as regards the abstract theoretical principles relating to the nature and functions of the church, or the concrete forms of them embodied in her ecclesiastical acts, has not hitherto attracted the attention which its importance deserves. The great question of "The Church," to the exclusion of nearly every other question, has occupied the minds and drawn forth all the learning and logical accomplishments of the two most intensely sectarian divisions of modern Christendom—the Anglican and the Roman church. Through this question the most

fundamental of the heresies of ten years past have obtruded themselves upon the world. And yet the whole subject of "The Church" "ecclesiology"—in the new technical use of terms—contemplated from a Presbyterian stand-point, has apparently been overlooked among us. With the single exception of a course of lectures at Princeton, volunteered by the Professor of Didactic Theology, in view, probably, of the emergency of the case, and a few articles, said to be from the same pen, in the *Repertory*, nothing that we are aware of has been said or written of the more abstract views of this great subject.

Nor has this subject in its concrete form received much more attention. Though the controversies of twenty years past have very strongly and clearly developed many of the chief points in the doctrine and order of the Presbyterian system—yet the outworking of the Presbyterianism polity so far as it relates to the measures of the church for her own expansion, have received little attention. Under the pressure of strong excitement in 1837 and 1838, forced into a system of measures for church expansion, devised, indeed, by wise and great men, but still, hastily devised, in the very nature of the case; since that time constantly employed in giving the system more efficiency; to suppose these measures perfect and in need of no farther examination, would be to claim for their originators, in effect, more than human foresight, and to suppose a direct Divine inspiration in the church ever since.

For, however perfect any system of measures at its first adoption, it is manifest, from the history of the church in every age, that such are the tendencies of even sanctified minds, that constant scrutiny and discipline is needful still to *keep pure* that which is in itself perfect. In the actual working of all measures, in the church and out of it, there is ever a tendency to the growth of error, unnoticed from its extremely gradual progress. It grows up under the surface, as the great coral reefs of the ocean; receiving accretions from its tiny builders, imperceptible in their magnitude, but countless in their number; and thus ever approaching the surface, its very presence is unsuspected until some convulsion shall heave it up, or some noble vessel wreck upon its hidden crest. The history of the church at large exhibits far more danger to her true interests, from over-confidence in her system of working, than from lack of confidence. Even in case of a system in itself perfect at first, the natural consequence, in the working out of years, is to lose sight of the fundamental ideas originally expressed in the very formula used to denote its spirit and design. No characteristic of the general mind of society is more marked than its proneness to cling to mere words, even after the ideas which the words were intended to convey are entirely lost sight of. Floating as husks upon the surface, the words but deceive and mock the credulous and uninquiring, long after the ideas thus contained, like the heavy grain, have sunk out of view. There is a continual need of investigation, if for nothing more than to keep up the connection between the words and the ideas of the church. Our

own history, brief as it is, yet abounds with illustrations of how readily errors in principle, latent at first in measures seemingly good, if allowed to pass unchallenged, in the course of time work out confusion and evil.

Such were the results of the wrong principles embodied in the Plan of Union of 1801. So, the singular fact that some twenty odd years ago, when the present two bodies of Presbyterians were one, out of the whole Ministry, (as may be seen from the Minutes of the Assembly of 1830,) embracing from 2,000 to 2,500, and out of the whole, there were but little over 600 pastors. So, also, the almost total disuse of the office of Deacon—even yet but partially restored to the church—and what is still worse, the very general, if not total, loss in the church, of the great truth, of which the office of Deacon is the representative—namely, that the contribution of funds to pious uses—the fellowship—is one of the stated ordinances of the Sabbath. But a score of such illustrations will readily occur to those familiar with the history of the church, all going to the same point, to wit: the absolute necessity of constant and careful inquiries into the principles involved in the ordinances, acts and measures of the church.

As regards the particular views of church affairs to be advocated, and the tone and spirit of our Journal, we have little to say. Considering that the parties to this work are widely scattered through four or five Synods, and perhaps differing among themselves on most of the questions which from time to time divide the opinion of our body, we can hardly be expected to speak very definitely. We therefore say, generally, that it shall be our aim in all cases that may arise, to advocate "strict construction" of the powers conferred by the Constitution on the Judicatories of the church, and strict adherence to the provisions of our standard in all ecclesiastical measures. We shall be found in the opposition when the question is the adoption or the imitation of the measures and expedencies of voluntarism and independence, on the one hand; or the recognition of the authority of precedents derived from Church and State systems, on the other. And equally so in regard to all tendencies within the church itself, to the centralization of power in any one place, or in any particular hands.

We shall by no means expect to confine ourselves to subjects involving these questions alone, but to illustrate and defend, as against all corresponding forms of error, the simplicity, the purity, and the peculiar adaptation to the American people, of the Presbyterian doctrine and polity. Our great practical aim shall be to set forth the duty and the peculiar obligation resting upon the office-bearers and leaders of our church, to evince in all their official acts, and promote by their personal influence intelligent, manly, and liberal views of the duties and responsibilities of the American church. As touching the spirit and tone which shall characterize the paper, we would here express, once for all, our high regard and strong fraternal feeling for all earnest-minded and sincere christian people of whatever name, in general, and for all Presbyterian people in particular.

Also our high appreciation generally, of the learning, wisdom and piety of the many eminent men whom the church and the christian public honor and confide in. We are proud of our church, and of the great number of excellent and eminent men in it. And this expression of our heart's esteem and good will we desire to be taken once for all, as it will illy comport with our very restricted limits—and they possibly not paid for—to preface our every strong dissent from the opinion of others with long preliminary declarations of our exalted opinion of the men personally. We are free to confess, moreover, that it comports as little with our ideas of good taste—probably from our association of this style of controversy with a school of men who have given the church trouble in time past, and whose peculiar taste for very loving and brotherly prefaces to very un-brotherly insinuations, we have admired as little as their theology. We desire to speak and to be spoken of, simply in the open, manly, dignified tone that is becoming christian gentlemen. We may be allowed to suggest, also, that from our very limited space, those who write will perceive, that in order to any variety, articles for our pages must be short, pointed, and suggestive—containing the "seeds of things," rather than the things themselves full grown. Those for whom we write must be presumed to need nothing more than simple and direct statements of facts, and a clear and suggestive presentation of the points of an argument.

To allay the apprehensions of any excellent and amiable people, who may anticipate agitation and danger to the church from such discussions as we propose, it may be proper to suggest, in the first place, that the parties to this enterprise—already numbering more than half a score from half as many Synods—are all of them men in whom the christian public, in their several localities have been in the habit of manifesting a good deal of confidence. In the next place, the class of minds to whom our journal is chiefly addressed—office-bearers and active working members—are not a class so easily led astray, or aroused to imprudent action, as to need any human guardianship. And still more, our own views are of the most strictly conservative order—not conservative in the sense of a blind devotion to mere precedent and authority, but the true conservatism of strong devotion to principles, and those the principles already established in the Confession of Faith. So far, too, as we advocate Reform, it is always with a strong preference for reform *through*, rather than *over* the official and recognized channels of action. We are by no means ecclesiastical Ishmaelites, nor do we intend to be provoked to become such.

We have adopted a title simply expressive of our distinctive aim. The too common association with the word "Critic" of an assuming, cynical, fault-finding spirit, was felt to be an objection—but in the true and proper sense of "Critic," as a "discerner," a "discriminator," and *therefore* a "Judge," it describes our chief purpose more clearly than any other word—while at the same time, our title "Review," expresses the incidental purpose.

We have a common aim in this, our work, and a common end to accomplish. Yet each writer is responsible for himself only. The peculiar views of the individual parties to the enterprise, touching questions which at present may divide the church, are not known one to the other. No member of the association possibly may agree with all that shall be published in any one number. We claim to be the organ of no particular ecclesiastical party in the sense of advocating one particular line of measures. Analogous to another use of the word "organ"—an instrument in which the grand results are attained, not by the powerful and skillful playing of one note, or even of one part, but by the combination in grand harmony of various, and often apparently dissonant parts. We are not unwilling to be made the organ, so far as our limits permit, of all earnest and practical thinkers, who are sure they have something to say, and will aim to say it briefly, pointedly, and respectfully.

We are committed to each other and to the public for a year, by way of experiment. The labor is all voluntary. It is hoped by the experiment of a year to demonstrate the necessity of such a paper as a permanent work. However that may be, we shall have published a volume on some of the most important questions of the day, and that in a form to be more read and more effective than in any other. If our Monthly shall prove to have taken hold of the right points and become the articulate voice of a large portion of the church, then, like other comparatively ephemeral journals which have preceded it, as those of Mason, Rice, Green, and Breckinridge, it will only increase in value by the lapse of years.

The Monthly paper being at once in form light and active enough to secure the advantages of the newspaper, and at the same time offering to writers the encouragement of preserving their thoughts in a form to be of permanent use, has its peculiar field of usefulness, and a most important one.

RELATIONS OF OUR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES TO
OUR SYSTEM OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES are institutions about forty years old in our denomination. Although this is more than the life time of a generation, it is but a short space in the life time of systems ; whose age is to be measured by centuries ; so that we may regard this system of theological training as still a novelty, in our Church. It certainly shows the unsettled relations of a new thing, in some respects ; and calls for the watchful heed, and correcting hand of the Church, until it is far more matured than now, and until we have ampler experimental assurance than we now have of the safety of its workings.

A local abuse has, some years ago, become obvious at some points, arising out of the disposition of candidates for the ministry to remove their connexion from remote Presbyteries, to some one which meets near the Seminary in which they are studying. The plea for this is, that it saves much expense, and loss of time, which would be incurred by journeys to distant places at inconvenient seasons, to attend the meetings of their Presbyteries, and undergo their trials before them. But the consequence is far more serious than any such temporary inconvenience. A few Presbyteries near or around our prominent Seminaries, are so crowded with candidates, that they have no time nor patience to attend thoroughly to their trials. At every spring meeting, they are called upon to wade through the tedious trials of perhaps five, fifteen, or twenty young men whom they do not know, for whom they have no pastoral affection, whom they do not expect to labor in their bounds ; who will ask for a dismission the hour after they receive their license, and never be seen again on their floor. All the examinations of these candidates, literary, religious and experimental, scientific, Hebrew, biblical, theological, historical, must be conducted ; and a Latin exegesis, popular lecture, popular sermon, and critical exercise must be heard from each of the five, fifteen or twenty, until flesh and blood can endure no longer, and the business of the Presbytery is thrust aside. The consequence is, that the trials are huddled over with a disgraceful mockery of faithfulness. The Professors of the Seminary, who probably have seats in the Presbytery, stand aside from delicacy ; saying that it does not become them to sit a second time in judgment on that scholarship which is their own handiwork. Thus the trials of the candidate for licensure are a mere hoax and sham ; but meantime, he goes forth to his distant region with the *imprimatur* of this most venerable Presbytery upon him ; and the people out there, good mistaken souls, think that, because this venerable Presbytery is so large, and basks under such near and direct beams of a theological Seminary, and has so many learned divines among its

Presbyters, its license must be evidence of peculiar scholarship ! Whereas it is, in fact, the most worthless of all similar documents which are issued throughout our Church.

Now the easy and obvious remedy for this abuse is, for Presbyteries to use a little firmness, and refuse to dismiss their own candidates for such a purpose. The Seminaries do not desire the continuance of such an abuse, nor are they blameable for it : and certain we are, that the afflicted Presbyteries near our Seminaries which now groan under the burden of these multitudinous "parts of trial," will not complain when the evil is arrested.

It is to be feared that a far more serious lack of adjustment has grown out of our Seminary system, than the one just described. Because there is a mature course of study covering three years, pursued in them, the Presbyteries are far too much inclined to take for granted the candidate's scholarship. It becomes a matter of course in many cases, that he who has passed through the full three years, and received his certificate of proficiency from the Faculty, shall have his license. There is too much disposition on the part of Presbyters to take for granted the Faculty's decision ; and to make the Presbyterial trials a merely decent form, instead of an actual and thorough test of attainments. This statement may be repelled as unjust ; and no doubt there are many Presbyters who desire and labor for a more faithful execution of this Presbyterial duty, and who would earnestly join us in saying that the trial and licensure of candidates is made by the constitution a Presbyterial function, that the Faculty of a Seminary is not a Presbytery, and that any custom which either formally or informally transfers to such a Faculty the virtual responsibility is mischievous and unconstitutional. But yet, what is the customary result ? Where is the young man who has been refused license, having passed through a Seminary course. Is it not notorious that among so large a number of Seminary graduates (if we may use the term,) there is as much difference of scholarship as there is of light between the sun and the moon ? And yet we may safely challenge the records of our Presbyteries to produce one case of a candidate, whose imperfections were glaring enough to delay his licensure materially, he having the Seminary testimonial.

When such instances of glaring deficiency occur, there are usually some Presbyters, who are conscientious, who desire to do their duty, and would postpone or refuse license. But the office of taking the lead in such an act is painful, odious and invidious ; and there are always some brethren, in whom goodness of heart has swallowed up good sense, who come to the rescue of indolence and ignorance. "Well, moderator, I doubt whether many of us would not be unable to answer some of these questions any better than this young brother. We all know that it is not the most learned man who makes the most useful minister. With zeal and industry, I don't doubt this young brother will do a great deal of good ; it would be a sin to disappoint that good, by refusing him license, now that the church so

greatly needs ministers." Such are the arguments which we are accustomed to hear on such occasions. It is wholly forgotten that we are a religious Commonwealth, governed by a written constitution, and that every Presbyter is sworn to execute that constitution with exactness ; that a certain grade of scholarship is there required ; and if this requisition is found impolitic and unwise ; the only proper, the only honest course is, to seek first an amendment of the constitution. It is forgotten that the very proof which the Presbytery should have, the only sufficient proof, of that zeal and industry in the candidate, which would make him a useful minister in spite of ignorance, is diligence in improving those means of instruction which the church has provided him for three years ; and that his failure to improve them is the very evidence which the Presbytery is bound to take, showing that he will be as indolent as a minister, as he has been hitherto as a student. It is forgotten that the question for the Presbytery is ; not how useful this young man may be with an imperfect education ; but how useful he might be with the best cultivation he can receive, and that he, and they, owe it to the church and to God, to be satisfied with nothing short of this, his highest usefulness.

We can scarcely conceive of any Presbyterial action more unseemly, and more injurious to the ministry and its great purposes, than these inefficient trials of candidates. Here is a body which sits as a court of Jesus Christ. We do not believe that the civil governments of christian nations ought now to be theocratic ; but the solemnity of the divine superintendence in the government of God's Kingdom is little less than that which awed and elevated the pious judges of the Hebrew Commonwealth. Every church court may say to itself with no little propriety, the words of the 82nd Psalm : "*God standeth in the congregation of the mighty ; He judgeth among the rulers. How long will ye judge unjustly, and accept the persons of the wicked ?*" Each Presbyter sits under a solemn oath to execute faithfully the constitution of the church. The body proceeds under these sacred sanctions to perform one of its most important acts, the trying of those who are to be examples and guides to Christ's flock, whose deficiencies, if they have them, may be so extensive a curse ; but it often performs it with a mere mockery of fidelity. The tests actually applied are often so different from those technically described in the constitution, that a school boy may perceive the futility of the proceeding. The candidate is tried in order to see whether he can write Latin, whether he knows well Greek and Hebrew, science and history, theology and interpretation ; and when the trials are carried far enough to make it pretty manifest that he cannot write Latin, and does not know these things in any proper sense, it is moved that Presbytery shall pronounce he does know them, and shall proceed to license. How could it be made more certain that this candidate, so admitted, shall be himself an indolent, inefficient, unfaithful Presbyter all his ministerial life, than by thus signaling his clerical birth day with a general example of Presbyterial unfaithfulness ?

What must be the impression, as to the moral grade and the dignity of the ministry, on the keen, criticising world, or on those men of secular professions, who are pursuing their vocations with an honorable ambition, and conscientious diligence?

Too often the Presbyteries thus relinquish to the Faculties, the virtual responsibility of licensing. But those Faculties do not by any means assume it. They say to themselves, "we are not the Presbytery, the licensing body; however strict our examinations, the Presbyteries may reverse all our verdicts; our action is in no sense final, and therefore we need not be particular." They have no roll call, no police, no "grade of scholarship" accurately applied to all the students, no demerit marks; every student attends recitations and prayers, or studies and writes, with just so much or so little diligence as seems good to his own conscience; and at the end of the three years, every student who has, in form, attended all the examinations, receives his certificate of proficiency. Now is it not the plainest thing in the world, to any one who knows anything of colleges, that where seventy or eighty young men apply for graduation (as is the case annually at our seminaries taken together) and all receive it, the testimonial so conferred ceases altogether to be any evidence of acquirement? At the University of Virginia, nothing is more frequent than the rejection of two-thirds of the applicants in the schools of ancient languages, law and medicine. Wherever there are no rejections, there the testimonials of scholarship *must be worthless*; for among every large collection of human beings, there will always be some inefficient. Thus, the duty of testing the attainments of our candidates is banded from the Presbytery to the Seminary Faculty, and is taken up by neither.

We greatly fear that the result has been produced, which might be reasonably expected: a degradation of theological training, in thoroughness and in conscientious diligence. After all our recent expenditure of money, men, and time on this great cause, the scholarship of our young ministry is losing in depth, what it has gained in extent of surface; in many, the habits of research and knowledge of the learned languages are soon lost, after they enter upon their active duties. The average grade of diligence in the seminaries is not what it should be, and what it is, among the better students of secular institutions. We shall, of course, not be understood as saying that it is as low as the average which we should find in secular institutions, by including all the idle and dissolute who are found there in such numbers along with the diligent. But it is no unfrequent thing to hear candid students in our seminaries avow that they do not there practise as much diligence as they did in the college, when competing for an honour, or studying to attain a standing for graduation, which they knew would be sternly applied. Now the Presbyterian Church should not be satisfied with a diligence in any of her ministry beneath that which is exhibited by the foremost in secular professions. While she has employment and awards for every grade of capacity, even to the humblest, she has no use for any degree of

indolence, or for any but the highest energy. The times demand that she should realize in the zeal of her ministry, the promise by Zechariah : "He that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David, and the house of David as the angel of the Lord before them."

But there are practical difficulties which we fear, will prevent the seminaries from carrying out any such honest system of examinations, as would effectually remedy this state of things. The knowledge that their verdict ought to have, constitutionally, no decisive weight, that it is in no sense final, that it is to be reviewed in all its grounds, and may be utterly reversed, will almost certainly slacken their diligence in making it up. The rejected candidate for their testimonials might at any moment remind them that they were not a licensing body, and might return to flaunt his Presbyterian license in their face. An honest rejection of the deficient candidates would be charged upon them by some, as an arrogant attempt to forestall the independent judgment of the Presbytery, and prejudice the claims of the unfortunate applicant. The Presbyteries would find themselves in a dilemma in weighing the verdicts of the Faculties ; if they disregarded them, they would be slighting the opinions of those best qualified by familiar acquaintanceship, to pronounce on the merits of the applicants for licensure ; if they regarded them, they would be depriving the applicants of a constitutional right, that of having the Presbytery as the sovereign judge of their qualifications.

We would propose, therefore, that the Faculties of our Seminaries should assume a different position and policy, which seems to us accurately conformed to the principles of Presbyterian government. The Presbytery is the master, the judge, the father, of all candidates for the ministry, whether licensed or unlicensed. The theological faculty is but the teaching agent of the Presbytery to train its candidates. Let not the agent assume the functions of master and judge. But at the same time let not the master and judge be ignorant of the results of his agent's labors. In a word, the agent should report all these results to the employer. There his agency ends. This therefore is the appropriate policy for our theological faculties—to keep accurate records of each student's diligence in study, in recitation, and in attention to the ordinances of religion ; of his daily and yearly scholarship as compared with a fixed grade of his energy of character and conscientiousness, as displayed in his academic demeanor. The Faculty should examine at the end of each session into the students' proficiency, and graduate their scholarship accurately. But on all this let it pass no verdict. Let it give no diploma. Let it pass no decree of rejection on any. Let it faithfully report the whole to the Presbytery to which each student belongs. Let the Presbytery when it comes to decide whether the candidate is worthy of licensure, have all the facts before it, so that it may know whether he was remiss or diligent in the recitation room, whether he was neglectful or observant of the means of grace, whether he was wasteful or economical of his time. Then the responsibility of deciding would be wholly placed in fact, as well as in form, where the constitution places it.

It may be objected that Presbyteries might still be lax, and might license candidates concerning whom theological Faculties made unfavorable reports. True; but they would have no pretext, in their relations to the seminaries, for doing so. This unfortunate dividing of responsibilities would be avoided, which is usually the pretext for their neglect by both parties; and though the student who brought bad returns from his teachers might yet be licensed, the knowledge that such returns would be faithfully made, that all his negligences and deficiencies would be publicly reported to that body, which was his spiritual guide and judge, would not a little stimulate to diligence.

Much has been said about the unwillingness of our young men of promise to seek the ministry; and many explanations have been suggested for it. We verily believe that one of the most important is this: that the honor of admission into the ministry has been too easily obtained. The spirited and ingenuous young man feels no inclination to enter the lists for a prize, which he sees bestowed with dishonest and indiscriminating looseness, on the most unworthy competitors. He is disgusted to see that bestowed on indolence and indifference, which he was proposing to win by strenuous exertion. Only the ignoble desire that the prize may be won without exertion or good desert. In illustration, we point to that fact, than which there is none more certain, that in those colleges or universities where a high grade of scholarship is rigidly applied, this strictness is the prime element of their popularity; and this popularity is greatest among the young men themselves: among all those young men who are worth having in a college. On this subject, we would commend to all, the wise remarks of Archbishop Whately, on the University of Oxford; that its history has always shown, literary honors *cease to be sought* whenever they become so easily attainable that nobody fails of getting them. Our unfortunate facility in granting admission to the ministry, has degraded the privilege in the eyes of young men of high spirit and ingenuous impulses. It is only the youth of low aims and grovelling spirit, who is attracted by this too facile reward. Let us elevate the terms of admission, and we shall see more men of elevated character seeking the sacred office.

It may be said, in opposition, that if a Theological Faculty should make such reports of the diligence and scholarship of students, they would be treating them as schoolboys; that such a literary police is a reproach cast upon their principles; that if it has any effect, it can only be by substituting a mere carnal fear, and rivalry, for conscientiousness; thus degrading the nature of the student's motives; and that if a young man has not conscience enough to be diligent, without such stimuli, he is certainly not fit to be a minister.

True: and the very thing we wish to find out, by holding him in the position of a candidate, is, whether he is fit to be a minister. What way so proper to settle that question, as to lay before the Presbytery, the judge in the case, the record of his conscientiousness? And that such a surveillance is an implied reproach on the honor of the diligent student, is certainly not the doctrine of the Apostle, who

teaches us that the same law which is a terror to evil doers, "is a praise to them that do well." The short and complete answer to all such shallow remarks is, that by the same rule, all repressive or punitive legislation in church and State ought to be disused, lest we should seem to imply a suspicion of good people. Let the student show himself a good one, by his conduct; and then the report to his Presbytery will be naught but a testimonial to his honor. Nor is it easy to see how a conscientious student can be made less conscientious by knowing that if he were not so, he would incur certain unpleasant personal consequences. All desire of the approval of the good is not wicked. We can see no harm in a desire to commend one's self to the approbation of God's dear children, seconding the desire for the approval of God. But suppose there should be many cases in which students show none of this high, ethereal conscientiousness, to which even the fear of the blame, and desire of the praise of the good, would be a taint; but in its place exhibit a painful indolence and carelessness? Is not even a little eye-serving industry better than sheer laziness? Practically, we think it is; though either of them would be a sorry quality in a gospel minister. But the philosophy of the mind, and common sense, both concur in teaching that if we would strengthen any virtue which was before weak or deficient in the soul, we must procure the outward exercise of it. It is by acting that it grows. We train our children to kindness by compelling them to forego acts of violence and cruelty. We do not argue that, because an enforced mercy is of no worth in the sight of God, therefore it will be better to permit every indulgence of angry tempers, until their own conscientiousness checks them!

The object of the writer is to commend these thoughts to the reflection and wiser judgment of the Presbyters of our church.

"A THEODICY; OR, VINDICATION OF THE DIVINE GLORY, AS MANIFESTED IN THE CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE MORAL WORLD." BY ALBERT TAYLOR BLEDSOE, Professor of Mathematics, &c. in the University of Mississippi. New York: Carlton & Phillips, 1853.

THE deepest thinkers have always been the readiest to acknowledge the insoluble difficulties which meet the understanding of man when "sounding on its dim and perilous way" in the discovery of truth: and especially when exploring the plans and dispensations of Him who shrouds Himself in an impenetrable veil of clouds and darkness. They know by many painful experiments, the very narrow sphere in which the human faculties have been ordained and constituted to move; and that the effect of enlarging the circumference of the territory of knowledge, is, according to the striking illus-

tration of Chalmers, only to multiply the points upon that circumference, at each of which, unanswerable questions may be asked in respect to the deep obscurity beyond. "Learned ignorance," as it has been called by the greatest thinker of this age, is one of the highest and most important results of their studies. "The highest reach of human science is the scientific recognition of human ignorance: *Qui nescit ignorare, ignorat scire.*" These master spirits, who believe more profoundly because they have doubted more profoundly than the majority of their kind, conveyed by the course of their meditations into that thick darkness where God dwells, are overwhelmed and subdued under a sense of their own littleness, and with all reverence and humility confess that righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne.

But "fools rush in where angels fear to tread," and there have never been wanting those who are bold enough to grapple with any difficulty, however intractable in its own nature, or however it may, in point of fact, have baffled a thousand times, the subtlest power of argument and the most sagacious instincts of genius. Well and truly has it been said that "everything is a mystery, or nothing is a mystery." To the thinking man everything is a mystery; to the presumptuous pretender, who has never had the Cartesian proof of his existence, nothing is; and he will undertake to Cartesian that Deity before whose hidden majesty wiser men are content to prostrate themselves in adoring faith. He sees not the necessity of waiting till it shall please that awful majesty to reveal itself, (so far as it can be revealed,) and vindicate its ways to men; to abate something of that excess of light which occasions our darkness, or to purge and invigorate our vision that we may gaze upon it, without being smitten with blindness: but proceeds with all the coolness, of confidence, and self-possession with which he would unravel a Chinese puzzle, to show us that really after all there is no great mystery in the matter. O! what need is there, that, in discussing such "high arguments," we should offer the prayer of the glorious old blind poet: "What in us is dark, illumine: what is low, raise and support!"

It would perhaps, be unjust, certainly uncharitable, to refer to the last mentioned class the author of the work whose title we have placed at the head of this article. He is not without metaphysical acumen, and has revolved the problem of the origin of evil with the seriousness of a man who sees more in it than a mere instrument of discipline for the logical faculty. We feel bound to complain, however, of the confident tone which pervades his discussions, which transpires even in his confessions of diffidence and modesty, and unless we are greatly deceived, waxes stronger and stronger as he approaches the end. It is very edifying and pleasant to be told, for example, that the mystery which baffled the powers of Plato and Leibnitz, not to mention a host of smaller luminaries, is no mystery at all, but only "the sophism of the atheist." It is only "in accommodation to the views of others" that he speaks of "the great difficulty in question," and "the problem of the moral world," which

he says "is not high and difficult in itself." "It is certainly a mistake to suppose," as Dr. Johnson asserted, that "it must be entangled with perplexities while we see but in part." Our author maintains that "it is only while we see amiss, and not while we see in part, that this *problem*" (called so, of course, out of concession to the weakness of Plato, Leibnitz and Edwards) "must wear the appearance of a dark enigma," (p. 23.) We wish we had space for all he says on the possibility of a Theodicy. It is enough to move the bones of that great master of human ignorance and impressive example of *cautious* inquiry, the author of the "Analogy." We candidly confess that if the choice lay between the spirit of Mr. Bledsoe, and that of "the insect lost in the depths of a fracture in the dome of St. Pauls," to which he compares the soi-distant philosopher of Fernay, we should prefer the latter, as corresponding better with the weakness of our nature. It would be better than claiming to be the Christopher Wren of the universe, and to be able to see proportion, harmony, and order, where no other mortal and perhaps no other creature, however unshaken his *faith* in the existence of these elements, has been able to see them. In a word, we should choose rather to be restive under real difficulties, than deny their existence.

The work we are noticing fell into our hands about the same time, some months ago, with "Beecher's Conflict of Ages," which also claims to be a Theodicy, though in a narrower sphere: and we must say that whatever may be thought of the intellectual calibre, respectively, of the two authors, Dr. Beecher appears to us to have the advantage, very decidedly, in the point just referred to, an appreciation of the true state of the question. He feels that there is a problem to be solved, a real and formidable difficulty to be met. He seems to have had some personal experience of the power of that "law in the members," which brings the soul into captivity to "the law of sin and death." But we are sorry to say that the perusal of Mr. Bledsoe's book has left a very different impression upon our minds. If his spiritual history had been similar to that of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, as recorded in the 7th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; if it had been such as to enable him to sympathize in that "exceeding great and bitter cry" "O! wretched man that I am!"—it is, in the last degree, improbable that he could have been the author of this treatise. Its views of sin, and its "*exceeding sinfulness*" are miserably shallow; and, as a matter of course, there is no lack of "great swelling words of vanity" and "promises of liberty."

There is another fact which cannot fail to strike any body who has read these two books, and that is the precariousness of all reasoning from so-called "moral intuitions." The author of the "Conflict" affirms that the eternal principles of honor and right require that every intelligent creature, who, *ex vi terminorum*, is to be the subject of moral law, should be created in a state of virtue, in order to have a fair trial. It is upon this self-evident moral truth that the

whole discussion rests; it is the pressure of this truth, standing as it does, in appalling contradiction to the actual condition of mankind, which has driven Dr. Beecher to the necessity of reviving the exploded absurdity of a metempsychosis. The author of "Theodicy," on the other hand, contends that the idea of a created virtue is a contradiction in itself, and therefore, an impossibility, a nothing, which cannot be the object of power, even Divine power. These learned advocates who have volunteered to defend their Maker at the bar of human reason, assume contradictory grounds of defence: each, in turn, pronouncing his own fundamental postulate to be a self-evident truth, and the postulate of his colleague a self-evident falsehood. It is not ours to compose this dispute. We only venture to suggest that one of them (not impossibly both) will certainly be asked as Job asked his friends, "Will ye speak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for Him? Will ye accept His person? Will ye contend for God? Is it good that He should search you out? Or, as one man mocketh another, do ye so mock Him?" Let them beware, lest "the wrath of God be kindled against them," and He "deal with them after their folly, in that they have not spoken of Him the thing which is right."

But vain man would be wise though man be like the wild ass's colt. If the history of opinions were not full of painful examples of the weakness of the human understanding, it would be incomprehensible how either the Doctor of Massachusetts, or the Professor of Mississippi could suppose that he had succeeded in vindicating the glory of God in the existence of moral evil, neve allowing that he had demonstrated his positions, and shown himself to be excepted from that melancholy destiny, which, according to South, belongs to fallen man, of "spinning his days and himself out into a pitiful controverted conclusion." Supposing with the one, that men are now expiating, by a condition of headlong proclivity to evil and of hopeless imbecility for good, the actual transgressions and apostacies of a pre-existent state, or with the other, that the will is independent, self-determined, not subject to the law of cause and effect; (either of which suppositions, if true, is a greater mystery than that which they have been devised to explain) still the great mystery remains how, in the first instance, a God of infinite perfections should have constituted a system of things which involves, in its administration, such an overwhelming amount of evil of every kind. This is the question upon which philosophers and speculative theologians have always been and always will be crucified. Mr. Bledsoe is an "optimist." The actually existing system, then, is precisely that in which the *maximum* of good, and the *minimum* of evil have been attained. But why did God create at all? Shall we say, with the German philosophers and Cousin, that he is an "absolute cause," and could not bu create; or rather could not but *become* the universe? Shall we confound cause and effect with substance and mode, and plunge ourselves into Pantheism? Shall we be followers of Bolingbroke, and make a gospel of the "Essay on Man?" It is well enough for

one who denies the *moral* perfections of God, but it will not do for us, or for Mr. Bledsoe. Or shall we turn Manichaeans? What shall we do? The truth is, that we can do nothing but accept with lowly *faith* (for we walk not here by *sight*) the solution given by our Savior to his disciples in a like case (Jn. 9:3) and conclude that moral evil exists, "that the works of God should be made manifest;" or, as in the case of Lazarus (Jn. 11:4) "for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." And we may observe, in passing, that the answer of our Lord, in the first case just referred to, was made to a question founded in part upon the theory revived in the "Conflict of Ages."

It is not our purpose, nor have we space, to discuss the variety of questions which Mr. Bledsoe examines, and to his own satisfaction decides. His book is much larger than there was need for; though as a *book* it is vastly superior to Dr. Beecher's, of which we might say, accommodating an old proverb, that one-fifth would have been more than the whole. We propose to present, as briefly as possible, the leading points of his theory, premising that we have met with nothing new.

1st. He accepts the common psychology which gives, in the nature of man, the three elements of understanding, desire, or emotion, and the will. The impressions of the first two he concedes to be necessitated: the acts of the third, he affirms to be absolutely free, spontaneous, undetermined; or, to adopt the terminology of Coleridge, to be entirely exempt from the operation of the law of cause and effect which obtains in *nature*. The old problem, therefore, of the schoolman's ass between two bundles of hay, would be no problem to him.

2d. In harmony with this view of man's nature, is his explanation of the agency of God upon the soul. As the states and impressions of the intellectual and emotional parts of this nature are *necessitated*, he admits that God may enlighten the understanding and change the sensibility, but denies that He can touch the will. A man, therefore, may have the illumination of the Spirit, and may be born again, have a "new heart," and yet may by an act of the will refuse to be a Christian! This conclusion is so monstrous, that it will be necessary to quote his own words, to avoid the charge of misrepresentation:—After having described the agency of God in the illumination of the mind, which is its *first* effect, he proceeds to describe the effect of the same agency upon the "sensibility," and adds:

"There is no difficulty, then, in conceiving that the second effect of the Divine power in the new creation is a 'new heart.' Having done all this, (i. e. enlightened the mind and changed the heart) He may well call on us 'to work out our salvation with fear and trembling, for God worketh in us to will and to do of His own good pleasure.' We have seen that the state of the will, that a volition is not necessitated by the intelligence or by the sensibility; and hence it may 'obey the heavenly vision,' or it may resist and do despite to the Spirit of Grace.' If it obey, then the vivifying light and genial shower have not fallen upon the soul in vain. The free-will coales-

ces with the renovated intelligence and sensibility, and the man 'has root in himself.' The blossom gradually yields to the fruit, and the germ of true holiness is formed in the soul. This consists in the voluntary exercise of the mind, in obedience to the knowledge and *love of God*, and in the permanent habit formed by the repetition of such exercises. Hence, in the great *theandric* work of regeneration we see the part which is performed by God, and the part which proceeds from man."—pp. 175. The italics are our own.

Now, we think that our Methodist friends, (who we are sorry to learn admire our author) will agree that the use of the phrase "a new heart," evidently in the sense in which it is commonly used by those who hold to the "new birth," in connection with what follows, seems a little out of place: and that the quotation from Paul is equally unfortunate, or at least, that the passage in which it is affirmed "God works in us *to will*" is not the best suited of all forms of words to fortify the doctrine that he cannot meddle with our *will* at all. For ourselves we are free to say that we cannot readily imagine any statement which betrays, from beginning to end, a profounder ignorance of the very principles and elements of the Gospel of Christ. It is a happy thing for the cause of truth and righteousness that error is usually accompanied with an infatuation which compels it to expose and convict itself: and we have an example here. What does the "love of God" mean in this passage? Will Mr. Bledsoe say that a man may love God, and yet live in disobedience to His law? If so, what becomes of all those Scriptures which make obedience the test and manifestation of love? If not, what becomes of his theory? Really, the world would be greatly indebted to so skilful a psychologist if he would give them his idea of *love*. And then that "*theandric* regeneration;" judging by the etymon of the term, one would suppose he meant that only the *male* members of the human family could be regenerated. Why not say *theanthropic*? Was it because it would too justly describe his presumptuous theory, as making every man a God unto himself, and regeneration a manifestation of the Deity in human flesh? A *theandric* regeneration! Where shall we look for it? In the dreams of continental philosophers? In the societies of the Illuminati? Where? Certainly not in the Bible. The only regeneration found there is the regeneration by the power of the Holy Ghost. If a man has never been the subject of any other than a *theandric* regeneration, he shall never enter, our merciful Savior being witness, into the Kingdom of God. If this be regeneration, then indeed was Nicodemus not a very indifferent master in Israel, and it was not very great folly in him to ask, "How can these things be?" But our author proceeds:

"This shows an absolute dependence of the soul upon the agency of God, for without knowledge the mind can no more perform its duty, than the eye can see without light; and without a feeling of love to God, it is as impossible for it to render a spiritual obedience, as it would be for a bird to fly in a vacuum. Yet this dependence, absolute as it is, does not impair the free agency of man. For Di-

vine Grace supplies, and must supply the indispensable conditions of holiness; but it does not produce holiness itself, because, as we have seen, a necessary holiness is a contradiction in terms."

He concedes, then, that the soul is *absolutely* dependent upon the agency of God. But the concession is nothing worth. For in the first place, this "agency of God," or "divine grace" is made merely a *causa sine qua non*, an "indispensable condition of holiness." It is the atmosphere which sustains the wings of the soul: it gives not the life and power within which propels it. In the next place, it is a concession made in contradiction to his own theory. For if the will is not determined by the antecedent states of the understanding or the sensibility, as he every where asserts, there is and can be no necessity for an operation upon either in order to a choice. Verily, the legs of the lame are not equal: the theory halts. If it did not assume the air of science, and disdain all appeal to Scripture, we might venture upon a Scriptural argument; but as an opinion not taken up upon reason, can never be removed by reason, so a theory not derived from Scripture will not allow itself to be convicted of falsehood by Scripture. We cannot refrain, however, from referring to a passage or two, which, we think, Mr. Bledsoe will not rely upon to establish his doctrine. One is, John 1 : 13, "Which (i. e. the sons of God, v. 12) were born, not of blood, nor of the *will of the flesh*, nor of the *will of man*, but of *God*"—another is, Jn. 3: 5, 6, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*: and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." The last is from the favorite apostle of Arminians, Jas. 1 : 18, "Of *His own will* begat He us with the word of truth." If we are to judge of Mr. B's success as counsel and advocate for God, by his success in vindicating himself from the charge of Pelagianism, he has reason to fear that question, "Who hath required this at your hand?"

3d. Another leading postulate of this treatise, indeed the hinge upon which the whole turns (a hinge on which there is great motion but little progress,) is that "a created holiness is a contradiction in terms," or in other words, that God cannot control or renew the will without destroying that freedom which is essential to responsibility. This is not proved but taken for granted as a necessary result of his psychology. And here again he will pardon us for pointing him to a single statement of Scripture. It is, Eph. 4, 24—"And that ye put on the *new man*, which, after God, is *created in righteousness and true holiness*." It is sad to find in this work no higher notion of holiness than that which makes it, merely, a *character*, the result of a repetition of acts of a similar kind—a *habit*, in the ordinary acceptation of that term, while the Scriptures make it a *nature*, the foundation and condition of character, a new birth, a resurrection from the dead, a new creation in Christ Jesus.

In conclusion—for our limits forbid us to enlarge farther—we remark—*First*, that Mr. Bledsoe's psychology, in assuming the will to be undetermined by the states of the understanding and the

sensibility, can be sustained only upon the principles of a materialistic phrenology, according to which all the faculties of the soul are separate in fact, as well as distinguished in thought, and differently denominated for logical convenience. *Second*, it contradicts the experience of all mankind in its moral application. It recognizes only *activities* of the will, *volitions*: it takes no account of *states*. *Third*, the very considerations adduced by him, to show that the impressions of the understanding and the sensibility are necessitated, are urged by the elder Edwards, and are conclusive as proofs of the determination of the will. *Fourth*, the only schemes in which the freedom of the will, in his sense of it, can be consistently defended, if consistency can be predicated at all of such a thing, are Atheism and Pantheism. Every system of Christian Theism proceeds upon the primitive and necessary judgment of the mind—that every thing finite has a cause, all the successions of the mind, as well as the changes in outward nature and the vicissitudes of affairs. *Fifth*, such a will as he contends for is impossible in God or man, and would be a degradation to either. In man it would be incompatible with responsibility: in God, there could be no moral perfection. He would be an arbitrary tyrant; the object only of fear, never of confidence. *Sixth*, in regard to all such discussions, we may say with the Apostle: “the Lord knoweth the thoughts of men that they are vain.” The relation of the finite to the infinite, of which the questions of the origin of evil, and the consistency of the Divine Government with the moral agency and responsibility of man, are branches, is not a relation for the scientific faculty of man to handle. It is full of *insoluble* difficulties and apparent contradictions. Let any man endeavor to realize in thought the relations of Time to Eternity, of Space to Immensity, of Finite Being to Infinite Being, and to reduce them to scientific expression. How he will reel and stagger! And so with the relation of the will of man to the will of God. The scheme, of necessity, in the christian sense of the term, can be as clearly demonstrated as any thing can be: the freedom of the will, so far as it is necessary to personal responsibility, is as indisputably a datum of consciousness, as any thing can be. Here there is a contradiction? By no means: for they are both true: each demanding to be received on its proper evidence. The difficulty cannot be solved *by us*, nor could it be solved *to us*, in the present state of our faculties. Let us then walk by *faith*, and seek not to *see*, till our eyes are unscaled, and it becomes our glorious privilege, *videre videntem*.

HINTS FOR THE TIMES.

THE Church of England was a noble bulwark of the Protestant faith in the better days of old. But it now appears to be rotting down as fast as the leaven of decay can work. And it is all for lack of courage in its members to defend their fundamental principles. It almost seems as if one brave man might yet preserve the church of Hooper, of Davenant, of Toplady and of Wilberforce, from being crushed by the stealthy involutions of Puseyism. "Of the three hundred grant but three, to make a new Thermopylæ." But a brave heart, wedded to a competent hand, and a sound head, is not found to save her. If prophecy has inscribed the words *fallen! fallen!* upon the gates of Rome, the mere human prophecy of an easy forecast, writes upon Lambeth, "*falling! falling!*" Lambeth is as certainly doomed, (though it may be not so deeply) for indifference to the Gospel of Christ and the purity of the church, as Rome is for hostility to both.

Something very similar is true, concerning what we may term the Church of New England. The old orthodox Congregational Church of New England has almost disappeared from the Zodiac, at least as a constellation of stars of steady light and of the first magnitude. Her noble foundations are subverted—her strong hold, once held by giants in the faith and in common sense, are now occupied, many of them, by a race of men among whom there is not left apparently enough of common sense for the religious principle to act upon. Men who seem unable to comprehend the plainest, simplest duties and dignities of life. Any nonsense spreads among this class in New England, as does the blue thistle in Virginia. Any flesh-proud, wise-fool of a thinker starts a new school of theological doctrine and gets followers. They cannot see the force of the denunciation of Scripture against "busy bodies in other men's matters." And such of late is becoming the ascendancy of this class, that the most stable minds begin to waver, even their very wisest, soundest, most conservative, most peace-loving preachers of the Gospel cannot clearly see this ground to stand on—the ground of minding their own business, in order to denounce the dangerous fanaticism of the day. The rust of fanaticism eats on. The instances are lamentably frequent in which the pulpit, that once knew "nothing but Christ and Him Crucified," has ceased to sound with the Gospel, and is desolated by coarse partizan topics. The preacher "taking his text (as their own Webster hath it) from the Bible, and sermon from the newspapers," plays the regular politician, and the church members become the pitiable tail of clerical demagogues, and true morality is as dead among them as sound religion and common sense. They declaim much of morality but their morality is the open, bold, and boasted perjury of Seward and Sumner; they talk of the Gospel, but it is the slave-stealing gospel according to Beecher; they boast of the New England common sense, but their common sense is the sense of Theodore Parker and Wendell Philips.

Just as certainly as old England is slowly careening to the Pope, just so certainly is New England going to materialism and atheistic infidelity. The philosophy of M. Auguste Comté is her inevitable goal. She has excelled, still excels, and will excell in a material civilization, in machinery, in handicraft, in mechanical thrift, in labor-saving control over physical nature. But New England never did esteem and appreciate highly enough the higher mental and social civilization—the personal civilization of taste, of the sensibilities, of the emotions, and of the heart. The necessary end of such a civilization as that of New England, humanly speaking, is materialism; fanaticism is hastening her to this necessary goal, to the race which she runs.

There are apt to be some people in every religious congregation who think that the preacher is casting dishonor upon religion itself, when he speaks of the reigning follies and corruptions of the times. So there are apt to be some readers of every periodical, who think the writers are playing into the hands of the infidels, when they speak of corrupting societies and falling churches. But God will have a people—Christ will have satisfaction for the travail of his soul, there will be a true church, a precious saving gospel, an ark of salvation on earth, though the churches of old England and of new England corrupt into dust and ashes; just as there is a gospel now, though the Greek and the Roman Churches are corrupted to the core. The infidel and the sweet conservative man of *mum*, are both welcome to all the capital they can make of the great truth that all earthly things tend to corruption, and that the salt of the earth is to be derived from the power of God, sovereignly given, but connected with the use of all the means of watch and ward and warning.

We believe there are more barks abroad on the ocean, which are not sea-worthy than these two of old and new England. The Wesleyan bodies with all their excellencies as pioneers in the wilderness, are manifestly not capable of riding out the tempests of fierce reckless American free-thinking mammon-worship. Dropping the figure, these people are not thoughtful enough; they are too deeply committed to needless and indecorous excitements; we wish God's blessing upon them, for all their warm and heart stirring zeal, for spiritual religion, notwithstanding their unscriptural Arminianism, and wish that they may stand as long as they can stand, which there is reason to fear may not be very long.

There is danger to other barks, when but one ship sinks at sea. Our Presbyterian ship of Zion is the best-built, and most tight and trim of them all; she will ride out the working of the sea, if the crew abide, and are true men. But we must get rid of the doctrine of *mum*; we must not yield to *hush*, as an eleventh commandment. We cannot afford to hold the doctrine that the swain, who may live in rural, remote, rustic regions, must either hold his peace, or be counted as an enemy. If the General Assembly is the parent of the Boards, then we must prepare the Assembly to judge of the Boards,

by constant discussion and examination; if the Boards are to plead the sanction annually of the General Assembly, then of course it follows as obviously as a sequence can be needed to an ingenuous mind, that inquiry, discussion, examination, are just as proper as the perusal of the papers in the case, is to a Court of Chancery before rendering a decree. We confess we are prone to return the suspicion of not wishing our Zion well, which they cast upon such as we, upon the advocates of the *hush* policy. We have a vindicated sound theology, a homogenous clergy, a loyal people, a noble eldership, and capable of being much more than it is, the potent second power of the church. Our present danger, if danger we are in—and when is it ever safe to say, that of danger there is none—is an ecclesiastical and not a theological danger. There never was a time, there never will be, never can be a time, this side of perfect, confirmed, celestial millennium, when the mute policy, the policy of non-inquiry, will be a safe one. The lines of Burns will steal to memory:

“There’s none ever feared
That the truth should be heard,
But they whom the truth would indite.”

We say we could not but think of them, we do not say we were so irreverent as to apply them a few years ago, when it was impliedly announced to be treason to criticise our Hymn Book, which though most excellent, has many more marks of nodding than the *Iliad*; which might have been corrected, had the way been left open for discussion; and when more recently, influential organs warn us off from the catalogue of the Board of Publication, as a subject on which criticism is hostility, we *think of Burns*, we say.

The politicians quote from Jefferson the pithy saying, that “the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.” Jefferson uttered such sayings as this, because, in spite of his infidelity, his knowledge of man compelled him to think as a christian thinks. Man rarely ever gave such an involuntary testimony to doctrines he did not believe, as the earthly sage gave in this maxim, to the truth of God’s word; we just have to paraphrase it a little: “the price of purity is eternal vigilance.” Now is the time of all others, for the Presbyterian church to adopt that maxim; not because she is in a bad state, but because in the main, she is in a good state. She ought to lock the stable door *before* the steed is stolen, and not *afterwards*; she ought to take the ounce of preventive, to avoid the convulsions attending the pound of cure.

We believe that the main danger of the times lies in corporations, firms, leagues, bands—exerting power in the church, but not really, though they may be formally under effective church control. The whole subject of ecclesiastical *imperia in imperio* has to be thoroughly looked into, and the aversion exhibited in some quarters, to a thorough canvass of principles, must be blown to the winds.

Among the “wheels within a wheel” in the church, to be tho-

roughly looked into, is the printing press. In the subject of the newspaper press, its immunities and its responsibilities, its prerogatives and its limitations—its relations to Church and to State—lie some of the gravest issues of the age. It seems to be time that men were set to thinking on that chaotic subject; though it is an unexplored subject to a great degree, yet we can see far enough into it to see that it is a tremendous one. Giant powers of evil lurk in the shadows, and walk in the wakes of giant powers of good; and the landmarks which separate liberty from license, though almost wholly unknown on this subject, are yet obviously as necessary to be fixed here as elsewhere, and a great deal more necessary to be well ascertained here than on other subjects on which a great outcry is made; and those landmarks are more completely in a fog on this subject than almost any other. In the cases of almost all the modern forces of progress in society, there has to be a sixteenth century—a period of struggle, away from and out of civil and spiritual chains. Then there has to be a seventeenth century, an age of struggles to advance beyond the half reform, and stinted liberty, and leaden *via media*, which tyrants concede, when they can do no better, and which prelates delight in—an age struggling valiantly after the higher perfectness, which a conscience, half fed with good and noble institutions, the more loudly demands—a puritan age. Then there comes an eighteenth century, first of deadness, when the powers of evil adopt the cant of moderation in good things; when the savor dies out of the purest salt of the earth, and the edge rusts off the sharpest weapons of holy warfare; and great upheavings come; and error develops itself in the seeded crest of atheism; and men learn the necessity of distinguishing things which differ, though they may resemble each other. And then, on the wheel of the destinies, there comes a sifting age—an age of scales to weigh, and measures to mete out, and crucibles to try, the true and the false; to cast off from liberty the reproaches which belong to license—from religion those which belong to superstition—and from a true free press those which belong to the saturnalia of the types. It is the age of the rider on the black horse with the pair of balances in his hands. “Then shall they return and discern between the righteous and the wicked.” We trust it may be called a nineteenth century. Voices from Heaven—audible not in the welkin, but in the occurrences of social life, call men to the judgment between abolition and benevolence; between red republicanism and true republicanism; between the personal liberty of Jefferson and the gregarious phalanx of Fourier; between personal independence and the envious levelling of French rabbles; between anti-rent and rightful resistance to real oppression; between the truth and a thousand base shadows and imitations, and parhelions of the truth.

The liberties of the printing press need to be sifted in the siftings of such a time as much as any other phenomena of the ecclesiastical world. A pastor sits in presbytery as a pastor; and is responsible by solemn contract for pastoral diligence and fidelity in his charge.

By his side sits an editor. The pastor preaches from the pulpit to five hundred people every week. The editor preaches through the columns of his journal to from one to ten thousand people every week. The pastor has the right to expound Scripture—so has the editor. The pastor deals professionally in practical divinity, and the moulding of views, feelings, and principles for time and eternity. So does the editor. The pastor has access to the more tender feelings of a community of people. The editor has the same access to the more tender departments of feeling of a whole segment of people in a whole nation. How does it happen that a pastor is responsible for his work to the ecclesiastical courts; but an editor is not responsible to the ecclesiastical courts? Whereabouts in Scripture do we find the editorial episcopate, the editorial patriarchate, the editorial popedom, provided for, as an unelected and irresponsible *set-fast* in the church, with the tremendous power of saying, not what men's opinion shall be, exactly, but of affording or withholding from whom they will, the very foundation-stones of facts, on which every opinion worth any thing must be founded? Where else but in the Roman censor, (who, however, was very solemnly elected,) do we find the power vested in one man, or in a small commission, to make reputations, to decide how every man shall stand, to deal out honors and stigmas to each one severally as he will? It may be said the editors have their own checks, and that discontinuance and disapprobation in case of their doing wrong, are sufficient restraints on them not to do so. Why then is not the preacher, in like manner, left to the disapprobation of the people? Why does a Presbytery preside over the contract? Is it said that it is because it gives a great power to blind the judgment of the hearers and warp it to the preacher's side, to permit him to have the ear of the people from Sabbath to Sabbath. And is not the same thing true, only much more abundantly, and on a much wider and more perilous scale with an editor? Was not a very great proportion of the wicked schism of 1837 produced by a few newspaper presses who were untrue? But ministers went astray at that time also. So they did—and under just and full responsibilities. On what food does an editor feed, that he is totally irresponsible to the courts of Jesus Christ upon earth for influential utterances for a life long, by which he obtains a livelihood, which are so directly esteemed by himself to be a service of the Savior, that his conscience permits him to give himself wholly to these weekly utterances in a newspaper?

We give these questions, and scores of others which they will suggest to the thought of the church, and of this generation. The days cannot be far away when they will be questions of deep practical moment.

THE POSTURE AND LIFE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH: CONSIDERED IN HER RELATIONS TO THE SUBJECT OF MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

THERE are in the bounds of the Presbyterian Church six Theological Seminaries at present in actual operation. Of these, three are under the care of the General Assembly, namely: Princeton, Allegheny, and Danville. They extend in a line from east to west, across that portion of the continent which lies east of the Mississippi river; occupying pretty nearly the same parallel of latitude; pretty nearly equi-distant from each other; the two extreme institutions resting, one on the great ocean, and the other on the great river of the continent; and the line which passes through all three of them, passing very nearly through the centre of the population of the nation; the two first located on the non-slave holding side of this line, and the third one, on the slave holding side of it. They were established in the order in which they are named; with about equal intervals of time between them. They contain, between them, at present, about 200, out of the 270 (or thereabouts) theological students, who are attending such institutions in our church, to wit: Princeton, over a hundred; Allegheny, about fifty; Danville, about forty. Princeton is about 42 years old; Danville about 2 years old; Allegheny between them, but nearer to her older sister. All these statements are fruitful. The reader will gather what he may from them, as it is not the object of this article to discuss any of them.

Of the other three Seminaries, not under the care of the General Assembly, two are in the south, and one in the north, according to one classification; and according to another, the two southern are also eastern, and the one northern is western; and the two southern and eastern are nearly in a north and south line from Princeton, about equi-distant from each other; and the one northern and western is nearly west from Princeton and Allegheny, and nearly north from Danville. Two of them, to wit: the southern, are in slave States; the other, on the south margin of the free States. The one at Prince Edward, Va., is under the care of two Synods, which embrace all the State of Virginia, except so much of its northern side as is in the Presbytery of Winchester, and one of the Presbyteries, we suppose, of Western Pennsylvania, and all the State of North Carolina. The one at Columbia, S. C., is under the care of two Synods, which embrace the entire States of South Carolina and Georgia. And the one at New Albany, Indiana, may be said, we suppose, to be under the care of three Synods, which embrace the State of Indiana, and the south-western portion of the State of Ohio, about one-third part, perhaps, of that State; although from the peculiar history and present position of this Seminary, we are likely enough to be inaccurate in details concerning it. These three Seminaries contain, we suppose, about seventy students of Theology, at this time, and were all three founded a number of years ago, the latest of them

we believe, above twenty-five years since. These statements, like those which went before, are very suggestive. Let the reader ponder them, if he so pleases; it not being our purpose, here, to develop any of them.

One thing seems manifest: considering the number of the Seminaries—their widely dispersed locations—their peculiar and varied relations to our church courts, and to our populations, northern, southern, eastern, and western—they must certainly afford sufficient accommodations for all their present students, and a few more; and they must satisfy the demands of students of all classes, conditions, and localities; or else, there must be something very much out of joint, either with the students, or the Seminaries. And, moreover, considering that somewhere about twenty of our ministers who ought to be presumed, from the places they occupy, to be well qualified for their work, are devoted to the business of training our theological students in these six Seminaries; this unspeakably important matter ought to be considered as being in a satisfactory position, in that respect also; or else something must be sadly defective about the whole machinery. These points, also—not proposing to discuss them—we leave to the candid and solemn consideration of the reader, beseeching him to consider them, all around, with some care.

It may be asked, what is it, then, that is proposed to be discussed, and to what end are these statements? We answer: if the attention of the reader is arrested by what has been said, our first object has been gained; for, possibly, in that case, his own thoughts will be better for him, than ours can be. And our remaining object will be gained, if in the power of that awakened attention some such thought as we shall proceed to give utterance to, should seem to him worthy of being suggested.

1st. Is it worth while to erect and sustain all these Seminaries, and send all these precious youth to them; unless, when they go to them, they are, to some reasonable extent, qualified to reap the benefits which are designed and supposed to be provided in them? Are you aware, good reader, of the general condition, as to human learning, in which our Colleges turn over their students to the Seminaries? For example: are you aware of the extent of the knowledge of the Greek tongue, and of the Greek of the New Testament in particular, which is ordinarily possessed by our students of Theology, when they have finished their college course—even in *ecclesiastical colleges*, and enter our Seminaries? You reply, you are; and that their scholarship is satisfactory, at that stage. Very well; we have nothing to add on this point—if that is the fact. Or, you say, you do not know. Very well, again. If you are a minister or an elder in our church, or perhaps a teacher by profession, or at any rate a lover of sound learning, and of a learned ministry, let us beseech you to know a little about this matter. Otherwise, it will be quite vain for you to expect a great deal from the Seminaries. No one respects the excellent men who have discussed so earnestly, of late, the ques-

tion of the *religious* relations of schools and colleges, more than the writer of these lines. But, if we might dare to suggest to them all, that, touching the glorious work of the ministry, and the training of our youth designed for it, the *literary* relations of all these schools and colleges is not beneath their notice; we should very feebly express the idea we have, that the vote of a church court, or even the endowment of a college, cannot, alas! of itself, teach Greek!

2d. Now, it may be answered that, the very object of all these Seminaries is to teach these young men all they need to know, in order to make them able ministers of the gospel. He who should answer thus, would reveal one grand cause of the disappointment of so many hopes. The Seminaries can have no such object, or if they have, they can never attain the object they propose. They can teach only a very few things of that vast multitude of things that combine to make a man a learned, nay, even a competent minister. Why not begin with reading and writing, when the Seminary course begins? Why not do the work of the district school, as well as that of the academy and the college? *As yet* we do not call the teacher of the village day-school Rabbi; nevertheless, his work is as much the work of the theological teacher, as that of his brethren, who give diplomas which they sometimes cannot translate, and endorse as competent scholars those whose competence they are not qualified to determine; or, which is worse, are not sufficiently interested to promote. The domain of the teacher in a Theological Seminary is strictly limited, and is of unspeakable difficulty and importance. If the materials on which he is to work are, in themselves suitable, and are in a suitable condition, he may, by God's grace, do wonders, even in the limited period allotted to him. But if he is cut off from the true and noble work which is peculiar to his place, by the necessity of doing a work which belongs to another place; if his earnest love for his own calling is chilled, year by year, in filling up a calling which is not his; how can the church expect any other result, but that the teacher himself should decline instead of improving continually, and that his pupils should leave him about in the condition in which they ought to have come to him? Some remedy has been sought, in protracting the Seminary course; but the remedy is unsuitable, and of course unfruitful. The real question is not *how long*, but *how much*? A Chinaman might be taught *mathematics* all his life, without learning a single word of *English*.

3d. No doubt men may educate themselves; no doubt they must do so in the end, if they are educated at all. Indeed, supposing a man to know any one alphabet—that of his vernacular tongue; suppose there is nothing to hinder him from acquiring every thing that books can tell him; teacher or no teacher; whether in school, college, or seminary. So, to any generous and earnest seeker after truth, human or divine, whose eye may light on these pages, we say firmly and kindly—brother be of good cheer! If you know your alphabet, you may defy them all, as for all the rest. Still, that is no

reason why they should delude you, and delude themselves too, and that upon the most momentous concerns both to you and to them. It was a great wrong to you to pretend they were educating you, when they were not; it was no excuse that they did this at an exceedingly religious, nay, even an ecclesiastical college, and by gentlemen who were exceedingly learned and pious, though perhaps, as you always suspected, a little dull; and, above all, it was a terrible aggravation of the injury thus done you, if you happen to be one of the almoners of the charity of the church, and as a beneficiary of its Board of Education, found yourself left with very little choice of your own, as to how they should train you, and where, and by whom. Do not think, we beseech you, that we blame *you*, beyond your just share, much less that we do so in unkindness. There are those, far above you in position, who are far more responsible than you are, in this whole matter. And, let us tell you, in all sadness, it is not by any means certain, that your inadequate training will terminate with your college course; and that, even if it were possible, which it is not, to recover entirely in the seminary, the losses sustained before you go there; that you could be perfectly sure, of finding in them, the best means of doing the work proper to them, in the best manner. This is strictly confidential; but you will, perhaps, believe it, before you have been in the ministry five years. We make the statement at our proper peril, and with some knowledge of its truth, not only, but of its importance also.

4th. And now, we will venture, taking the case up at that point of it, to plead it a little, on behalf of the students of theology, of the people of God, and of a world lying in sin. Plead it with whom? With you, reader; with all who desire to see the standard advanced higher and higher; for ministers of the Gospel. You are a Pastor? You are the parent of a young brother of Jesus, who is about to enter some seminary? You are a member of some committee of Presbyters or Board, that controls the movements of this student? At least, you are one of those who aid in his support? It is you, with whom we plead. Why will you send this youth, to a certain place, no matter where, from motives wholly distinct from the good of the youth himself; when, you may be firmly persuaded that *his* good would indicate another place? Why do you do it? This is north, and this is south; this is east, and this is west; this is in a free State, this is in a slave State; this is *our* seminary, this belongs to *our* Synod, this is under the Assembly! Are these suitable reasons on which to forfeit the most serious advantages, of the most important years, and the most vital training, your son, your pupil, your young brother, has on earth? What are all these things to him? What he needs is the very best training he can get. Your duty—your clear, high duty, is to secure this for him. It is ungenerous to him; it is ignoble in you; it is wrong in itself; it is ruinous in its consequences, to act on any other principle. Full or empty, old or young, north or south, east or west, yours or ours—give him *the best*. We

do not pretend to determine on what precise grounds any one is to decide, what and which is best. Judge for yourself. What we insist on is, that you shall conscientiously decide in favor of that which you believe to be best, all things considered, and act accordingly.

5th. No doubt, acting upon this principle, many subordinate results would follow. But the great result would be reached—a conscientious bestowment on our students, and through them on all mankind, of the best we have, according to our honest convictions. The old and the rich seminaries might for a time gain unduly, from the natural presumption arising in their power; while the young and the poor ones might for a time lose unduly, from an apparent presumption the other way. But these are incidental and temporary effects, inevitable upon every rule of judgment, and most endurable when that rule is most righteous. In the long run, the church and her ministers would reap all the benefits possible under the circumstances. For the public judgment, righteously directed, would in the long run decide righteously. And the seminaries themselves, and their Professors, pressed under such a rule of judgment, would have the highest external stimulus to excellence, of which pure and generous minds are capable. The rivalry of schools of every grade, like all other rivalry, will shape its spirit according to the spirit which it aims to propitiate. If the churches were to refuse to settle over them as pastors, any except those who read their discourses, in a single generation, speakers would be almost extinct amongst us. If the whole of our seminaries were filled with Professors who taught, carefully, that ministers ought to wear white cravats, and the churches would merely acquiesce for a couple of generations, white cravats would become as much a part of our ministry as white and black gowns now are in some religious sects. If the churches would honestly and firmly act upon the single principle that the only recognized rule of all the seminaries shall be to make able and faithful ministers of Jesus Christ, and those which are capable and disposed to do this most effectually, shall be preferred for that very reason, the immediate result would be that capacity and disposition to do this, would be the very spirit cultivated in them all, by the highest stimulus which the church is capable in itself of imparting to them.

6th. These suggestions would be at once incomplete and unjust, if nothing were added touching the Professors in our seminaries, personally considered. No doubt it is difficult to speak of a class of persons so limited as to numbers and so conspicuous as to their position, without being liable to the suspicion of invidiousness towards them as a class, or of indelicacy towards them as compared amongst themselves, individually, or by Faculties. We have no purpose saying a word in either of these aspects of the subject. What we have to say is this: that the church has no interest which is higher or more difficult to maintain, than, *first*, to secure in all her seminaries men fully qualified for the station they occupy; and *secondly* to secure the performance by them all, in their respective stations, of their

proper work, in the most thorough manner. We presume there never has been a time when, in the general judgment of enlightened men, the Professors in our seminaries were not, in the aggregate, held to be competent and faithful; and the general method in which, in the aggregate, their duties were discharged, reasonably satisfactory. On the other hand, we presume there never was a time when a similar judgment was not equally distinct, that the method needed further consideration, and that the corps of Professors might be considerably improved. We speak not of the opinions of the captious, nor of that indiscriminate and ignorant applause, which follows high station; but of the well-considered judgment of the thoughtful and the wise, throughout our church. These statements express that judgment at the present moment, as accurately we presume, as at any former period; and probably that judgment is more vivid now, than heretofore. It may not, therefore, be without its use, to say a few words, bearing in the direction indicated by the progress of opinion amongst us.

7th. In our oldest Seminary, only a single Professor—the teacher of Theology proper—is required to be a minister of the Gospel, by its *plan*, though in point of fact, we believe, the most of those who have held office in it, have been ordained; and some of them have been old pastors. In our youngest Seminary, by its *plan*, no one can be a Professor in it, who is not only an ordained minister, but who has not had, in connection with our church, some charge, as such, involving a care of souls, for at least five years preceding his election. Here is a very marked change. Is it the result of accident, or is it the result of progress? Is there any serious advantage in having seen the divine truths which are enforced, pass through the practical operations of life, and through the souls of men? Does such experience necessarily affect our knowledge of these truths, or our capacity to teach them profitably? These are very grave questions, and many like them are involved in this change. Again, according to former ideas, the lines of separation between the various departments of instruction in our seminaries, were held to be deep, and were purposely made sharp and distinct. At present, the tendency seems to be all the other way, and the nearest possible approximation of all the departments, opening the borders of every one to all the others, is held, by not a few, to be the true method of teaching all. By one method, it is proposed to teach men God in His various manifestations; by the other, to teach men the various manifestations of God. A wide difference again, and wonderfully fruitful! Is it accident, is it caprice, or is it progress? Again, according to former ideas, the students were divided into three classes, and were kept distinct, physically and intellectually, pursuing a course, in the notion of one Professor and one department, following after another, as if each part and each Professor led up to the next beyond. More recently, we have the idea, that the whole subject is but one, having several parts, with teaching specially suited to them; and so everything goes, abreast

through the whole course, by all the Professors, with all the students; one notion being built on the idea of teaching the parts of a great profession; the other notion on the idea of teaching a great profession which has parts. We say, once more, here is a very radical change, and pregnant, with outbirths—challenging regard. Is it, or not, progress?

8th. Without going further, it is very obvious that questions such as these, once set in practical motion, in concrete forms, are very serious questions, and may become very great powers. They enter deeply, not only into the character and qualifications, but into the training by which that character and those qualifications were produced in him, who is to teach those, who are in turn, to teach the world. And having begun with the teacher, they cut through the heart, of his system and his profession; and they can hardly fail to affect, very deeply, one way or other, the whole career and destiny of our Seminaries and our students, and by consequence, our future ministry, and the church itself. We say—one way or the other, for their rejection is as deep a cause, and will as assuredly produce effects, as their reception will.

9th. It has been a grievous error, latent in the bosom of the Presbyterian church in this country, from its origin, that it was always afraid of its own inherent life. At first it could hardly creep away from the shadow of the churches of Great Britain. Afterwards, it seemed happy only when it had the smiles of congregationalism, not ashamed even to make very low obsequance for any nod of recognition as a very distant relation of Episcopacy. And when she could serve nothing else, she has worshipped the work of her own hands—ready to say of Boards and Seminaries and what not—these be our Gods. The shock and the purgation of her last great conflict, did for her, amongst multitudes of other blessings, this immense benefit, that it taught her, somewhat to her amazement, that she had not only a soul of her own, but also a life and a destiny peculiar to herself. Nothing in her history is so remarkable as the outworking of this life, during almost twenty years iast past. It is, by far, her greatest era; and the spirit and power of it ought to conduct her onward, indefinitely and most gloriously. And they will, if she will be true to herself, and earnestly follow out the impulses which are struggling within her. They who think she has finished her gestation, and brought forth all her children, and now needs only ploddingly to sow and reap, and be full and satisfied, know nothing of what is in her inner heart—nothing of what her great life means, and is capable. They who know these things—must work, and have faith and patience.

"THE GREAT GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1854."

ON being informed that the Assembly here referred to, is the New School body, our readers will perhaps consider the imposing appellation as a sneer of our ill-natured Old Schoolism at that dignified body, venerable in its 16th vernal efflorescence. We protest our innocence of any such intention. The appellation is not original with us, but quoted from the highest New School authority. In the September No. of the "Presbyterian Quarterly Review, Benj. G. Wallace, Editor—Albert Barnes, Thomas Brainerd, John Jenkins, Joel Parker, Associate Editors, with the assistance of Professors in the New York Union, Auburn and Lane Seminaries"—is an article of 50 pages, on the "General Assembly," which obviously laboring under an overwhelming sense of "how difficult it is to describe the closing scenes, so that our friends who were not present, may understand the spirit of that Great Occasion"—closes sublimely in these words:—"Thus ended the Great General Assembly of 1854. God grant us many such!"

On first reading of this eloquent peroration, we confess to a momentary resentment at the implied slur therein at all the ten previous General Assemblies; and especially the cruel slight of the glorious Assembly of 1838—which the future German critical historians will doubtless call the "Heroic Age" of the New School. In our ill humor, we indulged for a moment the uncharitable thought, that the transcendent greatness of 1854 might be accounted for mainly by the fact that its slighted predecessors had no Homeric Quarterly Reviewer to celebrate their immortal acts. That this is but another illustration of what the world had long ago been reminded of by a Latin Poet—

"Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona
Multi; Sed omnes illacry mabiles
Urgentur, ignotique longa
Nocte; carent quia sacra vate."

Candor, however, compels us to admit that the internal evidences of the history in this article, when duly weighed, dissipated our uncharitable suspicions. "The Unities" are admirably observed throughout. The history opens by quoting the saying of one of the Commissioners—he a man too, "almost unrivalled for strength and acuteness of mind"—who declared "I have been a Commissioner to fifteen Assemblies, and *this is one by itself.*" The Assembly, we are informed, was opened with a sermon by Professor Allen, of Lane Seminary, (a school, as every body knows, which has always been "*one by itself.*") The sermon, on the text "Christ Crucified," we are further told "was in one respect especially, *an exponent of our Church. There was nothing old-fashioned about it.*" Certainly a sermon on the text "Christ Crucified" with "*nothing old-fashioned about it!*" was "*one by itself*"—among all the sermons preached on that text for 1800 years! And no one who reads the article in

question will dispute that this ecclesiastical idiosyncrasy—a church with "nothing old-fashioned about it"—represented in this anomalous "one by itself" General Assembly—which was opened by the Professor from Lane Seminary—that "*apax legomenon*" in the world's educational history, with that unprecedented new-fashioned sermon; has found in this Review historian, a Homer worthy of the Achilles—to "embalm in the gorgeous ceremonies" of his immortal pages the deliverances of the Great General Assembly of 1854. One of even moderate "strength and acuteness of mind," can perceive, that considering either its style, manner, or substance—this, among all Review articles on General Assemblies, is "one by itself,"—the *great* Review of the Great General Assembly of 1854. Thus, throughout, "the unities" are perfect.

But we had no other than a most grave and serious purpose in calling attention to the late New School Assembly. Nor in what we have said have we meant to speak of the body with disrespect—above all, of the amiable and excellent gentlemen who opened the Assembly. We have been looking—not at the real Assembly, but only the preposterous caricature of it in this magniloquent Review of its proceedings. We have meant to express our disrespect only for this "penny-a-liner" style of recording the history of the doings of a High Court of the church, as though it were some political State-house-square meeting, "got up" to manufacture public opinion, by every sort of clap-trap, stage-acting, and rhetorical "ground and lofty tumbling,"—and as if the purpose were merely to raise the feeling of the party to the highest pitch of frenzy for the approaching canvass. Indeed, so far from any disrespect to the body itself, or its doings, we call attention to it—just because we believe that in a high and important sense this last was, relatively to all previous meetings of that body, really the Great Assembly. Not *great* in any sense dreamed of by this Reviewer. But great in the radical nature of its discussions—great in the number of fundamental acts passed—great in its significance as representing an entire revolution in the views of this body—great in its spirit, as being manly enough to strike out a new course of policy in spite of an effoete and malignant party pride which would naturally be wounded at so late a discovery of the better way. Great in the nobleness and independence of its smaller men (that is, in their church's calendar,) and (if the paradox may be permitted) great in the exceeding littleness displayed by some of its Great men. Any how, great in its grand results, as admitting, after twenty years of folly—that "co-operative-ism" is a failure—and that the twenty years' further experiment with it demonstrates the wisdom of what Old School men were abused for saying and doing twenty years ago.

That this is its true interpretation will, we think, be manifest from the brief notice, which only our pages will admit of. We present a view first, of the "*res gesta*" of that Assembly, and then, illustrations from the debates of the "*quo animo*" of its members in so enacting.

Of some sixteen subjects of action mentioned in our history, seven were acted upon in some one or other definite form. Now it will be found that through all the action on these seven topics, one great idea runs, namely: the purpose to bring the church into a strictly Denominational organization.

1. There was a completion of the church erection scheme, by the creation of an Assembly's Board of Trustees, with a charter of incorporation. And this a form of organization into which our friends at the North West, who now are clamorous for a church erection Board, would do well to study. If such Board be desirable to us, there are important and wise points in this New School plan. Certainly it is strong enough, and intensely ecclesiastical enough—even to giving to the Board a control over the houses when built.

2. The enactment touching "the legal relations of the Assembly." This is one of the most characteristic documents we have seen—exciting our sympathies for these earnest advocates of a thorough Denominational organization—in their efforts to get the thing done without *seeming* to yield the sore point of the legal succession to the Old School. We need quote two propositions of the Assembly's deliverance—which our historian says "happily arranged this important matter"—in illustration of our meaning—"1. Whereas we regard the rights of this body as complete under the charter of 1799, (Old School charter,) therefore no action is required in respect to a new charter. 2. It is recommended that the Trustees of the church erection fund endeavor to have inserted in their act of incorporation a general provision authorizing them to hold in trust for this Assembly any property committed to them by donation, bequest, or otherwise. (3.) "That the Board of Trustees of Publication House * * (if a committee of three legal gentlemen determine it safe and expedient * *) secure the insertion of a general provision in the act of incorporation like that provided for in the preceding article."

We quote this very significant "happy arrangement" without comment, simply beseeching our readers to supply, each as best he can, the logical links wanting, between proposition No. 1—declaring their rights complete without any other charter—and propositions No. 2 and 3—providing for two new charters. Our reference to the subject is not to criticise or find fault with it, but simply to point to it as a great fundamental movement of the body for an organization as a regular, legally recognized Denomination. Our taste would have been rather for a bold, square movement, here as in most of the corresponding acts of the Assembly,—just say "we intend to be a denomination, and must have a charter." But it must be borne in mind by us younger lookers-on, that this legal question is a sore subject with our New School friends. Let them slip past this ugly point as quietly as possible.

3. The complete organization of the Assembly's Committee of Publication. Of this we need say only that we regard it in some points as an improvement upon the Old School Board of Publication in its simplicity—but at the same time, far in advance of our Board

in the *intensity of its ecclesiasticism*. It not only constitutes a Board to print and publish, but to make and procure the making of authoritative Tracts on all the points in controversy. The Old School men are too jealous of constitutional prerogative, to allow that.

4. The organization of "*The Standing Committee on Education for the Ministry*"—with a "General Secretary of Education," the duties of which "Assembly's committee shall be to *superintend the whole cause in behalf of the Assembly.*" And in connection with this, an arrangement so remarkably "one by itself" that we quote the terms:—"Resolved, The 'Central American Education Society,' at New York, and the Philadelphia Education Society, shall be and they are hereby constituted co-ordinate agencies of this Assembly; provided the Directors of these Societies will consent to act in such capacity, and *will make an annual report to the Standing Committee, as early as the first of May, of all that they have done in connection with the Presbyterian church.*"

This we consider a peculiarly happy arrangement; and we wonder it never occurred to our Old School fathers to take the same happy turn on voluntary-ism! Not only create an ecclesiastical Board, but a *Board which shall take oversight of the voluntary Societies!* The Old School men of '37 and '38 were content, alas! to simply spike the enemy's cannon; but the great Assembly of 1854 with profounder policy, will turn the enemy's cannon against their own camp!

If such a system could have been inaugurated in 1838 or '40, and we could have persuaded the Voluntaries to report to our Boards or Committees of Assembly—making a "clean breast of it"—what an incalculable amount of negative good would have accrued to us in keeping us advised of "what they were doing in the Presbyterian church"—and of positive good to all the world in satisfying the church that their means were well and wisely expended.

5. The conference with the American and Philadelphia Home Missionary Societies resulted in a declaration that "The difficulties apprehended being all happily adjusted, the Assembly see *no occasion to create any other instrumentality.*" In this connection as exponential of the same general state of feeling, we refer to another matter.

6. The subject of "*Presbyteries in Foreign Lands*" or in other words, the Assembly's position toward the American Board. It seems that a short discussion only took place also on this subject. But the action, though little, is very significant.

1. "That the Assembly regard it inexpedient *at present* to organize Presbyteries or churches in a Foreign field.

2. That an annual correspondence be kept up between our foreign missionaries and the Presbyteries to which they belong," &c. We find, therefore, that the declining to act on these two remaining branches of the great subject of church erection by ecclesiastical Boards or voluntary societies—is even more significant than the positive action on the other three. It is simply a resolution to preserve

an armed neutrality on these two subjects, and take the action on the former as enough for one Great Assembly.

7. The action on Slavery—though in like manner negative—being simply an agreement to let off the Southern churches from the operation of the inquisition established by the preceding Assembly—we interpret as all in the same direction of a purpose to organize as a church and inaugurate Denominationalism. Such a course was obviously a condition precedent to any organization that should keep fast the Southern churches. This Southern portion, in itself considered, the large body of the church deem unimportant, owing to the merely nominal existence of the body in the South. But an *American* Church must of course make some show out of New York and Pennsylvania—for it happens unfortunately for this immense idea of a peculiarly "*American*" Presbyterian church, that two-thirds of the whole church and ministry are in the synods of New York and Pennsylvania. Or what is more significant still, leaving Pennsylvania out, New York with its synod, embracing part of New Jersey, contains above one half the ministers—say 726 out of 1562; and largely over half the church—78,000 out of 141,000. And New York too, raises largely over two-thirds of all the funds for all church purposes. These facts furnish a clue to the importance of even a small show in the South and West—in an "*American*" church, and the reasons of the expediency (for it is put on the score of expediency altogether) for the Assembly's not now pressing the slavery question—while engaged in completing the organization of this new-fashioned church. Such, then, are the "*res gesta*" of this great Assembly of 1854. Those who may be disposed to think from the style of the Review that the Assembly was run mad—will find, on reflection, a most marvellous method in its madness. All its great acts are in one direction—toward one great object (and we heartily approve of that object)—thorough organization as a Denomination. It augurs the most favorable results for the truth and kingdom of Christ.

In order, however, to show that we are not astray in our interpretation, we will devote a page or two to illustration, from the debates of the "*quo Animo*" of these remarkable doings, to wit: That they imply a formal renunciation of all the cant about "*Co-operative Christianity*," as opposed to "*Denominational Christianity*."

Says the adopted report on publication:

"Every denomination must have its appropriate denominational literature—cease to preach a truth, and it will soon cease to be believed. Regarding a true Denominational spirit as kindred in its nature to love of home and love of country—and just as innocent, &c.,—we must have an agency of our own."

The chief discussion on the main question of Denominationalism arose on the organizing the education scheme on ecclesiastical principles.

Dr. Allen, chairman, said—"The committee aimed at a middle ground. Without giving up the voluntary principle, and avoiding centralization—yet he desired to place the matter under the control of this Assembly."

Dr. Beman—"regarded the whole scheme as an incipient ecclesiastical Board, and as the initiative of such a system in our church."

Mr. Mills said—"We are not bound to work for ever, with every thing, in a voluntary system, because some people like that, or because it was once true, or may be now good for one thing; nor are we bound to ecclesiasticism when it does not answer the purpose. He had in 1837 been thoroughly in favor of voluntaryism. But he was an older man now, and experience had taught him to follow God more, and man less. The church must do her own work—the radical idea of church extension is self development. The church is not to be governed or fettered by its agents, committees, Boards, or societies;—it is to use, and not to be used."

Bravely said, Thornton Mills! and like a true out-spoken Kentuckian. The man who can think and speak in that style, needs not the pillowing up of D. D's from any quarter! We shake hands with any man, without stopping to enquire about "new school" or "old school,"—who looks at things after that practical style! The "American" Presbyterian Almanac boasts that Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge endorses the super-orthodoxy of the 16 Theses of the Auburn Convention. If it will gratify any body to receive so humble a testimonial, without the terrible back-handed compliment to their "moral characteristics" which accompanied Breckinridge's endorsement, we are ready at a venture to endorse Thornton Mills' creed as well as his ecclesiastical politics—no man who speaks in his style can be much out of the way, whatever his school.

But we proceed with our report on Debates :

Mr. Fancher, (Genesee,) said—"He believed the appointment of this Education Secretary was an entering wedge to the whole system of Ecclesiastical Boards, and this was one of centralization."

Mr. Martin, (Illinois,) said—"In the West they had seen other denominations work with so much power, without any apparent anxiety lest they should do too much for their own denomination, that they had lost all terror of the bug-bear of centralization, our church being the only one that does not take care of herself," &c.

Mr. Sherwood (N. Jersey,) "would not give a straw for the plan without the Secretary, who is the motive power of the machine."

Mr. Moore, (Pennsylvania,) "He should earnestly deprecate Ecclesiastical Boards, if by them was meant such as those in the other branch of the Presbyterian church, virtually ruling the denomination. But he should deprecate still more a power controlling the church, and managed by irresponsible—voluntary associations."

Dr. Parker "made one of the most interesting speeches of the occasion, but one which it is not easy to report, so as to preserve its aroma," says our historian. As the aroma is what we are after, and all we have room for—we pass this as well as that of Mr. Holt, (Iowa,) described as "one of those western speeches so difficult to give so as to retain the flavor,"—except to express our agreement with him—"that their church was like the man twisting the rope which a monster was untwisting behind him." We fear this is an unkind slap at New England.

Dr. Riddle—"I deem it the initiative of a perfect scheme of ecclesiasticism in our church—and a departure from one of the vital principles which has heretofore distinguished us from the other branch of the Presbyterian church. I do not see my way clear to support the measure, and would prefer being silent when the vote is taken. It was sympathy for these men and these principles—not want of orthodoxy, of which I am not suspected—not Congregationalism, for my blood and Presbyterianism are true Scotch Irish—that brought me into this branch of the church. Co-operative Christianity—not denominationalism—was then, and is still my idea. If I believed, as my brethren seem to do, that ecclesiasticism is the true system—I have it all around me in the other branch of the church. When my principles change, it will be far more convenient and promising to avail myself of their perfect organizations and genuine ecclesiasticism. If my brethren will launch out on this untried sea of ecclesiasticism—even though the movement be contrary to my judgment and feelings, yet I will, and do, bid them God speed!"

There again speaks a man, though on the wrong side! Good blood is this Scotch Irish!

Dr. Brainerd—"Our young brethren must remember the peculiar circumstances under which we committed ourselves to the policy which it is now proposed in part at least to overthrow. The same principles which in one set of circumstances lead to one set of measures, may under another set of circumstances lead to different ones. I affect no supererogation of virtue. *I do not mean to be again roasted as a heretic for the sake of New England—especially in view of the returns we appear to be receiving for our former great sacrifice.* We must be Denominational to put down Bigotry: we are surrounded by powerful denominational influences. My principles are precisely the same as when I first proclaimed my detestation of the acts of excision. When we stood shoulder to shoulder by New England, 400 New England ministers had not crossed the Hudson to repudiate the "Plan of Union," &c.

At the close of this speech on Saturday, Mr. Barnes, in due Senatorial form, moved to adjourn till Monday, announcing thereby his purpose to make a great speech. From what has gone before, our readers, will, like ourselves in reading the full history, be curious to see what course Mr. Barnes will take. The day is obviously lost—"Co-operative Christianity" given up as a failure, and Young Presbytery determined to inaugurate the Old School system of 1837, what turn will Mr. Barnes take now? A very characteristic one, good reader(!) In face of all that has gone before, he goes for this Ecclesiasticism in Education because it is not Ecclesiasticism! This Standing Committee he thinks is fully consistent with "Co-operative Christianity!" "It is not an Ecclesiastical Board," says he; "It has none of the features of such a Board!" As to the question of fact between Mr. Barnes and the speeches already quoted, we need say nothing. Mr. Barnes himself we doubt not can perceive some harmony between this scheme and the voluntary system. He saw a perfect harmony twenty years ago between the Notes on the Romans and the Confession of Faith. But he must deal charitably with those of us who, lacking his great practice, are not so acute in detecting resemblances.

Our historian reports this speech of Mr. Barnes through some 10 mortal pages. We would be pleased, if space permitted, to quote largely, but as is commonly the case with Mr. Barnes, the 10 pages may very readily be compressed into 10 lines, without thereby doing damage to the ideas or the logic. Translated out of *Barnesese* (as Macauley says of Dr. Johnson) into plain, short English—the substance of the speech is, that he, with others, had suffered martyrdom—"all that a man can be made to suffer in this land"—for their Platonic love of co-operative Christianity. That his brother martyrs (we presume because a martyrdom did not pay in their case as in his) had deserted him and the cause. That left in this defenceless condition the beautiful Platonic Deity has been roughly handled (1) By these savage old school excinders (2) By her quandom worshippers the Yankees, and (3) not truly and heartily worshipped even by many of her own peculiar children. As a natural consequence the splendid air-castle built for her in the heroic age is now in a very dilapidated condition—and now "Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis"—As there is no other possible way of keeping off the devouring lions of Old-school-ism, let us adopt their ecclesiastical divinity—not to the exclusion of ours—but while we

do all honor to the Divinity of our enemies, we will serve as best we can our own !!

We suppose that by this time we have conveyed to our readers a very full and distinct impression of the real nature of the acts of this Great Assembly, and the motive and end of its members in enacting them. This is chiefly what we purposed to do in the beginning. We cannot refrain however from adding here in passing, an illustration touching *the spirit* of the old party in the Assembly.

A single passage from Mr. Barnes' speech will sufficiently answer the purpose—

"Their course (the Old School) towards us has been uniform in its character and aim and tendency. In no way have they ever been disposed to recognize us as a denomination : in no way have they ever manifested a disposition to do us justice, or to treat us as brethren. By a mere exertion of power they dismembered the church—an act in moral wrong, compared with which the dismemberment of Poland was a trifle. The collected funds of the church they have retained, with no proposal to offer to divide them, or to distribute them by any rule of fair proportion, or indeed by any rule at all. The Seminaries they have retained under their control, never inviting or admitting us to share in their administration. They have sought no correspondence with us—they have rejected all overtures for re-union—they have refused to commune with us—they have practically insulted us, by refusing to admit any of our members into their Presbyteries, except by examination. In addition to all this they have sought to entice our churches from us, and to accomplish piece-meal, a work which they could not do by the act which excinded us, with the hope of *absorbing* what they could not *destroy*!"

We quote this—not by any means to reply to it—for as our readers are supposed to be somewhat acquainted with church history—and not lack-a-daisical "old women" of either sex—we will not insult them by replying to it. But it may be of service in moderating the contempt which intelligent men among us are so prone to have for certain third rate demagogues, whom they are disposed to consider heretics in the point of the 9th commandment—at least so far as they seem to except old school men in their definition of the term "neighbor"—when they hear their tirades about constitutionalism—excinding acts, &c., &c. What better can be expected of them—when Mr. Barnes on the floor of the General Assembly—where three-fourths of the body knew his charges to be utterly groundless,—dares to set all decency at defiance? But this quotation illustrates a higher truth—namely, that your noisiest anti-sect men are ever most intense in their bigotry and hate. Just as Unitarianism and Campbellism that rail at sects, are of all bigots most malignant—so this *liberal* Presbyterianism.

The New England brethren, also those dear brethren of the Old School in '37 thought very good sort of people in their way, but not to be relied on as Presbyterians. Mr. Barnes now, in the usual style of his school, slabbers over with kisses, while he is aiming the character-killing dagger—and in substance declare they have proved traitorous allies!—Yea, saith he, "There (at the wicked Albany Convention) was Beecher, who had been tried and acquitted by the influence of those now in our denomination. Here was the *very man who in Ranstead Court* moved that 'whereas we have been advised by counsel learned in the law,' &c. "But from not one of these men, a word of kindness toward our church." These, remember, are the New England brethren for whom he is ready to die!! (We hope never to be among Mr. B.'s friends.)

The third cause of the present trouble he avers to be, the love of some in the New School Body for Ecclesiastical Boards. He then proves that this is not giving up voluntaryism. The *Assembly* does not *control* the societies, but the Assembly's Committee!! And finally after showing that the proposed plan is in itself wise—he concludes with one more general scream of defiance and glorification. One turn in this last part of the performance, we cannot but notice specially. "We have passed through the dangers which every other denomination must meet, and encountered more perils than we have done." (How charitable a boast!) We have discussed slavery!!" Our Old School brethren must meet it. "The Episcopal Denomination must meet it." "We have passed through the conflict," &c. We are not so clear as to this logic. It recalls our boyish days, when the favorite game at our school, was "*follow leader*"—in jumping a mill race at various widths—the play consisting in forming a long line of boys, with the most active in the lead, and obliging each to run, jump or climb just when and where the leader did. On one occasion our ambitious leader attempting too wide a leap over the race found himself suddenly half submerged in mud and ice; when crawling out he stood shivering on the opposite bank and shouting through his chattering teeth—"Come on! you *must* jump, because I did!" We are not so sure that because Mr. Barnes' Assembly has tried to jump this mill race, and in consequence is surprised to find itself alive, therefore we must too; that because they were unwise enough to recognize slavery legislation as a legitimate exercise of their power—and now stand shuddering as they look back at the yawning gulf into which that folly was near driving them—there is therefore an obligation resting upon the Old School and the Episcopalians to learn the wisdom he has learned in the same way. Let him first show that duty and wisdom required the New School to attempt to jump the mill-race.

We are transgressing our prescribed limits. Much that is very inviting in this history of the Great Assembly of 1854, yet remains unnoticed. This then is the sum. That after seventeen years farther trial of New England, the New School find that the Old School men in '37 were not wrong in their judgment that New England Congregationalism, whatever else it may be good for, is not Presbyterianism. That co-operative christianity and anti-denominationalism is a failure. That the principles of the Old School in the contest of '37 in regard to church expansion are true principles, and the only safe principles. That whilst therefore the bitter revilers of Old Schoolism in past days, are put into a very bad humor at being forced to acknowledge these things—yet their new generation of men are no longer to be frightened back, from doing the work of the church in the best way, by the raw-head-and-bloody-bones which the imagination—if it be not the the bad spirit of Barnes, Beman & Co. create, and hold up as Old-schoolism. And therefore it has turned out that the Great Assembly of 1854 is such—simply because it has shown itself as wise *now*, as was the Old School in '38—'40. Verily "Truth is the child of Time!"

 OUR MOTTO.

"TRUTH, LIKE A TORCH, THE MORE IT'S SHOOK IT SHINES."

The present publication will, perhaps, be deemed of too little importance to be in danger of any "*envious Juno*" sitting "cross-legged over its nativity," but as it happens, in one respect, to realize the dream of the mother of the founder of the Inquisition in being born with a *torch* in its mouth, it may not be unnecessary to meet, at once, the apprehensions of those amiable and excellent people who may be disposed to regard it as a monster, and, therefore, the better "burnt or sunk into the sea." It may be well to show, that not all discussion and controversy are wrong: that not every torch is the torch of the inquisitor or the incendiary. The leading purposes which this Journal is designed to accomplish have been frankly avowed in the opening article of this number: and among these is *agitation*, but not agitation for its own sake. God will curse and all good men abhor the agitation which has any other purpose than the discovery, illustration and progress of truth, the glory of Christ and the best interests of man. Our aim is, by discussion and, if need be, by controversy, to explain and vindicate the great principles of Christianity, with special reference to the life, posture and active operations of the Presbyterian Church. So far as bitterness and asperity may be mingled with our work: so far as we may fall, through the infirmity and sinfulness of our nature, into the error of those sons of thunder, who, in their ignorance of "what manner of spirit they were of," would fain have invoked the fire of heaven upon the enemies of their meek and lowly master; so far we trust we shall be willing to submit to the admonition of our brethren, while we ask forgiveness of Him who spareth us "as a father spareth his own son that serveth him." It is our desire, however, and by the help of God we hope to be able to abstain from giving just occasion of offence to any human being, and, particularly, to any who love our common Lord. We cannot promise not to be in earnest and, it may be, vehement: but we trust, it will be, according to a distinction which has been made, the vehemence of *sentiment*, not the vehemence of *passion*. The torch shall be shook only that it may shine.

So much for our purpose and the manner in which we hope to fulfil it. But some people object to all controversy as of doubtful expediency, if not positively wrong: and in this country, where, happily, no established religion exists to be the engine of tyranny; where every man has the right, civilly and politically, to think as he pleases, under a responsibility to God alone, controversy seems to wear, (if we may be allowed so to express it) an unconstitutional aspect, as if we attempted to abridge the liberty of a brother, when we refute his opinions. The idea was happily expressed in a sermon by a minister of the South a few years ago, when he said that, "in this country *diversities in religion are established*." A man

may hold his own with any degree of tenacity, but he must not meddle with other people's. "The conscience of every individual is recognized as the only tribunal before which a religious volition, sentiment or act, can be justified or condemned. Thus the men of Babylon make Succothbenoth, and the men of Cuth make Nergal, and the men of Hamath make Ashima, and the Avites make Nibbuz and Tartak, and so on. Now, if the men of Israel say, our God hath made us and all things that are made, it may be endured; but if they proceed to testify 'that our God is the *only* true God, and there are *no* gods that are made with hands,' then the men of Israel violate the religious rights of the men of Babylon, of Cuth, of Hamath, &c., and by *their exclusive* religion, put themselves without the pale of the general toleration." It cannot be denied that there is some truth in this quaint statement: that there is a general disposition to bury differences or, what amounts to the same thing, to *establish* them. In our own denomination, debate is dreaded in church-courts and public journals, as if it were, in itself, injurious to religion; and that too, with the history of the first Synod at Jerusalem, where there was "much disputing" (Acts 15: 7), before our eyes. The evil concomitants of controversy are confounded with the essence of it. It may be well, therefore, to indicate, in a few sentences, the necessity together with some of the advantages of controversy.

In the first place, then, controversy of some sort is a necessary element, in every inquiry after truth, in what the logicians call "contingent matter." There are certain judgments of the mind which are primitive, universal and necessary, fundamental laws of belief, the very conditions of thinking or intelligence, which philosophers have ably illustrated, but which, as fundamental and primitive, cannot be made the object of controversy. They cannot be recognized in this character and at the same time denied without, as Sir Wm. Hamilton expresses it, reducing all philosophy to zero. Then, there are the truths of mathematics, which are also necessary. If a man denies, he lands himself in absurdity as well as falsehood: there is a contradiction, a violation of a fundamental law of thought, a condition of thinking, and the result again, is zero. There can be no controversy here. As soon, however, as the mind emerges from the regions of intuition and demonstration, controversy begins and must begin. In probable reasoning there is a balancing of weights: a state of equilibrium is a state of doubt: the preponderance of one scale or the other, is presumption, opinion, conviction, moral certainty, according to the degrees of preponderance. It is in the region of probability that we live, move and have our being: that we are educated and disciplined for honour, glory and immortality. And yet the moment a man begins to think in this department, that moment his mind becomes a battle-field of contending probabilities, an array of evidence and argument on one side, and a mass of difficulties and objections, soluble and insoluble, on the other. It is often a protracted conflict; and many a frail body

worn down by the ceaseless excitement of the mind, the agony of doubt, the alternations of light and darkness, has perished under its severity before the victory has been obtained. It matters not whether one debates with himself or another; there is *discussion*, a shaking of the mind, a shaking of the object-matter about which it is employed, a shaking it away from the difficulties, a shaking of the torch of truth from all that may choke and hinder the purity and brilliancy of the flame.

Various *discussions* tear our heated brain,
Opinions often turn : still doubts remain ;
And who indulges thought, increases pain.

The pain which the poet describes is not the result merely of a conflict of probabilities, but of the disturbing influence of the passions and prejudices which beset us in our fallen state. We have mutilated the limbs of truth in our rebellion against the Father of Lights ; and it is the Nemesis of truth that we cannot gather her scattered members without ceaseless and exhausting search, or retain the possession without ceaseless vigilance against the assaults of doubt and falsehood. The inquiry of truth, according to Lord Bacon's famous saying, is the love-making or wooing of it : and, with an offended mistress, the course of love cannot be smooth.

After all allowance, however, has been made for the discomfort arising from the tyranny or occasional insurrection of the passions and the importunate intrusions of doubt, the law which God and the constitution of our nature impose upon us in the discovery of truth by discussion and controversy, is not oppressive in its operation : but, on the contrary, is the source of some of our highest improvement and purest pleasures. And on this point we will quote the words of one who is as competent a judge in such matter as any man who has lived since the days of Aristotle ; though, in doing so, we must enter our caveat against what he says of the comparative value of Truth and the search after Truth, in its application to the department of human duty. " If the accomplishment of philosophy imply a cessation of discussion,—if the result of speculation be a paralysis of itself; the consummation of knowledge is the condition of intellectual barbarism. Plato has profoundly defined man, the ' hunter of truth;' for in this chase, as in others, the *pursuit* is all in all, the *success* comparatively nothing. ' Did the Almighty,' says Lessing, ' holding in His right hand *Truth*, and in His left *Search after Truth*, deign to proffer me the one I might prefer :—in all humility, but without hesitation, I should request—*Search after Truth*.' We *exist* only as we *energis*e ; *pleasure* is the reflex of unimpeded energy ; energy is the *means* by which our faculties are developed ; and a higher energy the *end* which their development proposes. In *action* is thus contained the existence, happiness, improvement and perfection of our being ; and knowledge is only precious, as it may afford a stimulus to the exercise of our powers, and the condition of their more complete activity. Speculative truth is, therefore, subordinate to speculation itself ; and its value is directly measured by the

quantity of energy which it occasions, immediately in its discovery, mediately through its consequences. Life to Endymion was not preferable to death; aloof from practice, a waking error is better than a sleeping truth. Neither, in point of fact, is there found any proportion between the *possession* of truth and the *development* of the mind in which they are deposited. Every *learner* in science, is now familiar with more truths than Aristotle or Plato ever dreamt of knowing; yet, compared with the Stagirite or the Athenian, how few, among our *masters* of modern science, rank higher than intellectual barbarians! Ancient Greece and modern Europe prove, indeed, that the 'march of intellect' is no inseparable concomitant of the 'march of science;'—that the cultivation of the individual is not to be rashly confounded with the progress of the species." That the illustrious author lays great stress upon the *process* which we are forced to employ in the search after truth, in its relation to the discipline of the mind, appears also in his conclusive argument against mathematics as an instrument for this purpose: the mind being passive rather than active in tracing the connection among necessary propositions. There is little development of energy.

What has been said of the necessity of discussion and controversy for the progress of the individual, is true also for the species, in a larger degree than some people seem to be aware, or are willing to acknowledge. To say nothing of philosophy and science, no man can deny that theology as contradistinguished from religion has made great progress in the lapse of centuries. We yield to none in our abhorrence of the theory of "development" as held by Romanists and Tractarians; a theory which forbids all controversy, because it necessitates a negation of thought: a theory which makes the word of God of no effect, and compels its rejection by every man who has not resigned his understanding to the dictation of a priesthood, whose wickedness is equalled only by their ignorance of the Gospel: but there has certainly been a development of the relations of the truth contained in the Scriptures. That truth has been shaken a thousand times in the storms and tempests which have beat upon the church, and has not only not been extinguished, but has burned and shone more brightly for them all. The promise of the Savior has been amply and gloriously redeemed: the Comforter has been the dwelling-place of His people in all generations, or rather they have been His dwelling-place; He has under all combinations of circumstances led them into "the whole truth" of Scripture suited to their emergencies: has instructed, animated, sustained, and given them the victory. And, however long it may please her adorable Redeemer, that His coming shall be delayed; though many tedious years of suffering and blood may elapse before her warfare shall be accomplished, the church may always be assured that the heaven-kindled torch which she bears aloft in the midnight darkness of the world, will shed a clear and steady light upon her path. The diversities of opinion, the discussions and controversies among brethren will all conspire to demonstrate the perfect purity of the precious

jewel entrusted to her charge, and to bring her forth, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.

A living writer who has never been remarkable for his love of truth, either in speculation or in practice, does homage to truth in the following words, an homage the more valuable, as coming from an enemy. "It is, in fact," he says, "the beauty and the perfection of truth, that it should stand the action of the most varied tests. It is only an impure ore which, while it resists, perhaps, the action of one or two re-agents, will, in the end, yield before the energy of a third; while the pure metal will defy the action of every successive test. Truth may be compared to a gem without a flaw, which may be viewed in different lights, which though held up to the eye on any side, and without artificial assistance, shall always present the same beauty and purity." The effect of controversy has been, in every variety of method, to test the reality and genuineness of truth: and the testing process has been a purifying process. The word of the Lord is as pure as silver seven times tried. The most violent and protracted agitation of the water of life, has stirred up no sediment: it is clear as crystal still. While, therefore, we deplore the bitterness, the angry passions, the numberless evidences of a carnal mind, which is enmity against God, that the history of religious controversies presents, we rejoice in the sovereign providence of Him who overrules all for the glory of His name and the progress of His truth. Jesus came to send not peace, but a sword, and yet He is the Prince of Peace, and peace will be the consummation of His reign. The solution of the difficulty, is that the peace will be the result of conquest, of absolute and universal conquest. He shall put down all rule and authority and power: consign all liars to the lake, which burneth with fire and brimstone: set up that Kingdom which rests upon the foundation of truth, and transform the torch into a blazing sun. Meanwhile, his servants must fight, must endure hardness as good soldiers. Conquest implies war. Only let us remember that the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual: mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong-holds, and the subjugation of every thought to the obedience of Christ.

If we descend from this general survey of the history of the church to an examination of particular periods, the result is the same. Take the age of Apologetics, of Polemics, of Scholasticism, of Systematic Theology: or the periods when (according to the division which pleases some writers) the Johannine, the Petrine or the Pauline types of doctrine, respectively prevailed, and it will be apparent, in the language of Hall, "that the evils of controversy are transient, the good permanent." And in our own beloved church in this country, which has often been shaken by debate, and more than once torn asunder in consequence of it, we are able to perceive even now, and shall see more clearly hereafter, how wisely and mercifully these storms have been ordered by Him who holdeth the stars in His right hand and walketh in the midst of the golden candlesticks. If the "brothers of charity," as they were then called,—"who constituted

the vis inertiae, the power of standing still"—had had their way in the last great struggle, what, in all human probability, would have been the posture of the Presbyterian Church now? Alas! let the condition of the New-School Body and of the Congregational Churches which sympathised with them answer this question. That glorious deliverance had to be fought for: it was the result of the blessing of God upon the *arms* of His people, "contending," agreeable to his command, "for the faith once delivered to the saints." Farther, it is plain to any man who has his eyes open, that many of the great principles contended for from 1830 to 1837, have not yet been fully recognized, at least in some of their applications: that these principles are still working and must work till the *fulness of time* shall come, when they will again appear upon the field and assert their right, perhaps in scenes as stormy as any that have been witnessed before, to the homage and obedience of the church. "A bright and blissful reformation," sending "a sovereign and reviving joy into the bosom of him that reads or hears," while "the sweet odour of the returning gospel imbathes his soul with the fragrance of heaven."

If these things be so there is no choice left us. We tell our brethren that there is *no standing still*. Stagnation is corruption. Life is motion. Motion is progress. Not the progress of the canting madman who would reform by universal destruction, but that progress which consists in the development, illustration and application of great principles, the eternal principles of truth and righteousness, which were before all earthly things and will survive them all—We must choose between truth and error: they lie together in this world so complicated and commingled that patience, vigilance and skill are required to separate them: to receive the whole mass is to receive the error along with the truth; to reject the whole is to reject the truth along with the error. The separation of the wheat from the chaff, the precious from the vile, is the result of the sifting winds of controversy. We are to prove all things: to hold fast that which is good. An idle acquiescence in the opinions of our fathers, natural or ecclesiastical, will never do: we must have some better reason for our faith than a Turk or a Hindoo has. We are responsible to God, and, therefore, must use our reason, with prayer for the illumination of the Spirit. "We may purpose, indeed, to live on what others have done, the mighty men of the days which are past, the fathers or revivers of our faith; and we may count that their gains will as much enrich us as they enriched them. But this will not prove so indeed; for it is a just law of our being, one of the righteous compensations of toil, that what a man wins by his labour, be it inward truth, or only some outward suppliance of his need, is ever far more really his own, makes him far more truly rich, than aught which he receives or inherits ready made at the hands and from the toils of others. And they of whom we speak *earned* their truths by toil and by struggle, by mighty wrestlings till the day broke; watering with the sweat of their brow, oftentimes with tears as of blood—

yea, with the life-blood of their own hearts, the soil which yielded them in return an harvest so large. So was it, and so only, that they came again with joy, bearing their sheaves with them. And would we do the same, let us first indeed see that we let nothing go—that we forfeit no part of that which we inherit at their hands. But also with a just confidence in that blessed Spirit who is ever with His Church, who is ever leading it into the Truth which it needs,—let us labour, that through prayer and through study, through earnest knocking, through holy living, that inexhausted and inexhaustible Word may render up unto us *our truth*, the truth by which we must live, *the truth, whatsoever that be, which, more than any other, will deliver us from the lies with which we in our time are beset, which will make us strong where we are weak, and heal us where we are divided, and enable us most effectually to do that work which our God would have done by us in this the day of our toil.*”

But these results cannot be reached without controversy. We may be idle, but the enemy never is. We must either do or die.

The allegation that religion loses more than she gains by controversy, we will answer in the words of Dr. Mason, that thunderbolt of war: “This allegation,” he says, “with an allowance for the mismanagement of unskilful advocates, is a direct censure of her champions, and a surrender of her cause. Are they who espouse such an opinion prepared for its consequences? Are they willing to say, that when the world was lying in ignorance, in wickedness and in wo, that the introduction of light from above produced more evil than good? That the gospel is a plague and not a blessing, because through the malignity of its foes, it has often brought a sword instead of peace? That it would have been better for men never to have ‘known the way of righteousness,’ than risk opposition in following it? That reformation of religion was a senseless scheme; that the martyrs died like fools; and that all the heroes who have been ‘valiant for the truth; all the ‘ministers of grace’ who have explained and established it: all the ‘apostles, prophets and wise men’ whom the wisdom of God commissioned to reveal it; and that Wisdom itself in the person of Jesus Christ, were disturbers of human tranquility, and spent their time in no better labour than that of ‘turning the world upside down?’” If you start at these things, what do you mean by asserting that ‘religion suffers from controversy?’ For all, prophets, apostles, wise men, and the Redeemer himself, fought her battles, and yielded their latest breath in her defence.” * * *

“Had apathy like ours enthralled the spirit of our fathers, we should hardly have been able, at this day, to distinguish, in religion, between our right hand and our left.” Religion would long ago have perished, or at least, “betrayed and insulted, her banner thrown down, her weapons shivered, her lips sealed, her limbs bound in affliction and iron, would have been laid at the feet and left to the mercy of her enemies, in testimony of *the respect and attachment of her friends.*”

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESBYTERY OF BALTIMORE ON SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE—Printed by Mills & Cox—Baltimore.

This pamphlet is designed to explain and vindicate the action of the General Assembly in regard to the subject named in the title: and, especially, the principles involved in the first Resolution, adopted by that body. It is very brief, containing only hints and heads of argument, but enough, it is hoped, to bring out clearly the following points—1. That contribution to the house of God, and to pious uses generally, is a *divine ordinance* and not an *ecclesiastical measure* merely. 2. That it is a divine ordinance of the *nature of worship*: an ordinance of the same general nature and design with preaching, praying and singing. 3. That this is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Standards, and, therefore, an element of our covenanted faith and order: and the raising of collections for pious uses can no more be dispensed with in a particular church, than preaching, praying or singing. Those churches, consequently, who do not regularly contribute to God's cause are delinquent in their duty to Him and to their brethren with whom they are bound to hold *communion*: and are depriving themselves of a very important instrument of growth in grace. 4. This being so, the church-courts have the right to call delinquents in this matter, to account: that is, churches, in which this ordinance is habitually neglected, may be called to account for the neglect. 5. No agencies are required, other than the ordinary officers of the church, in the stated discharge of their duties. Notice is taken of the office of Deacon in this connection.

We look upon the effort to direct the christian mind of the country, back to the great principles which underlie all true beneficence as among the most hopeful of the signs of the times. Once these truths shall pervade thoroughly the christian heart, we shall cease to hear complaints of the meagerness of missionary funds, and a tremendous impulse shall be given, with the blessing of the Holy Spirit, to the great work of testifying for Christ. On the other hand, unless God in his mercy, shall interpose, we fear that the final outworking of the system of agencies and appliances for raising funds in the church, which practically overlooks these principles, and which separating the contribution of funds from the stated ordinances, appeals to mere philanthropy, pride, or still less worthy motives, must be to corrupt the church, and bring us back the financial operations of the days

of Tetzal. No one who has had occasion to labor in the work of raising funds for pious uses, of late years, in the church, will have failed to be struck with the singular views which prevail in many quarters, and the singular means often resorted to for replenishing the Lord's Treasury. We have ourselves been gravely advised if we wished to succeed in obtaining funds for an object solemnly commended to the church by the General Assembly, to dine out, sup out, and make ourselves generally agreeable, and then on the ground of personal esteem for ourselves, and the courtesies of hospitality make our appeal for the cause. In our simplicity, we could not help suggesting as more in accordance with our notions of honesty and fairness, that we ourselves should do the hospitalities, at some fashionable hotel, and when our guests had well eaten and drunk, then seize the golden moment of their high good humor, to present our cause. It would look, to be sure a little odd for an agent to bring in to the General Assembly, as agents in the lobby of the Legislature or of Congress, often bring in to their employers, bills for suppers, wines, and other appliances. But is it in principle worse, than an honest report of other people's dinners and suppers eaten with a view to raising funds for the church? Just so of scores of measures now becoming common. Who that has witnessed the auctioneering off of some popular speaker, or some favorite preacher, at the close of a missionary meeting—or listened to the sort of begging appeals made for funds, and not unfrequently "the pious frauds" used to beguile covetous christians (for the natural connection between mendicity and mendacity must ever show itself)—who, we say, that has witnessed these efforts to entrap christians into acts of liberality, and then turned to the New Testament teachings on this subject—but has been made to feel the infinite hiatus between much of the current liberality, and that enjoined by the Gospel. We select among many illustrations of our meaning, that suggest themselves, the following from the "Christian Observer of Nov. 18th—under caption of Letter from Washington."

"*Brother Converse*:—I use the hand of a friend to furnish a brief statement of what the newspapers in Virginia call "a most frightful accident on the south side Railroad" in which I was a sufferer. * * * The train came in contact with a cow. * * * I was thrown from the upper to the under side of the car, receiving several bruises on the left side of my head, several injuries in

my left side and on my right shoulder. * * At this present writing I am unable to rise up, or lie down, dress or undress without assistance. * * * I periled my life, and nearly lost it, for the WESTERN CHURCH. The injuries received, unfit me for further effort, mental or physical, and yet THAT WORK MUST BE DONE! The Providence of God has arrested my active operations, and thrown the responsibility upon others; and, as I think, upon the members of our American Presbyterian Church, in all places. That responsibility can be met and the work fully accomplished, by an early remittance of donations. * * * Let this be done at once, and without stint, and if these contributions do not repair the injuries I received in my body, they will certainly relieve me from my anxieties, and the pressure of pecuniary responsibilities.

JOHN C. SMITH,
Pastor of 4th Church.

It is due to ourselves,—lest we seem wanting in sympathy with others in misfortune—to say, that in our concern, to know the result of the said catastrophe, we inquired a short time after the publication of this letter, for the health of its author, and were gratified to learn from a lady friend in Washington, that she had met him on the street but a day or two after the above came to hand, and not only was his brain unaffected by the tremendous blow on the head, but even “the beauty of his countenance was not marred” by the accident. And so far from the gloomy fears of having been laid aside by Providence, being realized, he seemed to be inspired with his usual energy and vigor. Now in what light are we to consider the contributions of American Presbyterians in response to this appeal? If this is a legitimate method of raising funds for Mission Churches—then the case suggest to us several important modifications of the agency system. (1) It is plain that a prime qualification of a good agent shall be a good thick skull, with a minimum of brains to stand hard knocks in a Railroad catastrophe, and survive to write appeals to the sympathizing public. (2) That therefore the church may turn to very important account, the useless drones and hangers-on, of whom so much complaint has heretofore been made. Set them to travel, and peril their lives for the enterprises of the church. If they survive the peril—as is most likely (for as Jefferson said of officers-holders, so of such men—they seldom die,) then their appeals to the christian public will do good service. If they die, the loss will not be great, and some “friend’s hand” can write an appeal, still more potent. (3) In that case moreover, the terrible Railroad accidents—so much deprecated heretofore, will be turned to

good account—and in no figurative sense, “the occasion may be improved.” But we ask our readers’ pardon, for this editorial dream. We hope they will carefully read the Presbytery’s Address, and weigh well its reasoning.

DISCOURSES ON TRUTH: *Delivered in the Chapel of the South Carolina College: by Jas. H. Thornwell, D. D. President and Chaplain: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855.*

When the author of these Discourses published his celebrated Letter on the Apocrypha, in reply to a Papal priest of Charleston, S. C., about eleven years ago, he was pronounced by one of the most illustrious men of this country, in a notice of that work, to be “one of the greatest and most original thinkers of this age, one of the keenest logicians who was ever set for the ruin of sophists and pretenders, one of the first scholars of his generation, and one of the boldest and honestest men in the wide world.” This verdict will be deemed extravagant by no man who has enjoyed the privilege of a personal acquaintance with Dr. Thornwell, who has heard him preach, or has read, with patient attention, what he has given to the world, in divers forms, through the press. An indefatigable student of the ways and works of God, an incessant reader of the writings of men, an enthusiastic lover of truth and of the souls of lost sinners; and all this combined with a degree of intellectual power which easily masters subjects whose difficulties confound and stagger most other minds; the Church has a right to expect great things of him. And it will not be disappointed. He never speaks without having something to say: and something, to which it is the interest of this generation to give earnest heed. Happy the young men of South Carolina who have such a standard and example, such a friend and counsellor! Happier still, if they follow him as he follows Christ!

They who expect to find, in these discourses brilliant and superficial declamation, will be disappointed. It is a work of profound thought, a book of principles, to be read, marked, and inwardly digested: a lump of pure gold, which some Dr. Cumming, perhaps, may one day beat out into a glittering leaf, for the admiration and improvement of the masses. If the students of the College listened to these sermons and understood them, South Carolina has no cause to fear that her glory and renown will be allowed to suffer in the hands of her rising sons.

A more extended notice may be looked for in our next number. The work may be had at Mr. Guiteau’s, in Fayette street near Charles.

THE CAPTIVES OF AB'S VALLEY, A LEGEND OF FRONTIER LIFE.—Presb. Bd. Publication.

"Truth is stranger than fiction," says the author of this very remarkable book. Well may he thus exclaim, as he looks around him in the Presbyterian Church, and traces so much of the good that has been done, and is now doing in it, back to his mother, the little captive Mary Moore;—who at ten years of age snatched her Testament from the burning pile in face of the horrid savages, and who gathered the bones of her mother from the smoking ashes, and with her tiny hands dug with the Indian hoe a place for her burial. We notice the book simply to ask our readers without fail to read it. As a specimen of what true romance the world is full of already, without any new creation of genius—of what epic grandeur may be attained by the simplest and most unvarnished narrative of truth—of what tragedy the real human life is constantly enacting—we know of no such book. But higher still, as a comment on the great doctrine of God's overruling Providence over the humble as well the great, we know of no better.

But we feel not like playing the critic here. The author of the narrative is our best earthly friend—the friend of our youth, to whom, under God, we owe all of the little good and none of the evil which we have been able to do in the world. And through him we feel ourselves infinitely the debtor of the little captive, Mary Moore.

"TENDER GRASS FOR LITTLE LAMBS"—By Rev. Cornelius Winter Bolton.

We have received this and several other books from our very kind friend Mr. Guiteau. Our editorial conscience is by no means clear on the point of receiving presentation copies for editorial notice. While therefore, we must beg leave to decline our excellent friend's kindness, with a view to keep ourselves in a position for independent criticism, we desire at the same time to express our thanks to Mr. Bolton for his very excellent little book. We have put it to all the tests—read it—got a mother to read it—and the little folks to read it—and it is pronounced to be one of "the books that are books." The man who has written such a book may feel that he has lived to some purpose.

We avail ourselves of the opportunity to say to our readers that they will find at Mr. Guiteau's, at the New Bible and Tract House, on Fayette, near Charles, all the books of the American Tract Society, of the American Sunday School Union, and of the Presbyterian Board of Publication. They will find also all the publications of the Car-

ters' and others, and every facility for supplying a library that can be found in New York or Philadelphia.

A DISCOURSE ON THE FASHIONABLE AMUSEMENT OF DANCING.—By Samuel R. Wilson, of Cincinnati.

We hope Mr. Wilson's congregation will take measures for giving this discourse the widest possible circulation. We have seen nothing on this subject which more effectually demolishes the flimsy pleas of dancing christians—or more forcibly presses home upon the conscience, the important principles relating to this whole subject of fashionable amusements.

PAMPHLETS ON THE EDUCATION QUESTION.—By Rev. C. C. Vaughan and E. C. Smith.

"Buried in a pamphlet"—hitherto a strong figure of speech, Mr. Vaughan's binder seems to take in its literal sense, if we are to judge from the sable dress in which he sends forth this production. We venture to predict however, that here is buried seed which shall spring up rapidly, and produce a harvest. Mr. Vaughan's argument is long, and somewhat diffuse. This however is not his fault so much as that of those to whom he makes this elaborate reply. One of the most remarkable characteristics of this whole discussion, to our mind, has been the vague and general statements and reasonings on which the advocates of Ecclesiastical control of secular Education have founded their conclusions. In consequence of this fact, any reply to their arguments in detail cannot be otherwise than diffuse and protracted.

Mr. Smith's "Defence of Denominational Education" adds nothing that we can see to the reasoning on that side of the question—nor can we understand why such an ado should have been made, about its exclusion from the pages of the Southern Presbyterian Review. We mean by no means to disparage Mr. Smith's pamphlet—it is as good as the average of the argument on his side of the question. But at the same time we cannot see that it advances any thing so new or so strong as to give it special claim on the Review—and to call forth from the "Presbyterian Herald" a grave censure upon the conductors for declining it—as not in keeping with their dignity.

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW—Jan. '55.

We had marked for notice one or two articles in Brownson—especially one on the Know Nothings, in which, as we think, this champion of pure Poperly begins to show signs of "Craw-fishing;"—and giving into the heresies of those whom he has hereto-

fore bravely denounced, as "Custom House Catholics"—such as Mallory and Chandler, who fear to stand up to the dogma of the temporal power of the Pope. This we are sorry to see, as Mr. Brownson has always been a favorite with us. We have regarded him as the fairest type of a true Papist—and Theodore Parker, his quondam College friend as the fairest type of Unitarianism, among all the modern writers. But we shall recur to this subject again.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW,—
December, 1854.

We have read, as yet, only the sixth article of this number, entitled "The Spirit of American Presbyterianism: The Division." This is however, so very remarkable a production that we cannot forbear offering a distillation of it for the edification of our readers. We are free to confess that it has not only afforded us special pleasure and amusement in the reading; but suggested to us many new and original views of the much canvassed subject of the Division of the Presbyterian Church. The author fully sustains the claim which gentlemen of that side of the house have uniformly set up—to be peculiarly and eminently philosophic Theologians. Here we have the philosophic view of the Division of 1837. All former theories of the causes of that Division, are coolly laid aside as scarce worth considering, and the true causes sought for in profounder depths than the historians and theorists have ever thought of diving into. According to this Reviewer, the ground of the separation, was *not*, as most have held, difference of doctrinal views. It was *not* either, as the New School orators and writers have affirmed, a struggle for mere power. It was *not* the excision of the Synods. It was *not* the question of Ecclesiastical Boards and voluntary societies. What then? Far back of all these in profounder depths; it was *simply* in a *difference of Blood!* "*The cause of the schism in the Presbyterian Church is to be found in two varying organisms!*" In other words, it was the unnatural mixture of Scotch and Yankee blood in the same church, and the natural revulsion of such antagonist elements. It had never occurred before to our unphilosophical controversialists, to carry back their investigation to the fountain head—"the varying organisms," which enter into the composition of the Church of God. We have here but another illustration of the necessity of making *not* only our Theology, but our Ecclesiology keep pace with the advance of science. The speculations of Dr. Morton touching the difference of species in the natural history of the race; or more especially the theory of Professor Agassiz touching the

diversity of origin of the different races of men: and the different centres of creation are not, it would seem, without their use to those whose acute and comprehensive minds seek for a philosophic christianity. Whether true or not, as theories, in the *natural* history of man, it appears they are great truths in his *supernatural* history. As Agassiz contends for a different centre of creation—for each of the "varying organisms" in the *generation* of man, so our Reviewer suggests the happy idea of a similar diversity in the *regeneration* of man. The *generation* according to Agassiz—and the *re-generation* according to our Reviewer, is originally an act of Almighty power, to be sure;—nevertheless the centre of creation in the one case, and of the re-creation in the other being in different "provinces" the creatures are altogether different. The grace of God, to be sure, makes men christians, but that grace cannot make the same species of christian out of a Scotchman, as out of a Yankee—sufficiently the same, at least, to allow of their living together in the same church in peace! Such we take it, is the germinal idea of this new theory of the "varying organisms" in the Presbyterian Church, producing the division in '37. In common with the great mass of our fellow Presbyterians, we had supposed, that christians "were born *not of blood,*" that "in Christ Jesus their is neither Jew nor Greek."—Scotchman nor Yankee. A more philosophic Calvinism, however, would seem to require that we take all such sayings of Scripture only "for substance of doctrine," not the "*ipsisima verba.*" The irreconcilable antagonisms in the "American Presbyterian Church," are to be accounted for only on the supposition of different centres of re-generation! Sawney and Jonathan—though both christians—yet being "varying organisms" must ever live at variance!

But lest our readers imagine that we are merely amusing ourselves—we shall let the author of this new theory speak for himself in as far as our very limited space will permit. We present first, the opening paragraph, in which the author announces his views both of his own competency and the incompetency of his predecessors in this field of investigation:—

"We do not know that we have a new theory of the division of the Presbyterian Church, but we certainly think that we have a vantage-ground for its consideration that no man can have who has not given his days and nights to the Records of our Church, and to all the minute as well as more general aspects of its entire history. All the analyses we have seen, on both sides, seem to us imperfect, and mainly for the reason mentioned, that the sketchers did not stand at the point from which they could take in the whole landscape. Very many things have been well said concerning the division, but in our judgment *the great central principle has not been reached.*"

(To be continued.)

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 2.

FEBRUARY, 1855.

Vol. 1.

TEMPORALITIES vs. SPIRITUALITIES.

So far as our ecclesiastical government is representative in its nature, the people are the broad base on which the whole system rests. To the people belongs the choice of their own officers, absolutely as to two classes (Deacons and Elders), and subject to the approval of the Presbytery as to the third class (Pastors). In this right, as we shall show, is involved every thing that pertains to the vitals of doctrine and practice. Now let the question be carried round among even intelligent Presbyterians—where are the metes and boundaries of *The Congregation*? who are the constitutionally enfranchised Presbyterian voters?—and the variety of answers given will reveal the need of attention to the whole subject.

The practical commentary on the law in the case among the churches opposes the interpretation that the Congregation includes only communing members, and those who submit to discipline. We have heard an ungodly rum-seller haranguing a congregational meeting against raising the minister's salary, and we have known to be appended to the pastor's call the names of men who tasted of every vice, and who would have spurned the idea of submitting themselves to sessional supervision. To say that there is no regularity of practice on the subject, is only to admit the existence in our system of a governmental anomaly. Civil governments have always found it necessary to define the privileges of each and every class within its jurisdiction. Order and purity would be impossible where matters of right and privilege were left to be decided according to the fancy of neighborhoods. Are the issues presented to congregations of less moment than the election of a constable or the question of a railroad tax? Shall commissioners stand with falcon eyes at the ballot-box to maintain its purity, whilst bewildered tellers in a church meeting dawdle about in a miscellaneous assembly and receive all votes that may be proffered, while at the same time many a retiring Christian will not vote for the want of knowledge or of right?

In many individual churches the elective franchise is defined clearly enough by a foreign power, whose usurpations will be considered presently ; but in many of the churches this whole matter is left in a haze of uncertainty,—and hence, in nicely-balanced issues, it is impossible to say whether or not there has been, or can be, any constitutional decision arrived at. Suppose, for example, the question to be as to unsettling the pastor. Here is a most important matter. Schism—change of relation—the reputation and usefulness of all concerned—the spiritual well-being of the entire community—are at stake. How often in such cases has the balance of power lain with men who at any moment would exchange churches for the bonus of a salaried office ! The spiritual portion of the congregation may be struggling faithfully to be relieved of a pastoral wolf, and yet their efforts may be prolonged, their desires baffled, perhaps their body torn asunder, by the hypocritical pastor rallying around him a moral tatterdemalion host who would rend a church because of personal pique, and be delighted to decide the question by a resort to the *ultima ratio* of rowdies—the fist or the bludgeon ! Say not that this is extravagant statement to one who, though he be a countryman, has witnessed what he describes.

But the saddest fact pertaining to this whole matter is, that in many cases the evil under consideration has been screwed and rivetted on the church by the arm and hammer of the Civil Law. During the last half-century, it has become increasingly common for churches to submit themselves to, yea, to invite charters from, the State for their property, which ignore all ecclesiastical officers, and all moral distinctions among those legally constituted into the congregation. The electoral power is commonly lodged in the pew-holders, and the management of the property committed to a certain body unknown to Presbyterianism, called the Board of Trustees. Thus the term “Congregation,” which the Church failed to define, has been defined for her with a vengeance ! And should she remain supine for another generation, the Presbyterian Church will consist of a host of little sovereignties, each as independent of the ecclesiastical authorities as an insurance office or a railroad company ; whose only federal tie will be a common subjection to the State. Let it be distinctly understood, that in all such cases the Congregation is in no *legal* sense an ecclesiastical assembly, but a *Civil Corporation* !

Let us now consider what are the materials which are thus consolidated into an enfranchised department of the Presbyterian Church—if, indeed, it be a department of this church at all. It would not be wide of the mark to affirm that, usually, the majority of pew-holders (the voters by law) are not professors of religion. The ark of our *orthodoxy* might be safe even in the hands of irreligious men, were they all Presbyterians by education and preference. But largely sprinkled through our congregations (especially our city congregations) are persons who are not with us in sentiment or feeling. Local convenience, inter-marriage, admiration for the preacher, and

other like causes, induce many to become seat-holders in our churches who have no other bond of sympathy with us. It is known to be the fact, that among the enfranchised constituents of our Presbyterian assemblies are Papists, Unitarians, Universalists, Jews and Infidels—as well as Episcopalians, New School men, Baptists, Methodists. And were we to investigate into moral character, we would find every grade down to the lowest.

Let a popular pulpit-orator in one of our large cities, starting out with a handful of Presbyterians, offer the twelve hundred sittings of his church to the public, and there will stream in at his doors to fill up his pews as heterogeneous a concourse of people as ever met in a market-place or crowded a hustings. Staid and sober people have already their places of worship, and are deliberate in changing; but there is always a numerous class like that which gathered around the Apostle Paul on Mars' Hill, who are ever on the alert for novelties, and who luxuriate in exciting preaching as they do in the dramatic scenes and sounds of the opera;—and these are like the shifting sands of the desert, sweeping in clouds hither and thither, and are as unfit to manage ecclesiastical concerns as the rooks which flit about the towers of our old English cathedrals.

May we not well feel concerned for the future of our Church when we see the springs of her power thus polluted! In this land, where, under God, the Church has nothing to rely on but her own purity and prowess, how great is the folly, not to say the wickedness, of domiciliating within her walls the spies of the enemy, who in the hour of trial will be found lacerating the bosom that cherished them! This is no day to be coquetting with the powers of darkness. The blast of the bugle may call us to action at any moment,—and then, in the hour of turmoil and dismay, with what confidence can we look to the rank and file of our Presbyterian host. As a Church, have we not had enough of “entangling alliances”—enough of “liberal Presbyterianism”—enough of smiling Abners? *This* Trojan horse is filled with something worse than Congregationalists.

But we pass on to a closer inspection of those independent gentlemen who, when they once get into power by the grace of the State and its motley congregational electors, thenceforward figuratively, may, if they please, carry the church building and all its contents in their pantaloons' pockets.

These honorable gentlemen (we of course mean no disrespect to the great number of excellent men who fill the office) have their own stand-point for viewing church affairs, and better off than Archimedes, they *have* a fulcrum quite outside of the church, on which they may rest their lever for adjusting the affairs of the church just to their minds. The minister has to look after the edification and salvation of the people—the elders must see that all are living sober, righteous and godly lives—the deacons must care for the comfort of the poor; but the trustee, theoretically, “careth for none of these things.” He has in his name a certain piece of land with a certain very costly structure upon it—within that structure are certain marketable ac-

commodations called pews, which, like the stalls in the market-houses, are to be let or sold. The lot may be held by regular title, most likely it is taken on ground-rent, which ground-rent *must* be paid annually—a gentleman with a white cravat must receive his salary in quarterly instalments—the music which swells from the gallery has, to the trustee, very *silvery* tones—and silvery too is the gas-light, and golden is the glow of the furnace. But probably the most serious thought of all to the earnest trustee is of that great, ugly monster that squats at the door of nearly every city church—the *Debt!* And Lord John Russell never revolved in his mind the debt of England more earnestly than the trustee does the church debt, if it be large, as it usually is. Yon tower and these cushioned seats groan under mortgage, and the interest on their borrowed thousands must be paid when due, or up goes the Sheriff's bill on to the front of the church. But the trustee is full of resources. He orders the minister to take up collections. He assesses the pews at a rate that will make the means flow in. If the poor are excluded, it matters not to the trustee. He does not want those who cannot pay; and the fewer plebeians in the seats, the better chance for patricians.

What other view could such men be expected to take? Could you expect men to care for the souls of the people who do not care for their own souls? And the pastor, too, hearing as he does a hundred groans over the debt to one that he hears over the souls of the dying, must be something more than common flesh and blood if he is not tempted to play the demagogue. All this must seem to our neighbor, the country pastor, almost, if not altogether, incredible; for amidst the untrammelled spiritualities of our church here in the country, the trustee is a very retired sort of *caput mortuum*—the mere larva of the fully developed major-domo—only the sleepy grimalkin purring quietly under the master's chair, compared with the lordly tiger ruling the forest. But the trials of the city pastor in the hands of his trustee-board are only symbolic of the usurper's reign all over the land, unless the alarm is taken in time.

A city pastor of short experience, wishing to lay his resignation before the people of his charge, was quite surprised to be informed by his session that they had no power to call a congregational meeting under the circumstances—that inasmuch as the resignation of a pastor affected the temporalities of the church, the matter must first be laid before the trustees. This puissant body met in conclave, and, after deliberations which were then, as upon all other occasions, inaccessible to the pastor, issued and sent to the pulpit *their* mandate for the desired meeting.

It has already been said that this board—this “power behind the throne greater than the throne itself”—is usually composed, in large part, of irreligious men. This is only carrying out the ordinary principle of representation. There is a policy in it too. While this office has no pecuniary emoluments attached to it, it nevertheless appeals to that love of place and authority which is inherent in human nature. Magistrates and city councilmen will often work

without pay in attending to the public business even more industriously than in attending to their own business. And it is an old piece of party tact to fasten wavering friends by complimenting them with appointments. This board is the seat of honor on which are placed the valuable new-comers into the congregation; and especially for those who are ineligible to the legitimate offices of the church, and who cannot be kept up to the rack from their love of spiritual provender. This board is the honey-dish into which such golden flies are coaxed, in order that their feet may be made fast. This is supposed to *interest* the men of the world in religious affairs;—no doubt; and so would the wolf feel interested if appointed to assist the shepherd to manage the flock. It is an easily-proved fact, that a large congregation in one of the cities had a Jew—a thorough Jew—for president of its Board of Trustees; and it is said that the obliging Israelite complained of the difficulty he had in managing the elders! Indeed, in such boards, there is no legal reason why all the arch-errorists of the day should not become lord-rectors of our congregational affairs. And when the General Assembly appoints its sessions in a city church, it cannot be assured that when the members reach the door they will not meet some cool disciple of Socinius standing on the upper step, with the keys in his pocket, ready to address them with the words—“Gentlemen, I am the President of the Board of Trustees of this church, and your meeting here not being contemplated in the charter, it is optional with us to admit you. And high as is our respect for your honorable body, we are of opinion that your sessions here would damage those temporalities which we are appointed to guard, for reasons which we do not see fit to detail, only hinting—as one of the most weighty—that your Southern members would damage our costly carpets with tobacco-juice.” Who knows but that some such reason as this prevents the Assembly from obtaining an invitation to the city of New York—the fear of the trustees about their Brussels carpets! Let it not be supposed, however, that all trustee-boards are so fastidious as this—especially when a moiety of the ground-rent can be raised by some such snug operation as renting a part of the basement to a neighboring brewer, wherein to store his empty beer-barrels, or to a neighboring liquor-dealer, wherein to store his full wine and brandy-barrels! And if the debt presses *very* hard, there is the old grave-yard, which is in a most desirable place for a store or a tavern: it would bring in many a thousand;—and as for the mouldering dead, they can be removed cheaply by wholesale contract, and if a few bones, broken by the spade, *should* be left lying about, nobody can identify them. So in goes the spade, and up goes the five-story store, and bland is the smile that plays in the trustee-board at its next secret session. What is the weeping of the poor widow over the desecration of her lost husband’s remains—what the destruction of ten thousand tender associations, compared with paying for the organ and elegant gas-burners!

The thoughtful mind can easily perceive that under the reign of

this worldly spirit, there is no security left for the preservation of either discipline or doctrine. As to discipline, the disposition, if not the ability, to enforce it ceases to exist in any effective form. The glory of the Church, as of the State, next to having good laws, is the fearless and consistent enforcement of her laws! But the pall of expediency has become broader than the mantle of charity. Instances are not wanting in which looseness both of doctrine and morals is invested with membership, and even with office, in the purest church in Christendom. And in those cases in which the charter puts the title of the church property absolutely in the pew-holders, or their trustees, there is no sort of guarantee that the church will remain for twelve months in any one ecclesiastical connection. The pastor, falling into heresy or crime, may at any moment bear off the congregation and all its belongings whithersoever he will. Or, by a large infusion of unsympathizing ingredients, the congregation itself may bid defiance to all ecclesiastical control, and go (as has been done) through descending gradations into Unitarian infidelity. Corruption, turmoil, schism, secession, distraction, are the legitimate offspring of the illegitimate wedlock between the world and the church.

The evil here portrayed is of recent origin, and its direst results have not yet transpired. Quietly the virus is spreading throughout our ecclesiastical body from many a hidden wound. Many a loyal-hearted disciple sends up the wail of discouragement. But this is only the sighing of a depressed spirit, and the struggling of once active limbs now losing their vital energies—symptoms of latent disease not yet understood. The hectic brilliancy of external appearance may be only as the floral beauties of a garden, which are bright and gorgeous in proportion to the decaying matter in the soil. The external splendors of Christianity have always been, and must always be, in inverse proportion to its purity and spirituality. Consider this, ye that are smitten with the fashionable doctrine, that Christianity in her outward adornments must correspond with the trappings of an over-developed materialistic civilization. Are not the most splendid cathedrals of the world standing on the vilest dung-hills of moral rottenness? And have not the splendors of the most splendid of them all—St. Peter's, at Rome—grown directly out of the vilest of all the vile practices of Rome—the sale of indulgences? Consider this, ye that would deck the spouse of Christ in the flaunting robes of a harlot. Look within, and behold the corruption whence springs this meretricious taste. Look abroad, and see if the dearest things that belong to Christianity are not expiring in the clutch of the destroyer. One is reminded at such times of the prophecy of the poet Pope concerning the reign of Anti-Christ :—

“ She comes ! she comes ! the sable throne behold,
Of Night primeval and of Chaos old.
As one by one, at dread Media's strain,
The sickening stars fade off the ethereal plain,—
As Argus' eyes, by Hermes' wand oppressed,
Close one by one in everlasting rest,—
Thus at her felt approach and secret might,
Art after art goes out, and all is night.”

The exact nature of the evil complained of may be defined in the following three propositions :—

1. It is wrong to delegate to the State the authority to prescribe the terms of the electoral franchise in the Church.

2. It is wrong to allow non-professors to have any voice in ecclesiastical matters, spiritual or temporal.

3. It is wrong to place anything belonging directly to church affairs in the hands of men who are not regular ecclesiastical officers, subject officially to ecclesiastical authority.

These propositions all converge in the principle that the Church of Christ ought to be a self-governing commonwealth—assuming no control over foreign subjects, and submitting to no foreign control—not, indeed, refusing to be tried by the laws of the State in matters belonging properly to civil jurisdiction, but at the same time claiming to manage all her internal affairs in her own way. As a Church, we have in America never held the theocratic views of John Calvin as to the relation between Church and State, much less those of Cromwell; nor have ever tolerated the Erastian views of most of the Protestant Churches of Europe. The true Presbyterian *spirit* as well as form flows to us through the Church of Scotland, at whose reformatory period there welled up into a broad fountain those modest streams of Culdee piety which had made Iona like an oasis, and those sweet streamlets which had murmured God's praise in the caverns and mountain gorges of the continent. The Church of Scotland has had its Erastian days; but the living spirit of Scotch Presbyterianism has always opposed, and often to the death, any sort of usurpation on the part of the State. The errors of Kirk have almost always been on the theocratic rather than the Erastian side. She has always been inclined to view the State as her servant rather than as her lord. Such was the drift of John Knox's interviews with Mary, Queen of Scots. But a glance at the history of Scottish Presbyterianism will show that it has never *harmonized* with any sort of alliance with the State. Freedom was an inherent demand of its nature. And this day the living and progressive Presbyterianism of Scotland is outside the Establishment. And where, since the days of the Apostles, do you find such noble defences of the autonomy of the Church, as in the Scottish ecclesiastical history and literature? And surely the spirit of American Presbyterianism has no inherent leaning toward any sort of subjection to the State. No; it certainly has not; but yet a spirit of moderatism may come upon us as it came upon the successors of Cameron, Peden, and Rutherford. We may for a time become possessed of the devil. The world has seen the successors of John Calvin preaching Unitarian philosophy; and the world now sees the successors of John Owen preaching politics; and the world *may see* the successors of John Witherspoon preaching Erastianism. This increasingly common form of church charters is certainly a step in that direction. It is certainly leaving the State to define the privileges of those who belong to our congregations, and allowing it to foist upon us a class of

persons as voters, who have no semblance of a right in the eye of our constitution. And as well might you take from the Church the management of her alms, and all her Missionary, Publication, Church Extension, and Educational concerns, and put them in the hands of State-appointed, irresponsible committees, as to make this disposition of her other temporal affairs. The church edifice is as much a donation to the cause of God as a collection raised for foreign missions, or as those goods, in primitive times, which were laid at the Apostles' feet for the use of the Church.

There is very much need for bringing our ideas as to the character of worldly goods in relation to religion more into conformity with reason and Scripture. Property, in all its forms, is as truly a talent as any gift or grace whatsoever. And instead of being regarded as a contraband article proscribed by religion, on the one hand, or as a Moloch to whom we must sacrifice the dearest treasures of the soul, on the other, it should be regarded as the humble and useful servant of religion, indispensable to the Church, as it is to man individually, to enable her to accomplish her mission on earth. And the Church, in her wise and faithful management of her wealth, should stand as a perpetual model to her individual members in the management of their wealth. She should give a practical commentary on the text, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," by avoiding a vain extravagance in matters pertaining to her own convenience, and bestowing with a cheerful liberality all her additional means for the good of the needy.

(To be concluded in next No.)

RELATIONS OF THE SEMINARIES TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

THE Church seems now to be awakened, in some measure, to the vast importance of Ministerial Education. This fact must be our justification for asking the attention of our readers to another subject connected with our Seminaries, notwithstanding the large place which they occupied in our last number.

There are now three Seminaries under the care of the General Assembly immediately. This increase of their number may be safely explained as showing, that it is now the settled conviction of our Denomination, that our whole interests should not be committed to one central Seminary. There is, indeed, every thing to enforce such a conviction. It is most imprudent to give the supreme control of our orthodoxy to any one human institution; when we take into account the fallibility of all things human; the danger of awakening

arrogance in the teachers and students of an institution so great and overshadowing, and controlling the whole literature of the Church; the known tendency of scholastic institutions to perversion, illustrated by the history of almost every such school in former days; and the power which able teachers have over the *esprit du corps* of their students, for evil as well as for good;—we may then consider it as the settled policy of our Denomination that we shall have, not one Seminary, but several.

This fact must inevitably work out, at some day, an important change in the management of those Seminaries which are now immediately in the hands of the General Assembly. And the writer is one of those who do not care how soon this change may be made. It is this: that the Assembly surrender the details of the management of these Seminaries, including the appointment of teachers, to the Synods immediately concerned in them, reserving a general review and control over all their government, and a right of veto over all important measures. Such is the control which it now exercises over Union Seminary, Va. And here a fact may be, in a word, asserted, which no one will venture to dispute, and which contains an important argument for the proposed change;—that this control of the Assembly is just as efficient to secure fidelity and orthodoxy in this Seminary as in any other. Not only has the supreme Judiciary a fuller control over the Board of Directors than over any Synod; it has also its customary powers of review and control over the Synods which appoint Professors and Directors; by which it could require those Synods to cite, try, and punish any unfaithful or erroneous officer of the Institution. Our brethren at large have not been blind to the necessity of such a change. At the close of the Assembly of 1853, Dr. Murray, of Elizabethtown, proposed to the Assembly that it should relinquish the election of Professors; but it was judged too late in the Sessions to introduce so important a question. In the Assembly of 1854 the same measure was moved, in a broader shape, but was successfully opposed by an objection which seemed conclusive, but which we will attempt to remove in the course of these remarks.

We do not fear that any person, after a moment's consideration, will impute to the advocates of this change an invidious desire to degrade from a pre-eminent position any of the three Seminaries of the Assembly; for, by the showing of their friends themselves, such pre-eminence has already become impossible for any of them. It has been distinctly claimed in the General Assembly, that the new Seminary at Danville was as much *the Seminary* of the Assembly as Princeton, that it should enjoy the same fostering care, and share the same intimate connexion with its elder sister. Nor were the friends of Alleghany less urgent in claiming that theirs also was the equal daughter of the Assembly. Now, if the three are co-ordinate, and equally entitled to the favor of the Assembly, as the two younger eagerly assert, and as the elder does not deny, it is very clear that

each of them must henceforth depend mainly on sectional patronage. Neither of them is any longer a national Seminary—the pre-eminent Institution of our whole Denomination. It is the Assembly itself which has said so. Any one of them may fairly enjoy whatever pre-eminence its own superiority would give it. This it would be both a wrong and a folly to resist. A change from the present mode of superintendence to the synodical would not, therefore, cause any one of them to descend from a national to a sectional position; for that national position has already ceased to exist. We believe that, so far from the older Seminaries' considering such a change invidious to themselves, the time will come when their own friends will demand it, as essential to their prosperity. The change would be in a direction contrary to the late action of the Assembly, and the policy of the Western Synods, in establishing another Assembly's Seminary. But let the reader weigh the reasons for it.

First: It may be made to conduce to the prosperity of these Seminaries themselves. While either of them may, by a superior reputation, draw a partial patronage from the whole Church, they must all henceforth be, in the main, sectional institutions—in no bad sense of the word, but as intended chiefly to benefit a part of the Church, and to draw their chief support from that part. Now that support will surely be more cheerfully given, when the section of the Church which is relied upon to give it, feels that it can have its own way with its own institution. The supposed *prestige* which is derived from the nominal direction and patronage of the whole Church, assembled in its highest court, will be soon found to be illusive henceforward. When the section of our Denomination appropriate to the support of Alleghany, for instance, finds that, after all, it has the burden to bear, the money to pay, the students to furnish, they will begin to feel that they ought to have the first voice in the control of the Institution. Why should strangers to Alleghany; from distant sections—strangers pledged to the support of other, and even rival institutions—have equal control with themselves over their money and labors? The merely nominal support of the supreme Judicatory of the Church will be purchased at too high a price, when obvious natural right is thus sacrificed for it. Since the substantial support of each of our Seminaries must henceforth be sectional, the way to call it forth heartily and cheerfully will be to give the management to those sections where it justly belongs. Let the Assembly resign the immediate control of them to those Synods to which they must naturally look for support. Let it give each Synod, which honestly sustains them with funds and men, a potential voice in their government, by the appointment of one or more directors responsible directly to that Synod. Let this Directory, in each case, manage its own Institution, while the Assembly reserves a general right of review and control, and a veto over all acts of such importance as might decide the orthodoxy or fidelity of the Seminary. Through this threefold rein—a direct veto on its fundamental acts, a review

of the records of the directory, and a general control over the Synods by which this directory is appointed and instructed—the Assembly would have as strong a virtual hold upon such a Seminary as it has on Princeton, and as strong as it can have, in the nature of our government. Thus, we are convinced, a more hearty interest would be awakened for each Seminary in the Synods of its own section; and to those sections the Seminaries must look, after all.

It might, perhaps, be sneeringly objected, that the facts declare the contrary,—that, while the three Seminaries under the direct control of the Assembly differ among themselves, according to their age, in prosperity, they are, upon the whole, in advance of the other three which are under the direct control of Synods. The proposal of this change may be imputed, perhaps, to the same envious motive which actuated the well-known fox, who, having incurred an abbreviation of his caudal appendage, meanly desired to bring all other foxes into the same misfortune. Seeming appeals to fact are usually effective arguments; but this objection will influence none except those who take up with the sound in place of sense. Of the three Assembly's Seminaries, which seem to present a superior prosperity, these are the facts:—Princeton was founded, and built up to an assured prosperity, when the direction and patronage of the Assembly did confer a national status—when this was the national Seminary—when there was no sister to divide with it the regards of its foster-mother. Now the case is directly opposite. As to Alleghany, we will venture to affirm that, if the question be submitted to the old and experienced friends to whose enlightened and persevering zeal it owes its all, they will tell us, that it is the Synods of Pittsburg, Wheeling, and Ohio, which have given the men and money, have done the working and praying; and that all they have ever received from the Assembly which they could not have as well gotten without it, was some very pretty Resolutions, and an occasional blunder in management, thwarting some of their best interests, or depriving them of some of their best men. They will tell us that, in its earlier days, the Assembly's support of Alleghany was, in fact, a Carlyleian "unreality, a sham;" that it did languish with this support; and that its present prosperity is owing to efforts purely sectional. As to Danville, it is too young, and its success is not enough assured, to be a basis of argument. So much, only, has been proved by the event thus far: that the name of an Assembly's Seminary has not procured for it that united support, which were hoped for from it.

Second: It has been said, that justice requires that the effective management of every Seminary shall be shared with those who bear the burden of its support. Both the friends of the several Seminaries and the Assembly feel this. How often have not members of late Assemblies candidly acknowledged, that in legislating—and especially in electing Professors for the Seminaries—they consulted chiefly the wishes of the special friends of each institution? "We

voted," say they, "to place a certain brother in this Seminary, not because we knew him, but because its friends desired him." Nor are they to be reproached for this. They could not properly have done otherwise. There would otherwise have been no answer to such complaints as these, uttered by the friends of any given Seminary:—"It is we who have the money to pay, the work to do, the loss to suffer, and the failure to repair, if there is a failure. Why, then, have you, coming from Georgia, coming from Louisiana, refused us the man of our own section, whom *we knew* to be the right one, because he was not personally known to you, when it was not to be expected that he should be known to you in your distant section?" Upon the present plan, the recommendation of the friends of each Seminary must and should have a potential influence in the Assembly.

But, now, how shall that recommendation be made? Who shall be recognized as the authorized exponent to the Assembly of the wishes of those parts of the Church? There is no safe answer; and the truth is just this: That the present mongrel plan introduces into the management of these Seminaries an influence which common justice demands shall be weighty, and which yet has no constitutional and declared mode for expressing itself. It is a mode of election liable to all the vilest abuses of the *Caucus system*! When we consider of what poor human nature is capable, and what ambitions, plots, and rivalries have been seen in the Church, it is plain that the continuance of such a system is liable to produce results the most deplorable and disgusting. He who needs to have them suggested must be short-sighted indeed. There must be some declared and legalized form in which the part of the Church interested may give that potential advice which justice entitles it to give. In other words, the elections and other important measures must be virtually left to be initiated by the sectional friends of each school. Let them be formally resigned. This alone is honest or safe.

Some one may suggest that, if the Board of Directors be permitted to nominate to the Assembly, as was done last spring, in an important case, the difficulty will be relieved. But, who nominates the Directors? The Assembly. So that, after all, the responsibility and the power run in a vicious circle. There is no warrant that the Directors will truly represent the wishes of the section interested; because they are not its representatives, but the Assembly's. And again: if the Directory is the proper body to which to intrust this effective and potential nomination, why may we not just call it in name what it becomes in fact—an election, with a right of veto in the Assembly?

Third: The purity, unity, and comfort of the Assembly itself, and, through it, of all the Churches which it represents, will demand this change. It now has three Seminaries to manage, all co-ordinate, each the Assembly's own, all embarked in an honorable competition against each other. They will cause too much legislation for the

Assembly, which will interfere with its other duties, all rapidly increasing with our growing Denomination. In three Seminaries, there will be at least twelve professorships. What year can the Assembly hope to meet without one or more elections? Take the short experience of the past. At St. Louis, the Assembly was agitated with professorial arrangements for Alleghany, and had two elections to make for Princeton. In Philadelphia it had this election to make over again, and six others besides. In Buffalo, it still had the Princeton election to make over the third time, and two others besides! And in this connection it may be noted, that, as the Assembly can meet but once in a year, in the frequent cases of non-acceptance, the Seminaries are left to struggle on with deficient faculties a whole year. The Directories could meet more promptly.

But, worse: The questions thus raised are unfit to be introduced into the court of the whole Church. They involve personal emoluments and promotions—they awaken too many selfish and partizan feelings. These Seminaries, being all under the immediate care of the Assembly, meet on its floor as competitors for its favor and fostering care. Their competitions are there brought to a focus. If they were, each one, under the management of independent, co-ordinate, and separate bodies, though there might be still a competition for public favor, there could not be this collision of claims. It is between children of the same family that the complaint of partiality may arise. Between two daughters of two separate families no such charge is ever made; because it is natural and right that each family shall favor its own daughter. Nobody dreams of complaining of it. As long as these Seminaries are daughters of the same family, complaints of partiality will be heard, as they have been heard. Prominent men will be allured by one from another; and the act of the Assembly in effecting the transference will be felt as a wrong; because the hand that takes away is the same that gave, and because it ought to feel as much bound to give to one as to another.

But, worse still: The management of these complex personal and partizan interests in the Assembly will give rise to those corrupt combinations known in the political slang of the day as log-rollings. The condition will, before long, be intimated from one side of the house to the other,—“Promote my measure, and I will promote yours.” The threat will be hinted,—“Dare to oppose mine, and I will thwart yours.” And when members of our Church courts are so lost to public virtue and purity of principle, that they will permit motives of personal or partizan concernment thus to dictate their decision on measures of general interest, the days of Simony and clerical bribery will not be distant. Why should all these matters, personal and sectional, with all their heats, intrigues, plots and complications, be thrust upon the whole Church, to embroil, alienate and corrupt it? Let them be kept where they belong. Let each Seminary be governed by its own section.

The objections which might be made to such a change are the following:—That it is best the assembled wisdom of the whole Church should be invoked in matters so important as the management of the schools where our preachers are trained. That the direct support of the Assembly gives a breadth to the foundation of its Seminaries, and a strength of patronage which they could not otherwise enjoy. And that the right to the funds set apart for their support would be forfeited by such a change; because they were given to Seminaries *under the care of the Assembly*. The last seems to have been the operative objection at Buffalo. The answer suggested already seems to us all-sufficient. The change can be so made as not to subtract the Seminaries from the care of the Assembly. Its control would still be virtually as strong as the nature of the case permits. It would restrain the institutions from perversion of trust, or infidelity to Presbyterianism, as securely as is possible by any invention of political sagacity. The second objection is illusory. To each of these three Seminaries we can say: “Two others have as much right as you to this peculiar favor and all its advantages. You can only enjoy any advantage over them from this source at the expense of infidelity and injustice in the Assembly towards both your sisters.” Surely it is not the interest of any one to depend directly on a treacherous and partial parent. To the first objection we answer: The assembled wisdom of the Denomination is inapplicable to a local or sectional object, except for its negative control; because it must either hearken, in the main, to local wishes and advice, or must run the risk of committing outrageous injustice to local rights in overriding those wishes.

A GLANCE AT THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE ELDERSHIP OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

ANY one, who is at all capable of getting beneath the outside of things, will often discover that the current of their real tendencies is bearing many precious interests in a direction very different from what appears on the surface—that semblances are not always verities—that the features of the outside body do not necessarily correspond with those of the inside spirit. As a matter of experience, we find that no man can keep up a proper acquaintance with himself or with any institution in which he is deeply concerned, unless he keeps daily knocking upon those externalities which catch and may deceive the outward eye, to know whether the echos from the hidden interior maintain their true responses. History informs us that even evangelical church organizations are not always what they seem to be—

that the doctrine which lies near the heart and the practice which reside in the members, do, not seldom, look away from each other to opposite points of the compass. We, who have been led by the hand of the faithful historian, to stand within the involved circles of those ecclesiastical movements which characterize the early Christian centuries, can easily discern the steps that led the church from an original republican simplicity to the monstrous papal despotism of later years. We see how an apparent purity of conduct covered over a real corruption of belief. We see how little symbols that published the professed faith, came to be discordant with the faith whose works were actually done. We see how the official co-equality of a seeming brotherhood was distorted, by inward causes, into the disparity existing between master and servant. We see how the clergy ascended towards the dignity of an established vicegerency for Christ by all the grades which lie between a universal bishop and a suburban pastor; how the suburban pastor did himself pass, by a wonderful metamorphosis, into the rank of a priest, who, in his narrow sphere, excluded all lay help that was above a mere menial service; and how the entire service of God's house became the substitution of a deceiving craft for a spiritual worship.

Now, we are not ready to believe that this sad history is to be repeated in the case of the evangelical Christianity which has outlived the old causes of corruption. We see no indications, especially, of any alarming degeneracy in that Presbyterianism which a very acceptable nomenclature has made known to the world as "Old School." But, viewing our beloved church as a great body, filling a large space in the world, and possessing organs of the highest vitality to give it an animation and a progress and a glory among men, there never should be any hesitancy in applying the stethoscope and the practised ear, for the purpose of learning whether the inward life continues vigorous and of proper tone. We boast neither of our stethoscope nor of our ear. Yet a word has been long upon our lips, which we wish to say, not in the spirit of censoriousness, but in the spirit of candor and good will. We have often thought that we heard a wrong sound—detected a sickly movement—in the very bosom of our church organization,—a something, at any rate, which has induced a languor in one of the great limbs of the body. That important arm of our ministry, known as the Ruling Eldership, have we not sometimes seen laboring under a partial paralysis; aye, even hung upon the breast in a sling? Although, indeed, no one can say with truth that the other arm—the right arm—has all the vigor, has all the length, has all the skill, of which *it* is susceptible—that the Preaching Eldership is surcharged with energy from the spirit of the gospel—that its movements are all regular and faultless. But has not some power cut the chords of sympathy by which these two arms should be strongly and firmly united? Do they strike, and push, and embrace, together? Are they always lifted in the same act of prayer towards God, or extend-

ed in the same act of warning and entreaty towards men? Does the one give its chief preference to the other, only in the pulpit—or is there an undue subordination on the part of the Eldership, in *all* those places where the great interests of the church are accustomed to be represented? We wish to see our lay-officers made—we wish to see them make themselves more prominent; not in the theory of our system; not in the organization of our churches; not in the outside characters of our judicatories;—but in fact, in the actual experiments of the official orders, in the very midst of all the church's activities. For, it is one of the strongest convictions of our minds, that the Presbyterian body is not properly alive in itself, and cannot meet, with the fullness of gifts which it truly contains, the crying wants of the times, unless the Ruling Eldership be in the right place and accomplishing the right work. It must not be a *nominal* department of the church—but her true servitor according to the divine appointment. We must avoid the danger (which some of us think we see) growing out of a concentration of the whole work of edifying God's people and converting the world, in the hands of the clergy alone. We must assert the movement, that is silently propagating itself, towards an oligarchy. We must maintain the proper republicanism—the unimpaired popular element—that belongs pre-eminently to our church system. The eldership must not be a convenient, or ornamental fiction, but an essential element of actual power. We must not fall into Episcopacy on the one hand, which looks upon lay-government as sacrilegious; nor, on the other, into Independency, which admits no intermediate authority between the pastor and the deacon. But “he that ruleth,” let him rule “with diligence.”

1. The main duties of the elder associate him immediately with the pastor, in the spiritual government of the church. This is seen outstanding from the very text which affords us a chief argument for the ordination of the former: “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labour in word and doctrine.” The two are to rule together—the pastor outgoing the elder only in this, that, in addition to his power to govern in the church, he possesses also the power to preach and administer sacraments. Such is the doctrine. Is such the practice? Are not the instances very rare in which we can point to a complete co-elaboration on the part of minister and elder, over the entire field of a pastoral charge? Is it not, in truth, a sight to call out the remark of wonder, that if an elder visiting the people from house to house, or making conscience of warning backsliders, or taking any decided position as a ruler in the house of God? Is it not a common opinion among elders themselves, that they have done well—are “worthy of double honor”—if they can point to the sessional records for the proof that they have never been absent from sessional meetings, except by providential prevention?—that they are always at the pastor's side when a candidate for church membership is to be examined, or a case of discipline is to be adjudicated? Do we ven-

ture too bold an assertion when we say, that a majority of our 8000 elders would regard their pastors with a gaze of entire incredulity, were they to insist upon their association in the rounds of a regular congregational visitation? The past history of many of our churches cheers us with the fact that this has not always been the case—and we have the assurance of facts that it is not now universally true. Many a time has the writer witnessed the pleasing sight of a young pastor accompanied by an aged elder, threading their way among the residences of a town parish, where all hearts were open to receive them;—where prayer and exhortation alternately trembled upon the lips of the old man, there in his large experience, and fell warmly from the mouth of the young man, there in his holy zeal—and where the people felt in their grateful hearts that God had sent them two messengers to convey His grace to their unforgetting spirits. They saw and blessed the man of business who had turned aside from his money-making to the cure of souls. And the world, too, admired—was, indeed, deeply touched. The church organization was not all a form. It had a life which came from the pulpit, not only, but also from the pew. The elder at his work-bench, or in his counting room, or amid the bloom of his fields—the elder in the house, by the way, at the social gathering—or, wherever he was—had a solemn word to speak for God. He felt upon his head, and thrilling through all his heart, the hand of a heaven-appointed ordination; and looked forward to the day when the awful obligations of his high office must meet him before the face of his final Judge. All hail! ye noble elders of a true Presbyterianism! We bow before you in involuntary reverence! *Yours* is the “double honor”!

A feeling has been long growing among our *people* that the elder is out of his place when carrying his official character into their scenes of business, or retirement, or domestic enjoyments. The pastor may exhort, but not the elder. The Dr., coming down from his pulpit, may warn and reprove; but not the unlettered farmer, coming out of his field. There is but one hand that shall open to them the secrets of their bosoms—the hand of ministerial authority. So it comes to pass, that they who shrink from the elder, must have the elder shrink from them. If the people admit his spiritual labors among them only by courtesy, and not at all because he is their chosen ruler in matters connecting his conscience with their christian completeness, then they do effectually ignore the highest department of his office. They must awake to the consideration that the *eldership* is a co-ordinate branch of the ministry, if they would reap from the Presbyterian system the peculiar benefits which it is calculated to bear to God’s own Israel.

In order to elevate the ruling power to its proper place beside the preaching power, it is necessary that the people shall choose to the *eldership* the most worthy men (i. e. the most godly men) among them—men of whom they will not be ashamed before the world—

men, whose religious experience will eminently fit them for spiritual guides—men, who, though poor in earthly goods, and mean in rhetorical graces, are rich in heavenly gifts, and mighty before God in prayer. Not prominent *members* must be chosen; but prominent *christians*. Not those whose pecuniary support is needed for the external prosperity of the church, must receive the general suffrage; but those whose holy example and heavenly conversation are needed to influence the hidden Christ-love at the church's heart. Such men will honor their calling. They will dress the eldership around with a new glory. The left arm will join with the right in harmonious efforts to advance the common cause, &c. &c. &c.

2. Look at the Elder as an *ecclesiastic*. Why is he almost always in the back ground in the church courts? We do not refer to his want of pre-eminence in the highest court of all, so much as to his corner-position in the inferior judicatories. In the General Assembly, where there are so many of the eldership commissioned because of their eminence, say, as lawyers, some must be found among the leading spirits. But even there, the ministry is left to have an undue pre-eminence. Even there, not less than in the lower courts, whenever the church is to take in hand any great enterprise, the burden is placed upon the pastor, to the almost ignoring of his elder. We well recollect a case in point, drawn from the proceedings of one of the most thorough-going Presbyterian Synods in our connection. A plan was to be matured by a committee, for placing upon a new footing the whole Synodical work of domestic missions. This committee, apparently well constituted for the purpose, thought over the matter during an entire year. Their report was well written, gave evidence of considerable reflection upon the interests in question, was warm through and through with a zeal that burned, and almost all received it with much favor. A member arose towards the close of the discussion upon its adoption, and pointed out a singular omission. Its author had assailed the ministry for their lack of missionary spirit, and, through several pages of manuscript, urged, besought, reasoned with the several *pastors* to accomplish at once the work which lay alone at *their* doors. He had taken no notice of—had made not the most distant allusion to—the duties and responsibilities and privileges of more than 700 elders in the premises; and this, too, in the face of facts which made it appear that the very first stones of Presbyterianism were laid in this whole Synodical region by this forgotten class of church officers;—as well as in the face of that large class of facts which almost the whole world has admired, which show innumerable churches established on Missionary ground by the ruling elder, who had carried with him the true spirit of his high office. But this omission met with little notice, except in a ten minutes speech by the member alluded to, and which was listened to with surprise by the *preaching* eldership; although with apparent (though *silent*) approval by the *ruling* eldership. Now, what then occurred, in this Synod, does not often occur in

the General Assembly;—still more frequently in Presbyteries; and not seldom, indeed, in the very session itself. These bodies are not mere convocations of *ministers*. Their representative character is chiefly wrapped up in the eldership. It is, no doubt, true, that in them all, the congregations of our people have a two-fold representation in the elder who rules, and in the elder who preaches; but the former is their *fullest* representative, springs more entirely from their own midst, carries the chief burden of their wants, lies closer to the heart of their sympathies; is not entirely their own creation. And, therefore, in the name of a thorough Presbyterianism, let him come forward. We want him in the forefront of the battle. We want the encouragement of his uplifted banner—we want his counsel in the chambers of the leaders—we want his voice ringing “onward!” in the ears of the people. For, an elder, can accomplish what the minister dare not attempt, in many a matter where the *people* are concerned. The ministry is indeed, highly esteemed as a divinely-appointed order—there is a deep love (thank God!) for its work’s sake—an abiding reverence for its piety, and learning and industry—but it stands off from the people as almost an independency, when viewed ecclesiastically, however near it may be to them when viewed pastorally. At least thus it stands, when compared with the Eldership. And we venture the assertion, that were the *elder* to think more highly of his own office, and the clergyman to throw more honor upon it in all proper places, that the masses of our people would warm towards our church system with an entirely new heart.

We, of course, are not absurd enough to affirm, that the test of the prominence of the eldership of our judicatories is to be found in the amount of *talk* which they may contribute to the current deliberations. The influence of many, in both classes of elders, would be greater if they would always keep closed mouths in debate. Their votes are more eloquent than their speeches. Their private conversations are of more importance than their public deliverances. But, those elders, all over the church, who, in committee or in open court, keep their counsels, or their warnings, or their instructions, in obedience, while matters of vital interest to their immediate constituents are under discussion, do, so far as this goes, proclaim their willingness to leave the whole administration of church affairs in the hands of the clergy alone. This is an evil which may not be felt very deeply, so long as they can plead with so much truth, their common justification: “We confide in our pastors; neither we nor the people fear to trust to their keeping the most important interests of the church.” It looks a little worse, however, when many further plead: “we are illy informed as to the questions at issue, let them be left to the more skillful handling of those men who have studied them thoroughly.” But men are fallible; ministers are fallible; they may come to demand the exclusive control which was at first granted to them only as a convenience or a business necessity.

We cannot enlarge. We have written, not to exhaust, but only

to suggest. Let us only ask, in concluding,—in the name of Arithmetic alone—what cannot 8000 well-disciplined office bearers in the church of Christ accomplish? Behold 8000 flags afloat, all ablaze with the motto: “Look unto me all ye ends of the earth.” Hear the solid tramp of myriads of soldiers, led on by the strong captains of fifties and hundreds. See the earth, encircled by the military posts of God’s elect, and all nations coming and kneeling at the feet of the great “Captain of our Salvation.” Amen and Amen.

THORNWELL'S DISCOURSES ON TRUTH.

IN a very brief notice of this work, in our last number, we promised to present a more extended notice of it in the next. This promise we now proceed to fulfil, as amply as the space assigned to us will allow.

The author, with characteristic modesty, styles it, in the preface, an “unpretending little volume;” but, like the majority of the publications of the day, its real value is in an inverse proportion to its pretensions. It is, nominally, a series of discourses, preached in the ordinary routine of his ministrations as Chaplain of the South Carolina College: it is, really, a series of profound discussions touching the very foundations of truth and duty—discussions so profound and searching, displaying such extraordinary subtlety and thoroughness of analysis, as to make it impossible that they should have been adequately understood, at the time of their delivery, by any other audience than one accustomed to listen to the more detailed expositions of the lecture-room. There is no lack, however, of earnest exhortation, of pungent appeals to the conscience, of zealous remonstrances against all that is false, low, and dishonorable in human impulses and human conduct, and the whole pervaded by a lofty and generous enthusiasm in the cause of truth and righteousness, which shows that the preacher is not contending for mere barren generalities of the schools, but for living principles which have moulded and controlled his own character and life. He speaks and writes in what the ancient masters of rhetoric called the “agonistic” or “wrestling” style; and there are few of his hearers or readers so athletic in stupidity or wickedness as not to feel the force of his reasoning, and yield to the influence of his intense enthusiasm. We find no far-fetched fancies, no coruscation of brilliant images introduced for the sake of coruscation, no effort to produce a “sensation,” no chasing of tropical butterflies for the amusement of an auditory; but a solemn simplicity of purpose and an unity of design, such as befits an ambassador of God, rushing in between the living and the dead. Nothing can divert his eye or relax the vigor of his arm, as he wrestles with dying men for their salvation.

The Discourses are seven in number, entitled, in their order, "The Ethical System of the Bible," "The Love of Truth," "Sincerity," "Faithfulness," "Vows," and "Constancy;" two of them being devoted to the discussion of the "Love of Truth." Truth, in the author's general plan, is considered in two leading aspects, either as having reference to the correspondence of our convictions with the reality of things, which may be called speculative truth, or truth of opinion; or as having reference to the correspondence of our expressions with the reality of our convictions, which, in contradistinction from the former, may be called practical truth, or truth of life and conduct;—the one protecting the mind from imposition and error, the other the lips from treachery and falsehood; the one keeping men from being deceived, the other from deceiving. The second and third sermons discuss the love of truth in its speculative relation; the last four are concerned with truth in its practical aspects and bearings. The first sermon is introductory, and presents some very striking thoughts upon the ethical system of the Bible, thoughts which it is well to ponder in this age and country of sophists, economists and calculators. Some of these we propose to present to our readers, before noticing the leading points in the remaining sermons. The ethical relations of christianity are not comprehended by many, even of the educated men of the country, and, consequently, they undervalue its importance. They know not what it is, and what it proposes to do for men, and what kind of offices it exacts from them.

The first caution of the author, is directed against the error, either, on the one hand, of exaggerating the necessity of revelation, or on the other, of exaggerating the sufficiency of reason: showing that morality is a subject which falls, undoubtedly, within the province of natural light; but that, at the same time, the Scriptures are the only perfect rule of life. To say that we can have, from the dictates of conscience only negative conceptions of rectitude, "sufficient to check the vice, but not to inform the duty," is to contradict alike the testimony of Scripture, and the experience of mankind. "For when the Gentiles," &c. (Rom. 2: 14, 15). A being without the sense of obligation, and a spontaneous recognition of the fundamental differences of right and wrong, could not be responsible. An intelligent creature, without primitive beliefs to determine and regulate the operations of the cognitive faculties, would be no greater absurdity than a moral and responsible creature without primitive laws of right to determine and regulate the operations of moral judgment. But there are two respects in which every natural system of morality is likely to be found wanting. In the first place, the difficulty of reproducing in reflection the spontaneous processes of conscience, and of seizing upon its fundamental laws in their integrity and completeness, renders it next to impossible, that the verbal generalizations of philosophy shall exactly represent the operations of the mind. Something is apt to be omitted or added. The danger is enhanced by the difficulty of distinguishing betwixt

prejudices of education and natural principles. In the next place, the application of these fundamental laws, supposing them properly eliminated, to the concrete cases of life, requires great delicacy and caution. The heathen father admits the great law of parental affection: he misapplies it when he murders his infant child, to save him from the miseries of life. The Scriptures, as an authoritative rule of duty, guard against these defects by prescribing the law in its fulness and integrity; illustrating its application by description and example; indicating the prejudices which are likely to pervert us; and signalizing the spirit which will always ensure obedience. In this connexion the author notices the singular confusion of ideas involved in Paley's depreciation of the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule, because they "presuppose in the persons to whom they speak, a knowledge of the principles of natural justice:" whence, the arch-deacon gravely concludes, that they exact of men, in order to be understood, some tincture of philosophy, as if it were not one thing to be a moral agent, and quite another to be a moral philosopher. The Scriptures leave the peculiar work of speculation untouched: the moral nature, in its phenomenal variety and essential unity, still invites the researches of the curious.

He next notices the universally conceded superiority of the Bible in point of efficiency as a rule, arising from the greater certainty with which it teaches duty, and the greater power of the motives by which it enforces it. It utters clearly the voice of infinite righteousness, and wields the thunder of infinite power. In regard to the motives, however, it presents, it must be observed, says Dr. Thornwell, that its legal sanctions are not its mightiest. The scheme of redemption, in its conception and evolution, is a sublime commentary upon the sacredness and supremacy of right, which, while it reveals the ineffable enormity of sin, presents the character of God in such an aspect of venerable grandeur, that holiness becomes awful and majestic, and we insensibly adore under the moral impression which it makes.

Thus far the ethical teachings of the Bible, considered as giving certainty and power to the doctrines of nature. But that book teaches lessons which philosophy could never have dreamed of. *First*, in regard to *happiness*, which is universally conceded to be the chief good of man, the conceptions of the Scriptures are noble and exalted. The nearest approximation which has been made by unassisted reason to this doctrine, is in the philosophy of Aristotle. His fundamental notion is, that happiness consists in virtuous energies—that it is not mere pleasure—not the gratification which results from the possession of an object congruous to our desires. That is good only in a very subordinate sense, which simply ministers to enjoyment. The chief good must be something pursued exclusively for its own sake, and never for the sake of anything else; it can never be used as an instrument; it must be perfect and self-sufficient. What then is the highest good of man? It must be something which springs from the peculiarities of his nature, and which

he cannot share with the lower orders of being. It cannot, therefore, be life—for plants have that; neither can it be the pleasures of sensitive existence, for brutes have them. It must be sought in the life of a being possessed of reason; and as that can be contemplated in a two-fold aspect, either as a state, or as an exercise; as the possession of faculties, or the putting forth of their activities; we must pitch upon the most important, which is activity or energy, or as he also styles it, obedience to reason. Energy, therefore, according to reason, is the characteristic of man. This is his business, and he who pursues it best, is the best man. Human good, or the good of man as man, is consequently energy according to the best and most perfect virtue. Happiness, therefore, is not something imparted to the soul from without—it springs from the soul itself—it is the very glow of its life. It is to the mind what health is to the body—the regular and harmonious action of all the functions of the frame. This is in accordance with the doctrine of Scripture. Happiness there, too, is represented as consisting in moral perfection, and moral perfection in virtuous energies. It is treated as the image of the blessedness of God: and when we remember the ceaseless activity of the Divine nature—*my Father worketh hitherto and I work*—there cannot be a more convincing proof that felicity consists in energies. To be happy is not to be torpid; it is not a state of indolent repose, nor the passive reception of extraneous influences. It is to be like God, who never slumbers nor sleeps, who fainteth not, neither is weary. This is the great thought of the Bible. The defect of Aristotle lies in this, that he has not explained how these virtuous energies are to be elicited and sustained in a course of unimpeded action. We cannot think without thinking something; we cannot love, we cannot praise, we cannot exercise any virtuous affection, without exercising it upon something. An abstraction wants life, and finite objects limit, condition and obstruct our energies. Besides, love is the fundamental element of virtue, and love implies the existence of a person with whom we are united in intimate fellowship. Communion is indispensable to the energy of holiness, and that the energy may be unimpeded, the person with whom we are in union must be worthy of the intensest affections of which we are susceptible. He must himself be the perfect good. Now the Scriptures propose the fellowship of God as the consummation of felicity. That man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever; that this and this only is happiness; that we enjoy as we glorify; that the very going forth of our energies upon Him, the ever-blessed, is itself blessedness—this is the doctrine which lies at the basis of the ethical system of the Gospel. This noble and exalted view of happiness is then compared with the beastly theory of Paley and the socialistic philosophers; and the Pagan Stagirite is shown to be before them all. If there is any one thing which ought to be rung perpetually in the ears of the modern champions of social reform, it is that comprehensive doctrine of the Apostle, "he that liveth in pleasure, is dead while he liveth."—But we must pass on.

Dr. Thornwell, in the next place, by a few rapid touches, brings out the Scriptural theory of holiness, a subject in regard to which, not only Pagan philosophers, but a very large portion of the Christian church, betray profound ignorance. As happiness is an image of the blessedness, so holiness is an image of the moral perfections of God. It is, consequently, that, in the energies of which, happiness must essentially consist. What is it? Men have noted the phenomenal manifestations of sin and rectitude, have analyzed and classified them in their habits and in their activities; but not even an Aristotelian power of analysis has been able to reach the fundamental unity from which such manifestations arise. Philosophy cannot penetrate beyond consciousness: though it may surmise that there is a higher unity in which all the laws of conscience are ultimately grounded, it is unable to lay its hand upon it, and bring it to light. Here the Scriptures come in with their doctrine of holiness: and what philosophy had surmised, they abundantly confirm. What then is holiness? It is not a single habit; it is not a complement of habits;—it is a *nature*, and by nature we are to understand, not the collection of properties, which distinguish one being from another, but a generic disposition which determines, modifies, and regulates all its activities and states—the law of its mode of existence. It is that out of which habit grows, from which every single action ultimately proceeds. There is a nature in the lion, the dog, the tiger, which determines their manner of life—a nature in all beings, which makes them as they are. In itself it cannot be defined, belonging, like substance and power, to that class of things which, incomprehensible in themselves, and incapable of being represented in thought, are yet matters of necessary belief. On the other hand, the unity of sin is to be found in a nature the contrary to that of holiness. We can dwell no longer upon this admirable discussion, but commend it to ministers particularly, as containing, in sum, all that need be said for the utter overthrow of all the Pelagian and semi-Pelagian theories of the day in regard to regeneration and the nature of holiness: or for the absolute annihilation of the schemes of those sanguine philosophers who hope every thing from the education of the race. *Ex nihilo nil fit*, except by the power of God.

Lastly. The superiority of the Bible, in an ethical point of view, is shown from the effectual provisions it makes for the restoration of man to the image of God, or, in other words, for the creation of this new nature within him: and in order to this, the method it reveals for his emancipation from the bondage of the curse: the work of Christ and the grace of the Spirit. But we cannot dwell upon these points.

The next two sermons on the love of truth, will remind every one, in their spirit and tone, of John Locke: in the amazing acuteness and thoroughness of the discussion, of Sir William Hamilton: and in the remorseless logic with which the cavilling sophist is hunted out of all his refuges of lies, of Jonathan Edwards. We will not pretend to do more than present a bare outline of the argument.

The Preacher demonstrates the love of truth, in speculation, to be a duty, from the constitution of the human mind, which is as clearly adapted to the pursuit of truth, as the eye is to seeing, or the ear to hearing: from the aptitude of truth to enlarge and expand it: from the intimate connection betwixt the culture of the moral and intellectual powers, (the man whose perceptions of truth and falsehood are confused, being generally obtuse in regard to the distinctions of right and wrong): and from the impossibility of indicating the obligation of specific forms, without recognizing the obligation of truth in general. The only plausible reply which can be made to this course of argument, is that which assumes that the operations of the mind, in the department of speculative truth, are exempt from the authority of the will, and, therefore, that man is not responsible for his belief. In answer to this objection, it is shown that we are responsible for our opinions, in so far as we are responsible for the motives and influences under which we form them: that the operations of the understanding have a moral character, inasmuch as the impulse of curiosity, like all our other springs of action, is subject to the direction and control of the moral faculty. The love of truth for itself is evinced to be the law, in conformity with which all our intellectual processes should be conducted. We call particular attention to this argument, for there is a great deal of nonsense and inanity, now-a-days, spoken and written in regard to the subject of it: and, especially, in this country, where shallow thinkers are always confounding political with moral responsibility. As to the nature of this love of truth, which has been shown to be binding upon men as intelligent creatures, it is, further, demonstrated that their whole duty in regard to the conduct of the understanding, may be referred to the single comprehensive principle, that evidence is the measure of assent. Now the primary data of consciousness are the standard and measure of evidence: they are the constitutive and regulative principles of intelligence, the light of the mind, the vouchers and guarantees for all the truth which it falls to the lot of man to apprehend. To regulate belief by evidence, is, accordingly, to receive nothing which is not either an original conviction, or capable of being resolved into one. If this be so, there are but two ways in which we are liable to be misled and deceived: the first, is in assuming as an original conviction, or the legitimate product of such convictions, what is only the dictate of authority, custom, education, or desire; and the second is, in misapplying the data of consciousness to the cases which are actually submitted to the decisions of the understanding. In other words, we are liable to err by having a wrong standard of judgment, or, by using a right standard improperly. These are the heads to which, it seems to the author, all prejudice, however originated, may be at last referred. These points are then illustrated at length, in such a manner as Dr. Thornwell alone is able to do it.

But our space is exhausted. We have not touched the second general division of the treatise—for so it really is—but hope to recur to some of its discussions at a future time. It is abstract for a practi-

cal discussion : but Southern men, and, particularly, the men of South Carolina, have been stigmatized as "abstractionists." For ourselves, we glory in the charge : and, would venture to suggest, that, if in some parts of our northern country, the abstract principles of morality were more clearly and firmly settled, the people might be none the worse. Long may our countrymen stand on the watch-tower—like our fathers who went to war against the proudest empire on earth for a *preamble*—on the watch-tower of abstract principles in religion, in politics, in personal and public morality ! And ever and anon, may an alarm, like this book, be sounded forth among the slumbering masses of society !

In conclusion, we add, that our only object in this notice has been to whet the appetite of the reader. If the contrary effect has been the result, and his appetite has been spoiled, we beseech him to blame the bill of fare, and, notwithstanding, try the feast.

THE ISSUES STATED.

It cannot fail to have struck an attentive observer, as one of the most remarkable features in the controversy recently begun in the Presbyterian Church on the subject of Education, that the issues have been so incompletely apprehended and stated by some who have taken prominent part in the discussions. To some it has appeared to be *mainly* a question touching the nature of education, whether it shall be religious or not, whether the intellect alone is to be developed by the course of studies, or whether the development of the moral nature is not equally to be sought as an end of education. To others it has appeared a question of the means to this end, involving the issue, whether, conceding, as all Christian and enlightened disputants must do, that the development of the moral nature is to be sought equally with the development of the intellect as an end of education, whether they are to be sought together *of the same agency*; or in other terms, whether both are to be sought of the schoolmaster, or whether the development of the mind only is to be sought of him, and the development of the heart of the other agencies of education—the home and the pulpit. To others it has seemed a question whether, conceding that both these ends are to be sought in the day-school, *by what agency* such school is to be established. *This is the true issue* in general terms between us and the Board of Education: it is a question touching *the source of authority* over the schools, a question, as *to the power* which is to *provide and control these schools*. It is a question of *agents*, not of objects—of *agencies of supply and control*, not of the *minor agencies of execution*. To

some the contest has seemed a dispute about the right of individual christians to unite in establishing a school for their children. Others have more properly conceived it to be an issue touching the right of *the Church as an organized body*, to establish a general system of education. Some have apprehended it as involving only a *temporary and limited claim* of the Church as an organized body, to establish schools in particular localities: while others have more correctly apprehended it as establishing a claim for the Church as a party in education, universal in its application, and permanent in its duration, investing the Church not with an *alternative and limited power* under special circumstances, but with permanent and unlimited jurisdiction over the whole subject of establishing an educational system. Some have lodged this claim of the Church as an organic body, among those ends of the ecclesiastical organization which are to be sought from the individual members: others have more correctly understood the Board to claim the power in dispute under the official functions of the *offices* of the Church, teachers and rulers alternately. The term *Church* has been very dexterously accommodated to the shifting exigencies of the argument. Sometimes it is used to signify *God's people* or the *body of believers*, simply as such, considered apart from any organization. Again, it has signified an *organization* of individuals without any specification as to the nature of that organization as *limited* or *unlimited* in its purposes. Again, it has signified alternately the *teaching and governmental* functionaries of the ecclesiastical organization. The question has been argued on grounds which variously modify the nature of the claim sought to be established. We wish to place the issues as they are actually presented in the papers of the Board, interpreted by the *action* of the courts which have embodied in action the doctrines of the Assembly, distinctly before the reader, not for the purpose of arguing them at this time, except so far as may be necessary to the elucidation of the issues, but simply to let the real nature of the question raised with the Board be seen by the Church at large.

1. We remark in the first place that it is not a question touching the nature of education, or of the agencies to conduct it. It is a question touching the agency to supply and control these agencies. Admitting that education ought to be religious, and that both the development of the intellect and conscience should be sought of the schoolmaster, the question would still arise, *who is to provide such a school and control its course of instruction*. One answer is the State; another is, the Individual parent; a third answer, and the answer given by the Board, is *the Church in its organized and governmental capacity*.

2. It is not a question of *mere temporary and limited jurisdiction* on the part of the Church. It is not merely that the Church is an *alternative* agency to supply the means of education. It is a question as to the *universal and permanent principles* that control the whole subject of education. It is not merely whether *the Church* may establish a school where no other agency could establish it: or

whether the Church may not establish a school under *peculiar and stringent* circumstances; but it is whether the Church may not become the general, nay, universal source of supply of the agencies of education, not *alternative* to others, but *co-ordinate* with them, not merely under peculiar circumstances, but under all circumstances whatever, with no limit upon her discretion but her own conviction, not of the necessity, but of the superior security and value of her own schools. The guide for the discretion of the Church in touching upon a matter so foreign to her sphere as the control of the general interests of education is a stringent and unavoidable necessity—a limitation which will always make itself more definite as a practical issue than it can be made in a logical statement. It is a principle, which, however difficult to define, makes ecclesiastical action on such subjects limited and temporary—incidental in its jurisdiction, circumstantial in its grounds, and temporary in its duration. The claim of the Board is for an ecclesiastical action far different from this—for a jurisdiction permanent and universal. The issue between the Board and those who are constrained to oppose its views is whether the Church of God as an organization acting through its officers, is a, if not the only *permanent legitimate source* for the supply of that great social demand which will exist as long as man exists, *for the means and appliances of liberal education.*

3. It is not a question, again, touching the right of the *body of believers or God's people*, considered simply as such, as Christians and parents to provide the means of education. It is a claim for *the Church* as an organic body, in the highest sense in which its organic life makes itself appear. It is a claim for the *government* of the Church. It is a claim of permanent and direct power to supervise and control the agencies of education, existing in the *official functionaries* of the Church—a right vested in them by direct grant, according to one argument, and arising as a necessary incident to their granted powers, according to another argument. It is a claim alleged to grow out of the relation of a baptized child to the Church of God. It is a claim which as thus based, can be conceived to exist by no modification of individual right, and is utterly at war with the rights and liberties of the individual member of the Church, both adult and infant, both parent and child. Hence, as a practical exemplification of this claim, the schools and academies erected under the suggestion of the Board, have been created *by the courts of the Church* in their official capacities, as Sessions, Presbyteries and Synods, and the control of these schools is still retained by these courts as such. It is not a question touching the rights of the individual member of the church, to unite with other parents, members of the Church, to form a school; but it is a question touching *the right of the Church as an organization*, acting not as the organ of individual will—which it has no right to become, except for its own purposes—but from a fancied right inhering among *its official powers*, to take order on the subject of education. It is an obvious sophism to argue the power of the Church from the powers existing in

a mass among the people of God, or body of believers. *The Church* is not the people of God simply as such: it is an *organization* of the people of God. Apart from the consideration of this *organization*, the people who believe in Christ may be distinguished *religiously*, but not *ecclesiastically*. Indeed, in a loose and general sense, they may, *prior* to this organization, be called *a church*; but this use of the term is loose and inaccurate. In strictness of speech, their *ecclesiastical* character ensues when they are brought into an *organized relation* to each other, and not before. *The Church* is not only an *organization* of the people of God, but an organization for *particular and specific purposes*. Therefore, what the people of God may do *inside* of this organization is one thing: what they may combine to do *outside* of it is another. Some of these ends of the ecclesiastical organization are to be sought from *its individual members*, such as the election of officers, the call of a pastor, the erection of a house of worship. Others are to be sought of the *officers* of the Church—some from the *teachers*, as the public preaching of the Gospel. Some from the *elders*, as the administration of discipline, and others from the *deacons*, as the care of the poor and the management of the funds of the Church. But *the Church*, as such, whether acting by individual or official members, *must keep to its legitimate ends*. The question in part as raised between the Board and its opponents, is whether the control of secular education is one of these purposes or not—one of the legitimate and permanent ends of the ecclesiastical organization. We deny that it is: we insist that as a general rule, subject to peculiar and strictly limited exceptions, the education of children is one of those duties which the people of God ought to combine to perform *outside of the ecclesiastical organization*. We hold this to be true no matter what theory may be adopted as to the source of the exceptional and limited power alluded to, whether deriving it as an incident to the granted powers of the *government* of the Church, or as a modification of individual right existing in the individual members of the Church. We hold that *the Church* as an organization, can no more control the general interests of education through the *official* action of her *individual members*, any more than she can by the *official* action of her *officers*. The individual members of the Church may combine outside of the Church, to any extent they see proper, to provide the means of education. They may combine *on any principle* they may adjudge to be best. They may make *their ecclesiastical relation* to each other *the principle* on which they unite. But although they may unite on this principle, and the line of the combination for educational purposes, may be exactly coincident with the line of the ecclesiastical organization, yet the *principle or source of authority* is by this distinction preserved to the individual, the demarcation between private right and ecclesiastical privilege, is made sharp and distinct, and it is clearly provided that the Church as an organization, or the officers of the Church, have nothing to do with it in their official capacity, except in the same way in which

they are concerned in the business contracts of the private members. It is clear from this view of the question, that there is no earthly necessity for raising this great issue of *jurisdiction in the organization* which the Board have done. What necessity is there for this claim? Why may not Presbyteries demit their ecclesiastical capacity while acting on this subject? They would then be acting as individual Presbyterians for themselves and others, accomplishing every practical purpose without raising this issue of jurisdiction, and placing the Church in a false and dishonorable position as a claimant of powers to which she is not entitled.

It will be seen at once that the issues involved in this controversy are commensurate in importance with the importance of keeping the Church of God in its true position, and within the limitations prescribed for its action by her divine head. It is clear that those excellent people are greatly mistaken who regard this question as involving the difference between tweedle dum and tweedle dee. The Board do not so regard it: they clearly discriminate in their official papers between Hampden, Sidney, or Princeton and Lafayette or Austin. They distinctly admit the difference between them, and contend for the value of the distinction arising from the specific ecclesiastical connection, and urge the universal establishment of this connection, wherever it can be done. What then is the difference? It is simply this: schools like Washington or Princeton are the results of the combined action of individual Presbyterians, looking in part to the education of children, and in part to the interests of the Church: schools like Lafayette and Austin are created by direct action of the courts of the Church, and they are retained under their control. In this action they claim to act officially as a Church Court. This at once raises a question of *jurisdiction*, and it becomes necessary to investigate the true nature, and limitations of the granted and incidental powers appertaining to these Courts, before we can determine *their right to act*.

To sum up the nature, duration, sources, location and grounds of the power claimed for the Church by the Board of Education.— It is a claim to provide a whole system of educational agencies. It is a claim vested in the *Church* as an *organization* of the people of God. It is a claim vested in the *government* of the Church in its *official orders*, as distinguished from the private member. It is a claim, not to a limited and temporary jurisdiction, based upon peculiarity of circumstance, but a claim to universal and permanent jurisdiction, based upon a direct or incidental grant of power, and subject to no limitation but the discretion of the functionaries of the Church. It is a claim conceived to rest on no modification of individual right, acting through the organization of the Church—an idea held by some, but subject to the objection that the ecclesiastical organization can no more suffer its action to be enlarged than it can enlarge it, itself. The Board claims it to be within the jurisdiction of the Church courts, acting not as individuals for themselves or as the representatives of other individuals, but specifically as

a court of the Church exercising its direct or incidental official powers. To vary the expression that the comprehension of the issues may be complete. It is not that Presbyterians may establish a system of schools. It is not that the courts of the Church exercising their official powers of government may occasionally and under a peculiar and stringent necessity, create a school. But it is whether the Courts of the Church, embodying the official powers of the government of the Church, may become and ought to become a general and permanent source of supply of the means of education in society at large. *It is whether the Church of God, acting through the highest official channel of her organic life, is the great and even divinely appointed agency to meet the great social demand for the means of education.* This is the great leading issue which is raised between the Board of Education and those who have felt constrained to oppose its views. The Church may now see the real nature of the issue, the nature, limits, duration and location of the power, and the reasons alleged in support of it—indeed all the material points in the claim preferred for the Church by the Board. Are the Presbyterians of this country prepared to endorse either them or the logic which sustains them?

PAPAL ORGANS IN CONGRESS.

WE intimated a purpose in our first number to recur to the subject of the temporal prerogatives of the Pope, as held by Dr. Brownson, the great ecclesiastical organ of the Romanists, and as promulgated on the floor of Congress by Messrs. Mallory and Chandler. After having gathered up and arranged the authorities for the illustration of the subject, Professor McClintock's letter to Mr. Chandler came to hand; which, as it is so able, and so completely finishes the matter with Mr. Chandler's main position, we prefer to refer our readers to that argument, rather than trouble them with another. If Professor McClintock's answer is not a finality in any body's opinion, we can do nothing for them. There is, however, another view of the subject, which the letter referred to has forced still more strongly upon us. What must be the character of a religious system, which leads men of the intelligence and reputation of Messrs. Mallory and Chandler to make use of their high position for giving currency to statements of fact and opinions, which the largest charity cannot shield from the charge of either a credulous ignorance of the subject, which renders them incompetent to speak at all—a Jesuitical tampering with words that "palters in a double sense,"—or a willful misstatement, solemnly designed to cover up the truth?

We think it worth while to devote a few pages to the illustration

of this phenomenon. It may shed some light on the genius and spirit of the great Roman Apostacy—especially in its tendencies to subvert, in the most intelligent minds, either the power of appreciating the force of the clearest facts, or the sense of the obligation resting upon all men—especially men in high position—to be candid, open, and fair in their public statements.

We select for illustration first, the remarks of Mr. Mallory in the United States Senate, on the 16th May last, as reported in the brief summary of debates in the *Baltimore Patriot* :—

“Mr. Mallory said that, yesterday, in the debate on the subject of securing religious toleration to American citizens abroad, an incidental remark was made by the senator from North Carolina, which was calculated to create much misapprehension. That senator had repeated a sentiment imputed to what the senator stated was an authorized organ of the Catholic Bishop of St. Louis, to the effect that, as soon as the Catholic population should get the supremacy in any State of the Union, religious toleration would be at an end in that State. The paper from which this statement was taken was called the *Shepherd of the Valley*. He regretted that such a statement had been made in the Senate; and he felt it to be just to state, that he was informed that that paper was not the organ or mouth-piece of any bishop of the Catholic Church, but had been disavowed as such by the bishop of that diocese. He alluded to the uniform conduct of the Catholic population of the country; and held that, from the colonial times to the present, they had shown themselves to be the friends of religious toleration.

Mr. Badger responded in explanation of his remark, and the matter then dropped.”

Now, after reading this, it must strike any one with amazement to be told that every essential statement in this paragraph is not only utterly unfounded in fact, but in face of the most notorious facts! We propose to show distinctly, 1. That the “*Shepherd of the Valley*” was published at that time, and for months previous, under the Archbishop of St. Louis’ sanction and approbation.

2. That approbation was formally given to contradict the statement, that the Archbishop in displeasure at the opinions referred to by Mr. Badger, had discountenanced the “*Shepherd of the Valley*.”

3. That the identical statement made by Mr. Mallory had some months previous been denounced by the “*Freeman’s Journal*”—Archbishop Hughes’ organ—as a “very mean and unjust, a false, shameless invention.”

We simply give our vouchers without comment.

1. The Archbishop’s approval, as we have it before us at the head of the “*Shepherd of the Valley’s*” leading column, in the year of grace 1854—the era of Mr. Mallory’s speech :

“APPROBATION.

“The *Shepherd of the Valley* is published with my approbation, and I recommend it to the support of the Catholics of this Diocese. † PETER RICHARD,
7th July, 1853. Archbishop of St. Louis.”

2. The “*Shepherd of the Valley’s*” statement as to why this certificate was given, as found in that paper, July 20th, 1853 :

“These rumors and this statement (i. e. the very statement which Mr. Mallory makes) are entirely without foundation. IN TESTIMONY OF WHICH, HIS GRACE OF ST. LOUIS HAS ALLOWED US TO PLACE HIS APPROBATION AT THE

HEAD OF OUR EDITORIAL COLUMNS. We shall, more than ever, strive to deserve it.

"Probably many of our readers recollect the controversy which we had with the 'Catholic Herald' in November, 1851, (in which he uttered what Mr. Badger quoted, predicting the end of religious freedom in this country, and which we will append in full presently.) * * * So FAR FROM RETRACTING anything that we had said, we REITERATED the STATEMENTS to which objection was made, and we have reason to know that the ARCHBISHOP OF ST. LOUIS ACQUITS US, NOT ONLY OF ERROR, BUT OF IMPRUDENCE in the course we then pursued."

3. We next give the comments of the "Freeman's Journal"—Archbishop Hughes' organ—on this paragraph, the following week :

"A very mean and unjust paragraph has been going the rounds of the press to the effect that the Most Rev. Archbishop of St. Louis had disclaimed the sentiments of our esteemed contemporary, the *Shepherd of the Valley*, and declared that he had no control over its columns. The anti-Catholic press, for a year or more past, has kept in constant circulation a sentence attributed to the *Shepherd* that 'the moment Catholics obtain the majority in this country, that moment religious liberty will be at an end.' We thought it exceedingly probable that Archbishop Kenrick had, upon inquiry addressed to him, said that he entertained no such idea whatever, as we are sure none of our Prelates do,—and that this declaration had been twisted maliciously into a condemnation of the bold and successful champion of the Catholic press in the Valley of the Mississippi.

"We are extremely happy to learn by the last number of the *Shepherd* that the report is not only false, but has not a shadow or semblance of truth to cover the shamelessness of the invention.

"Mr. Bakewell asks of the papers that have circulated the report of his condemnation by his Archbishop to publish this formal contradiction; and to say that the *Shepherd of the Valley* is published with the Archbishop's approbation. If the doctrine of restitution is not too *Popish*; if the conductors of the multitude of papers which have circulated this piece of false gossip believe that having done a man an injury, they are bound to repair it so far as they can, we hope they will attend to the publication of this denial."

We leave it now to our readers' reflection to solve the puzzle how, in face of all this, a United States Senator could rise in his place and volunteer to contradict flatly Mr. Badger, and repeat (if we remember rightly, he said on the "very highest authority") what the journals of that Church had, within a few months previous, denounced as a shameless invention, &c.

We subjoin now the passage in the "Shepherd of the Valley" of November 23d, 1851, which gave rise to all this ado,—which the Archbishop thus formally endorsed—and which we ask the readers of Mr. Chandler's speech to ponder, until we get space in another number to consider that gentleman's claims as a Papal Organ in Congress :

"The Church, we admit, is, of necessity, intolerant; that is, she does everything in her power to check, as effectually as circumstances will permit, the progress of crime and error. Her intolerance follows necessarily from her claim of infallibility; she alone has the right to be intolerant, because she alone professes to possess and teach the truth; no other religious body on earth makes such a claim: she not only makes it, but is able to prove that it is not made in vain.

"If the Catholics ever gain—which they surely will do, though at a distant day—an immense numerical superiority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So say our enemies. So we believe. But in what sense do we believe it? In what sense are we the advocates of religious intolerance? In the sense

in which the enemies of the Church understand the word? By no means. We simply mean, that a Christian people will not consider the ridicule of Christianity, the denial of its fundamental truths, of the immortality of the soul and the existence of God; the overthrow of all morality, matters beneath their notice and condemnation; that the foundation will be laid for a legislation which shall restrain the propagation of certain doctrines; that men will no longer be permitted to attack dogmas with which morality is inseparably connected; that the State will take its proper position as ancillary to the Church. It is useless to disguise this fact; every man's reason will tell him that it is true, and every Catholic will feel that he wishes that time were come, even whilst he wastes his breath in empty praise of liberty of speech. This is our answer to the attacks which have been made upon us by the religious press; we avow it as our intimate conviction that Religious Liberty, as at present understood, is inconsistent with the prevalence of any particular form of belief, and with the prevalence of Infidelity itself.

"We have said that we are not the advocate of religious freedom, and we repeat it, we are not. The liberty to believe contrary to the teachings of the Church, is the liberty to believe a lie; the liberty to think otherwise than as she permits, is the liberty to abuse the mind and pollute the imagination; from such liberty may we and those we love at all times be preserved."

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1854 AS PER THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

An article in the "Southern Presbyterian Review," for January, aiming chiefly at sundry misrepresentations of the spirit and acts of the last General Assembly by the Presbyterian and the Biblical Repository, has been announced to the churches by the former as "*a very curious Review of the doings of the last General Assembly, from one of the Editors of the Baltimore Presbyterian Critic, savoring of the renewal of agitation and reform measures in the Church.*" As the Presbyterian sees fit strangely enough to lay to the charge of the "Baltimore Presbyterian Critic," this incendiary article—so dangerous as to induce him to issue orders to the Presbyteries to have the next General Assembly *packed*, ready to counteract it—we hope our readers will pardon the insertion in our pages of that portion of the article relating to the Board—and containing the *virus* of the heresy. We desire thus to ask the candid judgment of all concerned, and at the same time to gratify the "curious" among our readers. We are only sorry that it did not occur to our cotemporary to give this portion of the article a place—ever so obscure a place among the curiosities that usually fill his last page, and thereby save us the trouble. Such a course would have made sad work indeed with his column of editorial on the subject, as a sober criticism, yet it would have amply compensated the loss, by turning that column into one of the real "curiosities of literature."

If any of our readers shall be in ill-humor with us for re-printing so long an extract, we ask him only to read it carefully, with the

Presbyterian's 10th of February criticism upon it before them, and if their ill-humor is not lessened by the process, we shall agree to their saying "stop my paper."

It may be proper to add that the article thus announced as from "one of the Editors of the Presbyterian Critic," was written chiefly before the "Critic" was thought of; and of course the "Critic" and the gentlemen concerned in it, other than the writer, have no more concern with it than the editor of the Presbyterian. If it does not seem to be making too much ado about so unimportant a matter as his opinions, the writer may be allowed to say, that he is not aware of holding any opinions, or of favoring any peculiar measures in regard to Church affairs, which he does not hold in common with a large portion of the wisest and most experienced men in the Church (out of Philadelphia,)—and all he asks of any who cares to know his opinions, (when he has any) is the privilege of making his own statement of them—or at least of choosing some one else than the Presbyterian to express them for him. Which request will seem but reasonable to any who takes the trouble to compare this extract with the Presbyterian's account of it. As to any who are content rather to judge of men from the night-mare creations of any Demetrius-the-silversmith—in the last Assembly, or since the last Assembly, he has more important uses of his time and labor, than to appropriate them to overthrowing wrong opinions, which not being founded on reason, cannot be corrected by reason.

"We recur, at this late period, and after they have lost all their freshness and novelty, to the proceedings of the late General Assembly, with a view chiefly to discuss the true interpretation of the more significant of them. Some of them are of importance, because of their direct and palpable bearing upon great and vital interests of religion. Others, because they involve principles, far reaching in their consequences, and widely extending in their application to the great measures of the Church. Others, because of their significance, as indicating a movement of the mind of the Church, more clearly and strongly in a right direction as we think, than perhaps any other since 1837 and 1838.

And that they have been generally so regarded, is apparent from the strong tendency manifested among the more earnest supporters of certain measures,—mistaking and misinterpreting many acts of the last Assembly, by reason of their strong partiality for favorite schemes,—to claim for them an endorsement which they did not receive; to fancy issues made before the Assembly which were not made, and adjudications of questions which were not mooted,—the final closing of controversies which were not opened, and battles won which were not fought.

Following the order of minutes, and aiming to select for remark, chiefly such topics as relate to questions of general and permanent importance, we notice first:

(The writer then discusses—The organization of the new Synods of Baltimore and Alleghany, showing its bearing upon the question of Synodical representation in the Assembly. Then the question of correspondence with Foreign Bodies, and the importance of some action to define distinctly the nature and meaning of that correspondence. Theological Seminaries. The Board of Education—especially the School policy of the Reporters of the Board. Systematic Benevolence, and Church Erection—then closes with the Boards of the Church as follows:

BOARDS OF THE CHURCH.

In connection with the matter of Church extension, an incidental discussion arose, which, though in itself unimportant, and neither getting at the real merits

of the question, nor leading to any practical results, has, since the Assembly, been made to occupy a conspicuous place in the proceedings. This instance, perhaps, as strongly as any other, is in illustration of the tendency already referred to, "to fancy issues made which were not, and battles won which were not fought." The paragraph in reference to this discussion, in the annual article of the General Assembly, in the Repertory for July '54, pp. 560 and 561, is so remarkable in itself, has been so widely copied in the journals of the church, and brings into view so completely the topics of which we desire very briefly to speak,—that in order to more brevity, we take the liberty of using that paragraph as the foundation of what remains to be said touching the Boards of the Church,—our only remaining topic. Summing up the result of the discussion, the Repertory says, "The sense of the house was so strongly evinced in favor of the Boards, and in opposition to merely speculative objections to their existence, that we presume the controversy will not be renewed." Now, there was no such "controversy" opened in the first instance, and no "objections to their existence," either speculative or practical. It so happens that in this case, we have not to rely for proof of this fact, upon the mere absence of any such opinions in the reported debates,—but the two gentlemen who are named as the parties in opposition to the Board, have furnished positive proof in their own utter denials. Mr. Armstrong has since felt called upon to deny formally, in the Presbyterian, that he ever was opposed to the existence of the Boards. Mr. Robinson, at the close of this very discussion, complaining that he had been precluded by the previous question from repelling as misrepresentation, the charge that he was an enemy of the Boards,—asked leave to offer Resolutions, not for action, but record,—(and singularly enough, the request failed, from the objection of the Secretary of the Board of Missions, whose misrepresentations they corrected,)—Resolutions which he had previously read, but not offered, and which he declared, set forth fully all his "heresies" on this subject. These Resolutions, so far from expressing opposition to the existence of the Boards, purport to aim at "the diversity of views touching the efficiency of the Boards as now organized and located," "which diversity of views tends to impair and embarrass the action of the Boards"—and suggest an inquiry as to three points: 1. Simplifying the form of the Boards to correspond with the fact, that they are Committees of the Assembly. 2. Requiring the Boards to act simply as organs and agents of the Presbyteries, not having to do with the concerns of individual Missionaries. 3. The expediency of locating the Boards at different centres. So far as the two gentlemen named are concerned, therefore, they were parties to no such controversy. The Reports of debates clearly show, that neither Dr. Breckenridge nor Dr. Adger, were parties to such a controversy, at this or any other stage of the proceedings. On the contrary, the Boards found in the former a true helper and friend, as they had before found him. But, whether such a controversy was had in the Assembly or not, if the paragraph of the Repertory be the true exponent of the views of those who claim to be the special friends of the Boards, we venture to predict that events will show that never was there a presumption more unfounded, than "that the controversy will not be renewed." It is singular to observe how, in this language of the Repertory, is brought out again the idea which ever seems prominent in the minds of many of the leaders in these measures of the church,—that of all other evils to the Boards and the church, discussion, controversy, is to be feared, and quiet acquiescence to be of all blessings desired. The speakers on this subject in the Assembly held the same tone, and for that chiefly are lauded in the Repertory. "Dr. Mugrave," we are told, "closed the debate, by one of the most effective speeches delivered on the floor of the Assembly for a long time." Then the Reporters have manifestly done the speaker injustice;—not less than his friends did at its close, in forcing the previous question by preconcert, in face of the worthy Chairman of the Committee, (Dr. Adger,) and his parliamentary rights in the discussion of his own Report. The speech, as reported, contains but three points relating to the general subject,—one the implied logic of the question, "Why do they not say what is wrong,—and not bring vague charges?" To which question, a most satisfactory answer is found in the incident just alluded to,—the fact, that the "previous question," was the

peroration of this discourse. The second point made was a singularly unfortunate analogy between objections founded on the admitted failure of the Boards so far, thoroughly to arouse the church,—and objections against Christianity itself, on the ground of its failure to conquer the world, which of course, has no force, except on the assumption that the hearts of God's people are, naturally, as averse to the work of Missions, as the hearts of natural men are averse to the spiritual truths of the Gospel. The third point was an analogy still more unfortunate, on more accounts than its want of parallelism between the case of the Board and the speaker's twenty years Pastorate in Baltimore; in which, to grant the parallelism in the two cases, would by no means strengthen the argument on the Board's side of the question, as results prove. The chief purpose, however, of these illustrations, is to present prominently, the single point, of the seeming aversion of the more prominent advocates of the present measures of the Boards, to all such discussion,—this being the marked characteristic of the tone, both of the speakers referred to, and of the Repertory. In connection with this indisposition to discussion, it may not be amiss to point out, in this paragraph, the same vagueness of terms, in regard to the question of the Boards, that has already been referred to, as marking the discussions in Education. Thus, on the one hand, it is asserted, "It seems, indeed, unworthy of debate, whether the body, &c. be called a Committee, and be appointed by the Assembly, or whether it be called a Board. In the one case, it would be a small body, in the other large." This we take to mean, that the Board, as now organized, is simply a large committee of the Assembly, nothing else, and it is "unworthy of debate," whether a Committee be large or small. But have the advocates of simple Committees never made any other demand than simply, a smaller Board? The Repertory need not be reminded that a Committee, constituted of Presidents and Vice-Presidents,—under charter of incorporation,—a Committee in which membership may be bought for thirty dollars, and "directorship," (a singular function in a Committee man,) for fifty dollars, is something out of the usual order of a Committee of a church court. After thus stating the case, as simply between a Committee large or small, the Repertory itself, proceeds to argue the advantage of a Board over a "simple Committee,—as protecting the church against the effects of throwing a responsibility and power on the Executive Committee which they ought not to be entrusted with;" as "serving the purpose of break-waters," &c.,—and finally, that the objection to the Boards that they are not church courts, is the "*ius divinum* theory in its dotage." Now, it is plain, that after thus comparing the several descriptions here given of Boards, the first and most difficult question to decide, is whether the Board be a *Committee* or not? Nor is this an unimportant question, since in this is involved the question, is "the church a Missionary Society?"—competent in her organized capacity, and provided in *her Constitution*, with all the agencies for carrying on her work. Or, is the Presbyterian Church, in this respect, no better off than the Independency, out of the defects of which grow up voluntary Societies. This is the true issue involved in the old controversy between voluntary societies and Ecclesiastical Boards. The question of reporting or not reporting annually, to the General Assembly, of Directors appointed by the Assembly, or a close corporation,—is a minor question compared with the other. Strangely enough the Repertory makes the admission, that "the accountability of an Executive Committee," (and, by parity of reasoning, of a Board,) to a body like the General Assembly,—a body, from its nature, incapable of effective inspection, would be *merely nominal*." And again, "so long as everything goes on well, the responsibility of the Executive Committee is *merely nominal*." This admission gives up, practically, the whole ground once held as against voluntarism,—and at the same time admits that the Boards are not Committees of the Assembly, but "a body intermediate between the Committees and the Assembly." If so, then, the Boards are something extra to the system of our church, and but a white-washed,—or, rather, faintly *blue-washed* variety of the voluntary society; and then the whole question involved in the controversy of 1835 to 1838, would "seem to be, indeed, unworthy of debate." Let the true issues on this subject be clearly and distinctly brought out before the church—Are our Boards simply Committees of the Assembly, representing the church

in her organized capacity, working through her constitutional agencies? If so, then let us not speak "half the speech of Ashdod, and according to the language of each people." Our objection to the paragraph of the Repertory is precisely that of the Ancient Reformer in Israel, to the mongrel tongue,—and for precisely the same reasons.

As to the challenge given in the Assembly, to point out the objections to the present working of the Boards, it was not accepted, for the very sufficient reason above given,—no opportunity was afforded. The gentlemen challenged, moreover, showed then and before, that they were too earnest in their desires to see the work of the church done, even if not in a manner exactly to their mind, to engage with any pleasure in the work of criticism and fault-finding. The gentlemen who gave the challenge may rest assured, however, that it is no difficult task to accomplish, once a man has a heart for it. We set down here, for their mature consideration, in brief outline, what are some of the difficulties in regard to the Boards, *as now operating*, in the minds of a larger number by far, than care to incur the odium of a fault-finding spirit, and to be pointed to as dangerous, unsafe, and troublesome men.

In the first place, there are many, and some of them among the most wise and experienced laborers in the work of the Boards, who cannot see the wisdom of the present structure of the Boards, with all the paraphernalia of Life Members, Life Directors, &c. 1. Because the *mongrelism* of the thing is, they think in the way of making the people understand the obligations of this work upon them, as the regular, ordinary, and special work of the church, as such. 2. Because nothing is gained in the way of efficient superintendence, by Boards of 100 men, who are scattered over a continent, and a majority of whom, probably, never has assembled in any one meeting,—thus giving the power practically, to a few, while the corresponding responsibility is destroyed by being divided among so many. 3. Because the tendency of this is to make the responsibility of the church's agents to the Assembly practically *nominal*.

Again, others object,—that the results of the system after 16 years of trial,—in the way of bringing up the church to her duty, have not been such as to authorize us to feel satisfied with the efficiency of the measures employed,—one half the church as yet, doing nothing,—and a large portion of the active part working irregularly, and apparently not realizing the obligation to contribute funds to the Lord's treasury, as an act of worship, spontaneously, but requiring to be incited thereto by appliances and means not in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel. Whilst even the Presbyteries, the constituted overseers of the work, in large part, are slow in assuming their proper responsibilities, and disposed to throw them upon the Boards,—who should be simply a bond of union, to the Presbyteries,—not substitutes for them. There are those also, who look with concern at the vast irresponsible power, now placed in the hands of the Secretaries, especially the Secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions, whose influence over the 4 or 500 men, whose support, practically and really, depends upon him, and who are as labourers in the field, responsible to him, may well excite alarm. The objections formerly urged against the power of the head of the Home Missionary Society, lie in nearly all their practical, though not their theoretical force, against the arrangement of our Domestic Mission system. The responsibility to the General Assembly, admitted to be nominal,—the responsibility to the Board, beyond a few members of it being not even nominal,—at least, in all ordinary circumstances,—the Secretary of the Board has, on the other hand, a power of patronage sufficient at all times, to hold the balance of power in the Assembly, and the church has no guarantee beyond the high personal character of the man, against the use of this power, so long as he is discreet enough to exercise it through the hundred channels, through which it may be exercised, without rendering himself liable to any charge of gross dereliction of duty, which can be proven. And yet, while professors in Theological Seminaries must be called to their office by the voice of the whole church through the Assembly, these officers, to whom so much power is entrusted, are appointed

frequently by the voice of a handful of men in one city. Probably no Secretary of any of our Boards has been elected for years past, by a vote of one-third even of the members of the Board whom he serves. The present Secretary of the Board of Publication, holds his office by vote of a majority of a larger meeting of his Board, than has occurred for years past, and yet that meeting consisted of less than one-third of the whole body. One of his predecessors in office, (Dr. Musgrave,) was elected at a smaller meeting, and then by a majority of *one* vote, which *one* vote was subsequently discovered to have been given in mistake by a gentleman who did not know even that he was *not* a member of the Board. We wish not to be understood as selecting this Board for illustration, because of anything peculiar in its history. This is contrary to the facts. The last election of a Secretary by the Board of Missions, was by a still smaller fraction of the Board, and that too, in the face of a protest spread upon the Minutes by some of the most influential members among even that small number. These facts are cited to show how little responsibility attaches to most important offices of the church under this system,—and that if, in view of such facts, there be those in the church who occasionally express doubts of the absolute perfection of the present methods, they should not be regarded in the light of enemies of the Boards, or of the men who control them.

There are again, economists in the church, who gravely consider the relative expense of the Boards,—while such an argument might have had no force so long as the effect to arouse the church was in its incipient stage, yet it is an argument of great force now, that full time has elapsed to show the result of the outlay. The argument of Dr. Plummer's Report in 1848, that the expenses of our system would be no greater, if involving twice the amount of disbursement, it must be remembered, ought to be constantly losing its force of application,—since one of the reasons which made the church content to bear the great expense at the beginning, was the expectation of increase of funds to be disbursed in future, at relatively less expense. If, therefore, that expectation has not been met, the reason for the large expenditure falls. In the light of this principle, many are disposed to doubt of the perfection of our system,—in view of scores of such facts as these: that the aggregate expenditure for management of funds in the Philadelphia offices is 25,000 per annum; that for fifteen years past, the income of the Board of Education has been stationary at \$33,000, of which sum \$25,000 are disbursed to candidates for the ministry, and \$8,000 for the whole cost of management; that the Publication House,—doing a business of \$80,000, (excluding colporteurs' salaries and expense, which is altogether a distinct matter, and paid out of a distinct fund,) is managed at an expense of \$10,000 annually, for salaries alone. It is needless to multiply citations,—the objection is not, then, that the labourers there are too well paid,—such may not be the case,—but that the system under which we are operating is a costly one, while it is not promising such expansion of the work as will diminish the relative cost.

The desire of others again, that the Boards should be located at several centres in the church, and thus avoid the manifest evils, both to the work of the church at large, and to the Pastoral work in Philadelphia, from crowding thus, so much of the work, and the official influence of the Boards, into a single city, has already been referred to, and needs not to be enlarged upon. Such are a few of the things which the gentlemen who were challenged "to point out what was wrong," would probably, have cited as cases in point, if they had deemed the objection proper. As wise men, they cared not, perhaps, to point out evils, so long as they saw no disposition to look at them and reform them, among those whose position and relations in these matters best qualified them to reform them. It is an injury to the church, and to the Boards themselves. Let it not be supposed, however, that those who see these evils, see nothing but evil in the present state of things. On the contrary, they see many a cheering and encouraging indication of progress in the right direction. The renunciation of the agency system is a great step. The resolutions on systematic benevolence, if once their force and meaning be apprehended by the church, are a still more important movement. But we must forbear.

Among all the grounds of discontent which have been enumerated, nothing has been said of the complaint of many, whose chief objection to the Boards, arises out of this constantly manifested hostility to free, bold, manly discussion of the principles involved in their action,—and their taste for mere measurism,—and demand of acquiescence in mere measurism on the part of others. This is clearly not the wise ground, for the representatives of interests so immense. The plea of unsettling the minds of the people, among such a people as ours, is utterly preposterous. The much-talked-of “confidence in the Boards,” if it can be impaired by manly, open inquiry, is a poor, piping, emasculated, unintelligent backing, which can do the Boards no good. It is manifest, that so far from being at the end, we are but at the beginning of the agitation, discussion and settlement of great principles, in the adaptation of our Presbyterianism to the glorious field which God has here given it to cultivate. It is too narrow and unworthy a view of our work, surely, to begin to talk of things ten years old, as finished and settled precedents. It must be remembered that many a measure, which the necessities of feebleness rendered expedient as temporary measures, may become subversive of the faith and order of the church, if recognized as permanent law. The plan of union of 1801, was not perceived to be hurtful in the days of the pioneers, but once the church grew up to power, its evils became so manifest as to require its utter abolition. Nor, as we have no precedents as yet, in our own church, for want of age, neither can we receive the acts of the Church of Scotland, or the Church of the Continent of Europe, with uninquiring acquiescence. A church united with the State, can have little in her acts of policy to furnish precedents to a church free from the State. It is closing our eyes on the light of the sun, and our ears to the calls of Providence, to permit ourselves, in our novel and amazing circumstances, to attempt to fetter the church with empty forms of mere authority. But it is equally blind to turn aside to human inventions and expediences, wherewith to do this great work of Christ, if Christ himself hath left to his church, a government and a form of working in the field. The conservatism we need, is simply the conservatism that seeks to abide by *principles*, not by *measures*. If there is danger of excess here, and of seeking to fetter the church “with the split hairs of metaphysics,” that error is not so bad by half, in its results, as the error of fettering the church with the drowsy cobwebs of a dull dogmatism. There are changes needed now,—there will be more changes needed. No sane man can hope, that the adaptation of our church to her new condition, can be accomplished without many mistakes first made, and continual reforms. One thing alone is sure and stable, the truth and order of Christ’s house. We want no new machinery, no new measures, but simply clearer developments of the Divinely appointed machinery and measures, in their adaptation to the new and ever varying phases of the work to be done. We are free to confess no sympathy with the spirit, which for years past has marked the movements, or rather want of movement, at our ecclesiastical centre. Great issues are at stake, and constant changes needful. And changes must come—the more for the peace of the church, if they come through the natural channels,—but come they must, either peaceably or forcibly, through the Boards or over the Boards. It matters little whether at first, great truths have few or many advocates, if they be truths—they

“Wake—

To perish, never.”

The result of a calm and close investigation into the various causes of the agitations of the church, will be the discovery, that with great unity in doctrine, there are radical differences amongst us, as to the polity and measures of the church, in fact, two distinct Presbyterianisms, becoming more and more clearly marked, and promising at some future day to present themselves for choice to every officer in the church. It is a difference analagous in some respects, to that which divides the two political parties of the country,—the theory of “strict construction,” as it is called, against the theory of large powers to the General Government. As regards the church, one of these theories finds, in the written Constitution of the church, all the agencies and means necessary to carry out the

purposes of the church, and inquires concerning all measures proposed: Do they comport with the Constitution? The other theory, "rejecting the split-hairs of metaphysics," argues the propriety of its measures from their expediency chiefly. The tendency of the one is ever therefore, to stick closely to the book, and guard jealously the purity of the church. The tendency of the other, to overlook the book and ever devise measures and expedients. The late Assembly leaned to the former of these theories.

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

OUR ENTERPRISE—ITS RECEPTION—OUR PROSPECTS.

At the date of this writing,—not yet ten days since we completed the mailing of our specimen No., to go out unannounced, and present itself for the judgment of the Presbyterian public—we have not of course data sufficient for forming an estimate of the prospect before us. So far however, as we can judge from near a hundred letters already received in response to our Card sent with the numbers we are highly gratified. With the subscription money there comes in the large portion of them also kind and encouraging words,—and that too from gentlemen unknown to us personally, as well as from other and unexpected quarters—from a large number of the men in whose wisdom and love of the Church we have long been in the habit of confiding. With few exceptions our general idea seems to have been readily caught by our readers, and when so caught generally approved—even by many who may not agree with some of the views expressed by us. To the two or three gentlemen who seem not yet to have apprehended our notion clearly, and therefore have written us, taking exceptions to incidental remarks of the writers, we take this method of responding by referring them to the closing paragraphs of "Our Idea" in No. 1. To the authors of the numerous manly and cheering salutations which have amply repaid us for the toil and censure which our work necessarily involves, we desire in this form to express our warmest gratitude.

As to the notice of our Enterprise by the press, as far as we have seen it, we have reason to be well satisfied. The secular press, so far as they seem to have comprehended our aims, have treated us with great courtesy; and have, as they deserve to have, our thanks. Some of them, indeed not seeing, as we see, the necessity of a perpetual Iconoclasm in the Church of God—as much in the 19th, as in any preceding Century—have thought us harsh "Critics." Of this we do not, as we have no right to complain.

The notice of our enterprise by the religious press, has not disappointed us. To the chief notice of this class we have already directed attention in a preceding page.—We trust no one will suppose that we are in the least hurt or offended at the course of the "Presbyterian" towards us. We had never supposed it to be in accordance with human nature in general that one long accustomed to the exercise of power and authority especially in the control of religious opinion would quietly endure so bold a proposition as a channel for out-and-out, untrammelled un-censured expression of opinion. Nor had we ever supposed that human nature in Philadelphia differed much from any other human nature, save perhaps in the peculiarly staid and marvellously proper manner of exhibiting itself. Our cotemporary the "Banner" treated us just as we would have expected from a mountain man, not yet long resident among her brick and mortar parrallelograms—plain outspoken, manly. "Our monthly cotemporary, the "Presbyterian Magazine," speaks of us just as everybody in the world expects Dr. Van Rensselaer to speak, if at all—kindly, liberally—and like a great-hearted Presbyterian. Indeed we always considered him, if he happen ever to get wrong, by far the most dangerous man in the Church—for even though one's zeal for the right may get his courage up to the sticking point of attacking Dr. Van Rensselaer's schemes—the noble-hearted earnestness and utter unselfishness of the man, seems as the fabled shield of the old mythology, to ward off the best aimed and most vigorous logical blows, from the wrong opinions sheltered under it.'

Our old friend of the "Watchman and Observer" in Richmond, hits us some hard raps—and, if rightly directed, well-deserved ones too. But he having been with some of us in the Assembly at Charleston, who expressed so strongly our horror of any sort of Ecclesiastical control of the press, in the cheap paper discussion, it was rather ungenerous to hold "The Critic" responsible for the idiosyncrasy of the "Hints for the times"—especially as "The Critic"

had declared that it did not endorse for its writers.

A writer in Mr. Converse's "Observer," as we are told by a friend—for we have no time to read fictitious literature—and have seen but two numbers of Mr. Converse's paper for a year; one of them the number containing the beautiful fiction headed "*Proselytism in Baltimore*," about a year ago—the other the number, containing the letter quoted in our last number. This friend we say informs us that a writer there puffs at us through two mortal columns—with all the fire and wrath of a high pressure steamboat, fast on a sand bar in the Mississippi—and—with about as much headway towards showing that we have written anything which the interests of truth and righteousness did not call for. Very characteristically too the writer begins or ends, we are told, with the absurd statement, or intimation—that we sent him "The Critic," with a request to obtain subscribers! and pretends to be assigning reasons for declining our request. We most gravely suspect the writer to be the author of that article on the Great Assembly of 1854—or still more probably, the author of the new Agassiz Theory of the Division of the Church! Of course if the "Critic" was sent him at all, it was sent by some New-Schoolman (with our Card to our friends in it) in order to have us roasted. Nobody in the world but the author of the New Philosophical Theory of the Division, could have supposed that he was one of those meant—when we said—"To our friends," &c.

We fully agree that our very good friend and neighbor of the "Methodist Protestant" should charge to our account, what his conscience holds to be the sin of *laughing* over our last "Editorial Exchange." Surely it is no mortal sin. We have a notion our neighbor would have at least *smiled*, had he heard Old Elijah's ironical exhortations to the very sanctimonious Priests of Baal on Mt. Carmel, cutting themselves with knives, for the glory of Baal. We only ask in return that he shall erase, per contra, the charge against us of *personality* in that article. We never thought of anything personal, in thus citing for illustration of a principle, a public appeal in a public journal. And if any disinterested person such as we take the editor of the Protestant to be, on due deliberation, adjudges still that our course in so doing may justly be held to be an unjustifiable personality, we stand ready to make any proper apology to the public. We assure our neighbor that nothing would give us more pain, than thus to find we had been turned aside from the great work we have in hand to any *personal attack* upon anybody—even the greatest enemy we have in the world. The "Protestant" as also any other Editors who have kindly announced us, whose notice of us we have not seen, will please accept our thanks.

We hope our friends will let us hear from them as soon as convenient, that we may know more definitely how large to make our edition. We have been obliged to decline selling any more single numbers for January—lest our edition be insufficient to supply subscribers. For the present we must decline also, sales of single numbers for February. Those who desire to use our pages for the discussion of themes consistent with our main purpose, must be patient with us, if they are laid over a month. We must first see how much space we can pay for, before we enlarge our borders. Our plan requires us to limit articles to from 5 to 7 pages, except in cases of emergency. But our friends, bearing in mind that they write for readers who need only the suggestion and statement of principles, will not find themselves much cramped. Only let articles for us be to the point—and that some important point—illustrating something—proving something. *If old sermons* must be sent

us, at least let the texts be carefully torn off. To our notion preaching is one thing—essay writing another thing—the attempt to combine the two creates a hybrid that is neither a good sermon nor a good essay.

Our subscribers will accommodate us much by remitting *gold dollars*—this comes just as safely. Notes under \$5 are an illegal currency in Baltimore. But we will not refuse the notes, in case our subscribers can do no better.

"THE PRESBYTERIAN'S" DISCOURSE CONCERNING THE CRITIC.

Our Patriarchal cotemporary of the 3rd February, devotes to us the greater part of a column. Considering how closely he has kept from his readers the profound secret of the existence of any such phenomenon in the world as the "Presbyterian Banner,"—having as we believe up to this time, "breathed not his name,"—we suppose we should feel much flattered. And therefore we are sorry for the necessity which compels us to the ungracious task of excepting both to the manner and the matter of that notice. We would have been as well content without the sugary compliment to "*the talent of the Baltimore pulpit*." We have no doubt it was kindly intended—and as little doubt that it is in spirit true; yet some how that style of saying the thing sounds to our ear as though the spirit and style of the new "Presbyterian Review" of Messrs. Wallace, Barnes, &c., were becoming contagious in Philadelphia.

We thought too, that the Presbyterian's extremely cautious and non-committal promise of his "humble support" to our enterprise, was a little uncalled for. For having undertaken our work, without the Presbyterian's leave asked, or permission obtained, the Christian public will hardly do him the injustice of holding him responsible for our behavior. So far as concerns ourselves, the "support" of the Presbyterian never having entered as an element into the calculation of the problem of our probable success, we do not feel at liberty to force out of our friend any such unwilling, cautious and rigidly conditioned puffers of support. We may be allowed to express also our regret at occasioning the uneasy 'apprehension' of the Presbyterian touching the difficulties which we are so likely to meet with in all attempts "to point out and apply the proper remedies" for evils in the Church. As we never have set ourselves particularly and exclusively to any such work—we see no reason to apprehend more difficulties than fall to the lot of other laborers in the same field. And even were there special difficulties to be apprehended in our case, we confess we never could see how it aids a cause any to cheer on its advocates with owl-ish vaticinations of the evil to come. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." As to ourselves, having

been accustomed to this cheer of "a lion in the way," in almost every good thing we ever undertook to do—the warning has somewhat lost its power to alarm us.

We are happy to agree with the Presbyterian in his estimate of the Proverbial Conservatism of (O. S.) Presbyterians.—"We shall probably differ" however, and having ourselves some acquaintance with that body of people, we venture to suggest that the large body of them will unite with us in thus differing from the Presbyterian as to the definition of true conservatism.—They with us understand by conservatism, an adherence to *well established principles*, not merely adherence to old measures.—Conservatism in the Church is not mere *measuro-worship*, akin to what is in the cant phrase of politics, called "Fogie-ism." It is not either mere place and office worship—vulgarly called "*Flunkey-ism*." It is not name and title worship—vulgarly called "*Daddy-ism*," (a corruption, we presume for "D. D-ism.") In short—to borrow the Presbyterian's elegant closing figure—Conservatism consists not in keeping the Church as some ship lying idle and rotting at her moorings, but in keeping her employed at what she was built for. Not in fearing the sea, but looking to the God who is as nigh at hand out at sea as in the moorings—and fearing not—even though God's Providence calls her to perform some great Columbus voyage, and discover in these last days the true solution of the problem of the Church visible, as a free spiritual Commonwealth in a free temporal Commonwealth—untrammelled and untrammelling—"Rendering to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's."

It is not however for the sake of these minor exceptions that we feel called upon to make this reference to the Presbyterian's article. Had there been nothing more, we should have quietly received the ambiguous compliments. But the Presbyterian kindly interposes his services to limit and define our "*vagueness*" for the benefit of our readers, and actually construct a Platform in Ecclesiastical Politics for us! Now considering that we had explicitly declared, that the parties to this work did not even know the peculiar views of each other in regard to the various measures that divide opinion in our church—considering that we had said—"Each writer is responsible for himself only"—"no member of the Association possibly may agree with all that is published in any number." "We claim to be the organ of no Ecclesiastical party in the sense of advocating one line of measures." Considering finally that the Presbyterian had given us only "a cursory examination"—by "glancing at our pages," we humbly submit whether the Presbyte-

rian has a right to force a Platform on us—and especially such a *platform*! Lest we be supposed to caricature we give the language:

"In glancing through its (The Critic's) pages we gather that it will oppose the present policy of the Board of Education: that it will advocate certain changes in the structure of the Boards, and as to their centres of operation: that it will urge modification in the system of our Theological Seminaries; and that it will lean towards an Ecclesiastical control of the religious newspaper press. Several of these points are, perhaps, rather intimated than stated, and if we have done our brethren injustice in the interpretations of their language, we stand ready to make the *amende honorable*."

Now we care not to stop and prove the negative proposition, that this is not doing us justice. And moreover our views of good taste and delicacy of feeling forbid us, in a case where one has volunteered to do us an act of kindness, to quarrel with him about the measure of it or the manner of it. We shall decline therefore to demand the *amende honorable*. Yet we feel that we are in debt to the Presbyterian for a voluntary notice—one that has caused the writing of many of those letters received by us—beginning—"We see from the Presbyterian, that you are publishing in Baltimore a Journal, &c. Enclosed find \$1.00." We feel anxious to pay this debt to the Presbyterian, rather as a debt of honor, without disputing the bill. And we know of no fairer or more delicate way of discharging the obligation than of returning it *in kind*. Following, as nearly as our editorial youth and inexperience will enable us—though conscious that it must be as when,

"Dextra se parvis Iulus
Implicuit, sequiturque patrem non passibus equis."

the very style and expression of our venerable model—(bating of course the compliment to "the talent of the Philadelphia pulpit.") We insert for the information of our numerous readers in all parts of the country this special notice Editorial.

AN OLD WEEKLY JOURNAL.

We receive very punctually from time to time "the Presbyterian," a weekly religious paper published by Wm. S. Martien & Co., Philadelphia. The "Co.," we presume may be the mysterious symbol of the invisible "Clique," which anchors the Great Presbyterian ship fast to her moorings in the "Presbyterian" office. From the very cursory examination which only we are capable of giving this paper, we should judge favorably of the occasional ability, but especially the uniform caution, reserve, and marvellous propriety with which it is conducted. It is characterized as to its method of treating

subjects, by its extreme reserve and vagueness in expressing its own opinion, when it has any—and by an equally extreme readiness to state, and extreme rashness in representing other peoples'. We presume there is no ground for the apprehensions which seem to distress the Presbyterian—whether on account of the Church or his subscription list—at the pertinacious determination of certain persons in the church to get the ear of the Presbyterian people themselves—without whispering through the lips of that excellent journalist. It is not that they love the Presbyterian less, but the Boards and the Church more—that they insist on free discussion. We presume there is no ground for the Presbyterian's apprehensions concerning those "certain persons" who have conspired to destroy the church by publishing such dangerous opinions—at least, no danger so immediate as to have determined the Presbyterian to "pack" the next Assembly. Nobody seems more surprised than these persons themselves at the novelty of the ideas and plans which are ascribed to them. Nobody so much wonders at the creative power of the Presbyterian's imagination, when they behold the portraits of their own opinions drawn by the Presbyterian and labelled as belonging to them. Nobody so much astonished as they at the skill with which their productions are metamorphosed by ingenious garbling, until like Virgil's grafted tree—

"Miraturque novas frondes et non sua poma."

The only important modification we have heard of (aside from the unessential one of reducing the Board more to the bulk and form of a Committee)—is to confine the duties of the Board of Missions' office to transaction with Presbyteries—requiring the Presbyteries to discharge their Constitutional duty of entire control over the individual Missionaries. The other modification is the proposal to locate the Boards at different points in the Church. This we doubt not is the alarming idea to the Presbyterian—

"Hinc illic lachrymæ."

yet we assure the Presbyterian that the "Presbyterial Critic" is in no way responsible for either proposition. One of the conductors gave utterance publicly to them—but declared at the same time they were other peoples' propositions, not his. We assure the Presbyterian he is on the wrong point after this terrible heresy. However that may be, even after such tremendous revolution—no fear the Presbyterian without the Boards would be respectably supported. Having done in time past much and doing still some service though less to the cause, Presbyterian people, except for some positive and marked delinquency

such as it is almost impossible the "Presbyterian" should ever be guilty of, will still, and perhaps ought still to support it. The main object of the Journal, so far as we can gather its spirit from a glance at its columns—though there is some vagueness in its habit of speaking and still more in its habit of *not* speaking, is to keep itself and to keep the church in a happy mediocrity between greatness and littleness—and to walk skillfully along the narrow line that separates between right and wrong. It displays great zeal and energy for the promotion of Presbyterianism as the Presbyterian understands it. And so far as its understanding and ours agree, the Presbyterian shall have, as it always has had, our humble support. It seems to be opposed especially to all distraction of the mind of the Church, by the circulation of more than one newspaper from head-quarters. It seems to oppose any crossing of the "t's" or dotting of the "i's" in projects of church policy which emanate from the Philadelphia offices, and indeed to deprecate as dangerous to the peace of the Church, all discussion except such as the Presbyterian may deem perfectly safe. It seems to advocate a newspaper control of Ecclesiastical affairs. In short its general tone we should say, is eminent satisfaction with the Philadelphia policy in the Church and indisposition to all Reform.

"These points are perhaps rather implied and intimated than stated; and if we have done the Presbyterian injustice in thus interpreting its language and spirit, we stand ready to make the *amende honorable*."

Having thus as far as possible discharged our obligations of honor to the Presbyterian—and thereby placed ourselves in position to treat with him as to our future relations—we take the liberty to make a suggestion or two. (1) Postulating only this one point, that we are not to believe that "The Presbyterian" is the Presbyterian Church,—we desire that the Presbyterian will feel embarrassed by no sort of obligation to speak patronizingly of us except in so far as we shall in his judgment be advocating truth and righteousness. (2) That if he don't like us (we mean of course editorially, for we mutually like each other personally) and our aim and purpose, he will not mince words in speaking of us, but oppose us and abuse us roundly like a man. (3) That if he do like us and our aim and object, he will speak out heartily and cordially in favor of whatever is good in us. (4) That if he is in doubt about us—or in any half-and-half mood—he will say nothing about us. That will make our course very plain. We love our friends naturally. We try, by God's grace, to love our enemies; and in the main think we do love a real hearty-out-and-out-enemy. But neither

nature nor grace has fitted us to get along either with hostile friends or loving foes, or any hybrid compound of friend and foe. And lastly, we hope that the 'Presbyterian' will bear in mind hereafter—that he and not we are responsible for originating any such editorial passages as these between us. That he began with "smiting us on the one cheek" in this notice of us in his paper of Feb. 3d.,—and then without even waiting for us to turn it to him—smote us "on the other also"—by a most curious, and gratuitous attack on us in his notice of the "Southern Presbyterian Review" of Feb. 10th.,—in which he goes out of his way to charge upon the "Presbyterian Critic" vicariously, an article of an individual, written before we were editorially known.

IGNORING THE MAIN THING.—*Fifty years a Pastor.—A Semi-Centenary Discourse, &c.*

The Publisher, JOSEPH M. WILSON, of *Phila.*, has sent us this Discourse of the Rev. Dr. JOHN McDOWELL; and we have read it with great interest. One of our oldest, most faithful, and most successful Pastors, this venerable minister must be an object of great interest to all his younger brethren, and this modest and comprehensive out-line of a Pastorate of fifty years, cannot be read without emotions of tenderness, respect and admiration. The writer of these lines has had abundant opportunities during about the last half of the fifty years embraced in this Discourse, to know and estimate the *public* life and character of Dr. McDowell. So situated, it has struck us with great surprise, that by far the most important event connected with the Presbyterian church, during those fifty years is passed over in this Discourse, as a matter of no interest, and having no results; alluded to indeed, in a manner purely incidental—and then only apparently to excuse the use of the great act for another purpose. "The Presbyterian church was divided in 1838." (1837?) This is all. "Both General Assemblies should be taken into the account, in composing the Presbyterian church as it now is, with what it was fifty years ago." (p. 27.) This is the whole reason why that great event is even so much as alluded to. This is all the more remarkable since Dr. McDowell's field of labor and residence was in the city of Philadelphia, the very theatre of this immense revolution,—since, moreover, he was one of the permanent officers of the General Assembly at the very period of its occurrence! To make all this the more extraordinary, this Discourse enters into all manner of statements, touching all manner of things, great and small, private and public, that related especially to its author, to the church and to the country during the period passed over.

Now we have not the slightest idea of saying anything that could wound our venerable brother, but we cannot, nevertheless, even by our silence, consent to the propriety of writing history, annals, biography or even the most fugitive sketches, in this manner. It is, as if some relic of revolutionary times, rehearsing his past career, were to put in a sort of parenthesis, and as his sole notice of that great war and its sublime fruits, a few words like these:—"Great Britain and America divided in 1776. In counting the Anglo-Saxon race we ought to number both." This will never do. And as the great events which led to, and which grew out of that greatest struggle and deliverance of the Presbyterian church on this continent, become more and more capable of full and impartial estimate by the efflux of time, the subsiding of human passions, and the advancing providence of God, it is less and less endurable that the spectators, and still more the actors therein, should, even in appearance, affect to treat them as insignificant. Dr. McDowell has, of course, a right to approve or to condemn, (we leave it to himself to say which he does) the deliverance of the Church; but he has no right to treat as of no consequence—when he professedly records the main incidents of his career,—the greatest transactions with which his life has been brought into contact. We mean it in no disparagement of any other claim he may have when we say, that one of his best chances to be handed down to distant posterity, is the connection of his name with several of the greatest of those great Assemblies which he treats almost as if their mention would be ignominious. It will be a deplorable day for the Presbyterian church when the apparent ultimate of this 'Discourse' shall be the estimate she puts on that remarkable era and its results. Assuredly, nothing of that sort shall be rendered possible through any connivance of ours. And we feel the more obliged to call the attention of the church to this mode of treating this momentous subject in the *first* place, because it occurs in a manner, simultaneously with fierce, concerted, and elaborate attempts of the New-school party, to misrepresent the whole matter to posterity. And in the *second* place, because besides the respectful action of two Presbyterian congregations (that of Dr. McDowell himself, and that of Dr. Murray, of Elizabethtown, N. J.) the name of the venerable Presbytery of Philadelphia, and in addition the names of thirteen ministers of our church resident in that city,—amongst whom are officers of all three of the Boards of the church located there,—are conspicuously used in the printed "Discourse," in a way well calculated to stamp it with ecclesiastical, as well as public approbation.

1. A SERMON TO YOUNG MEN: *Delivered in the Presbyterian Church, Wilmington, N. C.*—By Rev. M. B. Grier.
2. THANKSGIVING DISCOURSE AND THE TRUE GLORY OF A NATION: *Two Sermons*—By Rev. T. D. Wardlaw, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Paris, Kentucky.
3. PRESBYTERIANISM, as a Method for building up the Church. A Sermon preached before the Presbytery of Newton, and published at their request—By Rev. H. N. Wilson, D. D., of Hackett's Town, N. J.

All these Sermons have been printed at the request of those who heard them, and must, therefore, have made an impression at the time of their delivery. This impression has been renewed and deepened upon the same minds, doubtless, by a careful perusal of the same discourses since. Here is an effect of very great importance. Character is developed, gradually and insensibly, by innumerable touches, each, perhaps, small in itself, but, in the aggregate, tremendous in their results: just as the dead shapeless mass of marble is transformed, by innumerable strokes of the artist's chisel, into the requisite statue, which almost lives and breathes. This consideration amply justifies the Minister of the Gospel in committing such sermons to the press, even though he may be certain, that they must share the fate of nearly all literature of their kind, which is to have a narrow circle of readers and be speedily forgotten. Our bodies are sustained by grain which grew out of the very dust and ashes of those who have fallen before us: and our souls are enlightened and invigorated by living thoughts and burning words expressed by multitudes whose names have perished from the memory of man. The above-named sermons are creditable alike to the head and heart of their authors. The first is an earnest and affectionate warning, addressed to young men against the temptations of wine, and contains some graphic pictures of the misery of those who have fallen victims to its seductions. It is written in the style of a man who has made himself familiar with the best models. The second, on the general topic of the goodness of God to our country and the responsibilities which that goodness imposes upon those who enjoy it, presents many wholesome and timely suggestions, particularly in regard to the indispensable necessity of maintaining the purity and discharging the duties of the family relation. These are points which cannot be urged too often, in a country which is governed by law and opinion as contradistinguished from military force. The author's style is polished, and has many of those characteristics which, when matured and chastened by experience and practice, constitute true eloquence.

The last sermon is a plain but forcible plea in behalf of Presbyterianism as a method for building up the church. It ought to be a source of profound sorrow to all, that there is not more faith among our ministers and people, in the peculiarities of our devotion, and order. It is too often conceded, for example, that the Methodist form of religion is better adapted to the propagation of the gospel among the poor, than ours. If so, then their's is a more Scriptural form of religion than our's: for "unto the poor the gospel is preached." The truth is, nothing can be done without faith, prayer and patience. Faith, other things being equal, will be proportioned to our knowledge.—Our Standards are not studied: our distinctive features as a denomination are not known or appreciated by our own people: "the hiding of our power;" the life which belongs to us as a church is, in a great degree, misunderstood. Hence, the disposition to go down to Egypt for help, in time of trouble: to subject the church to the mechanical spirit of the age, or convert it into a house of merchandize. We want no machinery, no clap-trap, no new measures. We have God's truth in the Word and Sacraments: the discipline which He Himself has ordained: the promise of the quickening Spirit. What more do we want? *Life! life! life!* and this no galvanic apparatus can create. Spasmodic motion may be imparted to the limbs of a corpse, by machinery; but not the lighting up of the eye or the warm, bounding life-blood of the heart. Let our "faith not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God." Let us pray, that "the promise of the Spirit" may be fulfilled to us and all will be well. Work, watch, pray!

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, —
December, 1854.

[Our printer—very dictatorial—as most good printers are—made havoc of our article in the last No. by cutting us off short at the beginning. We now continue.]

In order to illustrate the process by which the writer reaches "the great central principle" of the division, we must quote another paragraph from his preliminary remarks:—

"The case seems to us very plain. If one present a mass of facts to a man and a woman, they will hardly look at them alike, and it will be so throughout their whole life; the difference is organic. It will be so if he present them to an Asiatic and an Anglo-Saxon American; the difference is of race. Try a German and a Frenchman; the diversity will appear not in one thing, but in the entire character. Every philosopher is in essence either Platonic or Aristotelian; every man is by nature mainly progressive or conservative. It is superficial, we think, to look for one occasion, or one of the unfoldings of development to account for the schisms in the Presbyterian Church; the cause is to be found in two varying organisms. This we have indicated through our entire discussion, in various forms. We now propose to apply the principle to the schism of 1837."

On this passage we have nothing to remark, save to express our difficulty—seeing that “every philosopher is in essence, either Platonic or Aristotelian”—in determining the category of this writer. In his views of facts he certainly breathes the romantic and highly imaginative spirit of Plato; whilst in his poetic rhetoric he exhibits some of the characteristics of the great Stagirite. In his method of reasoning from premise to conclusion, he seems to be untrammelled by the caution and prudence of either.

We have a similar difficulty in regard to the other great, Dualism of humanity herein asserted—to wit, “that every man is by nature mainly progressive or conservative.” For, as we turn to seek for illustrations of the principle, our Reviewer, naturally, presents the first case; and here again we are at a loss where to place either himself, or the church which he represents. They can hardly be ranked among the progressives, seeing that it is only in this year 1854, they are first beginning to open their eyes upon the great truths touching the nature and mission of the church and her functions, which the “conservatives” of the Old School fully comprehended in 1837. We would venture in all modesty to suggest to our philosophic friend, that the advance of science and the superior methods of analysis of late years have devised a four-fold rather than a two-fold classification of mankind, in regard to this characteristic;—or rather, perhaps, have separated, each into two elements, the former classes of “Progressives” and “Conservatives.” Of “Progressives,” two classes are now reckoned—one, the “Phaëtonic,” or “Deconstructives”—progressive by “new measures” only; the other, Progressive by the development of principles. So, also, there is held to be Conservatism of two sorts—one, the conservatism that holds fast to settled principles, while it moves forward with their development; the other, the conservatism that clings fast, not to principles, but to measures, and therefore, of necessity, stands still, while the world moves past it. To the last form of conservatism the modern terminology applies the name Foggyism. By the aid of this more modern classification, we find little difficulty in determining the category of such philosophers as this writer, and of our New School friends generally. By a sort of necessity of the system, its young men are “Phaëtonics,” and its old men “Fogies.” These may be said to be the two poles of its Dualism.

But we waive further speculations in the higher philosophy, to give space to the Reviewer's theory of the division:

“Various causes have been, with great confidence, assigned for the division. We will analyze the more prominent of them, to show that they mistake symptoms for disease.”

“It has been asserted recently, with great energy and positiveness, as the main cause of the division, that one party wished to carry on benevolent operations through ecclesiastical boards, and the other through voluntary associations. We have been a good deal surprised that even some clear thinkers should have urged this idea.”

“It has been often asserted, too, that the division was a question of power simply, and of money and legal position to attain power. Here again there is a manifest fallacy.”

“It is hardly worth our while to consider seriously the question whether the excision of the four Synods was the cause of the division.”

“Difference of doctrinal belief is a reason having in it far more plausibility than all others. There is a certain degree of truth in it. It was not, however, difference affecting the vitality of Calvinism or Presbyterianism, but diversity of view in regard to certain minor and unessential points. The realities were, that in the progress of philosophical intelligence, certain methods and theories of explaining Calvinistic truth appeared to certain minds much more inexplicable than the doctrines themselves.”

“Another great salient verity was the want of metaphysical discrimination in the leaders of “Old Schoolism.” We do not think that any fact lies plainer than this upon the very surface of history.”

“We have made these preliminary remarks, because in our criticism of this interesting point of history we wish the reader to have his mind full of the right idea. It is this: There have always been two classes of Presbyterians in our church, and as these classes are founded not merely upon historical peculiarities but upon the nature of human mind itself, perhaps there always will be two classes.”

Such is this Reviewer's preliminary effort to reach “the great central principle.” We quote now a paragraph, which in the reading, struck us as more suggestive of the real causes of the Division than all the others together—and leave it without remark to the reflection of our readers:

“Or let him observe our excising brethren, two thousand ministers who have spent, we will say, upon an average, ten years in constant study to deepen and broaden their minds and make them fit for the Christian ministry, yet insisting upon subscription to the *ipsissima verba*, not of God's Book, but of four hundred and fifty pages of uninspired matter, elaborated by certain wise and good men, fallible like ourselves, two hundred years ago, by order of the British Parliament! And let him observe how, when a cordial offer is made of subscription to this Symbol in all its great features and outlines, they still insist on its being taken word for word, or rending the church in twain!”

We proceed now to present in full the writer's development of the “varying organizations” which produced the trouble:

“That our theory of foreign influence is true, may be seen in the names of many of the most prominent leaders in the Division. The Presbyterian Magazine favors us with a list of the defenders of the faith in the excising ranks, then and since, who are so regarded by themselves. Among them are the Sceder names of Junkin, Engles, Phillips and McGill—to which certainly that of Dr. McElroy ought to be added,—and those of Drs. Caylor and Janeway of the Dutch Church.”

“On the other hand, there was obviously a too great preponderance of New England leadership during the “fitful fever” of the high party times which preceded the Division. Drs. Beecher, Peters, Cleveland, Leavitt, and others—who have all, or nearly all, shown their natural affinities since by very active feeling for Congregationalism—urged, at these times, Presbyterians to action, that in part, at least, was pushed too far, and which, by its disregard of the prejudices of the brethren was misunderstood to mean much more than was really intended.”

“It was not wise, it was not becoming, it could not issue rightly, that men of alien blood, coming in the maturity of their powers, with habits and principles fixed in another Church, should attempt almost immediately to seize the helm in ours, without acquaintance with our special characteristics and prejudices.”

"The mind of New England is often more acute than comprehensive, often sharp rather than wise. It manoeuvres too much. It is not sufficiently straight-forward. Too much doubling and winding both loses time and lessens confidence. New England reverses the celebrated line of Goldsmith in relation to Burke,

Too fond of the right to pursue the expedient.

It builds expediences story upon story, until the whole fabric ruins down, whereas he who looks to right only, is building upon the Almighty's central rock. Its reforms are often superficial, its agitations fanatical, its theology not well considered. Successive issues of "notions" keep her people excited, turn off their attention from the simple Gospel and operate to the detriment of wholesome religion."

"The New England leaders did not understand the guidance of Presbyterians. A child can start a machine that a thousand men cannot stop and the gathered avalanche of a hundred snows is delivered to its work of destruction by a breath. They supposed that they could temper the rounded thunder, say to the tempest-driven wave of the Atlantic, "thus far shalt thou go and no farther," and speak to the live lightning that it be harmless in the heavens. The providence of God no doubt meant to punish us, and it-delivered us into the hands of strangers, who, accustomed to work on a small scale and in minute spaces, within the limits of a Scotch Presbytery or a Congregational Association, excited against each other the opposite prejudices of a continent; the badges which they placed upon us discolored brother to brother's eye, and immense forces drew off to civil war and fratricidal strife."

Such is the philosophic theory of the great division. It will doubtless puzzle many an unfortunate Scotch Old-School-man, by reason of his unhappy lack of "metaphysical discrimination." But alas! what will his more metaphysical antagonist of New England think of this "unkindest cut of all," which speaks of him as a "foreigner"—a church which claims to be par eminent the true "American Church," which is "striving to extinguish all foreign nationalities!" Poor Jonathan! In these days of eminent *Americanism*—when Brownson's Review and Barnes' Review combine to advocate pre-eminent *Americanism*! Now, to be called a "foreign element" in the American church! And that too, by his peculiar friends—his former allies in the great cause of "Co-operative Christianity!"

Is this not retributive justice? In former times Jonathan had the phrase ever on his lips, "Out of this American Union into Texas." Jonathan's representative—"the Soap-man," at the Jersey City Ferry, calls upon the railroad passengers to provide themselves with his article, since, says he, "you are now, gentlemen, about to go out of this great American nation into the State

of New Jersey." Now behold the representative of the Great American Presbyterian Church, puts New England and Scotland side by side among the "foreign elements!"

We are unwillingly compelled to pass over many a paragraph which would be a treat to our readers. Especially would they enjoy with us the philosophic history of the Act and Testimony, and the writer's terrible exhortation of the Princeton Repertory, for having denounced the Act and Testimony and the Convention, as revolutionary, and yet defended the excinding acts.—Whereas "the little finger of the excinding acts for revolutionary atrocity, is thicker than the loins of both Act and Testimony, and Convention taken together." Yet we must be allowed to say, that whilst we are not sorry that Princeton shall be reminded of her fallibility, yet, by the showing of this article itself, the highest offence of Princeton was only in discovering between '34 and '37 (in two years,) what it has taken the New School body from '34 to '54 (20 years) to discover—namely, that neither New England Philosophy, nor New England Ecclesiology, consists with the Presbyterian standard.

We cannot refrain from giving our readers a portion of the last paragraph, as at once a fine specimen of the new style of Quarterly Reviewing; and also as furnishing them with some new ideas of the dignity and grandeur of a Publication House.

"While these lines are passing through the press, we stop its rapid movements to say, that on last evening the Presbyterian Publication House was opened. Presbyterians have indeed, in this House, a Home, and in separating from the festival, our brethren and friends felt disposed to linger, and with warm hearts congratulate each other. It is our Act and Testimony against tyranny. Its fair proportions, ever in view on the most crowded thoroughfare of our great city, are our perpetual Protest against injustice. The rooms were crowded with the best and loveliest of our Church in Philadelphia. The Editors of this Review were called upon to take part in the services."

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE LITERARY SOCIETY OF EASEING COLLEGE, S. C.—
By Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.

The name of the author is a sufficient guarantee, that what he undertakes to do, will be well done. His theme is "The Love of Truth, the Inspiration of the Scholar." It were well, if all our countrymen were taught that mammon is not the only source of inspiration, or the only soul of heroic achievement.

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 3.

MARCH, 1855.

Vol. 1.

THE RADICAL DIFFERENCE : IN THE LAST ANALYSIS
OF THE CHURCH QUESTION.

It is not pretended, by that portion of the Presbyterian church which holds most tenaciously to the supernatural Element in Religion—and therefore most exactly to the ancient landmarks ; and which, on these accounts rejoiced the most in the deliverance of the church ; that she had been completely restored from her great defection—or completely delivered from all danger, by the wonderful events of 1831–9, and the signal interposition of God at that period.

It is earnestly contended by them, that the great truths which were revived, after a long eclipse, at that era, were found effectual, precisely to the extent to which the church applied them ; that they delivered her from stupor and defection—as well as from oppression and danger, precisely as far as she had courage to follow them ; and that they have marked her extraordinary career of peace, success, and revival in its best sense, from that day to this, precisely as far as that career has been fortunate. Nor would there be the least difficulty, in demonstrating from the writings and speeches of the leading actors in those scenes—and from the most formal conclusions of the highest tribunals of the church : In the *first* place, that this result was foreseen and confidently relied on : In the *second* place, that the corresponding career, in the opposite direction, of the New School branch of the church, was distinctly pointed out, as inevitable : In the *third* place, that it was clearly understood, and repeatedly bewailed in the most conspicuous manner, that the entanglements of the church, by reason of her previous defections,—rendered her incapable *at once*, of the *complete* application of the grand principles and truths which, by God's blessing, saved her : And in the *fourth* place, that the exhortations of the very persons, who were raised up by God, to give shape to all that was done—were most earnest and repeated unto the church, that she should faithfully and to the end, follow out the principles of her vital reformation, as Providence, and time, and opportunity, and the faith and piety of her members would permit.

In the widest sense, the principles which divide between the Reformed church, throughout the world—and Popery—are the same principles, only more rigidly applied, which divide between the Reformed churches which more exactly follow those principles, and those which follow them more loosely. And when we enter the bosom of the most rigid of these Reformed churches—for example, our own,—these same principles still meet us, in the conflicts of opinions and parties—which on the one hand demand the complete application of them, or on the other, are content with a less exact obedience to them. There are those who exalt the logical element in Religion, to an equality with—or even a supremacy over, the supernatural element : and as the result—we have peculiar forms of error. The same statement applies to the historical element : and again—to both combined : and in both instances, other specific forms of error. It is only they who allow that these logical and historical elements, are to be reduced to the mere condition of exponents of the grand supernatural element, in revealed Religion, that have any possibility of following clearly the mind of God : and amongst these, such as most simply and exactly, do this—are the most certain to succeed. Nor is it of the least consequence, as to the result,—considered as true or false,—to what part of the great matter of revealed Religion,—these principles are applied.

Whoever will take the trouble to inform himself will be obliged to understand, that the distinguishing marks of that portion of the Presbyterian church, which set on foot the proceedings which resulted in the events of 1837 & 1838,—and in all the steadfast tendencies of that church, to the present moment ; were these very principles,—uniformly avowed, and as far as God's providence permitted, uniformly enforced,—by which the church is to be reduced, in all things, to the exact standard of the Gospel,—and maintained, in its perfect simplicity, and force,—as a Divine Institute on earth—according to the revealed will of God. This is the life principle of all their efforts—all their theories.

It is true, no doubt, that they have been often at a loss, upon questions purely practical—as to the urgency with which, certain innovations upon the principles of a pure Presbyterianism, should be rooted out : at a loss to determine, whether this weakness, imitated from Independency,—or that vanity caught from Prelacy—or the other defilement cast into us, from the world, or from Popery—should be left to perish of itself, or be cut down, and cast away : whether this stronghold in which some error had taken lodgment, should be carried outright, by a charge with the bayonet—or that one, reduced, merely by turning its position. Moreover, in the progress of the last sixteen years, there has been perceptible, at times, a very obvious reactionary movement in certain quarters and institutions of the church ; and occasions have not been wanting, on which a counter-revolution against the grand movement of 1837–8, seemed to be consolidating itself,—sometimes on one point—sometimes on another. In the midst of this career of the church since 1837, the spirit and the men made conspicuous in that era, have assuredly exhibited nothing more

remarkably, than the patience with which they have awaited the consummation of their great principles, in the application of them to all her great outward movements. *Cunctando Restituit*—seems indeed to have been their agreed motto, expressive of their sense of duty and wisdom, on this entire branch of the subject : and hundreds, perhaps thousands, have heard it uttered by such as were amongst the younger actors in those great struggles—and are therefore amongst the rapidly diminishing survivors of those great Assemblies. That they have not always received credit for their forbearance—nor even for the spirit which produced it—the church knows right well.

This chain of reflection has been suggested at this time, by the perusal of two widely different articles on our General Assembly of 1854 ; one in the *Princeton Review*, the other in the *Southern Presbyterian Review* : and, in connection with them, we were led to turn over the leaves of some former publications, and amongst them the sermon preached at the opening of the General Assembly of 1842, by the Moderator of the previous Assembly ; and published, at the time by *Martien* of Philadelphia, under the title of “*The Calling of the Church of Christ.*” And the particular object now had in view, is to call attention to the fact that, from the beginning, the matter was understood, as we understand it to-day ; and that they who now desire the complete conformity of the church, in all her *action*, as well as in all her faith and *form*, to the simple word of God,—always desired the same thing : and that, by consequence, it is not they who are justly amenable to the accusations, more and more implacably hurled at them—as disturbers of the church ; but it is their accusers, who are far more amenable to the more serious accusation of factious resistance to the progress of the church, by persistent endeavors after a counter-revolution, upon every point where they can make a stand. It is a practical corollary from this state of the case—which however, will not be pursued at present,—that final safety against this reactionary spirit, seems, after so much delay, and so large an experience, unattainable,—so long as the central force of the church continues to be unduly consolidated—and her great means of practical effort are allowed to remain subordinated to one particular local control. By whatever means the church acts—she—and not a particular locality must control those means ; and to control, she must disperse them.

The author* of the Discourse above alluded to, will probably be allowed to have been a competent witness, in May 1842, as to the general principles of those with whom he had acted most intimately, during ten or fifteen previous years ; and with whom, for about as many succeeding years, he has been understood to have acted since. Perhaps our accusers will allow, that he might be considered something more than a witness ; but this is sufficient for the present purpose. And in this respect, the matter assumes the greater importance, as his testimony on this occasion was delivered in the face of the General Assembly—and uttered as its chief organ ; delivered with great solemnity and precision—and unquestioned, as far as we know,

* Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge.

then or since. He availed himself of one of those great occasions, which few men ever possess—and which no man has possessed a second time,—to vindicate the past action of the church—to exhort it to persevere in its glorious career—to expose, justly and terribly, its corrupters—and to state clearly the principles, upon which he expected the verdict of posterity and the approval of God. And so far was he from attempting any apology for a proceeding so unusual on such an occasion—that he introduced that particular portion of his Discourse, with these decisive words : “ I thank God for this peculiar opportunity to testify to the greatness of that work which he has wrought for our Zion : to record, as her organ, her grateful sense of his blessed interposition : and to exhort her, in his name, to perfect in faithfulness that to which she has set her hand.” (p. 11.) This was uttered to the fifth Assembly after the work of 1837 had been done. And then, through twelve or thirteen pages, he goes over the whole period, from the “ Plan of Union” in 1801, to the moment in which he was speaking—a period of forty-one years ; developing the causes, progress, and results, of the semi-Pelagian controversy—as the church understood them in that day ; and, as we doubt not, posterity will understand them. Towards the close of this condensed statement, the whole of which we would be glad to quote, the passage occurs, which we print in the next paragraph. It is quoted for the double purpose of showing, precisely, the fundamental point to which the radical difference of the two parties amongst us is at last reducible,—in the whole matter of the form and action of the church ; and of showing further, that it is not we who are disturbing the church by questioning and obstructing its accepted methods of action—but that it is our opponents, who are trying to consolidate a most dangerous re-action in the church, against the accepted principles of that great movement which saved the church itself in 1837–8.

“ This principle,” (the *Work of Faith with power*, 2 Thess. i. 11) “ is the very life of the church of God. * * * * * Away then with all “ human trust, all human contrivances. With a doctrine taught of “ God, an order revealed by him, an efficiency communicated from “ him, a mission entrusted to us of him ; all carnal devices of what- “ ever kind are at once a hindrance to us, and an insult to the Majesty “ of Heaven. God has laid for himself the model of his kingdom : why “ should we mar, by our foolish additions, the workmanship of infinite “ wisdom ? He has committed to his church, as his church, the means “ of saving the world : why should she with an imbecility at once “ faithless and presumptuous, confessing herself an insufficient *agent* “ and claiming at the same moment to be an all-sufficient *counsellor*, “ turn over to others, no matter to whom, her own appropriate, nay “ her express work ? The germ of all apostacy is concealed in this “ defection. For if the objects set before God’s people are not ad- “ dressed to their *faith*, they come with no obligation to his church : “ but if they do address themselves to our *faith*, they specifically “ appertain to the kingdom of Messiah. In the one case we divest “ the sacred investiture of Christ ; in the other we substitute as his, “ the commandments of men. In either case a principle is enthroned

“in the bosom of the church, which is sufficient if fully acted out, “to remove every land-mark established by God, and to bring in “every invention ever devised by man. It is a defection whose “principle covers the totality of revealed religion. For the instant “we settle it, as the mind of God, that the office of his church is, “not to do his work, but to see it done ; then the whole position of “the church as well towards God and his people as towards this “guilty world, is utterly changed from the ground on which the “Apostles, the Confessors, and the Reformers have all placed it.— “But until this be done, there is an end of all reason by which to “justify the least departure from the simplicity of Faith.” (pp. 22-3.)

For our part, we see not how this is to be met. We say the church is the *agent* of God to do his work : to do it—not to see it done : to do his work, and no other work. And this is of Faith ; and relates to every thing that is of Faith ; and relates to nothing else. Our brethren agree not with this. They appear to say, in effect, the church is the counsellor of God ; and as such, may omit to do his work—if she only sees that it is done ; may contrive methods, to that end, never appointed by him ; may give herself to work, that is not of Faith—nor addressed to Faith. Here in its last analysis, is the difference between us. A difference radical in itself,—and fatal except only that they say *may*, while we say *must*. In its practical results—it is a difference presenting on one side, in the fruits which the church will bring forth, the precise measure of her ability and her piety combined ; on the other side, the ever-fluctuating results of human contrivances acting and reacting upon the spiritual life of the church. A difference, in its theoretical results on the one hand, planting the church in her Doctrine, her Form, and her Action, immoveably on the eternal Word. On the other hand, setting her adrift, amidst the rage and conflict of boundless carnal commandments.

Let our brethren, then, cultivate a spirit of charity and moderation ; not a spirit of exclusiveness and denunciation. We have far more to bear with, than they have. For they have more and more demanded the broad heritage, which long ago, we won, by God’s mercy, with our bow and our spear ; but upon which they have constantly exercised an undue control ; and would now, by a counter-revolution, as we see reason to fear, rob us of it utterly ! This, it is no part of our purpose to allow, as they ought to be well assured, when they remember the past. But it is our purpose,—already manifested through long years, and many misconstructions, to bear with their errors—as long as they will bear with our truth. Nor ought they to forget, that between their views and ours on these disputed points, there lies this great distinction ; that ours are the result of fundamental convictions as to the very nature and foundation of the kingdom of God : while theirs only express the absence of any convictions—at all, as of Faith, upon the subjects themselves. Are their views of Policy—so much more sacred than our views of Faith ? Moreover, we must add, that these differences of opinion, are liable to a very considerable practical influence upon them, from the personal character and demeanor of

conspicuous representatives of them—and from the temper which may prevail in the great organizations hanging around the church.— There are men whom one cannot avoid loving and trusting—even when their conduct is perilous to great interests, one feels obliged to contend for : as there are also men whose just and noble spirit may almost suffice to rob evil institutions of their danger. But there are also men, whom it is a kind of Atheism for one not to distrust ; as there are others whose temper and character force them to give an infinite activity to every dangerous element, even in good institutions. It is not impossible that we have too readily postponed the duties we owe to our fixed principles, out of love—on the one side : too reluctantly, perhaps, even too tamely resisted offensive encroachments on the other : risked too much both ways. It may be so. But it was not the design of this paper to discuss questions of this sort ; and they are alluded to only as they tend to explain the fluctuating aspects of a struggle between principles, whose clear statement was our immediate object.

TEMPORALITIES vs. SPIRITUALITIES.

(CONCLUDED.)

THE common and correct evangelical idea of the Church is, that it consists of those who have been truly united to Christ by a saving faith, and of none others. In whatever connexion or locality these persons are, they are all constituent elements of the one only true Church of Christ on earth. But as we cannot look upon the heart, our only mode of discovering and defining this church is by its faith and practice : and we are at liberty to recognize as members of this church only those who make a credible profession of faith in Christ, as he is offered in the Gospel.

The Church, as thus defined, is “the house and family of God,” under His sole instruction and government, and by means of His Word and Spirit. We need not stop to argue such evangelical truisms before a Protestant community. And we need only remind the reader, that civil government, whose chartered corporations of irresponsible men so often control our churches, had no part in founding the Church, in furnishing her with doctrine, discipline or constitution, and is designed for an end altogether different from, and inferior to, that of the Church; nor did men, as men, in any capacity, originate the Church, or anything that validly belongs to it. It is a divine institution, in a peculiar and exclusive sense. Its charter is written and sanctioned by God. His Word, and His Word alone, furnishes by direct statement, or obvious implication, all that should enter into the faith and practice of the Church. His Word, and His Word alone, shows us that Christ as head of the Church, has given us all truth, all ordinances, all offices, which the Church requires for her existence, her welfare, and her universal extension.

It belongs not to any power external to the Church, to add to Christ's doctrines, nor to his ordinances, nor to his officers, nor to the power appertaining to his office-bearers. Such additions would imply a charge of criminal neglect or ignorance of the Church's wants, on the part of her Head: or else superior wisdom or power on the part of the party making the addition.

The Church has no authority to surrender either her doctrines, her liberties, her ordinances, or her rule and government. She may not surrender them to the State for any supposed advantage. She may not surrender them, or any of them, to citizens, who may be members of a civil community, but who are not members of Christ's spiritual household. The Church has as much liberty to surrender her doctrines—or her ordinances, as her government: that is, she has no liberty at all in the matter.

Government in the Church appertains to two departments, viz: first, to spiritual matters, such as the exercise of discipline in case of scandal among the members, involving the rebuke, suspension, or excommunication of the offending member: and second, to the management of those temporalities which the existence and extension of the Church require, and which may be contributed by the membership of the Church, or placed in their hands for these ends.

Now it is evident that the Church is not at liberty to surrender discipline into the hands of any authority out of her pale: within which are already provided office-bearers, appointed by Christ, and acknowledging and submitting to Him. And for the same reason she may not surrender the management of her temporal affairs. All Church temporalities, when viewed in connexion with the motive in contributing, the end for which they are given, and the spiritual kingdom in which they are used, possess an ecclesiastical character; are to be used for Christ's honor, and to be accounted for at the bar of God.

Surely none but Christ's liege subjects should be entrusted with the stewardship of such goods. But non-professors have not submitted themselves to Christ's authority—they are not citizens of his kingdom, and hence can have no valid title or authority to hold office, any more than aliens have a right to civil offices or emoluments in this or any other nation. If in any case aliens were thus admitted, because of their wealth or influence, it would be a violation of the constitution, and would be placing the liberties and interests of the community in peril. And so with non-professors in Christ's kingdom. Allegiance, and declared allegiance, are essential to office. It may be taken for granted, that if men be not at heart the enemies of Christ, they will declare and yield open allegiance to Him. And what a profane absurdity it is to put Christ's rebels and enemies into office to manage his cause. No other association of men on earth are guilty of such suicidal inconsistency as the Church of Christ in America. Think of the allied army in the Crimea voluntarily placing the commissariat in the hands of the Russians, and behold an illustration of the mad policy of the Church in placing her temporalities in the hands of the foes of her Great Captain!

And equally absurd is it to admit to the electoral privileges of the Church, those who have never pledged fealty to the Head of the Church, and whose whole attitude is one of insubordination. Their mere presence within the walls of the Church edifice signifies nothing. The owls gloaming in the deserted niches of Tintern Abbey, proved not that their wise eyes took in the real meaning of those walls. From the days of Christ until now the four walls of the Church have been the familiar resort of multitudes, who seeing see not, and believing understand not, the things that belong to the spiritual kingdom. They *cannot* say "Shibboleth"—they *will not* say even "Sibboleth." Labor to convert them, but clothe them not with the insignia of Christ's chosen ones, until they have been clothed upon with the ermine robe of righteousness.

It is easy to anticipate objections that will be urged against this view of the case, which would exclude non-communicants from all Church power and privilege whilst they remain such. It will be asked, "what advantage there is allowed to the non-communicant, as an equivalent for the seat-rent and other contributions he pays towards the expenses of the Church?"

To this it may be replied, first, that he has all the advantage which is enjoyed by the tenant, who pays house rent. All the advantages of *occupancy* are enjoyed by him, although the property is not under his control. The occupant of the pew gets more than the value he sacrifices, in the privileges connected with a comfortable opportunity of regularly hearing the Gospel, and his *eligibility* to all the privileges and offices of the Church, as soon as the means of grace are allowed to take effect on his heart.

But, secondly, it might simply be replied, that the mere renting of a pew in the Church, no more purchases the right to a part in the ruling and managing of Church affairs, than it buys a right to the Lord's table, or a right to receive the ordinance of Baptism. The democratic apothegm "no taxation without representation," has no application in this case, any more than to the occupancy of seats at an exhibition, or in a railroad car. In fact, when we consider how the presence and propriety of Divinity hallows all that it touches, how the gold of the Temple becomes holy because it belongs to the Temple, how the very ground becomes holy when Divinity is near, how the whole mountain becomes electric and deadly to the touch, when Jehovah visits its summit, it is amazing that the holy things of the Church should be placed in the hands of the unholy and profane. Shall the next step be to offer for sale the gifts of the Holy Ghost?

But again, says the intrusionist: "by denying to ungodly men the right to take part in Church affairs, you lose a potent means of influencing them for good."

It is easy to see that this is only the cardinal maxim of Jesuitism masked in pious phrase. It is certainly nowhere written or intimated in God's Word, that "the end sanctifies the means." It savors of profanity to expect the Almighty to bless unlawful means for the conversion of men. The advocates of this system might deem it an

insult to have it said that they were advocating the policy which sent Pizarro to Peru, and Claverhouse to Scotland—which planted the cancer in the bosom of the Church of England, and which lead the priests of Rome in heathen countries, to adopt the insignia of the prevailing idolatries; and yet all alike acted upon the principle of doing evil that good might come. But even on this ground, it is a strategical error, to suppose that the world will be led to admire religion, by seeing it betrayed into the hands of its enemies. Religion is thus only rendered contemptible in the eyes of those who are thus treacherously courted. The more spotless and unapproachable the purity of the Church, the more will she be honored, and the more subduing will be her influence over the minds of those without her pale.

The only other objection to be noticed, is one which demands a careful and respectful consideration. It may be thrown into the form of a question, thus: "Is there not something in this idea of confining the electoral privileges of the Church absolutely to communicants, which conflicts with the theory of the Presbyterian and other Pedo-Baptist Churches, as to the relation which all their baptized members bear to the Church? And does it not imply an error either in the idea itself, or in the theory of those Churches?"

This is not a dilemma. As before intimated, the Church has never clearly and fully defined the relation which her baptized non-communing members bear to her. This leaves room for an unfortunate difference of sentiment and practice.

Those who take the highest view, maintain that these baptized ones, although not entitled to a seat at the communion table, without an individual profession of faith, are in all other respects full members of the visible Church, and as such are under the supervision of its affairs, whose duty it is to apply to them the established canons of discipline—and that it is only on their refusal to submit to such discipline, that they forfeit their membership.

To say the least of this view, it casts great reproach upon the consistency of Pedo-Baptist Churches. Frequently as strenuous efforts have been made to bring the Church to act upon this theory, no Church within our knowledge acts, or has ever acted, upon it. Then, either the Church has been, and is, guilty of the most gross and persistent infidelity to her Great Head, or the theory itself is wrong. The fact is, the theory is impracticable, and would be destructive if it were not impracticable. The strict enforcement of it would render infant-baptism a nullity and a farce. Its beauty and efficiency as a means of propagating and perpetuating the faith among the generations of the faithful, would all be gone. And for this reason: The discipline of the Church recognizes no distinction between morals and religion. And the offences under her penal code swell in magnitude in proportion as they affect the honor and glory of Christ. The sorest of all punishment is due to the man who tramples under foot the Son of God, and counts the blood of the covenant an unholy thing. This capital offence is committed by

every one who has not exercised a saving faith in the Redeemer. And the discipline which would ignore this crime whilst it busied itself with peccadilloes, is unworthy the name. And if, in any true sense, the government and discipline is to be exercised over its non-communicating members, then must every baptized child be excommunicated as soon as it reaches the period of accountability, unless it comes forward immediately and acknowledges Christ at the communion-table.

It is too great a tax upon credulity to ask us to admit a theory which either implies a most criminal unfaithfulness on the part of the Church, or which would reduce Infant-baptism to a vain ceremony, and as *cruel* as vain, by bringing children into the Church only to cast them out, in the great majority of instances. For although it be happily true, that a large majority of the baptized do ultimately come to the Saviour, and thus vindicate the faithfulness of God, yet it is equally true that many years usually elapse after the period of accountability before they yield their hearts to Him to whom they were early dedicated. Let there once be a serious enforcement of this theory, and the ordinance which is now so sweet and soothing to the parental heart would become the most fearful and harrowing spectacle upon earth; and the blessed hope which cheered the mother, as she laid her child upon the altar of the Lord, would, in a few short years, be changed into the most agonizing despair, as she saw that child cast away from the sacred bosom that had before received him, but has now flung him out into the darkness of the world, a mortified and branded outcast. Surely there is something more benign, more efficient, in this ordinance of God. The blessings of the covenant are not thus to be dissipated.

Would it not be a more correct view of this relation to say, that the baptized children of all ages are members who have not reached their maturity,—minors, who have not come into possession of their estates, until the parental and ecclesiastical teachings are fully received? They have certain vested rights in the Church, which are theirs, not by acquisition—as in the case of the non-baptized,—but by inheritance. Their full enjoyment of these rights only requires a presentation of their claims in proper form. Meanwhile, they are infant heirs in tutelage, heritors in embryo, awaiting the development of those conditions in their characters which qualify them for full possession. The advantages which they possess over other non-professors, are similar to those worldly advantages which the children of the rich have over the children of the poor. Whilst, in the latter case, wealth is attainable by all alike, and fortune gives a universal invitation, yet there is more promise, more security, more hope in the one case than in the other. And the advantages of the baptized lie not simply in the fact of being born of Christian parents, as our Baptist brethren contend, but are enhanced very greatly by the fact of their being baptized. Not here to contend for the Divine authority of the ordinance, it must suffice to state, that in the baptism of the child there is a guarantee for parental faithfulness not

But there is not space to enter fully upon this branch of the subject. It is only designed to say enough here to show, that the birth-right of the child does not necessarily carry the right to all the privileges of the Church, during what may be considered its minority, any more than in the case of infant heirs, who do not control their own property, or enter upon the full privileges of citizenship, until they have reached a period when they are supposed to be qualified to manage their affairs properly,—and not even then if, from intemperance, mental weakness, or any other cause, they be incapable of appreciating their position and duties. Under the most democratic form of civil government, there are many classes of people in the country who are not considered suitable to be intrusted with the full franchise of citizenship. And thus should it be in the Church. Her franchises should be committed only to those who appreciate her duties and enter into all her sympathies.

Many who are favorable to some reform in these matters, are not prepared to go the full length of what is really demanded. There are those who agree that non-communicants should not be allowed to take part in ecclesiastical affairs, but who are still inclined to allow the Church property to be managed by an extra-ecclesiastical board of trustees, chosen for this special purpose from among the communing members of the Church, and frequently changed: fearing that if the whole management of the property were left to the regular Church officers, there would be danger of secularizing the officers, and of a dull, inefficient system of managing the temporalities.

Here we still perceive the lingering feeling that somehow we can improve on the divinely-constituted organization of the Church, and adapt it more perfectly to the active and progressive spirit of the time. So far as there is any force in the strain of this article, it goes to show that the Church in all its affairs should be self-governed, and the Church ought to have no business of any kind which might not with propriety be managed by her regular officers. The Apostles certainly foresaw all the necessities of the Church; and it is unreasonable to suppose that they left any part of them unprovided for. And it is difficult to understand how a thorough Presbyterian can avoid the conclusion, that the Deacons are the proper persons to manage all the temporalities of the Church. The Deacons do not, indeed, manage any part of the temporalities independently of the Pastor and Elders; nor should they manage the estate and revenues of the Church except as the executive committee of the consistory, which is composed of all the regular officers of each congregation. But it seems beautifully accordant with our system of Church government for the Deacons, acting with and under the consistory, and thus subject to official review and responsibility, to be the trustees and general agents of the Church in all her temporal affairs.

As for the fear that the regular officers would be tame and unenterprising, it lies equally against them in their spiritual capacity; and if it is to be regarded, then we had better establish an outside board, to supersede the regular officers in their *spiritual* functions.

elsewhere to be found. And history testifies upon this point very wonderfully.

The truth of the matter is, that there is now by far too much thought given to the temporalities of the Church; and this is far worse than the opposite extreme. But we are not dealing with a question of *policy*, but of *principle*.

A reference to the most standard expounders of the Presbyterian system, both in Scotland and in America, will satisfy any one that the principle advocated in this article is the principle of old-fashioned, uncontaminated Presbyterianism. (See Hetherington, McCrie, Melville, Stuart, Miller, &c.)

WHOSE CHILDREN HAVE A RIGHT TO BAPTISM?

THIS is a question which our Pastors are often called upon to decide in the regular course of their ministrations, and the decision must generally be made under circumstances involving a sacrifice of personal feeling on their part, and the risk of offending those to whom they are anxious to do good. The impulses of kindness or considerations of expediency are sometimes too strong, even in wise and good men, to be resisted by a simple conviction of right; and this is particularly liable to occur, when, as is the case with nearly all Pastors, such impulses and considerations are fortified by the recollection that they have been generously treated by the very persons to whom they ought to deny the privileges of the church. We need, therefore, to have our convictions of truth and duty confirmed: that, while we hold ourselves ready to become all things to all men, if by any means we may save some, we may yet firmly refuse, even for an hour, to resign one principle of the gospel, or prostitute any, the very least of the ordinances of Christ. We ought to feel continually that the pastoral office is a *trust*, and, consequently, that our only concern is to be found faithful. We have no right to preach our own Gospel, or administer our own ordinances, or administer God's ordinances in our own way. We are not ministers plenipotentiary, but ambassadors with definite instructions which we dare not transcend. If we are abused by foolish men for doing our duty, and refusing to yield to their humours, let them look to it. We serve the Lord Christ, and to Him alone must we finally render our account. The smiles of such a Master will be an ample compensation for the frowns and curses of a world.

Although the doctrine of our Church in reference to the baptism of children, is perfectly explicit, as explicit as words can make it, our practice has not been entirely uniform, and, we have reason to fear, there is not an entire unanimity of opinion amongst us. The General Assembly of 1811 appointed a Committee to prepare a Report

on the Duty of the Church in the Instruction and Discipline of her Baptized Children. This Report was presented to the Assembly of the following year, but was not adopted by that Assembly or by any other. It is reprinted in the Presbyterian Educational Repository. Why it was not adopted, we suppose, will be plain enough to any man who will read it. We refer to it now, merely for the following enumeration of errors against which it was, among other things, designed to bear testimony. They are errors against which, we rejoice to believe, the great body of our church would bear testimony now.

“The errors to which we refer,” say the Committee,—are “that the right and power of handing down baptism to our children, are derived from the baptism of the parent; “that the original guilt of baptized infants, is so covered by the blood of atonement, symbolized in baptism, that its condemning power, at least with respect to baptized infants dying in infancy, is destroyed by the grace of the new covenant;” “that a profession of saving faith in adults, is not requisite to entitle them to baptism;” “that a mere owning of the covenant, without a credible profession of a person’s being in the covenant, entitles him to the baptism, of his children;” “that a child ought not to be punished, by refusing baptism, for the fault of its parent;” “that a parent’s profession is to be considered credible, if his life be moral, without inquiring into his religious practice, or exacting from him a promise of obedience to all the commandments of Christ;” “that a person may lawfully be admitted to the Lord’s Supper, who neglects religious duties, though he may be moral in his deportment;” and that the sacraments are converting ordinances, intended to regenerate sinners, or to procure the pardon of sins.”

Such errors betray deplorable ignorance of the very nature of a sacrament. They spring from the tendency in our fallen nature to lose sight of the spirituality of religion, and the sovereignty of the Holy Ghost in the great business of salvation; that tendency which has worked itself out in the apostate communion of Rome, and made it the cage of unclean birds, the hold of every foul spirit. The consequence of this tendency, aggravated by the long and dismal reign of Papal darkness, is, that with unconverted men, the sacraments are a sort of charm, and the verbal forms, used in celebrating them, a species of magical incantation. A horse-shoe, nailed over the door, has much the same meaning for some grossly superstitious people, that the precious seals of the covenant of God have for some educated and enlightened men. And perhaps it is not going too far to say, that many intelligent christians in our own church, regard the sacraments with a sort of awe nearly allied to superstition. Why that slavish fear in approaching the feast of heavenly charity, spread by a Father’s hand? Why that anxiety to have a dying child baptized, when no such anxiety is felt for the child in health?

It cannot, therefore, be out of place in a journal like this, devoted to the exposition and defence of Scriptural Christianity, to attempt an answer to the question, “whose children have the right to Baptism?”

The doctrine of our own church, upon this point, is very clearly

expressed in the answer to the 166th Question of the Larger Westminster Catechism, which is in these words: "Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church, and so strangers from the covenant of promise, till they profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him; but infants descending from parents, either both or but one of them, professing faith in Christ, and obedience to him, are in that respect, within the covenant, and are to be baptized." See also Conf. of Faith, c. 28. s. 4. The only difficulty that can arise in the interpretation of this statement, is, as to the meaning of "faith in Christ, and obedience to Him." In some branches of the great Presbyterian family, a credible profession of *saving* faith, is not required in order to full communion in the church. It is well known, how earnestly Dr. Mason of New York protested against the right of church-sessions, to demand evidence of a change of heart from candidates applying for admission to the Lord's Table: and the same views are held, we believe, in the churches of Scotland and Ireland. But that branch of the church to which we belong, so far as we know, has always acted upon a different view of the case, and held that the faith which qualifies for communion is that faith in Christ, which is defined in the 86th answer of the Shorter Catechism, to be "a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon Him alone for salvation, as He is offered to us in the Gospel." It ought to be noted that the Question is not, "what is *saving* faith?" but simply, "what is faith in Christ?" The title of the XIV chapter of the Confession is, of "Saving Faith;" and the description of it is only an expansion of the answer in the Shorter Catechism. It is plain from the Larger Catechism above cited, that the qualifications which are required for full communion of adults by their own baptism, are required also to give them the right to have their children baptized: and these qualifications are "faith in Christ (as elsewhere defined) and obedience to him." Jonathan Edwards has, we think, clearly demonstrated in his *Treatise on the Qualifications for Full Communion*, that the views we are defending, are the Scriptural views of the matter, and we doubt not that the sympathies of our whole communion, with rare exceptions, are with him. We cannot regret the controversy which compelled him to write that able *Treatise*: and, although for reasons which he states, he abstains from the discussion of the question before us, it is not difficult to determine what his conclusions, in regard to it, would have been.

It may be said that the General Assembly (*Digest of 1820*) refused in 1816, to decide that "those parents who live in the constant neglect of the Lord's Supper, are not entitled to the right of having their children baptized." But in answer to this, it may be observed.

1. That they did not decide the contrary.
2. That the proposition (*Digest*, p. 330) submitted to them, has very little to do with the main point, and they may have rejected it on account of its irrelevancy.
3. The proposition seems to have referred to the case only of a regular member of the church, absenting himself, of his own accord, from the Lord's Table; and not to baptized, or unbaptized

men of the world. We can conceive of cases even of actual suspension from the communion of the church, in which serious doubts might arise whether the children of such suspended persons ought to be debarred the privilege of baptism : but such cases rarely, if ever, actually occur, and when they do, they are to be judged upon principles differing very materially from those which control the question, as it relates to parents who have never professed "faith in Christ and obedience to Him."

In 1794, the following reference from the Synod of Philadelphia was laid before the Assembly : (see minutes for that year :) "As Baptism is to be administered to the infants of those who are members of the visible church, but our Directory leaves the description of the visible and credible profession of christianity vague and indefinite, it is humbly proposed to the Assembly to give some precise direction and definition of such a profession for the information of its ministers." In answer to this reference, the Assembly judged it unnecessary, and perhaps impracticable, to deliver rules more explicit than those contained in the Standards of our Church ; but should cases of difficulty arise, they must be decided, respectively, according to their own merits, before the proper judicatories. Here, again, the meagreness of our ecclesiastical records leaves us in doubt, as to the views really held by the Assembly. But this much is clear, that, in their judgment, whatever might be the ambiguity of the Directory (which is not, in the full sense, a part of the Standards of the Presbyterian Church,) the Standards are explicit enough. And so we think.

Seeing then that these Standards teach, that the children *only* of parents, one or both, professing "faith in Christ and obedience to Him," have a right to be baptized ; let us inquire whether this is the teaching of Scripture. In doing so, we take the liberty of saying, that, in addressing the officers of our church, the argument from Scripture is *ex abundanti*, as they have solemnly acknowledged the Standards to be Scriptural. If any man thinks that they are not in accordance with God's word, he ought to be something else than an officer in the church which holds them.

In the New Testament, baptism is no where recorded as having been administered without profession of "faith in Christ," or repentance from sin. These two things go together, and are, in some sort the same act of the soul—contemplated, in the one, in its relation to the *terminus ad quem*, in the other, in its relation to the *t. a. quo*. It is a turning away *from* sin, and turning *to* Christ. Hence Philip says to the Eunuch, asking if he might be baptized: "If thou *believest with all thine heart*, thou mayest : " and Peter says to the multitude on the day of Pentecost, "*Repent* and be baptized." (Acts 8 : 36, 37 ; 2 : 38.) "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation, not to be repented of," (Rom. 10 : 9 ; 2. Cor. 7 : 10.) This is the faith and the repentance required, in order to give the right, as before God, to baptism : and a credible profession of such

faith and repentance is necessary, as before the church, to warrant the administration of it. "He that *believeth* and is baptized," said the Saviour, "shall be saved." "*Repent*," said John the Baptist to the multitude, "for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and "they were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." In a word, as Baptism sets forth the union of the believer with Christ, by the in-dwelling Spirit of holiness, that union from which faith, repentance, and all the other manifestations of spiritual life, proceed: it should seem to be the emptiest ceremony in the world, without the reality or the credible profession of such an union. If this be so, then in the baptism of children, who shall make the profession? The children themselves cannot do it. Nobody has a right to make it, in such a case, and children ought not to be baptized at all, say some. Any body may do it, god-fathers and god-mothers, say others. Parents may do it, say the Scriptures and our Confession, if they can do it honestly. And, accordingly, we have examples of household baptisms on the profession of faith of the head of the household, (see Acts 16: 15, 33; 18: 8.) the profession of *saving* faith. Paul and Silas said to the Jailer, "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be *saved*, and *thy house*;" and it was on the profession of such faith, that "he and all his were baptized straight-way." The Jailer "*rejoiced, believing* in God with *all his house*." "And Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue, *believed* on the Lord with *all his house*." We are not disputing now with Anti-Pedo-baptists, and therefore, shall not stop to vindicate our view of these household baptisms, as implying the baptism of children. What we insist upon is, that a profession of faith on the part of parents, either one or both, must go before the baptism of children, if such baptism is to be administered at all.

This may be argued further, from the very nature and design of the sacraments. There can be but two theories essentially, as to the nature of a sacrament, the one confounding in some form or other, the sign and the thing signified: the other asserting their distinction and separation. In the Lord's Supper, for example, there is no middle ground between Popery, in some form, or Zwinglianism in some form. There can be in like manner, but two theories essentially, as to the efficacy of the sacraments. The one making it to depend upon the fact of administration, *ex opere operato*: the other making it to depend on the sovereign power of the Spirit, accompanying the *truth* of which the sacrament is the sign and seal. Take away the truth signified and sealed in the sacraments, and they become unreasonable ceremonies, and our worship becomes the sacrifice of fools. Hence our Assembly decided ten years ago, that Romish Baptism was no baptism; not upon the ground only, that the element of water was materially corrupted by the admixture of loathsome foreign ingredients, but that the *truth* constituting the form of the sacrament was utterly denied, and trampled under foot by that mother and mistress of abominations. Hence her Eucharist has ceased to be "that feast of free grace and adoption to which Christ invited His disciples to sit as brethren, and co-heirs of the happy

covenant, that feast of love and heavenly-admitted fellowship, the seal of filial grace ;” and has become “the subject of horror and glouting adoration, pageanted about like a dreadful idol.” These ordinances are monuments without an inscription, and it depends upon what we write on them, whether they be true and precious memorials of God’s love to us, or, like the tower of Babel, the memorials of our rebellion against God. The truth is the grand instrument of our sanctification, the *mould* into which the soul of the believer is to run, and take its shape (John 17 : 17, 19 ; Rom. 6 : 17, in the Greek.) And whether that truth reaches the mind through the avenue of the ear, in the preaching of the word : or, through the avenue of the eye, in the symbolical elements and actions of the sacraments, it conduces not to our sanctification, unless the Spirit melts our hearts, by an immediate influence of His own. The shapeless piece of metal will lie by the side of the mould and in contact with it, shapeless for ever, if nothing more be done. How then can the sacraments profit us, or our children, if we believe not? They cannot, any more than the eternal springs and fountains of the hills can assuage the burning thirst of the dying travellers in the desert. Why then should an unconverted man ask for baptism, either for himself, or for his child? Are the signs of that ordinance any signs to him? Of what is the word trumpet the sign, to a man born deaf? Is the seal of the covenant any seal to him, when he has not yet set to his own seal, that God is true? In a word, is baptism, in the case of such a man, any thing more than weak superstition, or wanton mockery of God? If the man knows not what he is doing, it is the first ; if he does know, it is the last. In either case, it is the duty of the minister not to allow, if he can help it, the ordinance of God to be profaned. Men should be taught that they are bound to believe in Christ and to confess Him, in order that they and their children may enjoy the privileges of the church : that they alone are to blame, if their children are deprived of any : and that the same law holds in the visible church, as in nature and Providence ; the children suffer for their parents’ delinquencies. *Believe* and be baptized : *believe* and have thy house baptized.

We might argue, still further, from the nature of the church as an association of men established for the purpose of accomplishing a certain end, and enjoying certain privileges. Is it not a universal rule that members only are to enjoy these privileges? What would a lodge of Free Masons say to a man, who should demand any of the rights thereto pertaining, when he was not only not a member, but was habitually using his influence, silently or openly, against the whole Order? What would a Railway Corporation say to a man, who should demand the payment of a dividend, or a free passage always over the road, when the man was no stockholder? And shall the church of Christ not protect her privileges from invasion on the side of the world, in league with the prince of darkness against her? She is not purely a voluntary association : she has no power to make or alter her charter : her charter is given her of God, and in it, there is no provision made for *honorary* members, entitled to enjoy the

privilege of baptism and no other. If the officers of the church were firmer in maintaining her dignity and independence, in this respect, her privileges would be felt to be worth having, and she would not be the poor pitiful slave and laughing-stock of men that she often is.

But a parent may say, the constitution makes baptized children members of the church: I have been baptized in infancy, I have never been excommunicated, and therefore, am a member now, and entitled to the right of having my child baptized. A great deal might be said in reply, but this is enough for our present purpose, that children who have been baptized are members of the church, in a sense somewhat analogous to the sense, in which they are members of the State: they are subject to law, and enjoy the fostering care of both, but they are not entitled to all the privileges of either, until they become adults. Adulthood in the State is defined by law, and consists in the attainment of a certain age: adulthood in the Church is also defined by law, and consists in the possession of faith, or credible evidence thereof. This view of the matter, therefore, will not help the non-professing parent who has been baptized in infancy: it is enough, however, to alarm him, about his own salvation, if he will look at it. If he is a member of the church, he has an awful account to meet, for broken vows.

We had intended to say something in regard to the recklessness—to use no harsher term—of unconverted men, in taking the sort of vows upon them, which they are compelled to take, in offering their children for baptism in our church: and in regard to the cruelty of ministers in allowing them to do it. But, we conclude by exhorting our brethren, to remember, that corruption has generally come into the church, through changes in the worship of God, and, that of all the parts of worship, none ought to be more strictly guarded, than the seals of the covenant, designed, as they are, to be the discriminating badges of the friends and followers of Christ.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

AMONG several subjects, of more or less urgent importance, which claim the careful attention of our Church through her highest judicatory, that of correspondence with other branches of our Protestant kindred is not among the least urgent. This necessity arises from several quarters. Our correspondence with the various ecclesiastical bodies of New England, has been more or less disturbed for some years,—the disturbance always coming from them—and our last Assembly took the initiation in agitating the quiet of our intercourse with the General Synod of the German Reformed Church. This, together with what has transpired in some of the New England As-

sociations since the meeting of the General Assembly, will devolve it upon the next Assembly to consider carefully, and if possible ad-just definitely, the whole subject. Many vague ideas, and perhaps some honest difference of opinion, seem to exist respecting the grounds or principles on which ecclesiastical correspondence, as at present existing, rests. Two or three things seem to be generally understood as pre-requisites to such correspondence.

1st.—A general agreement in great leading doctrines ; or in the same scheme of doctrine considered as a theological system.

2nd.—The absence of rigidly exclusive ideas, on the subject of Church government.

3d.—A sufficiently liberal and catholic spirit, to overlook minor differences for the sake of fundamental agreements.

4th.—It adds to the pleasure and propriety of such correspondence, if the parties to it are able to trace, and do consciously realize, an affinity of origin, and a similarity of historical experience.

For want of acquiescence in the third rule given, we are prevented from having correspondence with the various Secession bodies in this country, who make the singing of the Psalms of David a term of communion,—bodies with whom correspondence would be in every way natural and desirable.

But after agreement on the general basis indicated, there are differences as to the actual meaning, conditions, and proprieties of such correspondence, which seriously interfere with its pleasure and profit. Some branches of the Church adopt the rule of receiving members on certificate, without examination, from those bodies with whom they are in correspondence. Our own Church does not recognize the force of this rule. Some, in various church connections, think that the correspondence implies “virtual endorsement” of every thing marked or prominent in the life and working of the other branches, and consequently each one is called upon to lecture the other upon every thing conceived to be done wrong, or improperly left undone. Others deny that the correspondence is an endorsement of everything except the general soundness, and hold that each denomination has a peculiar life and work of its own, which can be developed and done best in its own way, and hence that any advice or officious interference on the part of delegates, is altogether uncounteous and out of place,—much more so are any hot-headed philippics. The whole issue seems to have been well presented in the last meeting of the General Association of Massachusetts, *viz*: whether the correspondence is like the social intercourse of neighbors at tea, in which their mutual failings and differences are to be forgotten in pleasure at their mutual welfare ; or is like sending children on an errand, to tell the neighbor of his faults. The latter of these views (exceedingly absurd as it seems to us) was apparently the more popular in the Association ; the former we think, is the sentiment of our church, so far as her sentiment can be gathered from her past actions. None of the Assembly’s delegates, so far as we know, have ever taken occasion to berate other bodies on what the Presbyterian Church considered wrong or defective in them ; and the Assembly

has repeatedly intimated, particularly in the case of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, that it did not wish to be lectured upon the admirably conservative position of the Presbyterian Church in America, upon the subject of slavery. The sentiment of our Church, we think, was admirably stated by the delegate from our last Assembly on the floor of the General Association of Massachusetts, when he said, "this correspondence is simply a form, but a form of marked significancy,—it is one of these great things which are words,—a word proclaiming that we hold in common the great truths of salvation." This happily chosen expression, gives the very core of the whole matter of correspondence, and suggests abundant reason why it should not be hastily dropped,—how strikingly out of harmony with it is the action of the last Assembly, with regard to the German Reformed Church, remains to be shown.

The resolution introduced into the Assembly by the Committee to nominate Delegates, is as follows :—

Resolved, That without intending to deny, as a general principle, governing their correspondence with sister churches, that the formally acknowledged creeds and symbols of faith, are to be taken as a true representation of the doctrinal views of the ministers and people of any branch of the Church of Christ, in the official action of this Assembly in relation to them; yet, in view of the peculiar position of the General Synod of the German Reformed Church toward the Theological Seminary at Mercersburgh, whose Professors, we are pained to witness, have so notoriously become antagonistic to Protestantism; and lest a continuance of our correspondence might be understood as countenancing the fundamental errors which they are laboring to disseminate; and lest we be regarded as disapproving the course of those in that communion, who have so nobly contended against them—a respectable number of whom, we learn, have wholly withdrawn from the General Synod, on account of the alarming prevalence of these errors in that body: therefore, this General Assembly will suspend its correspondence with the General Synod of the German Reformed Church, and decline sending a delegate to that body."

This resolution was put upon the docket, and owing to the press of business, it was not discussed or acted on, but at the last sitting of the Assembly it was indefinitely postponed, and yet the Assembly, on motion, "*declined to send a delegate to the German Reformed Synod this year.*" In this, as we conceive, the Assembly committed a most unfortunate oversight,—we say *oversight*, for we are disposed to attribute it to the press of business, and would hope for the honor of the Assembly, that if the subject had been fully and calmly discussed, the result would have been different. It was a virtual prejudgment of the whole case. It was taking for granted the things stated in the resolution without proof. It was doing the very thing without discussion, which should only have been done after mature deliberation; and doing it in such a way as to be peculiarly offensive, if not insulting, to our German Reformed brethren. The General Synod at its last meeting (in October, 1854) declined, of course, to send a delegate to our next Assembly, and thus the correspondence is suspended until renewed by our Assembly. If the Assembly had not time to discuss and decide upon the things stated in the resolution, surely every dictate of charity and justice would have required the correspondence to be continued until the charges preferred were made good. The law of Christ, like the civil law, and for a tenfold stronger reason, presumes a man to be innocent until he is proved guilty.

If the next Assembly takes up the subject, and refuses to renew the suspended correspondence, (the contrary, however, we earnestly hope for) we suppose it will be for some such reasons as those given in the above resolution. We propose, therefore, to consider the statements therein made.

The principle stated in the opening of the resolution, and which it is "not intended to deny," that "the formally acknowledged creeds and symbols of faith are to be taken, &c.," is undoubtedly a true principle, and one which should not be violated except in a case of most palpable and flagrant deviation from the acknowledged symbols. With regard to the creeds and symbols of faith of the German Reformed Church, we need not say a single word. Their soundness is tacitly conceded in the resolution. And if the question be asked, "does the German Reformed Church adhere in profession and practice to the Heidelberg Catechism?" we answer with a most emphatic affirmative. She has never done anything officially to indicate the contrary, but everything to indicate her increasing attachment to her venerable symbols, and her practice in her several congregations, fully confirms this.

What, then, is her "peculiar position" toward the Theological Seminary at Mercersburgh? We answer it is a very peculiar position. It is a position of a fond mother toward her eldest, and until lately her only daughter. The Seminary is emphatically the Seminary of the Church, founded and sustained amidst much discouragement and difficulty; and in the trying ordeal through which the Church has passed, it surely was not to be expected that she should change her "peculiar position" toward her *Seminary*.

But further, "whose Professors, we are pained to witness, have so notoriously become antagonistic to Protestantism." What Professors are here meant? We are half constrained to believe that this resolution was based, not upon an accurate knowledge of the real history and present stand-point of the German Reformed Church, but upon vague impressions derived from common newspaper rumor, much of which has been of the very vaguest and most perverted character.* What are the facts in the case?

At the meeting of the German Reformed Synod at Lancaster, Pa., October, 1851, the resignation of the Rev. Dr. John W. Nevin, as Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Mercersburgh, came formally before that body, having been duly made, according to rule, to the Board of Visitors six months before. Upon this, the Synod did not definitely act, but requested Dr. N. more fully to consider his duty in the case. He still insisting upon his resignation, it came up again at the next meeting in Baltimore, October, 1852, and was accepted, and the Rev. Bernard C. Wolff, D. D.

* To one who has before him the official documents of the German Reformed Church, and the whole "Mercersburgh Literature," and who has been in a position to watch carefully the progress of officers in that Church, the blunders of those who attempt to sit in judgment upon her, are often ludicrous enough. We have just seen a new book, "Christianity and Statesmanship," by Dr. Hague, a Baptist, (we believe,) in which mention is made of Papists, and Puseyites and the "Lutheran school of Pennsylvania under Dr. Schaff!"

elected to fill the vacant chair. So that eighteen months before the above resolution was offered in the General Assembly, Dr. Nevin had retired from all connection with the Theological Seminary, and is now living privately in Carlisle, Pa., engaged in the instruction of his children. "The Professors," then, who have become "so notoriously antagonistic to Protestantism," must be Dr. Wolff and Dr. Philip Schaff. Against the former, we believe, no suspicions have ever lain; and against the latter, we hesitate not to affirm boldly that such suspicions are wholly unfounded. They arise from the common error of confounding the theological position of Dr. Schaff with that of Dr. Nevin. There is, practically at least, a world-wide difference between them.* To say nothing of assurances derived from personal acquaintance, we confidently appeal to his published writings, and challenge the most careful examination to produce anything inimical to the essentials of Protestantism. His last and greatest work, the "History of the Apostolic Church," whatever other exceptions may be taken to it, ought to, and will, effectually dissipate from a candid mind the suspicion that he is "notoriously antagonistic to Protestantism." What then becomes of the charge in the committee's resolution?

Another item is, "lest a continuance of our correspondence might be understood as countenancing," &c. There is a very slight shade of difference (as it concerns the matter now in hand) between "countenancing" and "a virtual endorsement;" and here we would have our Assembly adopting the very interpretation of this ecclesiastical correspondence which tastes so unsavory when it comes from our New England brethren, and which our Church has heretofore practically repudiated. Our correspondence with the German Reformed Church "countenances" nothing except her position

* We are not called upon to define Dr. Nevin's theological position. We have shown that he is not involved in the issue now made. He has undoubtedly thrown himself open to suspicion from his Protestant brethren. We have our fears and our hopes. Of his honesty, and profound, almost painful earnestness, we cannot have a doubt; and we have been sadly pained at the flippancy with which he has been treated, and the want of manly ability to grapple with the solemn-issues he has made. In the first No. of this Magazine, it was justly stated that the great question of "The Church,"—"ecclesiology," has been almost entirely "overlooked among us." Dr. Nevin has done more than any other man in America towards pointing out the conditions and necessities of this great problem, upon one of its sides; and yet his portentous challenges have been treated, in most quarters, as though—to quote the eccentric Sandy Mackaye, in "Alton Locke"—they were mere "Samothracian mysteries o' bottled moonshine." Is this the way to dispose of them? But Dr. Schaff has been treated with singular bigotry and unfairness. To say nothing of the "New Brunswick Reviewer," whom we leave to the tender mercies of "Protestant," the "learned and eminent scholar," of the New York Observer, even the Presbyterian has been able to find nothing good to say of him. It must even preface his impartial and laudatory account of religious affairs in Scotland with a disparaging remark. The "Banner" seems to be more just. The position of the "Repertory" is rather peculiar, as may be seen by comparing its reviews of the German and the English editions of the Church History. To all concerned we would commend an article, by Dr. Bacon, in the New Englander for May, 1854,—especially his remarks, that in America many are not willing that "a German should be a German," and that no serious alarm is created by Translations of Huluch or Neander. By the way, we see advertisements of translations of Hagenbach, Gieseler, Havanich, Muller, Hengstenberg, Nitzsch, in the Presbyterian,—a dangerous avalanche, if Dr. Schaff is outlawed as "notoriously antagonistic to Protestantism."

among the "orthodox" family. It leaves her to work out her own problems, and do her own work, and settle her own difficulties in her own way.

But will it be averred that the German Reformed Church has become radically heretical, or anti-Protestant? Pshaw! To what extent have they endorsed Dr. Nevin's "peculiar views?" They have not endorsed them officially at all. They simply abstained from stopping his mouth and his pen, because they charitably believed him to be honestly in search of truth. We have been informed by one of his most ardent admirers, that in his later published views he finds but very partial sympathy, if any, in their Church. If it be asked, then, why the Synod did not at once accept his resignation,—we reply, (1) that his celebrated and alarming articles on "Early Christianity," in the *Mercersburgh Review*, had not then been published; (2) that his great weight of personal character, in connection with his manifest honesty and deep earnestness, constrained them to exercise all possible forbearance; (3) it was felt that men to fill the vacant chair were not plenty. But Dr. Nevin, as far as he is anti-Protestant, does *not* stand before the world endorsed by the German Reformed Church. We quote from a paper adopted by the German Reformed Synod, at Philadelphia, October, 1853, concerning the action of the Dutch Reformed Synod in suspending correspondence:—

"In their late Synod in this city, they gravely charge us with having done what 'amounts to a tacit connivance with, if not a virtual approval of, views which strike at the vitality of the truth as maintained by the Protestant Church.' This your committee regard as an unqualified slander. * * * The doctrines and sentiments charged upon our professors and others, but which they disclaim *in toto*, are doctrines and sentiments in regard to which this Synod has never felt itself called upon to sit in judgment, and to which it has never given 'a virtual approval.' The genius of our Church allows diversity in non-essentials, &c."

After this, we find that the "Rev. Robert Steele, D. D., delegate from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, (O. S.) took his leave of Synod on the morning of the ninth day of the Sessions, in a very feeling, kind, and appropriate address, which was cordially responded to by the President in behalf of the Synod."

Any one who can suppose for a moment that there is any "Romanizing tendency" in the sterling and practical German character, as found in the Reformed Churches,—that the heart of the Church is not sound,—must know less of the German character than the writer of this paper.

Space absolutely forbids us to notice the last item in the Assembly's resolution, except to say that it is open to the same objection as the former.

The German Reformed Church has had a severe ordeal, but we trust she has passed it safely. Let us not help to heap unjust odium upon her. She has had her difficulties, but we believe they are over. Let us not refuse her our fraternal greetings. Historically,

our Church is bound to her by the closest ties of affinity. But she is German and we are Scotch. Let us not seek to compel her to think and feel just as we do. Her ministry, as a body, are zealous, laborious, and evangelical. Let us not be frightened by the cry of every heresy-hunter. The homes of her people are beside the homes of ours. The Scotchman and the German have been closely associated on this western continent. "Upon mountain slope or plain, in forest or prairie, on river or lake, they are always found side by side." Let us not sever their Christian intercourse. We earnestly hope the next Assembly will take prompt measures to renew the correspondence.

SABBATH RAIL-WAY TRAINS—TO THE PRESBYTERIAN STOCKHOLDERS AND DIRECTORS IN RAILWAY COMPANIES.

We ask our respected brethren to lend an ear to a few plain but honest words, touching this subject, which is of such importance to the morals and welfare of the whole people. If what we say is not true and weighty, we give you full leave to dismiss it as an impertinence: but if, in the sight of God who trieth the hearts, it be found just, then let its justice excuse its seeming officiousness.

The first consideration we offer you is, that by running Sunday 'Trains on your R. Roads, you are sinning as much against your own pockets, as against the law of your God. (No doubt the world will think that this is our strongest, as well as our first point, if we can establish it.) The safety and durability of all your apparatus and engines, require that they shall not be kept perpetually liable to use. There ought to be time for your locomotives to cool out, to be deliberately inspected, and thoroughly oiled. In this single point of view, we doubt not but that a weekly cessation from all labor, would save, in the wear of your enginery, as much as is gained by the profits of your Sunday mails and travel. And the same remarks apply with far more force and certainty to your human machines, your hirelings of every grade. The same God who made the Sabbath rest, made man's frame, and he made the one for the other. Man cannot enjoy the vigour of his bodily and mental faculties, if this rest is neglected. He can do more work, and do it better, in six days, than he can in seven. This is proved by the testimony, not of preachers and divines, (that meddlesome, impractical, pragmatic set!) but of medical men, of manufacturers, of emigrants, and travellers on long journeys, of farmers, of commanders of armies, of able committees of the British Parliament. And if you capitalists knew a little more of that daily toil which you exact of your begrimed and sweaty operatives, you would soon find it true: that the human

frame and mind, after six days' labor, need a whole day's rest; and if they are robbed of it, will lose or waste more than a day in the toils of the next six, from languor and discomfort. Bear in mind then, that all those "hands" who are robbed of their Sabbath's rest by your Sabbath mails and travel, are incapacitated for your service during the rest of the week, to more than the extent of the value of their unlawful work on God's day. They lose for you, during the week, what they had earned for you on the Sabbath.

But that is by no means the worst of the loss. It is certain that man needs a weekly rest: and if he is robbed of it, the effect must be a feeling of bodily and mental discomfort, a feverish languor, a loss of healthy, mental balance and presence of mind, and a painful sense of fatigue. These discomforts are mentally and morally depraving. The man who taxes his mind every day with his week day cares, must inevitably lose his elasticity and capacity for thinking and judging, in the end. A vigorous constitution and elastic spirits may bear up long: but the break-down will come at last, and come all the more heavily. The mind, before clear and quick, will become muddy, heedless and rash. Is it not thus that many an act of madness in business men, before shrewd and cautious, is explained? They had allowed their minds no Sabbath. It is thus that the portentous catastrophe which closed the previously irresistible career of Napoleon is explained. He had allowed his mind no Sabbath. But the moral degradation effected by the continual sense of discomfort, is more marked still. We have only to refer you to the fact well known, that an army cut off by a retreat from the comforts of their baggage and barracks, is always demoralized by its sufferings. Farmers all know, that young men who are polite and moral amidst the comforts of home, are reckless and dissipated under the hardships of the muddy road, the wagon-yard, and the drizzling rain. This is partly because they are then removed from the restraints of domestic society: but it is also partly because they are deprived by the constant discomfort. It is because the person who is worried by physical hardship and privation, becomes obtuse to the more delicate restraints of the moral feelings, and craves any enjoyment, even though it be unlawful, which will indemnify him for his disagreeable sensations. And the feelings developed by this sense of discomfort are the very ones most dangerous in a R. Road official: recklessness, a disregard of conscientious restraints in small things, and carelessness. The soldier, harrassed with excessive privations and hardships, will throw himself down to sleep under pestilential dews, and on a damp soil, too reckless and indolent to gather for himself a bed of leaves. He will waste to-day, the food for which he will starve to-morrow, and neglect the very arms which are to defend him from captivity and death. Rest assured then of this: that if you deprive any of your officials of their Sabbaths, and entail on them this sense of over fatigue, with the indistinctness of mind, inattention, looseness of conscience, and recklessness, which inevitably follow, you will "pay dearly for your whistle." Some fine morning, they will

smash a new engine for you, which had just cost eleven thousand dollars, and break a regiment of arms and legs, whose owners will tax you a good many thousand more, in the shape of litigation and damages. So, there goes at one stroke, all the filthy lucre of many Sabbath days' desecration: a righteous consummation, little to be lamented, were it not for the piteous effusion of blood—blood less guilty than that of the lordly managers and proprietors, who have ordained the sin and its catastrophe, from their safe and luxurious head-quarters! But if you had spared and cultivated these men's comfort and faculties, by observing God's ordinance, they would have continued attentive, careful and conscientious.

But the supreme folly of this "superfluity of naughtiness" is not yet exposed. Do not you Presbyterians believe, that the only sure foundation of morals is religion? No decent and sensible man of the world dares to dispute it. Do you not know that where you find a man utterly regardless to the fear of God, and his worship, there you usually find an unreliable man? Do you not know that in the main, the respectability, the conscientiousness, the diligence, the honour, of our people, are found among those who respect the ordinances of Christianity? But THE SABBATH embraces within itself almost all that is useful and elevating in Christianity: the sweet domestic rest, the clean apparel, the Sabbath school, the sanctuary, and its sacred services. It will not do, to answer that there are, confessedly, many decent, honest men, who are not regular and punctual in Sabbath observance, and who do not pretend to personal holiness. We may admit this: but, to be irregular in Sabbath observance, is a very different thing from being willing to covenant *always* to break the Sabbath. And usually, he who is willing to bargain this, must be a thoroughly heathenish, and therefore, an unprincipled man. When you determine that you will run Sunday trains in spite of God and man, this therefore is what you virtually resolve: "We will not permit any man who truly fears God and his law, who desires to lead the feet of his little ones to God's courts, and to learn the law of righteousness, to serve us in those Sunday trains. No: we are afraid we might get hold of an honest, reliable man; but if there is any man so heathenish that he is willing to engage to break God's law and man's, weekly, with wicked punctuality—who is prepared to covenant that he will never spend a quiet Sabbath with his household, that he will always neglect the souls of his little ones, and refuse to lead them to the Sabbath School and the sanctuary; ah, he is the man for us! He is just wicked enough, just unprincipled and brutal enough, to be entrusted with myriads of our beloved property, and hundreds of (less) valued lives." Yes, you determine that you will refuse the good and choose the evil, to be engine-drivers, stokers, conductors, ticket agents, wood men, post masters, all along your line—to fill, in short, all those offices which are required by your Sunday trains. And for this religious principle, this conscientiousness, so essential in an official, you propose to substitute, a strict system of discipline and responsibility. Who is to be

trusted, to administer that system conscientiously? You decree that all your officials, up to the highest, shall by all means be unscrupulous enough to direct this Sabbath-breaking organization. You decree that they *shall* cheat God; how can you know that they will not cheat you? But moreover, all men know that there is no system of checks so perfect as to circumvent men who are unrestrained by moral principle. Collusion between dishonest officers can easily evade them all. The true result and meaning of this Sabbath-breaking policy therefore is, to entrust myriads of valuable property, and thousands of dollars of fees, to men who either must be unprincipled by the terms of their contract with you, or are likely to become so, by reason of their compulsory neglect of all religious influences. And here is one of the main explanations of that corruption in management, that confusion and extravagance, which have made all your corporations sink-pockets, even where they enjoy a patronage almost immeasurable. You have "fallen among thieves." But it was your own choice.

Now it would be no relief to the pressure of these considerations, to propose to give your officials who serve on Sunday, some other day's rest in the week, for no other day possesses the Sabbath's rest, quiet, sacredness, and sanctuary privileges. If you give other days, they will be spent on the street, or in the tavern.

Once more: It is obvious that usually, as much gain will be made in the regular and legitimate travel, by six trains a week, as by seven. And then there is the saving of the wear of the rolling stock, one day out of seven. It is well known that the "life" of a locomotive is measured not by years, nor by the relative burdens it draws on its different trips, but by the number of thousand miles it runs. By saving one trip out of seven, one seventh of the wear, and of its cost, is saved, as well as one seventh of the fuel, oil, and all other expenses of running a train. But usually, the same men who travel Sunday, on legitimate journeys, would go on Monday, if no opportunity were offered them to break the Sabbath. Six days' work would carry as much of the legitimate travel as seven: so that there would be no serious diminution of income, and a clear saving of outgoings.

But perhaps a skeptical feeling of this sort has arisen in the minds of our readers—"How can these things be? If these Sabbath trains are so obviously impolitic, how is it that it has not been thought of by our directors themselves? They are pretty shrewd; the pocket nerve is usually very sensitive; there must be some offset to these arguments, or else they would have seen them, in their wisdom, as well as this sapient writer in the good Journal, "the Presbyterian Critic."

Yes, my good brethren, there is an offset, and we will tell you what it is: There is a profit in Sunday trains, notwithstanding these heavy deductions, and we will tell you the secret of it. It is, that you thereby gain a Sabbath-breaking patronage, which you could not have on any other day. It is that you get great car loads of

truant apprentices, loafers, free negroes, strumpets, and slaves, who take a Sunday ride in the morning, and return in your evening train, (if not too drunk), and who would not go any other day. This, and this only, is the source of that profit which is found to remain from Sabbath breaking, notwithstanding all those grievous deductions which we have pointed out. But are you willing to be partners of this low trade, to stun the Sabbath quiet of all the villages along your lines, from twenty to a hundred miles from your great termini, with the roar of the engine and the crowd, string all their taverns and bar-rooms with rowdy guests, bring fish to the nets of all their rum-sellers and gamblers, grieve and injure all their good citizens, and statedly vomit out the crime and pollution of the cities in long tracts, upon the peaceful country, on the most peaceful and sacred day of the seven? Are you willing that your great and dignified corporations shall thus descend, and set themselves cheek-by-jowl with circus-men, tapsters and jugglers, as candidates to cater to the peculiar tastes of the dissolute rabble? Are you willing that the foul gains of this foul trade shall pollute your pockets, and go between your teeth with the bread you eat?

Some will attempt an excuse, by saying, that these Sabbath jaunts are an innocent, needful, and wholesome recreation for these sons of toil and poverty, who thus breathe free air, and see the green fields, and that it is true benevolence to afford the facility. But experience and morals say, that a far more wholesome recreation might be sought at home. Surely it is not best, that these classes should spend their Sabbaths in the crowded and promiscuous car, instead of the sweet domestic quiet, and should seek the end of their trip in the bar-room of the distant village grog shop, instead of the Sabbath School and the church. Surely it is not well to remove them from domestic and social restraints, to plunge them into the foulest company, with all the license of distance and a strange place. Would not the home-Sabbath, under the parent's or master's eye, with its repose, its sacred lessons, its cleanliness, and if need be, its quiet, pleasant saunter, with domestic company, be a better, safer recreation, than a hurried, dusty ride, in the crowded, rushing, thundering train, which ends in profane and drunken riot?

But you may say: "Why all this to us? We are not the majority." We doubt not, that in many cases, you are a strong minority; for the godliness of our Presbyterian folk very generally reaps the promise of the life that now is. But by your own votes, and by your influence on other religious or thoughtful men, you might, in most cases, control the evil. If you said to your partners: "Finding this sin incorrigible by us, we are bound in conscience to free ourselves from participation in it, by selling out." This would soon bring them to reason; for the simultaneous forcing of so many shares of stock into market would be felt to be an evil, which the profits of Sunday work, doubtful at best, would not offset. "But the stock is below par," it may be said, "and such a step would put it lower; we should sell at a ruinous loss." Well, we confess that is unan-

swerable. With Christian men, who set pecuniary loss against duty, we do not know how to argue. Ah, if Christians were as bold, as resolute, as fearless of giving offence to the citizens of Satan's kingdom, as they are towards us, our power would soon be felt against these abuses. But when we truckle and consult only how we may keep fair weather with those with whom there ought to be no peace—when Christian capitalists connive, pocket the gains cankered with sin, and refuse to lift a finger to aid faithful men in their struggles for right; when they are more tenderly alive to the risk of lowering dividends, than of dishonouring God and damning souls, then it is no wonder we are weak.

But let us look, for one instant, at the moral aspects of this topic. We have tarried too long upon its mere economical views, and feel that we should apologize to our readers, for seeming to wish that they should govern their conduct by arguments so low. There is a most unauthorized laxity of conscience as to their corporate acts, in many minds, which are strict in their personal dealings. Many a man who would not suffer his own carriage to travel on the Sabbath, or his own servants to labor, connives at the R. Road desecration. Now we assert that each member of a corporation is responsible, to the extent of his personal influence, for all the sins of that corporation, until he does all he can to prevent them. If individuals were not responsible for their corporate acts, then all we should have to do, would be to combine, and we should evade every law of God which we wished to break. The guilt would be annihilated by being divided out. But saith God, "though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." If any Christians are inclined to separate their acts as stockholders from their personal acts, in their moral regards, we would commend to them a story of the Middle Ages, which we read somewhere. One of the kings of England came into collision, in his continental wars, with one of those military prelates, who existed in feudal times, and who led his troops in person, and was noted for his ferocity. When taken, and brought before the king, he upbraided him with his unclerical character, and asked him whether it was seemly that a holy Bishop should be seen with his hands dyed with blood. The Prelate answered that he bore two characters, and he had fought as a Baron and not as a Bishop. "Well," said the king, "bethink you what will become of the Bishop, when the Devil begins to roast the Baron for his murders and bloodshed?" The application is easy.

Go, then, brethren, to your depot, on the sacred morning of God's day, when all your tired beasts are at rest, your family is ordered for prayer, and your laborers at home are bedight for church. See those stokers toiling and sweating over the furnace. They are *your* laborers. See that conductor and ticket agent elbowing, fussing, bustling, counting money. They are *your* hirelings, and that is *your* money they are counting for you. Hear that engine thundering away, to affright the sleeping echoes of the Sabbath for hundreds of miles. That is *your* vehicle, and all this discordant scene is *your*

act—*yours* to the extent of your relative right and influence in the corporation. And yours is a like share in the guilt, till you have done all that may be bravely, manfully, honourably done by you, to correct the sin, and to wash your hands of participation in it. And then return sanctimoniously to your own house, where all reposes in most seemly order, lead your household to the throne of grace, and go up and take one of “the chief seats in the synagogue.” Will God be deceived by it? Read the answer in Isaiah, ch. I, verses 12 to 15.

PAPAL ORGANS IN CONGRESS.

WE have exhibited the proofs, which, beyond all question, establish the singular fact,—that a Senator of the United States did, in his place in the Senate, and in face of another Senator, affirm as fact, concerning a Romish Journal, the *Shepherd of the Valley*, that which was not only not fact, but *notoriously* not fact;—denounced by a Journal of the very church in whose behalf the Senator was speaking, as having “*not a shadow or semblance of truth to cover the shamelessness of the invention.*”

It was our purpose in calling attention to this matter—not to challenge the veracity of the Senator—for we had no idea that a gentleman of Mr. Mallory’s standing and intelligence would knowingly have made a false statement in the Senate or elsewhere. Nor can we suppose either that he would condescend to Jesuitical quibble and evasion touching a plain matter of fact. We are shut up to the conclusion—which we shall now proceed to justify fully by other instances—that Mr. Mallory incautiously allowed himself to be imposed upon, and become the mouth-piece of unscrupulous Jesuits, in whom he too credulously confided. That even Protestant Senators have been thus imposed upon we have no doubt. Many of our readers will remember the surprise, with which, about a year ago, the country received the report of a series of speeches in the Senate, in which such men as Mr. Cass, Mr. Everett, and Mr. Butler, gave utterance to most indignant rebuke of a terrible anti-Bedini mob in Baltimore—of which most of the people of that city perhaps, received their first information from the speeches in the Senate—certainly no *such mob* as figured in the speeches of the Senators, occurred. For even the Baltimore Sun, usually relied upon by people in this city, as well posted in all items of city news, reported nothing of this sort, beyond what was termed, if we remember rightly, “a foolish frolic of certain boys and young men from the northern part of the city, in Monument Square.” Those however who were familiar with the private as well as the public theatricals of Washing-

ton city, as we are informed, know something of another "frolic" nearer the Senate Chamber, which had more to do with the matter probably by far, than any of the riots elsewhere. They knew that an evening or two prior to that display in the Senate, there was a magnificent entertainment in honor of Bedini, at a Roman Catholic house in the District—That with Senators and Representatives, invited to meet Bedini, were also invited all the available Jesuit force of the District, male and female. That amid the saintly festivities of the evening, the persecutions of Bedini by the American people, and the consequent inextinguishable stain on the honor of our country in the eyes of foreign nations, were the theme of discourse. We stop not to point out the natural connection between this entertainment as the antecedent, and the speeches in the Senate as the consequent. If such Protestants as Messrs. Cass, Everett, and Butler, could be entrapped to that extent, it is not difficult to imagine how Mr. Mallory might be imposed upon still more grossly.

We proceed now to consider a still more remarkable instance of the kind, in the case of Mr. Chandler's late speech. We are disposed to put this case in the same category as that of Mr. Mallory—since we cannot suppose that Mr. Chandler, unless imposed upon, could have made such an exhibition of himself.

It is not our purpose here, to go into a formal answer to Mr. Chandler's main point—the utter denial, in behalf of Roman Catholics, of the Temporal power of the Popes. That, Prof. McClintock and others, have already done, to the satisfaction, we presume, of all the world,—saving perhaps such Romanists as hold logic and argument in religion to be a mortal sin,—and that class of non-Romanists, (unfortunately not small,) who seem to hold logic and argument in religion to be an ungentle *vulgarity*, which, like hand-labor, industry and usefulness, should be turned over to the unfashionable thinking classes.

Supposing, as we are obliged to do, that Mr. C. allowed himself in this case, to be made the mouth-piece of the Jesuitism that lurks about the District, seeking through our public men, as channels, to get currency for "inventions" which Jesuitism itself has no longer character enough to gain credence for, we wish to use Mr. Chandler's speech as an illustration of how Romanism in the nineteenth century, is in one respect, at least, what it claims to be—*semper*, *ubique idem*—ever and every where the same. The same—but alas, in specifically the very sense in which the Devil himself is "ever and every where the same;"—in Jesuitical double dealing and tampering with the truth, as well as in brazen impertinence to face down the truth, by the counter utterance of "mean and shameless inventions."

We wish at the outset to remind our readers distinctly, that the point of fact in dispute is not whether the Supremacy of the Pope in temporals, is a dogma of *faith*, but whether it is a current *opinion* in that sect. For we accept as just, the distinction which Romanists take between matters of faith and matters of opinion—nor do

we object to the distinction again, of *opinions* into *Sententia Ecclesiae* and *Sententia in Ecclesia*—opinions of the church as such, and opinions of men in the church. We do not understand that Mr. Banks or any one else has charged the Papal church with holding the temporal power of the Pope as a dogma of Faith. To admit this distinction, however, does in no degree affect the argument. For claiming, as Rome does, at any time, to *transubstantiate* matter of *opinion* into an article of *faith*—as in the recent case of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception—the opinion once becoming prevalent enough, shall become a matter of faith. All that is needful to the argument, is to prove the currency of the *opinion* of Papal Supremacy in temporals. And if it lay in our way, nothing would be easier than to show, that the Temporal power of the Pope has a far more hopeful prospect of becoming a dogma of Faith, than had the *opinion* of the Immaculate Conception, three years ago. It is manifestly therefore, a mere Jesuitical trick in logic, to pretend to understand the opinions charged by Mr. Banks, as intended to assert the Pope's supremacy in seculars as matter of *faith*, and to deny the charge in *that sense*. Mr. Chandler, however, with extreme boldness of manner, undertakes to deny the charge as understood of the *opinion* of any one in the Romish church, save a "few careless writers, whose individual opinions have been discountenanced by the bishops." Now, this is the point which we select, more especially for an illustration, as going to establish the same conclusions which we have drawn from Mr. Mallory's conduct. It shall be our aim to show distinctly, not from Latin Bulls and decrees of middle ages, which Mr. Chandler may not be familiar with, but by full and fair quotations from the current journals of the day in his church—for we make it a point of conscience, always to let a Papist express his own opinions in his own terms—and these quotations from those fully endorsed as having in so far a "right to speak,"—that Mr. Chandler has made representations of the opinions of his church on the floor of Congress, so notoriously in the face of all the current Romish history and literature of the day—as to make it obvious that his credulity has been *duped* by designing Jesuitism, and himself made a mere channel through whom unscrupulous zealots may play upon the credulity of the public. We quote from his speech the points which we now have in view:

"In the Catholic Church, as in all other churches, there have been found a few individuals of less discretion than zeal, who have, from a mistaken view of the Christian duties, thought it a merit on themselves to impute to religion a direct secular power which it was never intended by God, nor understood by good, prudent men, to exercise. We see it in the careless writings of certain Catholic scholars, as we find it in the preaching and discipline of many other denominations. But in the Catholic Church those individual opinions have been discountenanced by the bishops, and in other churches they have grown much out of practice; by all they are considered as rendering unto God the things which are Cæsar's. The assertion by individuals, or the practice by a few Popes, of any power, does not make that power right. That only is of faith which is so declared, and which is so for all times and all circumstances.

The question which concerns us here, and which arises out of the charges made by the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, is not whether the right

has been claimed; but on what grounds this right was asserted. *If it was a divine right; a right inherent in the spiritual office of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter, then, sir, I confess it may never, it can never lapse; and its exercise may be renewed with the reception of additional power.*

I may be permitted to say that, in the pursuit of information with regard to the Catholic Church, it has been my chance to converse with every rank and degree of her hierarchy—Pope, Cardinal, Nuncio, Archbishop, Bishop, and Priest, and and I never heard one of them claim any such power, and never heard one of them speak upon the subject who did not disavow any belief of its existence.

The vexed question of governing Ireland, and of granting to the people of that kingdom a part of the rights enjoyed by the subjects of Great Britain, has often lead the British Parliament to inquire into the charges made against Roman Catholics, with reference to the asserted right of the Roman Pontiff to interfere with the internal affairs of other Governments.

So entirely satisfied was the British Parliament with these and similar responses, that the different concessions made to Roman Catholics by that body are mainly due to such testimony.

Mr. Chairman, the Roman Catholic neither holds nor inculcates a doctrine of power in his head to interfere in the affairs of temporal Governments, to disturb the monarch, or release the subject.

I have adduced no testimony *not of my own knowledge, or from those who are authorized to speak* to the question at issue, and with reference thereto, with my hand upon my heart, and my eye on Heaven, I call this House, and (I speak with reverence) I call my God to witness the truth of all the assertions made from my own convictions and knowledge, and my entire confidence in the credibility of all the testimony which I have adduced from others.”—(Daily Globe.)

Now we propose to show generally, that every statement here made is as notoriously absurd and in face of facts—as though Mr. Chandler had declared—that none but a few careless writers of the Democratic party had ever held to the unconstitutionality and inexpediency of a United States Bank—and that he had personally conversed on that subject with every rank of official, from old Jackson down, and of his own knowledge, derived from those authorised to speak for the party, solemnly declared on oath that the Democratic party held no such doctrine. And this we shall prove by showing specifically these points:—

1. That the Papal writers who affirm the temporal power of the Pope, by virtue of his office, inherently, as vicar of Jesus Christ—so far from being a “few” and “discouraged by the Bishops,” are the large body of the most formally “authorised to speak”—the most able, the most admired and applauded living writers of the sect—whilst the only Romanist writers, so far as we know, advocating anything like Mr. Chandler’s views, (though even that far short of his statement,) are scoffed at and denied any ecclesiastical authority.

2. That these writers—not occasionally and incidentally—but constantly, directly and fiercely, since the revolutions of ’48, have been advocating this opinion of the temporal power of the Pope, as the one great fundamental idea of the Papal system, in such a manner as to render it impossible to suppose that any intelligent Papist could make the representations which Mr. Chandler has made, without a design to conceal the truth, and deceive the public. And, unless on the supposition of a split in the sect, fatal to the pretended purity and infallibility, no one can, as a Roman Catholic, hold the extreme opinions of Mr Chandler.

3. That the declarations and oaths of English and Irish Bishops cited so triumphantly by Mr. Chandler, have been practically repudiated by the Bishops themselves, for five years past—and that the perjury has been justified by the highest Papal authority in America, on the ground specifically—that the English and Irish Bishops had no right to make such declarations binding—that the British Government must have known it at the time, and therefore took the guarantee only for what it was worth.

4. And by way of solution of the mystery of such cases as Mr. Chandler's—we shall show, that notwithstanding the indignant denial of, what is popularly known as *Jesuitry*, by the Roman Catholics, yet popular living writers in that sect are advocating principles in regard to holding back the truth, which the most reliable authors of that sect themselves, declare to be *Jesuitry*. Nay, that we have the highest Papal authority for saying of apostates to Romanism, *as a class*, that they are utterly *unreliable* in their statements of their opinions, and the opinions of their church.

With the indulgence of our readers, while keeping our main point in view in our quotations of testimony—we shall quote more largely and fully than is absolutely needful to our argument, with a view to furnish to such as have political Popery to deal with, a repository of reliable, ungarbled testimonies, touching the spirit and teachings of modern Popery. We suppose that many who have no access to Popish Journals, may be pleased to have some convenient manual—a sort of *Catena Patrum*—or more properly, *Catena filiorum*—showing, not by citing learned Latin authors, what Popery *was*, when Luther and Calvin smote it, but from living, speaking authors, what the Popery now around us *is*.

As Mr. Chandler has by way of anticipation, impeached the character of our witnesses, as “careless,”—“individuals discounted by the Bishops,” we proceed first to present the vouchers for the witnesses. We propose to cite—say “Brownson’s Review,” “The Paris Univers,” “Rohrbacker’s History”—in chief. The other writers of less degree, as the Freeman’s Journal, and Shepherd of the Valley, (already quoted,) being direct organs of Bishops and Archbishops, need no other vouchers.

For brevity sake, we shall quote Dr. Brownson largely, and through him our readers will be introduced to all the authorities on the Pope’s supremacy in temporals.

Mr. Brownson says of himself:—

“We cannot be accused of Gallicanism, or of the slightest Gallican tendency and we go to the full length in asserting the prerogatives of Peter. Peter speaks to us through the Pope, but ordinarily the Pope speaks to us through our own bishop, and we appeal to our bishop, not from the Pope indeed, but to know what it is the Pope decides or commands. Our own bishop, as long as he is in communion with Rome, is to us the organ of the successor of Peter, as that successor is the organ of Peter himself.

We have no right to publish a single word on religious or ecclesiastical matters without the permission of our ordinary, and even with that permission we should never publish any thing without the supervision of one who has authority to teach. If we forget this, and assume to ourselves the right to give freely, at our own pleasure, our own views of the government or administration of eccle-

siastical affairs, and to interpret Catholic doctrines according to our own private judgment, all our zeal, all our good intentions, and all our labors in defending religion and society against avowed enemies, even granting that we possess the most profound reverence for the Pope, will make but poor amends for the internal disorders we shall create, and the scandals we shall occasion.”—(Br. Rev. Ap. '53, p.p. 263, 264, 265.)

“These (very opinions of Papal supremacy) were the principles prescribed to us for our guidance when we commenced this Review as a Catholic Review, and on these principles we have endeavored to conduct it to the best of our ability. The age is latitudinarian, and thinks one religion, unless it be the Catholic, as good as another, because it believes in none.

We found a very general disposition among the Catholic laity to separate religion from politics, to emancipate politics from the Christian law, to vote God out of the State, and to set up the people against the Almighty. Was this in these revolutionary times to be passed over in silence, and no effort made to arrest the tide of political atheism? What was then our plain duty? Was it not to assert the supremacy of God, the jurisdiction of the spiritual power, to expose the fatal error of Gallicanism, and, as far as we could, exhibit the real position of the Papacy in the Catholic system? So we have felt, and so we have done.”—Br. Rev. Jan. '54, p.p. 100-1-2.)

Now to show that this writer, thus declaring he speaks by authority, is not “discountenanced by the Bishops,” we cite the formal endorsement of the whole Hierarchy—still standing on his cover.

Baltimore, 13th May, 1849.

DEAR SIR,—

After the close of our Council, I suggested to our venerable Metropolitan the propriety of encouraging you by our approbation and influence to continue your literary labors in defence of the faith, of which you have proved an able and intrepid advocate. He received the suggestion most readily, and I take the liberty of communicating the fact to you, as a mark of my sincere esteem, and of the deep interest I feel in your excellent Review. I shall beg of him, and of other prelates who entertain the same views, to subscribe their names in confirmation of my statement. Your very devoted friend,

† Francis Patrick Kenrick,
Bishop of Philadelphia.

O. A. Brownson, Esq.

† Samuel, Archbishop of Baltimore.

† Peter Richard, Archbishop of St. Louis.

† Michael, Bishop of Mobile.

† Anthony, Bishop of New Orleans.

† John Joseph, Bishop of Natchez.

† John, Bishop of Buffalo.

† M. O'Connor, Bishop of Pittsburg.

† Mathias, Bishop of Dubuque.

† John M. Odin, Bishop of Galveston.

† Martin John, Bishop of Lengone, and coadjutor of Louisville.

† M. de St. Palais, Bishop of Vincennes.

† William Tyler, Bishop of Hartford.

† J. B. Fitzpatrick, Bishop of Boston.

† Richard Pius, Bishop of Nashville.

† John Baptist, Bishop of Cincinnati.

† John Hughes, Bishop of New York.

† Richard Vincent, Bishop of Wheeling.

† James Oliver, Bishop of Chicago.

† John M. Henni, Bishop of Milwaukee.

† John, Bishop of Albany.

† Amedeus, Bishop of Cleveland.

† Peter Paul, Bishop of Zela, Coadjutor Administrator of Detroit.

† Ignatius A. Reynolds, Bishop of Charleston.

† Andrew Byrne, Bishop of Little Rock.

This we suppose to be all-sufficient to show that this witness (Dr. Brownson,) speaks with all the authority any one can speak, touching American Papal *opinions*. We might, if needful, quote compliments to Dr. B. from almost every Romish Journal in America. We add, however, one more testimony from *head quarters*. The “Corres-

pondence de Rome," of Feb. 24, 1852, (a tri-monthly published at Rome,) translates this certificate of the Archbishops and Bishops, saying "it surpasses all eulogium"—then adds, in reference to an article proving the Temporal Prerogatives of the Pope, (which we shall quote)—these remarks:

"The last article is an extraordinary dissertation on the temporal power of the Church. We frankly confess, that, to the best of our knowledge, no European writer has treated this question with more freedom and ability. For his own part, Mr. Brownson professes to be an *ultra-Ultramontane*, and admits the little sympathy he has with Gallicanism and the various explanations its adherents have proposed. We should like to give a fuller account of this article, the conclusion of which presents a summary of the whole."—(Br. Rev. July '52, p. 420.)

So much for our first witness. No one surely will dare put him into Mr. Chandler's category of the "careless" and "discountenanced."

We avail ourselves of this witness to introduce another,—"*The Univers*" of Paris—the very country on whose writers Mr. Chandler so much relies:

"*The Univers* is well known as one of the leading Catholic Journals of Europe, and no one doubts its Catholic intentions any more than its brilliant wit and rare ability. It makes loud professions of Ultramontanism, and brave war against old-fashioned Gallicanism, which has no longer any representatives, or at most not more than three or four, among the bishops of France; but it seems to imagine that the profession of Ultramontanism will atone for all manner of sins against bishops, priests, and distinguished seculars. It has abundance of zeal, but it lacks discretion and seems never to have considered that even the truth may suffer by an indecent and untruthful manner of defending it."—(Br. Rev. Ap. '53, p. 275.)

But even "*the Univers*," want of discretion in its war against the French Bishops of Mr. Chandler's school, was not an objection to that Journal at Rome—whither the dispute was carried for settlement. We find in Archbishop Hughes' organ, the *Freeman's Journal* of April 9, 1853, the following statement:

"**THE UNIVERS AT ROME AND IN FRANCE.**—The number of the *Univers* that we have received contains a correspondence between M. Louis Veuillot, Editor of the *Univers*, who is now in Rome, and the Secretary of Latin Letters of His Holiness. M. Veuillot exposes to the Secretary his sentiments and dispositions; and begs Monsignor to let him know frankly the sentiments and advice of the Holy Father.

The Secretary of Latin Letters writes in reply a long and most kind and flattering letter. He says that the labors of the *Univers* and its pre-eminent merits are most highly appreciated at Rome, as throughout the Catholic World. That what renders it particularly acceptable at Rome is its efforts to attach Catholics of France and other countries *more closely to the Holy See and to its Apostolic traditions.*

This letter from the Secretary of Latin Letters of His Holiness, written in answer to the request of M. Veuillot to be informed of the sentiments and wishes of the Holy Father, is of the highest significance at the present juncture; especially as it was written with the intention that it should be published. It reassures any friends that may have been startled by the recent outcry against the valiant champion of religious liberty in France."—(*Freeman's Journal* N. York April '53.)

Nor let it be supposed that only Papal bigots on this and on the

other side of the water—rejoiced in the success of the “Univers” in putting down the *Chandlerism* of France on this subject of the Pope’s Temporal authority. The Papal politicians of the United States, we find were ready enough to endorse the advocates of highly Papal prerogatives—before the hue and cry raised by the *Know Nothings*, as we shall now show.

It will be remembered that in 1851 a famous Astor House dinner was gotten up, in honor of Archbishop Hughes’ return with the pallium from Rome. A dinner to which, impudently enough, most of the public men in the U. S. were invited, from President Fillmore downwards, and but one of all the number had the manliness to rebuke the impertinence of such an invitation. Let his name be put on record to the honor of Old Virginia. It was A. H. Stewart, Esq., of Staunton, Va. At this dinner, amid the saintly festivities in honor of the Archbishop—and that pious “cannonade of cork-popping,” which the Archbishop’s organ, the *Freeman’s Journal*, described at the time in strains to make the mouths of all champagne drinkers water,—the following was drunk by this assembled crowd of American ecclesiastics and politicians, as the tenth REGULAR TOAST :

THE LEADING MEN OF THE CATHOLIC PARTY IN FRANCE,—
De Montalembert, De Falloux, Veuillot, De Riancy; ever foremost in the National Assembly, and in the columns of the Press, to **ASSERT THE RIGHTS OF THE CHURCH**, and defend her interests!”

Such is the formal endorsement by this splendid coterie at the Astor House—of the editors in chief of the “Univers”—and of men whose aim at that time in France was to re-establish the Inquisition, and the old despotism of the Bourbons. Mr. Veuillot thus endorsed, had thus recently declared in his book:

“I own frankly my regret, that JOHN HUSS was not burned sooner than he was, and that LUTHER was not burned also in the same way. I regret that a Prince was not found sufficiently pious and sufficiently polite as to excite a general crusade against the Protestants.”

With such facts before us—though we profess not to be posted as to the aims and ends of the *Know Nothings*—we are free to say, that however naughtily they may have behaved, they have at least some apology for their bad behaviour. It was surely time for sober American citizens to begin to think seriously—when at such ecclesiastical dinners, American public men not only figured, but drank *such Toasts in honor of such men*. The *Know Nothings* may have been very unjust to Roman Catholics—so far as they may have combined to make politics bear against any religion, as such, they have done very wrong—but we cannot think they have done the politicians much injustice.

So much for our second great witness against Mr. Chandler—the *Univers* and its writers. For Dr. Rohrbacker, the Historian, we will give the vouchers, when we quote his testimony.

As Mr. Chandler treats so cavalierly our witnesses—we will be pardoned for returning the compliment, not by asserting, but by

proving, that the only Romish Journal, which, so far as we know, has called in question the opinions of the other writers in favor of the Pope's supremacy in Temporals—is, if not a "careless" writer, at least "discountenanced" in high quarters. This Journal is a monthly cotemporary of ours, in Baltimore—"The *Metropolitan*"—concerning which we submit simply the editorial notice of the Freeman's Journal, of its 2nd No. in March, 1853.

"If it were professedly an Ecclesiastical journal we would interpret it into a modest admission that no one expected it to find its way beyond the provincial limits of Baltimore. But as the Magazine has no Ecclesiastical character, the giving it so grandiloquent a title, &c. But it is a matter of taste, after all. A grocer in one of our by-streets advertises "*Metropolitan peanuts*," and why not as well Baltimore "*Metropolitan Magazines*?"

"Being nearly all *extracts* from the newspapers.—We are sorry the Magazine does not correct the accidental blunders of the Weeklies. It will be seen that the Magazine is *full of matter*, (48 pages octavo, besides the cover,) and that it deserves its name as the *Metropolitan Magazine of Baltimore*."—(N. Y. Freeman's Journal, March, '53.)

We may be allowed to say, in passing, that this attack upon our neighbor is quite as *unbrotherly*, as is common even amongst us heretics, who make no special boast of our *unity*. Nor from what we have seen of Romanist Journals generally, can we see that Papal unity at all relieves the faithful from the horrible evils of controversy.

Having established the character of our witnesses, we proceed to submit, without remark, their testimony, as to what *is now* the state of *opinion* in the Romish Church, on the subject of the Pope's relation to temporals.

"M. de la Tour is an Ultramontane, but he will pardon us, we hope, if we hint that his Ultramontanism is not ultra enough for us. He doubtless concedes the Papal infallibility, and the Pope's supreme authority in all ecclesiastical matters; but he does not seem to have very well understood that the secular order exists only for the spiritual, personified in the Sovereign Pontiff, and should in all respects be subjected to it. We try all princes and secular powers by their relations to the spiritual order, and care not a fig for any of them any further than they serve it. The Church is all and in all to us, and she is to us only through the Sovereign Pontiff.

The true policy for all the friends of order and liberty is now to attempt, by safe and honorable alliances, to check both revolutions, and to repair, as far as the altered circumstances of the times will admit, the old feudal order, that is, under some form, as we express it, centralism tempered by federalism. This order has certainly been greatly weakened in Austria, but its elements are preserved there with more life and vigor than elsewhere, and therefore is the best fitted to assume the lead in reconstituting fallen Europe. Assisted by all the Catholic states of Europe she can easily do it, and with advantage to their separate independence and internal prosperity. Let these states, then all form a league with Austria, and with one another, to resist both the Russian and the American despotisms, and to repair the wrongs of past revolutions, and let them recognize anew the Holy Father as the divinely appointed arbitrator between sovereign and sovereign, and between the sovereign and his subjects, and something like order and liberty may again flourish on the earth.—(Br. Rev. July '52, p. p. 28, 32 and 33.)

Hence, no men are better received in Protestant society than they who declare that their faith is sound, but they find nothing in it which forbids them to rail at the Pope, or which compels them to take their *political, social, or scientific opi-*

nions from any bishop or priest. The Pope and the Confessional form the sum of Protestant objections against the Church, because by these she is a living, universal, and imperial power. Lukewarm, liberal, or nominal Catholics never, if we are to believe them, dream of denying the faith. The real obstacle or trouble is the necessity of sacramental confession, which is an intolerable grievance, and not the less so, in that a few good, humble confessions ordinarily suffice to eject the devil which rails at the Pope and at priestly interference in secular concerns."—(Br. Rev. July '52, p. 404.)

"M. Artaud evidently believes himself an Ultramontane, and is much more Ultramontane than many Italians who declaim lustily against Gallicanism, but he is not precisely a Papist after our own heart. He denies, indeed, the last of the Four Articles, the one of which asserts that the doctrinal decisions of the Pope are reformable, unless accepted by the Church; but we can find nowhere in his pages a distinct denial of the first, by far the most objectionable of them all,—the one which denies the Church all temporal authority, and asserts the independence of sovereigns in temporals, and which therefore involves the political atheism now so rife throughout the civilized world.

According to M. Gosselin, as cited by M. Artaud in his *Life of St. Gregory the Seventh*, "the power exercised over sovereigns by Popes and Councils in the Middle Ages was not a criminal usurpation of the rights of sovereigns by the ecclesiastical authority," because "the Popes and Councils who exercised this power only followed and applied the maxims then very generally received, not only by the people, but by men the most enlightened and virtuous." The fact here alleged is undeniable, but when we adduce it in defence of the exercise of that power, do we not defend the Church as a human rather than as a divine institution?

Popes and Councils in exercising authority over sovereigns even in temporals were, according to those maxims, only exercising the inherent rights of the Church as the spiritual authority, and consequently sovereigns were bound to obey them, not by human law only, but also by the law of God. Such incontestably is the doctrine of the magnificent Bulls of St. Gregory and Boniface, and of the maxims according to which it is attempted to justify the power exercised over sovereigns by Popes and Councils.

Now these maxims either were true or they were false. If they were false, how will you justify an infallible Church—expressly ordained of God to teach the truth in faith and morals, and to conduct individuals and nations in the way of holiness—in adopting and acting on them? If they were true, how can you deny that the power exercised is of divine origin, or pretend that it is derived from the consent of the people, or the concession of sovereigns?

Moreover, we confess that we are extremely averse to defending things in the history of the Church, which happen just now to be unpopular, on the ground that they were authorized by the maxims of the age, that is, the public opinion of the time. We have yet to learn that public opinion is infallible or obligatory.

We regard this question, as to the relation of the two powers to each other, as of no little practical importance at the present time, and even in our own country; and though we have often discussed it, we must be allowed to discuss it again, and with some thoroughness. There have crept even into the Catholic camp not a few gross errors in regard to it, which are no less dangerous to civil liberty and social order, than hostile to the Church and derogatory to the rights of her Sovereign Pontiff. It is quite the fashion even for Catholic politicians to assert, that, though the Church is supreme in spirituals, the state in temporals is absolutely independent of her authority. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. As long as the Church keeps within her own province, and confines herself to spirituals, we respect her, and submit to her authority; in spirituals, we even recognize the authority of the Pope, and allow that in them he may do what he pleases; but he has no authority in temporals, and in them we will do as we please." Such is the popular doctrine of the day, and of not a few who would take it as a gross affront and as downright injustice were we to insinuate that they are but sorry Catholics.

It will not do to say here that she is its guardian and judge in spirituals, and that sovereigns are its guardian and judge in temporals. The commission is to the Church, not to the state, and nowhere can it be found that our Lord has made princes, as such, guardians and judges of his law, even in the temporal order. He only gives them authority to execute it when declared to them. Besides, to keep, teach, and declare the law of Christ, whether in spirituals or temporals, is manifestly a spiritual function, and temporal sovereigns, it is confessed in the very doctrine we oppose, have no spiritual functions.

Here we must be permitted to avail ourselves again of the reasoning of Roger Archbishop elect of Sens, in the conferences held on the subject before Philippe de Valois, in reply, as we have said, to Pierre de Cugnieres. After having, in the passage already quoted, established the dominion of our Lord according to his human nature, over both orders, temporal and spiritual, he proceeds:—

“I prove it, also, from St. Luke (xxii. 38,) cited by the lord of Cugnieres in his own favor. I will beat him with his own staff. He says, and says truly, that by the two swords are to be understood the two powers, the temporal and the spiritual. But in whose power does Christ will the two swords to be? Certainly in that of Peter and the Apostles, of the Pope and bishops, that is, of the Church. Do you say that Christ blamed Peter for striking with the temporal sword? That is nothing. For, mark, he did not tell him to throw it away, but to tield him to return it to its scabbard, to keep it in his possession, signifying, that, although this power is in the Church, he wills that under the New Law it should be exercised by the hand of the layman at the order of the priest.”

We are indeed not at liberty to assert that the Church has no temporal authority, for that she has no temporal authority, direct or indirect, is a condemned proposition,—condemned, if we are not mistaken, by our present Holy Father, in his condemnation of the work on Canon Law by Professor Nuytz of Turin,—and we have seen that she has even direct temporal authority by divine right; but the power we are now asserting, though a power over temporals, is itself, strictly speaking, a spiritual end. The Pope, then, even by virtue of his spiritual authority, has the power to judge all temporal questions; if not precisely as temporal, yet as spiritual,—for all temporal questions are to be decided by their relation to the spiritual,—and therefore has the right to pronounce sentence of deposition against any sovereign when required by the good of the spiritual order.

Would you have us, in order not to incur the censure of our age, or offend the god of our demagogues, so belie our common sense, so stultify ourselves, as to accept such arrant nonsense, or rather such horrid blasphemy, which the fools of the day boast as a proof of the light and progress of this nineteenth century? But we must do it, or reassert the Catholic doctrine of the supremacy of the spiritual order, and maintain that the whole temporal order in all things is subordinated to the law of God as interpreted by the Roman Catholic Church. We cannot assert the premises of the idolaters of kings, the idolaters of the people, or the idolaters of the individual, and deny their conclusions; for their conclusions follow necessarily from their premises. We must deny their premises, and that we cannot do without asserting the supremacy of the Church as guardian and judge of the law of God over sovereigns and subjects, in temporals no less than in spirituals. There is no medium, save at the expense of common sense or common honesty.

Who has the authority to answer this question for us as Catholics? Not Cæsar himself, for he is neither infallible nor impeccable, and may claim somewhat more than his own, nay, the things that are God's, which he has very often done, and is in general inclined to do. We will give him exactly what the Church bids us give him, not a groat more, though he burn us at the stake, behead and disembowel, or hang and draw and quarter us, for the Church is the highest authority. But may not the Church usurp the rights of Cæsar, and refuse to authorize me to give him his dues? And if she can do such a naughty thing, who is to decide for us whether she does do it or not? Suppose she does, what she usurps may be safe in her possession as in his. The Church any day is as sovereign as Cæsar, and as safe a depository of power, and the insolence and encroachments of Churchmen, suppose them to be as great as the most shameless

courtier or politician ever pretended, are less intolerable than the insolence and encroachments of Cæsar and his satellites. Any day the mitre is above the crown, and the priest above the demagogue.

We only ask our readers to bear in mind, that the Church is not herself the civil authority, and that, though she possesses the temporal authority *in radice*, she ordinarily governs the temporal order only through the temporal sovereign. She bears by divine right both swords, but she exercises the temporal sword by the hand of the prince or magistrate. The temporal sovereign holds it subject to her order, to be exercised in her service, under her direction. This is the normal order, and it is only an unmanly fear of offending, or an undue desire to please, secular governments that has ever led any intelligent Christian to concede the contrary."—(Br. Rev. Jan. '53, p.p. 28, 29, 30, 34, 41, 42, 48, 57, 58, 60.)

(To be concluded in our next.)

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

JOHN LIVINGSTON AND HIS AMERICAN PORTRAIT GALLERY.

We have hitherto been prevented by want of space from acknowledging the receipt, to our great surprise, one morning about the time of our first issue, of a certain letter, marked "5 cents," *postage unpaid*. As such a thing had not happened to us, from present recollection, since the new postage law, we were curiously eager to get into the merits of the document. If our surprise was great at the external form of this phenomenon, how much greater at its internal essence! Nothing less than information that our humble self's "name has been proposed for a place in the pages of the American Portrait Gallery!" Yes, our humble self—doomed as we had thought to be "a flower horn," &c. Who could have proposed us? "Ay, there's the rub!" No doubt some mysterious, but very discerning, Unknown, who—Old Mortality like—is passing about among the living graves of "talent;" bringing to consciousness "unconscious greatness,"—which the German philosophers declare to be the *greatest* greatness; and, with the mallet and chisel of his Yankee ingenuity, carving for them

"immortal names

That were not born to die."

Let our friends—especially our old backwoods friends—be incredulous, we subjoin the letter,—that is, the important parts of it,—to speak for itself:—

"157 BROADWAY, N. Y., Jan. 26, 1855.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I desire to call your attention to the American Portrait Gallery, and to say that your name has been proposed for a place in its pages. Should your consent permit us to give to your friends and the world a true and permanent record of your life and features, please lend me a good daguerreotype likeness of yourself to be handed over to our engravers. Please cause to be forwarded also, a memoir or a

full and accurate statement of such facts as will enable me without much labor to prepare it. The sketch may be either lengthy or brief, according to your wishes; it may embrace a full history of your life, or be confined to a single page giving mere data, such as your parentage, place of birth, vocation, &c.

"P. S.—I will add that, to enable you to obtain a better knowledge of the work, we are willing to send you, if desired, the four volumes just published, bound in cloth, gilt, for \$10, which is little more than half the retail price."

While listening to the music of one's own thoughts suggested by such a letter, the vulgar din of the \$10 postscript comes in.

"Grating harsh thunder" rather than

"On golden hinges turning."

To dispatch the more disagreeable part of our work first, therefore, we merely remark, in passing, touching this postscript,—that money is quite scarce here in Baltimore. Besides, there is much suffering among the poor in Baltimore this winter. Ten dollars would make ten housefulls of hungry children glad for a whole day or two. Ten dollars would help some brave-hearted missionary through a tight scuffle. Or—if this seems a rather fanatical mode of estimating money—ten dollars would pay for ten volumes of the "Critic," which, we are vain enough to think, would have more "good readin' in" than these "4 vols. in cloth gilt." Or, if our friend at 157 Broadway cannot appreciate the force of this view of the subject, then we may add in the words of Southey or Charles Lamb—we forgot which, (though either of them pretty good portraits in the gallery of immortals,)—"ten dollars will command the world, just to the extent of ten dollars' worth."

Aside from the ten-dollar question;—we do not think we should like the book. If

for show,—as most books are now-a-days,—these “4 vols. in cloth gilt” would put to the blush those dingy old friends—partakers with us of our tribulations in many a hard rub—that stand in sober array upon our shelves. We don’t care to hurt our own feelings by seeing old friends cast into the shade. Some of those scarred and faded-looking fellows in the rank and file there, were among our earliest possessions,—became ours when our acquaintance with dollars was far more limited even than with Greek and Hebrew idioms, and when we felt richer in being able to own that half-dozen or dozen books than we would now feel in being able to buy out the Carters. Somehow, we have a lingering affection for them, just for the exquisite pleasure they once gave us. If these “4 vols. in cloth gilt” are for use, we have no use for such books. We can’t get time to use much better books. And then we have some singular fancies about these “4 vols. in cloth gilt.” We do sometimes—we would, no doubt, oftener if time permitted—enjoy books of the “cloth gilt” genus. When it is the soul of some Wordsworth, or Southey or Walter Scott, that ripples along in the beautiful rivulet of type, through a glorious meadow of margin. But our fancy concerning these “4 large octavo vols. comprising about 240 portraits, and 2000 pages of letter-press, *likenesses and memoirs of men now living*,”—is not of that type. The rivulet of type and meadow of margin is rather now some “Jones’ Falls” or “Gunpowder River” at low tide,—a great continent of slimy mud, ornamented at intervals with every curious variety of float-wood,—here and there sticking up the dismal phiz of one of these 240 odd candidates for fame, left hard aground by the freakish “tide in the affairs of men.”

So much for the Postscript. We have space for only a word or two in regard to the proposal of the letter. In spite of all the very suggestive reasoning of the printed circular accompanying the letter, concerning “the pleasing and instructive lessons afforded mankind, and the happy influence produced by the biography of men whose fame rests on their attainments, character and success,”—we cannot, as honest men, agree to go into that book. To say nothing of our having made no such attainments as persons with our opportunities should have made; of our having no such public character as to justify imposing upon the public our biography—save, perhaps, the little editorial character which two Nos. of the “Critic” may have made for us, and that rather a bad sort of reputation in the opinion of such candid judges as Dr. Converse and his correspondents, whose piety, brotherly love, and Christian forbearance toward us, restrain them from saying any

thing harsher than that we are *not gentlemen*—obviously in their view a venial delinquency;—to say nothing, then, of “attainments and character,” we have had no such success in doing anything great and good, as to entitle us to even one-half of the two-thousand-and-first page of letter-press. We dare not pretend to even a “squatter’s title” in the vacant territory of the immortals. Like most other men, we *hope* to do something—*expect* to do something. If no higher good, we shall lend our feeble aid in preparing the way for wiser men to do good, by clearing off the rubbish under which social, moral and ecclesiastical empiricism tends ever to bury great living truths and realities; and, on the other hand, to expose and scourge the cant and quackery which, aping the eagle, soars only as the buzzard to spy out and batten upon the putrid weaknesses, self-conceit and bad passions of this generation. If ever we succeed eminently in this work, we shall feel that we have some claim to half a page or so of letter-press.

We have other objections, on the score of principle, to this Biographical Barnumism. Fame, reputation, is becoming too cheap altogether to be desirable any longer. Scarcely shall we have paid our ten dollars with incidentals for one of the ten thousand pages of letter-press, till some enterprising Yankee “Old Mortality” will offer land-warrants in the great vacant territory at half the price. Or, how do we know but our next neighbor on the pages shall be some reputation infected with moral small-pox, and thus our name be compelled to endure the dangerous juxta-position for ever? For be it borne in mind, there is no selling out and moving off in this operation. We have no doubt Mr. Livingston has already gotten a score of settlers under his patent, who would give all they are worth in the world, to be able to *give away* now, what cost them ten dollars, with a large margin for extras.

We are sorry to perceive indications of this cheap-reputation-making getting into the Church. Here are our New-School neighbors already under-bidding Mr. Livingston. They have opened a free immortality list in their Almanac—one of the curiosities, by the way, that we have been watching for room to pay our respects to for two months. It is a small space, compared with Mr. Livingston’s indefinite number of octavo volumes, and cannot, therefore, make magnificent offers of whole sections to a settler:—he must learn to settle New England fashion, on a *quarter section*, or an *eighth*. But then, there is no \$10 to pay; and the settler is not asked even whether he be a native or a “foreign element.” We observe in the list of “84 Clerical Authors who are or have been con-

nected with our Church since the Division," at least eleven who, in the judgment of the great lights of the "Great Assembly of 1854," have no very clear title to their place among the New School immortals. We observe even "Bush" with the title "on the resurrection" appended as the voucher for his claim to New School canonization. We observe, too, on the other hand, many—and we doubt not there will be more of them—who probably would be as heartily glad to get out of that list, as would scores of Mr. Livingston's immortals to be out of his "2000 pages of letter-press."

But we are wandering too widely. We venture to suggest, in conclusion, in return for Mr. Livingston's flattering proposal, what probably his modesty would prevent his even thinking of,—that the frontispiece to his rare Biographical Encyclopædia, shall be the likeness of John Livingston himself, in brass, or bronze, in the classic attitude of Isaak Walton, angling for minnows, in a very small pond, with a pinhook, with eye intently watching for signs of nibble at a cork float, about the size of the "unpaid" post-office stamp, and branded 5 CENTS.

P. S.—On whispering to our friend and co-laborer the secret which we have communicated to our friends, he puts on a most quizzical air, and tells us *privately* of some 40 or 50 of our neighbors who have received exactly the same letter as we, and the same things "proposed."

MR. PUTNAM'S SPEECH ON ECCLESIASTICAL TENURES.

This pamphlet of 40 pages, contains an oration—hardly a mere argument—delivered in the Senate of New York, on the 30th of January last. It made a great sensation in Albany, where it was pronounced, and has been widely circulated. The object of it was to favour the passage of a Bill through the New York Legislature, protecting the Roman Catholic congregations of that State from the rapacity and oppression of their own Bishops, in the matter of Ecclesiastical property: and preventing the accumulation of estates held for sacred uses in their hands. The object is one of very great importance, and the provisions of the Bill to effect that object, clear and effectual. We have not heard what was the fate of the measure in the New York Legislature. The immediate occasion of the introduction of the Bill, was a petition from the members of the Catholic congregation of St. Louis in Buffalo—who, for five years, have been deprived of all spiritual offices in their church, because they would not convey the title of it to one John Timon, the Papal Bishop of that Diocese, who was backed in his rapacity, not only by the Decrees of the papal councils of

Baltimore, but by the Pope of Rome, thro' his very pious Nuncio, Bedini—of infamous memory amongst us. What renders the outrage more striking is, that the laws of New York not only sustain the Trustees of the church, but encourage them in doing, what the said John Timon excommunicated them for doing. The case, however, is like thousands of others, only that in most instances the Catholic congregations submit to the Bishops—in this they refused to submit. It ought to be better understood in this country, that the Papal Bishops who hold office from the Pope, in turn hold in their own right, almost the entire church property of their sect, amounting to from \$30,000,000 to \$50,000,000—and rapidly accumulating: and the intolerable evils and dangers of a condition of things, which places 3,000,000 of the people, and \$30,000,000 of their money, in the hands of the Pope of Rome, ought to be more carefully considered than they are. On this account, we are glad to see this discourse of Mr. Putnam's in print; and hope it will hasten the day of reckoning with these proud Prelates, which is sure to come.

We must say, however, that there are passages of this speech, not only untrue, but utterly disreputable, in the mouth of a Protestant gentleman—which we understand Mr. Putnam to be—in which he traduces in mass, not only the whole Protestant clergy of this country, but degrades the very office of spiritual teaching, as inevitably productive of intolerance and imbecility. "*The same element of intolerance, allow it development, exists in the bosom of every spiritual teacher,*" are the slanderous words with which he closes one of his tirades, (p. 17.)

Now we take leave to say to Mr. Putnam, that the clergy of his own denomination—be it which it may—(we believe he is a Presbyterian,) have no more of the "element" of John Timon, Bedini, and Pius IX. than he himself has of the "element" of Robespierre, Marat, and Cataline; and that, we doubt not he knew this very well, when he catered in this miserable and disreputable way, to the vile passions of the vilest men. And we take leave further to intimate to Mr. Putnam, that as to the incompetency of all clergy, "for the management of affairs," which he gloats over, and quotes Lord Clarendon to prove—the truth is, that *this affair*, of saving mankind from the thralldom of Rome, into which he has now, at last, put a very small venture of his own, has been *managed* for about three and a-half centuries, with some tolerable success, by these very clergy: of whom there may be at this writing, perhaps one thousand in America, who, it is no disparagement to him to say, understand the whole *affair* about a thousand times as well

as he does. This entire aspect of this oration is the more offensive, because there was not the slightest occasion for the introduction of it; and because it is so woven into the discourse, as to make the redress of gross outrages and grievous wrongs, on the part of Popish priests, appear to depend upon the double falsehood, that the teaching of Religion necessarily begets intolerance, and that the Protestant clergy of America have objects, and are actuated by motives, essentially identical with those of the Papal Bishops, whose flagitious acts it is the object of his Bill and his oration, to correct. Mr. Putnam must excuse us from consenting to the infamy of religion—as the proper ground for securing public liberty.

THE OFFICE OF DEACON—ITS NATURE AND IMPORTANCE, AS TAUGHT IN THE WORD OF GOD, AND THE STANDARDS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.—*A Discourse by Rev. L. A. Lowry, of Jackson, Mississippi, 1854.*

As this journal is set for the defence of the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, against assaults from without, and corruption from within, we rejoice in any indication that the interests of our brethren in the essential elements of the system set forth in those Standards, is reviving: and are, therefore, glad to see this discourse. The author's patience seems to have been severely tried by contact and conflict with Anglican Prelacy, a form of religion famous for the modesty of its pretensions, and its Pharisaical scrupulousness in the choice of means to accomplish its ends.—We tender him the consolation of 1 Pet. 5: 8, 9. He protests, in a bold and manly way, against the corruption of the order of God's house, of which this narrow sect has been guilty, in the matter of the Deacon's office: showing, that while the Deacon is required by the Word of God to be a man of faith and of exemplary life, there is nothing in that Word, which can give the slightest colour of plausibility to the description of his office given in the "Prayer-Book." In this "incomparable," and "almost inspired" collection of curiosities, the essential, and the only Scriptural functions of the Deacon, are relegated to a very subordinate position; and other functions are given to him, which are not only not authorized by Scripture, but which cannot be discharged, it appears to us, in the relation there defined, without a sense of personal degradation. The Deacon is the assistant of the Priest when present, and only emerges into an "ens substantivum," in the absence of the superior officer. And if we, whose heads are unanointed, understand the action of the last General Convention, the Priest is the same next-to-nothing in the presence of

the Bishop, a presence which seems to exert a benumbing and paralyzing influence upon all below it.

The Preacher protests also against the neglect into which the office has fallen in our own Church. He does not say enough, we think, on this point. If the office had been properly understood, and respected, our congregations would not have groaned under the evils of the Trustee-system, exposed in this magazine: and the Church at large, would not have suffered so many preachers of the word to leave their proper calling, and "serve tables." The functions of Preacher, Elder and Deacon are, respectively, defined in our book, with the greatest clearness: and the health of the whole body depends upon the normal exercise of all these functions. It is always a symptom of disease, when the work appropriate to one organ is thrown upon another: and weakness is the inevitable result. Let contributions be made to the cause of God, according to the doctrine of our Form of Government, as a regular ordinance of the Church: let these contributions, in whatever form they may be made, money, clothing, books, bricks, lumber, paint, fuel,—and for whatever specific purpose, the support of the Gospel among ourselves, the sending of it abroad, the endowment of Seminaries for the training of the ministry,—let them all be committed to officers ordained for the very purpose of keeping and disbursing them; and let preachers give themselves to "the ministry of the word, and to prayer."

It has come to such a pass, in some of our great towns, that a minister is scarcely regarded as fit for the pastoral work, in a new Church, unless, like Shabbethai and Jozabad, he has some talent for the "outward business of the house of God." But where is a turn for financiering laid down as one of the qualifications of a minister of the word? It is well enough to have it, especially, if a man has to solve the problem, in these hard times, of living on four or five hundred a year: but, certainly, when it is conceded, that such a gift may be a valuable *accident* of the preacher, nothing more ought to be asked. Preaching is one thing, and discharging the office of Deacon is quite another: and the gifts and qualifications required for the one and the other, are different also.

We would suggest to Mr. Lowry, since his attention has been called to the subject, to pursue it in the light of Scripture and our Constitution; and he may be able to give something to the Church which will be of more permanent value. There are some incidental views of the office of "evangelist" expressed by him, in which we cannot concur: but this is another subject, which is in great need of being looked into.

POLITICAL RELIGIONISM.—This is the caption of an article in the February number of the "Metropolitan," a Monthly Magazine, as many of our readers need to be informed, published in Baltimore, by a "Committee of Literary Gentlemen," and designed to furnish the "Most Choice Catholic Literature" for the edification of the faithful. The publishers, however, with the usual liberality belonging to the sect, are making, we understand, some effort to circulate it among heretics also. And why not? The two dollars of a heretic will go as far towards the support of the Magazine and the comfort of the Literary Committee, as the two dollars of the most thorough-going son of the Church: and as there are Protestants, who, as really and completely, though not as devoutly, abstain from the use of their reason, as any believer in transubstantiation or Papal infallibility, this "choice literature" is likely to be admired even beyond the precincts of Holy Mother.

In regard to this article on "Political Religionism," it is difficult to determine, how far it expresses the true feeling of the church. The usual imprimatur of the dignitaries, the "Rev's," "Right-Rev's" and "Most Rev's," with the dagger (†) insignia of their Graces and Lordships, which adorn the covers of some other journals—is wanting here. It is edited by a committee, but a committee of what, or by whom appointed, we outsiders, of course, cannot be expected to know. We only know that "the church" has always acted upon the principle that the end justifies the means, and has recognized such men as Alexander Borgia and Leo X as the Vicars of Him who was "holy, harmless and undefiled." When the very impersonations of beastly lust, diabolical malice, and scoffing unbelief have been enthroned on the seven hills, and worshipped under the style of "His Holiness," we ought not to be surprised if this unknown and indeterminate quantity, "X" (for so the writer signs himself) should turn out to be an infidel. Herod and Pontius Pilate have once before shaken hands, when the Savior was crucified. We suspect that the article was not written by a Papist, or if so, by one who has not been long enough in that fold to bleat after the fashion therein in vogue. For instance, he speaks in the language of Protestant Ashdod, when he refers to the commandment against theft as the *eight*; whereas, every body knows that according to the Council of Trent, it is the *seventh*. In our opinion, he cares nothing either for Protestantism or Popery: and would be willing to exercise his talent for raillery on either side by turns. But this is a matter of little consequence.

The leading purpose of the article is to

ridicule the assertion, which, the writer says, he has often heard, though he cannot tell where, that "*we (Americans) are eminently a religious people.*" This is the thesis he aims to overthrow, or the logical contradictory of which he attempts to establish. And, by what arguments, gentle reader? (1.) By showing that we are not remarkable for humility. (2.) That we are a money-loving people. (3.) By the fact that there is polygamy in Utah and murder in California. (4.) That Congress is not a model of honesty and purity. (5.) That we have had Soule in Spain and Saunders in England, and have written Hulsemann letters to the amiable government of Austria. These are all the positive arguments we can find: and as it is rather a barren array, we suggest a few others in addition. (6.) We recognize as fellow citizens, two or three millions of people among us—a very large proportion of whom are foreigners—who, by their very profession, are the subjects of a foreign tyrant: whose priests do not often, if ever, become naturalized: whose bishops swear in secret, that they will to the utmost "persecute and oppose Heretics, Schismatics and rebels to their Lord the Pope, and his Successors:" openly put their approving *daggers* on journals which teach the lawfulness of such persecution, (*when they have the power*) while at the same time, other organs of the church, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, in Congress and in festive halls, are saying precisely the contradictory things for the instruction or infatuation of the sovereign people, who have not yet made up their minds to allow themselves to be persecuted as rebels against "our Lord, the Pope." And farther, when the said dignitaries arrayed in their gorgeous man-millinery, present themselves to the gaze of the profanum vulgus, that same vulgus is so destitute of "humility" as to be slightly affected with some other emotion than that of unmingled admiration. (7.) We are not only a money-loving people, but carry our love of money so far, as actually to refuse to tax ourselves for the benefit of Roman Catholic schools: and even Papists themselves, after they have been in this country a little while, and become infected with the avaricious furor of the people, become reluctant to resign their property to the Bishops!! (8.) We not only tolerate polygamy in Utah, but, perhaps something worse, as among some of our people, celibacy is established by law, and regarded as a peculiarly *holy* state.

The case is made out, we suppose. But there are some things in the aspects of society and the state of opinion in this country which appear to gravel our amiable author a little, because they stand in the way of his conclusion. (1.) The preposterous regard we pay to the Sabbath. We make

ourselves "miserable one day in the week" by going to church, listening to expositions of God's word, and singing psalms like any stiff-necked Puritans; regarding the "free-air as iniquity, and the sun-light mortal sin." while the ox and ass enjoy a *real rest*, the one braying in the "free-air" of the fields, and the other calmly chewing the cud, in the genial rays of the sun. If we were *really* religious, as we pretend to be, we should go to Mass in the morning, and gambol over the meadow the balance of the day: being assured that the Kingdom of Heaven is meat and drink, and that cessation from bodily toil, a full manger, and a wallow in the grass constitute the true rest for a rational man. (2.) The regard we have for the "reverend clergy." We are such an irreligious people, that the clergy do with us just as they please, and we cannot do without them: not even sell a "plaster for chilblains" or a "wash for pimples" without their certificates. The people have so little religion, that they cannot start an Insane Asylum, or an Aged Widows' Home, or even express their indignation against religious persecution without them. Nay, such is the awful prostration of religion among us, that things against evangelical christianity, which might be printed in English or Scotch journals with impunity—e. g. Sidney Smith on Methodism—could not go down here. The *moral* power of the clergy, in this country, without the aid of law, is stronger than that of the clergy in the Old World, with all the strength of establishments. Such is our dreadful impiety. (3.) The multitudinous "isms" which infest the country, owe all their power to the *religious* elements mixed with them: which, according to our Author's logic, ought to prove—What?

We ask again, has not this writer made out his case? What solution, think ye, does he propose for this apparent contradiction between his conclusion and his premises? Why, that we are a nation of Puritanical hypocrites. Alas! when men have no faith in the existence of conscience or virtue in other men, what must we think of their own. We offer another solution of the difficulty. It is to be found in the writer's notion of being *religious*. Every thing depends upon that, in settling the question whether we are a religious people or not. We cannot find out, whether the author's religion is that of the "Age of Reason" or of the "Council of Trent:" whether he is a follower of the Pope or Tom Paine. The spirit of Popery and of Infidelity is very much the same. The utter absence of any connexion between premises and conclusion, the gross obtuseness in reference to the commonest and most obvious distinctions in thought, the hatred of the Sabbath, (that great barrier to *despotism*, to Papal

tyranny or Infidel anarchy,) the malignity against the *evangelical* clergy: the scoffing tone of the whole article, leave us in doubt, to which class he belongs. Perhaps to *both*: for such an union would not be without a parallel. If either be his religion, then may we never be "eminently a religious people." The religion of Paris under Chaumette and Hebert, or the religion of Rome under Pius IX, is not the thing for us. Hence the wrath of the "Metropolitan." If the influence of the Protestant clergy could only be transferred to Papal priests or Infidel lecturers, what a millennium we might enjoy. Only think of it! The pleasure of going to a bull-fight or to a temple of Venus on the Sabbath, instead of a Puritan conventicle! A priest with a game-chicken under his arm, and a crucifix hanging from his girdle! and still more, to give zest to the entertainments of the day, a few heretics roasting before a slow fire, or the heads of believers in God falling delightfully from the guillotine smoking with their blood. Can any body imagine a state of society better entitled to the epithet of "golden," than this?

One can scarcely read a Papal disquisition upon this country, without being reminded of the description of Satan's entrance into Eden, in the Paradise Lost:

"As when a prowling wolf,
Whom hunger drives to seek new haunt for prey,
Watching where shepherds pen their flocks
at eve,
In hurled cotes amid the field secure,
Leaps o'er the fence with ease into the fold:
Or as a thief bent to unhoard the cash
Of some rich burgher, whose substantial doors,
Cross-barr'd and bolted fast, fear no assault,
In at the window climbs, or o'er the tiles:
So clomb this first grand thief into God's fold:
So since into His church lewd hirelings climb.
Thence up he flew, and on the *Tree of Life*,
The middle tree and highest there that grew,
Sat like a cormorant; yet not true life
Thereby regained, but sat *deriving death*
To them who lived."

"Aside the devil turn'd
For envy, yet with jealous leer malign
Ey'd them askance, and to himself thus plain'd

Sight hateful, sight tormenting!"—
"Vixque tenet lacrymas, quia nil lacrymabile cernit," is the poetical description of envy. *Hinc illae lacrymae!*

Let our countrymen remember that *perpetual vigilance is the price of liberty*. The speculative tendencies of the age seem to indicate the possibility, at least, of a union

at no distant day, of infidelity and Popery. They unite now in slandering the people of God: they may unite, soon, in murdering them. The liar-murderer who blasted Eden with his breath, is not yet chained in the bottomless pit.

THE PRESBYTERIAN OF THE WEST, AND THE CRITIC.

We venture to suggest to our cotemporary—and as he seems to be, like ourselves, a novice in the editorial work, we hope he will not think us presuming—that editorial comments, especially touching the important matter of the objects and aims of another journal, should be original judgments founded upon the *reading* of the journal, and not in the way of *echo*. Editorial echoes may sometimes be as singular as Pat's famous Irish echo, which, when he cried "Good morning, yer honor," would repeat, "Weel, weel, Patrick, my boy!" Our cotemporary, after announcing us, our object and contents, and declaring *he has little sympathy with our views*, thus discourses:—

"They are mistaken when they say or think that the last General Assembly intended, in any action of that body, to favor their peculiar views. We voted with the majority to erect the Synod of Baltimore; but we—and we think others generally—did not intend this action as an earnest of the removal of one of our Boards to Baltimore or to any other place. Have they forgotten that the Assembly, by a vote almost unanimous, declared substantially that it was a mistaken accusation, that 'there is a screw loose somewhere.'"

Now, our readers need not be told that of some five propositions here in effect charged as held by the "Critic," No. 1, not the shadow of foundation for either can be found in the paper itself. They know—

1. That the "Critic" said nothing about the feeling of the Church as to the wrong working of our system.

2. Nothing about the last General Assembly's endorsement of their peculiar views, or any body else's.

3. Nothing to the effect that the General Assembly intended to move the Boards.

4. Nothing to the effect that a Board ought to be located in Baltimore. On the contrary, the personal feelings of the Conductors of the "Critic" are against such an arrangement. One of them declared so in the Assembly.

5. Nothing implying that the last Assembly voted the Boards "all tight" or "screw loose."

What the writers in the "Critic" may choose to say hereafter on any of these topics, we cannot tell. We wish to keep the peace with all our cotemporaries, if they will let us. All we have to say is—

"Soft, you; a word or two before you go. Speak of me *as I am*; nothing extenuate, Nor set down aught in malice."

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW FOR MARCH.—We have received this No. too late for notice in our present issue—for we make it a point to *read* first—then give our judgment. From a glance over the pages, we are disposed to anticipate a treat in the reading.

Our quondam acquaintance — of the "Spirit of American Presbyterianism—The Division"—appears in continuation in this number; and having gotten down from the region of transcendental speculation, as to the "varying organisms," deals very lustily about him. The portraiture of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, by an artist of that school is, as the editors usually say, "of itself worth the price of the volume." The portraiture of the "Critic" is less elaborate—rather one of the "Charcoal Sketches."—We are sorry to have excited the wrath of our neighbor, and then set him to calling us naughty names. There is, however, a "marvellous method in his madness." For he brands us a "*second chop Breckinridge of the exsinders*." We suppose to a New School ear, such a combination of epithets, exhausts the last dregs of the vocabulary of bitterness. To us, however, a far bitterer pill—yea, "the unkindest cut of all"—is his declaration, that we "sneer at his Review and his Church, *and then adopt their suggestions*." Now, we could quietly have stood all the hard names—but to charge us with adopting New School suggestions,—we can't stand that. As soon as we feel at liberty to claim that many pages of the "Critic," for such a purpose—we shall make a defence. And not confining ourselves to the defensive either—for we believe in the lawfulness of war in both kinds—we shall retaliate on our assailant, by quoting as fully from his own pages as our space will permit.

A HISTORICAL VINDICATION OF THE ABRIGATION OF THE PLAN OF UNION. By Rev. Issac V. Brown.

We have received from the publisher, W. S. Martien, a copy of this work, and hope in a future number to be able to make some extended notice of this volume,—which, though we have as yet not had leisure to read carefully, we are much prepossessed in favor of from what we have read, and especially from the tone and spirit of his preface. In what Mr. Brown says of the necessity and propriety of exposing the recent attempt of New-Schoolism to pervert and falsify the whole history of the Reform of 1837-8, he "expresses our mind exactly."

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES—

Life and Character of the late Rev. Isaac M. Cook. A Sermon. By James Allison, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Sewickly, Pa.

Thoughts for the Times; or, the Bible as a Classic—adapted to Childhood—in the Common School, &c. By Rev. L. S. Halsey, Louisville, Ky.

Temporal Power of the Pope, Dangers to Civil and Religious Liberty, &c. Rev. Dr. Grundy, Maysville, Ky.

Mr. Allison's discourse is a noble tribute to a noble man. The members of the Assembly at Charleston will all remember Mr. Cook. Cut off in the midst of his days, yet he lived not in vain, if the publication of this discourse served no other end than simply to exhibit how much ardent zeal for Christ, energy, and activity in the Ministry can accomplish in a few years.

Mr. Halsey's discourse is a most timely publication, and not less *well put*—as the debaters say—than timely. There is no one practical point more needful to be fully understood and felt in these times, than just Mr. Halsey's view of the Bible as *practically* as well theoretically "the Religion of Protestants." We wish Mr. Halsey would execute as well one other discourse on "*the Bible in the Pulpit*,"—showing how it, the simple explanation to the people of what the Bible says and means, is the sum and substance of the preacher's office. And that this office, properly and earnestly discharged, dispenses with all necessity for "getting up" themes for the pulpit to attract or to keep an audience. That either the hair-splitting preacher of topics from the commonplace book of Divinity, conscientiously dull—or the curiosity-hunting

preacher—or the grand moral-principle-of-the-universe-expounding preacher—if they would really allow their profound and curious minds to come down to so common a level—would find (perhaps to their surprise) that the Bible would show them

"There are more things in heaven and earth Than ever dreamed of in their philosophy."

Of Dr. Grundy's discourse it is enough to say that it is *characteristic*—not doing things or saying things by halves. It is interesting to compare together the several replies to Mr. Chandler—or rather, as we have shown, more probably to the Jesuits speaking through Mr. Chandler—and see how men, standing at every point of the circumference of truth, strike to the same centre in working out their conclusions.

Our old and ever candid and fair friend, Dr. McKinney, of the "Banner," last week, makes the mistake of calling upon the Southern Presbyterian Review, and the Critic for the *amende* in regard to certain statements of a correspondent of the "Watchman and Observer," concerning the election of the Secretary of the Board of Missions.

Our friend will see on looking over what the *Review* published, and the *Critic* republished—nothing is asserted in the matter beyond what the *Banner* fully confirms, except perhaps, the improper use of a technical word "Protest," in relation to the act of part of the Board. Nor in what is said in the *Review*, is there any thing having the *personal* aspect or bearing, which the Watchman's correspondent gives the statements, in repeating them and adding other statements to them.

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 4.

APRIL, 1855.

Vol. 1.

THE QUESTION OF ECCLESIASTICAL PROPERTY,
AND FRANCHISES—IN ITS BEARING ON THE TRUE
MISSION OF THE CHURCH.

THE student of the Bible is aware, that God gave to the tribe of Levi, no inheritance amongst the other tribes of Israel. Cities were appointed for them to dwell in; and provision was made for their comfortable support—in the ordinary working of the religious system of the Jews. But the whole system of church property and franchises, as well as the entire method of the support of religion and its ministers, and the movement of spiritual life in its organic connection with property—were placed on a footing, in that divinely organized commonwealth,—peculiarly remote from the possibility of vast accumulations, and from the danger of secularizing religion, by the agency of money.

It is also well known, to every one who has examined the subject, that the Christian Church, for nearly three and a half centuries after the birth of Christ,—was placed in circumstances, which, according to our present notions on the subject of ecclesiastical property and franchises, would render its continued existence, much more its wonderful progress—well nigh inconceivable. Without charters, without estates, without permanent funds, without separate colleges or schools, without churches, nay, even without a visible existence recognized for any other purpose but persecution—the early Church of Christ subdued the ancient world, in a period about equal to that which has elapsed since the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

In some respects, the conversion of the great Emperor Constantine, must be considered one of the greatest calamities which ever befell the Church of Christ. The whole question of ecclesiastical property and franchises, in its widest, and most desolating form—gradually received that solution, and that firm establishment through-

out the Roman Empire—which the barbaric sovereigns of the Middle Ages—in general—accepted and extended—and which; at the dawn of the Reformation, found all Europe struggling under mortal agony and pollution. Half the soil of all States was owned by the Church; the persons of all the ministers of religion—immense and profligate multitudes—were exempt from civil jurisdiction; personal freedom was at an end; the progress of civilization had become impossible; and the religion of Jesus had been converted into the direst engine of human suffering and crime. Neither christians—nor statesmen—should forget this lesson—written in blood, over twelve centuries of European history.

The manner in which the reformed States and sovereigns treated these questions of ecclesiastical property and franchises,—and the light in which the early and great Reformers viewed them; are amongst the most interesting topics of practical enquiry, connected with that grand era. They are far too extensive to be discussed here; and, unhappily, they are little understood or cared for. This at least may be confidently asserted; that throughout all Christian States, immense reforms—revolutions indeed—were seen to be wholly unavoidable—and were actually attempted, with more or less earnestness; but, in no single European State, was that reform—that revolution—thoroughly accomplished; and, as the inevitable result of that failure—and in proportion to it—every reformed State and Church in Europe, has felt the old corruption working at her vitals—to the present hour. The Christians and the Statesmen of America, speak in ignorance, or they speak in treason alike against the freedom and the religion of their country—when they propose for our complete imitation—the best model, of the best reformed State or Church of Europe.

In the year 1849, the seventh Provincial Council of the Papal Bishops, held at Baltimore—in one of their ordinances—afterwards approved at Rome—confiscated, by one sweeping enactment, all the ecclesiastical property, and by consequence, all the ecclesiastical franchises—belonging to that idolatrous sect, throughout this Republic; and vested it all, in the Bishops of the Dioceses respectively; saving only such as was already vested in orders of Monks, or congregations of Priests. It is very difficult to determine—nor is it of any consequence just now to examine, how many millions of property, and how many and what various franchises—were thus transferred from the people to the Bishops; nor, is it worth while to arrest the course of our remarks, to comment on the opposition which certain Papal congregations, in various portions of the Union have manifested against this act of indiscriminate plunder; or to call attention to the discussions which that act has given rise to—in newspapers, Courts of Justice, and Legislative Assemblies. The act itself is a distinct presentation of one aspect of the entire subject, and of the principle on which that aspect rests; and for this reason, it is now cited. It is not necessary to suppose it to be possible, that any Protestant Church Court would imitate the flagrant robbery of this Pa-

pal Council; but if any Protestant Church Court should hold the doctrine, that the ecclesiastical power—as contradistinguished from the people of their sect, must possess and control ecclesiastical property and franchises, that Protestant sect, is placed precisely on the doctrinal foundation of this Papal Council. This Council committed the robbery—because it held the doctrine; and it is not the robbery which is most dangerous—but the doctrine which produced the robbery; for though it may never produce the robbery, it will produce all the evil results of the robbery, by other means than confiscation; and it will produce many and most fatal consequences—far beyond confiscation. Suppose ecclesiastical property and franchises to be needful and to exist—no matter to what extent, and no matter for what object: the point here insisted on is, that they must not exist in the hands of the Bishops of the Dioceses; nor in the church courts of the Protestant Churches: but, they must exist, so far as they are ecclesiastical at all—in the hands of *the people*—the non-ecclesiastical element in religion: and that a contrary doctrine, is Popery—is a doctrine underlying the Papal confiscation of 1849. If the Methodist Episcopal Church should see fit to insist that the titles of all her churches should vest in her travelling preachers, or in Conferences composed exclusively of them—or in her Bishops; this is the doctrine of the confiscating Papal Council of 1849. If the Presbyterian Church should see fit to insist, that the titles to her churches, should vest in the session of the Church, or the Presbytery; or if she should demand that franchises granted to her, should be granted to her ecclesiastical element only; this is Popery. And it is perfectly immaterial whether it be property simply, or franchises simply, or both united; and perfectly immaterial again, to what object, and by what agency, the property and the franchises are directed; the result is still the same. What we assert is, that pure ecclesiasticism—is the essence of pure Popery. The very moment you eliminate the popular element,—you reject the idea of a commonwealth, and found upon the idea of a hierarchy; which is the essential foundation of Popery.

We are aware—for we have seen it tested on the question of general as contrasted with ecclesiastical education—that our good brethren, though they blush when they appear to come up side by side with Rome, will, after a few groans, face the difficulty manfully—and say, that after all, Rome may be sometimes in the right. No doubt. But in this case, which is a very old one—Rome has been commonly supposed to be wrong; and the wrong has been supposed to lie at the root, of ten thousand other wrongs—the chief of which are the destruction of society—and the subversion of the Church of God; both of which are, logically and historically, the inevitable results of pure hierarchy—addressed to the principle of property and franchise. Therefore our brethren have only commenced the argument, when they groan that Rome may be right. Conceded; now go forward, and show how it is possible for her to be right in this case, without at the same time showing that hierarchy and not

commonwealth—is God's doctrine; or else, show, that pure ecclesiasticism, after eliminating the popular principle—in the control of property and franchise, is not hierarchy; or else, in default of both of these showings—cease to think hard of us,—for showing profound anxiety, at what seem to us, to be tendencies towards hierarchy, in the matter of ecclesiastical property and franchises.

There is however, another aspect of this vast question. Besides having the aspect already contemplated, which may be considered its internal aspect—that is, the relations of Church powers—and the people—touching matters of ecclesiastical property and franchises; it has, what may be called an external aspect—that is, the relations of the Church, considered as a whole—to the civil power, on one side, and to Christ her head on the other.

Very much is written about Ecclesiastical Boards; very much about Church Colleges; very much about Deacons and Trustees, in congregations; and the like. Have these ecclesiastical Colleges—any charters? If so, who gave them those charters? Did they get them from the Synod, or from the civil power? Who are the Trustees under these charters? By what authority do they hold the property and the franchises? Suppose they break the charter—can the Synod mend it again? Suppose they squander the fund, or forfeit the franchise—can the Presbytery send the sheriff after them? Did our Boards at Philadelphia get their charters from the civil power in Pennsylvania—or from the General Assembly of our Church? It is—you know—*res adjudicata*—notwithstanding Judge Rodgers—that the General Assembly is not even a *quasi* corporation—which we heard learned judges vow in the Assembly of 1837—it was; and we laughed, inwardly, as we heard—marvelling at learned judges. And your Deacons—whose functions the blessed God made as large as the wants, the sorrows, and the sufferings of man,—but whose functions were thought all lost twenty-five years ago—and are thought now, to be mainly exhausted, in holding title to a meeting house and a grave yard; your Deacons—if they have any civil corporate existence—which indeed they never should have—who gave it to them? Did the Session—or the Presbytery—or the civil power? If men would but consider—if they would but look at facts as they pass before them, with open eyes—if they would wake themselves up, when they read their Bibles; verily, they would save themselves from a world of confusion and mistake—not to mention gross errors and great misfortunes.

The Church *as such*, cannot hold property or franchises, by any civil title, without at the same time, and to the same intent, becoming a part of the State. Under the civil law, technically so called, meaning thereby the old Roman Law, which is still the basis of the civil code of all Western Europe, except the British Isles; there was no such thing—in our sense of them—as Uses and Trusts—which cut so great a figure in British Jurisprudence, and in our own. Direct connection with the State—by means of hierarchy—was therefore, the inevitable solution, under the civil law, of the question of

ecclesiastical property and franchises. The doctrine of Uses and Trusts, applied to questions of charity, in Britain—freed the case, in part: with us, it is capable of freeing it perfectly; unless it shall be confounded again, by the madness of Protestant ecclesiasticism. The case of the Free Church of Scotland—and that of our General Assembly of 1837—illustrate, perfectly, opposite cases, when applied to Presbyterianism. In Scotland, the Church being part of the State—the civil power took cognizance of the civil rights involved in the case; and when these were decided—the spiritual rights, must needs follow, as mere incidents. The Free Church, therefore, had but three alternatives; to obey the civil power; to go to jail; or to march out—four abreast to the great secession Hall—hastily fitted up. With us, the Church is not a part of the State; and so the civil power had nothing to do with us; and when the Church had decided the spiritual states of the worthy men who tried to make a legal row—the case was ended—civil rights followed as mere incidents, and the worthy legal rioters had to march out in Indian file, or otherwise. This was all very dark to the muddy brains of the great thinkers, eighteen years ago; and they laughed—even outwardly—when they were plainly told how it would be—must be. But John Sargeant understood it all; and Judge Gibson and his court—decreed it all. And now, if we can keep down hierarchy—in the question of ecclesiastical property and franchises—it is law forever—and the Church, in this broad land—free forever—both from ecclesiasticism, and from the tyranny of the civil power. But, beware of your multiplied, petty corporations, and beware who they are who hold your Uses and Trusts—and beware of your church colleges, and your corporate Boards—and beware above all, not to eliminate the popular element, and sink the idea of a free, Christian commonwealth. If you do not, you will repent it, long enough after the great leaders, who carry you astray under pretext of fidelity to the principle of ecclesiastical control, as applied to Boards, and Church Colleges, and what not—rest in dumb forgetfulness. Do men make trouble—merely that they may control it?

If we turn to the other subdivision of this external aspect of the question—the true posture—namely—of the Church of God with reference to estates and franchises—considering her as the Bride of the Lamb,—and looking to the glorified Redeemer, her only Lord and sovereign; it really does appear to us, that all such questions assume a miserably insignificant—if not absurd aspect. The mission of the Church is simply and singly to save men's souls: and every man who takes up this sublime parable—is a follower of Him who had not where to lay his head; and every result that follows, except the saving of souls, is an indirect result—however glorious or blessed it may be. 'That believing—ye might have everlasting life; this is the very reason—why the gospel was given—to prove that Jesus is the Christ! that whosoever would believe on him—might not perish, but have eternal life: this is the exact end, for which God, out of his unsearchable love for the world—gave his only begotten Son! What

madness is it, then, to rest on the civil power—the money—the franchises? To be crying out continually about insufficient support; a cry ordinarily loud and prolonged—in proportion as there is no just reason for any cry at all! To be ceaselessly busied in patching up expedients to supply the lack of zeal and fidelity on the part of ministers; or the lack of piety and charity on the part of the people; or the lack of earnest and simple obedience to Christ, on the part of the Church herself! Are so many Boards and franchises necessary—in order to save souls? Is the Bride of the Lamb enthroned on estates and franchises? Do you not know, that the Saviour used personal violence, but once during his life—and then it was to whip money changers, out of the temple of God?

The wealth of the universe is no compensation to the Church, for the loss of one smile of Christ. Franchises, that would build a pyramid to the moon—are utterly useless, when the Spirit of Christ is banished from the Church. Are we so foolish, then, as to risk the loss of his love,—the possession of his Spirit—as in the most remote degree contingent upon the conditions on which we may obtain, hold, and use ecclesiastical property and franchises? Are we so wedded to schemes and ways, hostile to our principles, but which we have borrowed from the world—or imitated from those who knew the way of the Lord less perfectly than we did ourselves; that we shall hold as enemies of the Church—those who ground themselves upon her very nature and end, and upon these won, all that in her hour of peril, was won for her; because some pampered official shall sneer at their zeal for the simplicity of Christ—or some secularised ecclesiasticism, interpolated upon the order of the church, shall mourn in good set phariseeism—over their bad spirit.

If the Church will do her duty—there is no fear that either property or franchises will fail her—as far forth as either can be used for God's glory. The civil power in this free land—will give her every franchise—she ought to possess: the danger is, that she asks in folly, and gets too abundantly; procuring a snare, when she vainly thought she was gaining strength. Her children will pour into her lap, boundless treasure—if she will train them to piety—and ask nothing but what she can ask, of their faith—and on the authority of Christ. Surely nothing is more clear, than that the alms which God's people will bestow, may be relied on as the combined product of their piety, their ability and their opportunity. And surely, again, it cannot be doubted, that if God has given any organization to his Church, and has made works of charity or any thing else—the end of that organization, and the duty of that Church; then that organization which God has ordained,—is not only the most safe and the most effectual method of accomplishing that divinely appointed end; but it is the mere caprice of human audacity, or the mere hardihood of voluntary ignorance,—which could lead us to contrive other methods, or other ends.

It is not the particular uses to which ecclesiastical property and franchises can be applied, that we desire to discuss now. It is only

the fundamental principle itself, involved in their very existence in the hands of the Church, *as such*,—that we would hold up for consideration. The history of all ages and all religions attests, that property and franchises cannot be confided to false systems of organized ecclesiasticism, without risking the most terrible results to mankind; and the divine history of God's Church, so far as it is written, under both dispensations—conclusively shows, that God never designed any such use to be made of his Church. Ecclesiasticism in its pure and absolute form is Popery; and in that form—this question of property and franchise, is the very point in which hierarchy and all civil powers, in all States which have been subject to Rome, necessarily coalesced—and gave uncontrollable dominion to the Man of Sin. But the tendency in the Church to ecclesiasticism, is in exact proportion to its tendency to be secularised; and this ecclesiasticism—in its pure state—we repeat—is hierarchy—which is the precise antagonism of a free spiritual commonwealth—which the Church of God is. Now our free Presbyterianism is the most perfect—when it is the most purely a commonwealth—and has most completely excluded all tendency to hierarchy. But it is precisely then, that it is most difficult to manage this question of ecclesiastical property and franchise—*without making full account of the popular element*, through which alone, we can come with perfect safety into intimate relations with the civil power. Let the Church, *as Church*, keep clear of property and franchise, if she would keep clear of ecclesiasticism—hierarchy—Popery—total secularity. We bless God that the nature of our political institutions—helps instead of hindering us, in enforcing these great principles.

Will that handful of brethren, in eminent station—and their thoughtless followers, who deem us disturbers of good things settled—be so good as to apply this view of the subject, in their calm moments, to the great principles of Church reform still lingering in dispute amongst us? What do they expect to gain—at last—if they should succeed in making our Church courts, great corporations, whose chief duty would be to manage properties and direct franchises and control Boards? If the risk be comparable to our apprehension of it—surely our anxieties may be excused—and our patience during eighteen years of watching—may be considered exemplary. What can we suppose the Church has gained—by its victory over the voluntary societies—by means of which the New School party carried on *it's* plan of campaign; if now, the instruments which supplanted those voluntary societies should become permanent engines, another plan of campaign—upon principles—less injurious, indeed—but yet most mischievous in many respects—one of which this paper suggests? We suppose the Church has gained a great deal; and we know that some of those whom we feel deep regret in differing from widely, now; rejoice as gladly as we do, in whatever was gained. But all that was possible—has not been gained; and much that was gained, is put at hazard, so long as more is not gained. And this is precisely the difference between us. In an age like this, and a

Church like ours, these things do not admit of being permanently smothered; and nothing but trouble can be produced—by attempts in high quarters, to evade an open examination of public conduct, and a free discussion of the great principles on which it proceeds,—by assailing the private motives or personal standing, of such as see fit to enter upon such enquiries. There are, no doubt, difficulties on both sides. We think we appreciate those of our brethren who differ from us—and that we make allowance for them, a good deal beyond, what in either respect, has ever been returned to us. Instead of solemn rebukes—show us a warrant from Scripture, which may justify the Presbyterian Church, in committing the whole work of spreading the Gospel over this vast empire, to a secular corporation—under the laws of Pennsylvania! Then show us the divine warrant, for the Archiepiscopal authority of the chief director of this secular ecclesiasticism—over five hundred of our ministers and churches! And after the *doctrines* is settled,—point out to us, how a free Christian commonwealth—may consist in theory—or permanently exist in practice, under such a combined domination of hierarchy and the State—working by money and franchise! Is this all we fought for—in the “big war?” Is this the permanent shape—which the ecclesiastical principle assumes, when it reaches perfection, in a free spiritual commonwealth? But this is only one illustration of the principle we oppose. It is *that principle*, which this illustration points to, that we dare not sanction.

THE PROOF AND THE HOLDING FAST.

We—(for as we understand it, all writers in the “Critic” may adopt the style editorial)—We render unfeigned thanks to the Divine Head of the Church, for the unexpected success which has attended the inauguration of the Presbyterial Critic, to the rights and immunities of speech in Zion, and to fit audience, and not few. We admit that success is not always the test of right; that it is too soon for us positively to conclude that we have succeeded; that the future may not be as to-day with us. But it seems to us that the general welcome with which, from birth, we have been hailed, proves beyond doubt, that there was need for such a journal in the Church.

Of course a variety of receptions from the Presses might have been expected. There are always persons to be found in the Church, who think that sound theology, and pure religion, cannot co-exist with intellectual activity; and they are apt to cry wolf! wolf! at the very first foot-fall of the march of living thought.

They are ever ready to call you unfriendly to the cause, and disturber of the peace of Zion, if you are unwilling to stand by and see the whole thought, and spirit, and life, and soul of the community, put to sleep by the waves of their sceptre. Others will think you a wild and lawless rebel, who "speak evil of dignities," if you do not revere all place-men, and adopt the liturgy of place-worship, as they do.

Some might have been expected to wait and see how we stood affected towards that particular minor interest, or *imperium*, by which they take the latitude and departure of everything, because they are specially interested in it; and then judge us favorably or unfavorably, accordingly as they may deem our existence well or ill for their hobby. And many good men, doubtless, were at first not able to decide as to our real character, and therefore distrusted us; but—now seeing our aim and end, they have treated us with manly and ingenuous kindness. And it might have been expected that an association of persons, combined on principle, and not on particular measures, thinking freely and earnestly, without fettering or wholly endorsing each other's opinions, would be regarded as a singular, and not at first easily comprehensible phenomenon, in a half stagnant Church, where the instrumentality of the press had to a great extent tended to clip, and repress, and petrify, the more earnest thought of the times.

When the allowances are made which will readily suggest themselves from these hints, the sudden, full, cordial welcome, which a large portion of the great and fresher mind and thought of the Church has given us, is truly cheering and refreshing.

We suppose no question concerning us, has been more frequently canvassed in the private circles of the office bearers of the Church, since the appearance of the Critic, than the question: What we are for, what against? What do we wish to destroy, what to preserve? Conservative of something, of course, all Christian men pretend to be—but conservative of what? What will be our wheat to be garnered, and what the chaff? What will pass as truth and right, and what as unveracity and wrong, at the tripod of the Critic? Now here we may as well plainly premise, that we do not expect to give any great aid, comfort, or delight, except in the way of ordinary civilities, either to the place-worshippers, or to the Slumberers in Sleepy Hollow—or to the devotees of special interests, who too take no pleasure in a fertilizing rain, on the whole Continent of America, if it did not rain on their own gardens. But we do most earnestly desire that the sword of our destructiveism may be accurately turned against that, and that only, which ought to be destroyed; and that our conservative shield may be always thrown over what is truly good, and over nothing else.

We are not in any great danger of failing in the accomplishment of any object which we may propose to ourselves, as honorable or desirable, for lack of an affirmative will, or of decision of character, or of intellectual backing. Nor do we expect to be deterred in the

least by *phillippizing* oracles, or by the chattering of the teeth of the timid, or by hasty and groundless charges from those who speak before they hear and judge. But we do fully acknowledge that we need to be guided by the Holy Spirit of God, in every thought, and on every page. We trust that we may ever feel that want, and obtain the supply of it at the throne of grace, as thoroughly as the most conservative of the fathers would wish or counsel. We hasten to confess our dependence on the divine grace, in the audience of all our readers. We admit fully, that we can never think ourselves equipped for any good thought or speech, without its being predicabile of us, as it was of the Apostolic Christians: *Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things*—and *“the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you.”* We would not, of course, very well love to be in a Church of piety, without active intelligence. But we pray to be delivered from a Church of active intelligence, without piety. We wish to cultivate both, as the gifts of God—to bear our weight on both wheels of the chariot of the Lord. When the Spirit of the Lord lifts His banner, and with helm, and shield, and flaming sword, beckons us to follow, we wish to shake off slumber, and boldly take the line of march where God leads, no matter whither it may be. The Church is guilty, if she does not dare at once to go through Red Sea, and through wilderness, and through the armies of the aliens. But we never wish to go before the fiery, cloudy pillar, or to move while it abides, on the other hand, not so much as to lay the weight of a little finger on Amalek, or on Moab, or on Ammon, unbidden and unled. There is so great and so precious a work before us, white for the sickle, which we ought to do, and can do, if we err not, and are not recreant, that we imagine we often hear, with solemn and attentive ear, the aged and white-plumed friends of Zion, saying, in deep, and hopeful, and cheering affection, *only let your conversation be as becometh the Gospel—keep your hearts with all diligence, for out of them are the issues of all true usefulness.*

Now as to our holdings fast—it is not every thing of which we profess to be conservative. In the inspired precept at which the title of this article hints, we are required, in proving all things, only to hold fast the good. We would not wish to have been conservative at Athens, in the days of Dionysius, the Areopagite; nor at Ephesus, in the days of Demetrius, the craftsman; nor at Ingoldstadt, in the days of Eck and Luther; nor at Westminster, in the days of Carey, Lord Falkland, and John Hampden; nor at Williamsburg, in the days of Lord Dunmore and Patrick Henry. We should wish to have been “root and branch” destructives at all those times. We should not all have ranged ourselves among the conservatives, in the days when John Knox was destroying the Popish architecture of the monks, in Scotland, as the most effectual method of keeping the monks away; nor when the Hueguenots of France were crashing the antique abbeys of Normandy, built in the grand old days of Matilda and the Conquest; nor when the modern Russels,

and Cavendishes, and Talbots, are pulling down cumbersome castles, and replacing them with commodious places of human abode. Some antiques we wish and love to save, but not all antiques. Nor do we think it particularly wholesome to our reputation, to own the conservatism of the modern Tories of Great Britain, who have reluctantly conceded every step of progress in true freedom, and the arts of life, who always face to the rearward, and advance backwards, and who have never yet fairly settled among themselves at what date, in the days long ago, and how much subsequently to the flood, the state of things was antique and venerable enough to be their model, and the end of their endeavor.

On the other hand, we suspect we should have been conservative to a man, at that noted period in the second century, of which Tertullian speaks so sadly, when, "by the instigation of the devil," the pastors were robbed of their primitive republican equality, and diocesan prelates began to be set up over them, though "it was not so at first." We should have been conservative between Luther and Carlstadt, though not between Eck and Luther. We should have been rank conservatives, when Archbishop Laud and Charles I. were bringing in Arminianism into the Church of England, as more favorable to despotism, and when they star-chambered good and holy Bishop Davenant, for preaching on the doctrine of election. And we hope we should have been conservative to the core, with Algernon Sidney, and Sir Harry Vane, when Cromwell trampled down that grand OLD CAUSE of theirs, the republic in Church and State, the glorious ideal of their prayers, their labors, and all the strivings of their bodies and their souls. We should wish to have been destructive with Patrick Henry, at the moment when he made and uttered that lightning-flash discovery: *We must fight!* But we should have been conservative with George Mason, when he engrafted the new liberties upon the stock of the old, and set the ship's head near her ancient course, only with unfettered sails.

It depends, then, as will most easily be seen, very much on what thing and what time it is of which the speech is, whether we are conservative or not. We confess to be thoroughly conservative of the bold, deep, grand theology of our ecclesiastical ancestors, because we believe it to be the theology of the Bible, and of sound common sense; the reproaches against it, and the objections to it, are no more, no less, than such as may just as properly be brought against the Bible. But this does not make us conservative of all the notions and maxims of a generation which fails to apprehend and digest, and take up into living faith, the power, and weight, and glory of its own speculative creed. We are thoroughly conservative of the republican and Scriptural system of Church government, framed at Westminster two centuries ago, "in such a forge, and such a heat," that the world will not soon see more wisdom met, to frame another creed, under more favorable circumstances. But we do not understand that this commits us necessarily to the usurpation of sec-

ular education by one of our Boards, or to the accumulation of all the Boards in a dangerous centralism, in the city of Philadelphia.

The objective creed of a generation, is a different thing from the apprehension of its creed, by any given generation. A creed embodying nothing but pure truth, may be taken to the heart and life of a generation, with a thousand degrees of completeness, as men understand, take up, feel, and live out, more or less, of the truth and significance of their creed. We do not profess eminent conservatism of the apprehension and digestion of their creed, by the generation in which we live. We may not be under the reign of moderateism, but we do not see the way clear, by any means, to pronounce the condition of our generation complete or unexceptionable in the matter of digesting, and working up to, and vitalizing, its own creed. And until that is the case, to stop the thinking, or any vital energy of the Church, is destructiveism of the very worst description. The worst destructiveism of the present day, is intellectual sleep and death, under the unfelt shield of a sound Church system, and the unlifted sword of a sound theology. We mean to have nothing to do with any agitation, for change in the objective creed of the Church, either in theology, or Church polity. But we do not promise the same acquiescence in all the notions, measures and expedients of the age, or of the Church. We go for a sound, calm, and settled theology and polity—but we go for a church with a living and active intellect, pushing its spiritual life, ever indefinitely and unceasingly, nearer and nearer to the lines of its written creed, and the inspired oracles.

We have no terms to make with Sleepy Hollow; nor with any of the sweet sons of indolence, who hold that thinking enough has been done heretofore, and therefore this is the time for them; nor with those who are willing to lull the active thought of the Church, because they hope that they can ride a sleeping leviathan, but might not sit quite so well aloft on a waking one; nor have we any terms whatever to propose, or to accept, with those who fear the waking thought of the age, lest in waking, it may discover the jugglery of their former language, how they have talked so earnestly of the interests of Zion, and have meant, all the time, some small interest of their own.

Nor do we expect to be frightened out of our propriety by the charge of agitation. There will ever be men, whose beau ideal of ecclesiastical prosperity, is a tame acquiescence in their leadership; who fear to give utterance to any hearty, independent outspeaking, which does not lie within their own procrastean measure; who trust not boldly enough in the truth of their creed, to see that an active mind will come, by the way of activity, to a true creed, and can never come by any other way, to any good purpose, to any creed at all. To these men, all mental life is agitation. Every thing is agitation to them, but the court-yard and the midnight of the fairy tale, where an hundred armed knights lie asleep under the enchanter's

influence, waiting a trumpet's call to awake them to life and motion.

We care not even greatly, to see agitation against selfish ends, nor against localities aspiring to be head quarters, which make themselves rivals of the whole cause of Christ in the land, nor against place-worshippers, nor against Sleepy Hollow, nor against centralism. It would look too much like "breaking a butterfly upon a wheel." We know the prompt hand and brave heart of our beloved Zion too well, not to know that these things will be swept away, clear and clean, as soon as their existence, as abuses, can be fairly demonstrated.

But we are for agitation in the Church, in the work of struggling up into a more deep and thorough apprehension of truth, and in increasing the vitality, and in elevating the intellect of the generation—agitation against dull books, and dry, drowsy, inefficient newspapers.

We suspect that we go just as much for the independence of the Press, as those who go farthest in that direction. We beg leave however, to retain that subject on our card, for some future utterance. There are cases supposable, in which the printing press belongs very affectionately, to Presbytery, or Synod, or Assembly, when commendation is wanted, and imprimatur is sought. Then it is the organ! Then Peter's shadow, falling on the Press, will not hurt, but heal. Then the Press can be free, and under Peter's shadow at the same time. But, by and by, comes a time, when that Press is not wanted there; when its presence is as much intrusion, as the installing a minister, to the empty walls of a Church—when the strife and turmoil of opposition, to drive out what is censurable only with miserable inefficiency, and invitality, can hardly be afforded, and when Peter's shadow will hurt, and not heal, and therefore must be kept very clear away. Possible cases of this kind, will convince thinking minds, that there is much to be thought out, and settled, and limited, correctly and judiciously, on this subject, between the present system of the control of the Church by the Press, and the other extreme, of the full control of the Press by the Church.

PASTORAL LETTER ON THE OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH—TO THE CONGREGATIONS UNDER THE CARE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF BALTIMORE.

The following letter was reported by a Committee of the Presbytery of Baltimore, and read before that body, on the 12th of April, 1854;—and, though not formally adopted, was approved by them, and the author requested to publish it.

DEAR BRETHREN: We, Ministers and Elders, in Presbytery assembled, respectfully and earnestly ask your attention to the following Resolutions, adopted by the General Assembly of our Church,

at their sessions in Philadelphia, in May, 1853, and to some considerations which we venture to add, by way of explaining, illustrating and enforcing them.

The resolutions are :

1. *Resolved*, That the proper observance of the Christian Sabbath is essential alike to the purity and progress of the Church, and to the prosperity of the State. A Church without the Sabbath is apostate: a people who habitually desecrate this Divine Institution, have abandoned one of the grand foundations of social order and political freedom.

2. *Resolved*, That the General Assembly most earnestly enjoin it upon their Churches, ministers and members, both in their public and private capacity, both by their discipline and example, to sustain the strict observance of the Holy Sabbath. The Assembly look upon the increasing desecration of this day, by the various modes of public conveyance, as of a most alarming character, as a manifest abuse of the great temporal prosperity of the country, and as tending to provoke the judgments of God upon the Church and the nation. So far as Christians are connected with the system of Sabbath desecration, by their ownership of stocks or other interests in our railroad and other corporations, there can be no doubt of their duty to protest earnestly and constantly, against the violation of the Sabbath, and to use all the influence of their position to arrest this growing evil.

That this is a seasonable testimony, cannot be denied by any serious observer of the signs of the times. In the universal agitation and conflict of opinions, which is one of the most striking characteristics of the age, the great questions touching the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath institution, and the change in the day of the week, from the seventh to the first, have again been subjected to a discussion, which, though earnest and solemn, has not been more solemn than the glory of God and the prosperity of the Church demanded, or more earnest than the discussions of men generally are, when their interests are concerned in upholding or in destroying any thing venerable for its age or influence. No ordinance of God can dread discussion: no plant of our Heavenly Father's planting, can ever be rooted up by the storms of controversy: and we are under no apprehension that the Sabbath, which (beside the institution of marriage), is the only flower that has been transplanted from Paradise in our fallen world, and which has survived the scorching heats and blasting winds of wickedness, for so many centuries, will be done away, till He comes who is the substance of all the shadows, the complement of all pledges and earnestness, which have been given to the people of God, and the final rest of all who are troubled for the cause of truth and righteousness. Still, unstable souls may be led astray, and even well instructed Christians may be reduced to perplexity and doubt, "by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." We exhort you, therefore, to study the Word of God, and especially the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, in which the Apostle brings out clearly the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath as a day of rest, and also the change (and nature of the change,) of the day, from the seventh to the first; by showing that when the warning was given in

Psalm 95: 11, the rest founded upon the finishing of creation, (which included the observance of a particular day,) and the rest founded on the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, (which also included the observance of a particular day, Deut. 5: 14, 15, and compare the same as it occurs in Exod. 20: 10, 11), had both passed away, and, consequently, there "remained still a rest, (Greek, in the margin, a 'sabbatism,' or 'keeping of Sabbath,') for the people of God:" a rest which also included the observance of a particular day; to wit, the day on which Jesus entered into His rest, having ceased from His own works, as God did from His. In thus studying the Word of God, you will find that the obligation to observe the first day of the week as a day of rest, and the consequent promises and privileges belonging to a conscientious and faithful observance of it, stand upon a foundation which cannot be shaken by the plausibilities of Christian argument, much less by the rhetoric of men to whom "gain is godliness." So shall you have boldness in the day of judgment and trial, and be able to stand before any tribunal on earth, and "give a reason for the hope that is in you."

The tide of immigration, unexampled in fullness and constancy, which is flowing into this country, invests this subject with peculiar importance to you, as American Christians and American citizens. The strangers from the old world, who come here, are, for the most part, from Ireland and the provinces of Germany. The vast majority of the Irish emigrants are Papists; and all the world knows with how little even of decent respect, the apostate community of Rome has been accustomed to regard the Lord's day. It has multiplied days of its own, till whole nations, subject, by the curse of God, to its dominion, have been reduced to desolation, misery and crime, and all possible evils which can flow from ignorance and idleness; but the desecration of the Lord's own day, has been tolerated with a long-suffering, very remarkable in her who has drunk the blood of the saints, for refusing to obey her commands. In this, as in all things else, obedience to God is eternal enmity to Rome. You, who reside in the city of Baltimore, need not be told what Rome thinks of the Sabbath of the living God. Your eyes are shocked with their childish processions: your ears are offended, and your worship is disturbed, by their bells and bands of music, grating harshly upon that solemn quiet, which ought never to be broken, but by strains of heavenly melody, the sweet invitations of the Gospel, or the voice of prayer. In all this they are consistent; they are not content with equal rights; they are not satisfied with the privilege of worshipping God or Mary undisturbed, but they must disturb others in their worship. They are driving us nearer every day, to the decision of the great question which must be decided, sooner or later, whether Protestantism and liberty, or Popery and despotism, shall rule this country: a decision which will not be doubtful.

In connection with the despotism of Rome, and its contempt for the Sabbath, and by way of illustrating the political tendencies of

the Sabbath institution, we quote the following passage from the world-renowned "working-man," Hugh Miller. We quote the whole passage, though the whole does not bear upon this particular point: "Among the existing varieties of the genus philanthropist," he says, "benevolent men, bent on bettering the condition of the masses, there is a variety who would fain send out our working people to the country on Sabbaths, to become happy and innocent in smelling primroses, and stringing daisies on grass-stalks. An excellent scheme theirs, if they but knew it, for sinking a people into ignorance and brutality—for filling a country with gloomy work-houses, and the work-houses with unhappy paupers. 'Tis pity rather, that the institution of the Sabbath, in its economic bearings, should not be better understood by the utilitarian. The problem which it furnishes is not particularly difficult, if one could be made to understand, as a first step in the process, that it is really worth solving. The mere animal, that has to pass six days of the week in hard labor, benefits greatly by a seventh day of mere animal rest and enjoyment: the repose, according to its nature, proves of signal use to it, just because *it is* repose according to its nature. But man is not a mere animal; what is best for the ox and the ass, is not best for him; and in order to degrade him into a poor, unintellectual slave, over whom tyranny, in its caprice, may trample, rough-shod, it is but necessary to tie him down, animal-like, during his six working days, to hard, engrossing labor, and to convert the seventh into a day of frivolous unthinking relaxation. History speaks with much emphasis on this point. The old despotic Stuarts were tolerable adepts in the art of kingcraft, and knew well what they were doing, when they backed with their authority the Book of Sports. The merry, unthinking serfs, who, early in the reign of Charles 1st, danced on Sabbaths round the Maypole, were afterwards the ready tools of despotism, and fought that England might be enslaved. The Ironsides, who, in the cause of civil and religious freedom, bore them down, were staunch Sabbatarians.

In no history, however, is the value of the Sabbath more strikingly represented, than in that of the Scotch people, during the seventeenth, and a large portion of the eighteenth centuries. Religion and the Sabbath were their sole instructors, and this in times so little favorable for the cultivation of mind, so darkened by persecution, and stained with blood, that, in at least the earlier of these centuries, we derive our knowledge of the character, and amount of the popular intelligence, mainly from the death-testimonies of our humbler martyrs, here and there corroborated by the incidental evidence of writers, such as Burnet. (Memoirs, vol. 1, p. 431.) In these noble addresses from prison and scaffold, the composition of men drafted from oppression, almost at random, from out the general mass,—we see how vigorously our Presbyterian people had learned to think, and how well to give their thinking expression. In the quieter times which followed the revolution, the Scottish peasantry existed,

as at once the most provident and intellectual in Europe; and a moral and instructed people, pressed outwards beyond the narrow bounds of their country, and rose into offices of trust and importance, in all the nations of the world. There were no societies for the diffusion of useful knowledge in those days. But the Sabbath was kept holy; it was a day from which every dissipating frivolity was excluded, by a stern sense of duty. The popular mind, with weight imparted to it by its religious earnestness, and direction by the pulpit addresses of the day, expatiated on matters of grave import, of which the tendency was to concentrate and strengthen, not scatter and weaken, the faculties; and the secular agitations of the week came to bear, in consequence, a Sabbath-day stamp of depth and solidity. The one day in seven, struck the tone of the other six. Our modern apostles of popular instruction, rear up no such men among the masses, as were developed under the Sabbatarian system in Scotland. Their aptest pupils prove but the loquacious *gabbers* of their respective workshops,—shallow superficialists, that bear on the surface of their minds a thin diffusion of ill-remembered facts, and crude theories; and rarely, indeed, do we see them rising in the scale of society; they become Socialists by hundreds, and Chartists by thousands, and get no higher. The disseminator of mere useful knowledge, takes aim at the popular ignorance, but his inept and unscientific gunnery does not include in its calculations the parabolic curve of man's spiritual nature: and so aiming direct at the mark, he aims too low, and the charge falls short." (First Impressions of England, &c. c. 3.)

In reference to that portion of our German population which is connected with the Church of Rome, we need add nothing, as what has already been said of the sort of reverence for the Lord's day, entertained by that Church, admits of the same application to them. Rome has reverence for nothing but her own inventions. In this respect she is truly, always and everywhere, and in all her votaries, the same; and always will be, till the Son of God shall destroy her "by the brightness of His coming." In reference to the Protestant portion of the German population, (we allude of course to those who have not been long in the country), a similar want of reverence for the Lord's day, must, to a great extent, be acknowledged. Whatever may have been the cause, whether the misapprehension of some of the leading Reformers, in regard to the true relation of the Fourth commandment to the law of Moses, and their consequent doubt as to its perpetual binding force, to the end of the world,—a misapprehension arising, perhaps, from some passages of the New Testament, and strengthened by the authority of some of the early writers in the Church, as well as by the preposterous abuse, on the part of Rome, of holy days—whatever account we may give of the fact, the fact itself is unquestionable, that the Sabbath has not been held in reverence as it should have been, among the churches

on the Continent of Europe, Lutheran and Reformed. And the case is far worse, since the formulæ and practical results of the modern pantheistic philosophy, have come down to the masses of the people. Thousands who understand, and can understand, nothing of the processes of reasoning, by which the startling conclusion has been reached, that every man is God, are able to perceive and feel the bearing of that conclusion upon the great questions of law, of personal immortality, of personal responsibility. Nothing can be idler, than to talk to such men of moral obligation, and especially, of moral obligation to observe a positive institution of God. The assembly of Germans who, a few years ago, issued their manifesto from Cleveland, and those who responded to them on this side the mountains, evidently regarded themselves as Olympian divinities, sovereign and supreme, and, therefore, subject to no law but that of their own will, and to be restrained by no bounds, except those imposed by the clashing of interests which must, of necessity, occur among a plurality of independent and lawless Gods. It is greatly to be feared that these sentiments extensively prevail; that many of the secret associations amongst us, have been organized upon the atheistic, radical, anarchical principles, which, at the close of the last century, were cherished in the Jacobin Clubs of Paris, and the societies of the Illuminati, and finally deluged, like burning lava, the institutions and governments of Europe. The Germans of St. Louis, or a portion of them, have already protested, formally, against the Sabbath laws, as unconstitutional encroachments upon their civil rights; and others, in other parts of the country, if published documents can be relied on, seem to regard laws of any sort as unjust restraints upon their liberties. When such doctrines as these are unblushingly avowed, it is time that the Church should utter a voice of remonstrance and protest, and say, with our General Assembly, to the world, that the "Sabbath is essential to the prosperity of the State, as well as to the purity and progress of the Church," and that not only "is a Church without the Sabbath apostate," but that "a people who habitually desecrate this divine Institution have abandoned one of the grand foundations of social order and political freedom." No wonder is it, brethren, that the lovers of their country, on these happy shores, are organizing themselves to resist and roll back the foreign influence which threatens to swallow up the precious inheritance of regulated liberty, left us by our fathers, and sealed and consecrated with their blood! We will have nothing to do, by the grace of God, with continental religion, or continental politics, except by our instruction and example, to rebuke, and if possible, to mend them.

As the government of this country is eminently one of law and of opinion, as contradistinguished from military force, it is evident that public morality is of the very last importance to our safety. But in what nation has public morality survived the degradation of the Sabbath? We have already alluded to the connection between the

Sabbath and the institution of marriage, as the common and only survivors of the fall; and the experience of the world demonstrates that when the first falls into contempt, the last, which is the great bulwark of morality and social order, will share in its disgrace. The only people in Christendom, who have attempted to abolish the Sabbath formally, and by law, were so far abandoned as to place a shameless strumpet upon the throne of God; and their short and melancholy reign is written in blood. If we give up the fourth commandment, which is the citadel of the first table of the law, we must soon surrender the seventh commandment, which is the citadel of the second table; all personal and public morality will be prostrate; our countrymen will become "brute-beasts, fit only to be taken and destroyed," "living in divers hurtful lusts and pleasures, hateful, and hating one another." God forbid that it should ever be said of us, as Napoleon said of the people just referred to, "Their great want is *mothers*," chaste and noble matrons, who, like Cæsar's wife, must not even be suspected; faithfully and laboriously polishing their jewels, and then with confidence in God, giving them to their country, to adorn and bless it.

In illustration of this point, let us recur for a moment to the present condition of some parts of Germany. In a recent number of one of the leading British Quarterlies, it is stated, that "in Breslau, the stronghold of Silesian Lutheranism, only a third of the Protestant population are church-going,—the public houses are forty times the number of places of worship, and the proportion of illegitimate births is one in four. Stettin, the chief city of Pomerania, seems now sunk to the most deplorable depth of Pagan, and worse than Pagan immorality. In a population of 50,000, the church attendance is only seven per cent. The number of persons in jail has doubled since 1851, their crimes being mostly committed under the influence of strong drink. One person in seventy lives by prostitution. The number of divorces yearly, (which the Prussian law allows,) is one hundred," &c. The statistics of Paris, the royal residence of his Christian Majesty, would doubtless make a more appalling commentary, upon the connection of the fourth and seventh commandments. Without the public worship of God, there can be no religion. "Without the Sabbath," says Daniel Webster, (Arg. in Girard case,) "there can be no public worship," and where there are not, there cannot be morality. "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." (Rom. 1: 28—31.) Can we read this catalogue of the fruits of despising God, and not tremble? Be assured, brethren, no

people ever robbed God of His time, or of the glory of His name, without paying for it. Remember the eagle in the fable, which stole a coal from the altar, and thereby kindled a fire in her nest, which involved herself and her young in common conflagration and ruin. "The curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked; but he blesseth the habitation of the just." (Pr. 3: 33.)

We had intended to say something to you in regard to another point in the resolutions of the Assembly; the responsibility of those who own "stock or other interests, in our railroad or other corporations," which violate the Sabbath, but must content ourselves with only a word or two.

There seems to be an aggravation of human guilt, in the use of our iron roads and copper wires. God, in opening these fields of discovery and improvement, has added greatly to the length of human life,—if life is to be measured by the successions of the mind, instead of astronomical revolutions—has made a very large addition practically, to the six days which He gave to man, while His proportion, His *one* day, remains the same, and yet men rob Him of this little. Will He not avenge such a *sacrilege* as this? Remember, brethren, that an omnipresent responsibility invests you. In all relations, in every place, at all times, you are accountable to God. If you have but one share in a joint-stock company, God will look into the manner in which you have managed that trust; and a few dollars here, will be but a poor compensation for the frown of your Maker on that day.

Finally, brethren, we say to you, that the Sabbath is the sign of God's covenant with us. (Exod. 31: 13—17.—Ezek. 20: 12.) It is a brilliant bow of promise upon the very darkest cloud that hangs upon the horizon of our country. So long as we observe it, so long shall the floods of Popery and despotism, Infidelity and anarchy, threaten us in vain. If we abandon it, or treat it with contempt, then comes merited vengeance; the opening of the windows of Heaven, the breaking up of the foundations of the deep, and a shoreless ocean, engulfing all that has exalted us, and made us prosperous as a people, and the brightest hopes and anticipations of the nations of the earth.

CHURCH UNITY AND THE EPISCOPAL MEMORIAL- ISTS.

Two years ago, a memorial, signed by twelve Episcopal clergymen, for themselves "and others," was presented to the House of Bishops, setting forth the views of these clergymen, as to the very limited usefulness of the Episcopal Church, and urging a scheme

designed to bring the Church more into sympathy with other denominations, and the masses generally. "The main purport of the memorial," was concurred in by a number of others, who "were not able to adopt certain suggestions of the memorial." This memorial evoked so important a discussion in the Church, that Dr. Muhlenberg, who seems to be the leader in the movement, has lately issued a pamphlet of 85 pages, which he calls an "Exposition" of the memorial.

It is certainly a salient fact of the times, that in the citadel (New York) of the American Episcopal Church, a body which hitherto has been a very Dead Sea of immobility, there should have arisen a reform party similar to that which now agitates the Church of England. This party, strong in number, talent, and personal influence, boldly declare the inefficiency of the Episcopal system, in its present form, as a means of converting the world. Dr. Muhlenberg, the worthy exponent of the party, frankly admits the existence, in the canons and services of the Church, of a number of evils, which Presbyterians have often pointed out, with the uniform result of having their existence denied, and the mention of them stigmatized, as an evidence of bigotry and unrefined taste. How broad are the criticisms of this party, will appear from the following quotation from the "Exposition" (p. 11):—

"Whether such an outpouring of zeal would be restrained in their flowings, just within the channels of our present system * * * admits at least of a doubt. The memorial does more than doubt: "Our Church [says the memorial,] restricted to her present canonical means and appliances, to her fixed and unvarying modes of public worship, her traditional customs and uses, is incompetent to do the work of the Lord, in this land and age:" that is, [continues Dr. M.] "she is too much bound up to certain set ways, to work freely and easily beyond her special range. She is not equipped for availing herself of opportunities. She is encumbered by her own apparatus. She is like David in Saul's armor, but not like him, expert in using the sling and stone. She proceeds warily, according to rule. Hence she fails to be instant in season and out of season, in doing the Master's work. In asserting this, the memorial does no more than give vent to what is extensively felt and acknowledged among us."

Some of the memorialists, individually, would like to begin the reform in the canons and services of the Church: but as memorialists, they agree that there shall remain an unchanged Episcopal Church, bedecked with all her present stays and robes, embracing all who can appreciate her refined attractions: but outside of this full robed church, there shall stretch away a broad irregular margin, corded on to the skirts of the church necessarily, by only the bond of Episcopal ordination in the ministry, whilst in all matters appertaining to organization and worship, there may be free scope for the idiosyncracies of those concerned. Godly men, of popular gifts, with or without literary training, are to be commissioned as evangelists, clothed in peasant's garb, in hood and cosack, or in skins and sandals, as they may severally elect, to go forth with Prayer Book, or without Prayer Book, and labor for the souls of men, in ways of their own choosing—a plan, by the way, worthy of our own attention.

But the main idea in the scheme—and the one which claims our special notice—is to make the Episcopal Church a great central bond of union, among all the evangelical denominations of Protestant Christendom. Episcopal ordination, they propose, as the basis of church unity. It is maintained, that in order to unity, there must be some ordination that will pass current throughout the Christian world. This can be postulated of Episcopal ordination, and of no other. The clergy of other denominations will be expected to apply to the Bishops, not thereby acknowledging the necessity of so doing, but submitting to it, for the sake of the blessings of ecclesiastical unity. The memorialists have no fear of any backwardness on the part of the non-ecclesiastical clergy: on the contrary, they fancy that there is a general longing for Episcopal ordination, which would be sufficient to draw all men unto the Bishop, even now, but for the repugnance of the sectarian clergy to liturgical trammels.

In all seriousness, our views of schism—either as to its definition, or its unmitigated evils—do not accord entirely with those of our Episcopal brethren, yet we heartily concur in the sentiment, that there should be allowed to exist no barrier to free intercommunion, among the ministers and people of the various evangelical denominations. The exclusiveness of the Episcopal clergy has rendered a warm love toward them, as brethren, an extremely difficult duty. We do not consider ourselves any the less scripturally ordained, because of their opinions; and we shrewdly suspect that as good men as Dr. Muhlenberg, and other of the memorialists, find it often difficult to keep their minds up to the churchly theory. But we have no words to express our sense of the importance of the different churches maintaining towards each other, views, and feelings, and associations, which are liberal, charitable and harmonious. Not only is it a duty we owe to one another, not only would it be a vast promoter of individual comfort and spiritual development, but it would be a profoundly impressive spectacle to the world. There is something more than a subterfuge in the excuse of ungodly men, that they are repelled from christianity, by the warrings of sectarianism. Every cause is weakened by discord among its friends. "Behold how these brethren love one another," would be the most subduing argument that christianity could offer to the world, next to that of Christ crucified. Would that christians could be induced to think more, and to pray more, upon this subject.

But it is a vain expenditure of strength, to be building up ecclesiastical platforms. Even if the impracticable idea of getting all Protestant Christendom to come on to one platform, were realized, the evil would by no means be subdued. Evil, unsubdued tempers, would still work their malign results, perhaps all the more fiercely, because of the propinquity of the parties, and schism would lacerate the body of Christ more fearfully than ever. Baiting hostile animals into the same cage, is not the way to promote their mutual affection. First tame their fierce nature, and then they will agree, whether in cage or forest. Strange, that christian men should be so

slow to perceive, that *unity of spirit* is the great practical desideratum in the Protestant world. What we want, is to *love one another*—to love in spite of differences—to yield ourselves entirely to the commands of our Lord, and his inspired apostles, and to follow without fear the impulses of the regenerated soul. Then will all barriers of form and feeling, disappear like mists before the rising sun.

Let it not be understood that we discard all unity of doctrine. As Christians, we have no right to demand of each other any doctrinal basis, except that which exists as a matter of course, as a bond of union among all who are united to Christ. So that when we acknowledge one another as true Christians, we do by that very acknowledgement, confess one another's essential faith. Thus the implied faith may become the objective bond of union—not so much because of what it is, as because of what it implies—not because it is a creed, but because it is the index of an inner life, whereof all are partakers. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father. A common Saviour professed—a common baptism of the Spirit symbolized—a common Creator, Ruler, and Parent of all good, who is over all, through all, and in all. Here is unity, inward and outward; or rather, the inward uttering itself in the outward, and the outward confessing the inward. Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid. Until Christ is divided, let not Christians be divided. Until Paul is crucified for us, let not "Apostolic Succession" be a wall of separation.

It is this overlaying of the essential unity with non-essential requirements, that is the gist of the error of the churchly theory, and the reason why all schemes for Christian union, emanating from its advocates, have failed, and will continue to fail. They are laying a foundation of hay, wood and stubble. They are demanding of their brethren more than is demanded by Him, whom alone they obey. They are requiring for earth what is not required for Heaven. The moment we require any other test than that implied in regeneration, that moment we are lost in a maze of inextricable difficulties. Countless barriers must then be surmounted—countless passwords sounded: and such a series of metamorphoses must be gone through as would appal any but the lover of an endless metempsychosis.

The New York memorialists, however, seem to think that the platform of Episcopal ordination is as smooth and inviting as the plan of salvation itself, inasmuch as all admit its validity. But whilst by this concession to the weakness to our Episcopal brethren, might settle the difference with them, it brings us not a whit nearer to our Baptist brethren than we were before. For they contend that the true test of catholicity is not in the constitution of the ministry, but in the form of a sacrament, and the whole undipt world, including the ordaining Bishops, are ecclesiastical Ishmaelites. And various minor sects have each their *sine qui non*, which they cleave to as pertinaciously as Dr. Muhlenberg and company do to the "three orders."

But suppose the 'sects' agreed to treat upon the ordination basis,

there is a perversity in human nature which would probably drive the lovers of parity into a denial of the validity of Episcopal ordination. Should this come to pass, then either the workings of the beautiful unity-scheme would be arrested in mid career, and a wider and deeper chasm than ever be created, or all Episcopal ministers repair to the High Church Presbyterians, and submit to the "laying on of the hands of the Presbytery."

We must confess, that in reading this overture for compromise, on the plan of all going over to them, the inquiry several times forced itself upon our mind—"Is not this after all only another scheme for proselyting? Tired of catching a malcontent now and then, "the Church" would go to work on a grand scale, and organize all Protestant Christendom into an Episcopal parochial school, for educating the rude sectaries up to the beauties of the full-jewelled system." But the evident pious sincerity of the men silenced the inquiry each time that it was suggested. The memorialists feel evidently so self-complacent, in the fact of themselves being in "the line of the succession," that their imaginations depict the host of poor, unordained parsons, as casting longing eyes to the grace-distilling fingers of the Bishop, holding back partly from bashfulness, and partly from a dread of the heavy yoke of ritualism. We must be pardoned for saying that this recalls the days of our boyhood, when, on donning our first suit of broadcloth, we imagined that every boy in the street was coveting our blue jacket and brass buttons, whereas probably, the most of them were only chuckling at our self-conceit.

Instead of the liturgy being the point of aversion, it is the only thing that impresses Presbyterians at all. And whilst they would be far from accepting the Prayer Book, it would be less difficult to form a liturgical than an ordination basis of union—although we are not quite prepared even for that. It was an immense misconception of the spirit of Presbyterianism, at least, to suppose that we were prepared to practically wipe out our ancient testimony against Prelacy in all its forms—to tear down the very flag of our glory.

But to us it seems evident that this scheme has a special aim towards healing the great Wesleyan defection. Such a flexibility in the Church in the days of Wesley, as is now proposed, would (as Macauley in his *Essays* labors to show,) have prevented the schism; but broken external unities are rarely healed. We pretend not to speak for our Methodist brethren, but we shall be slow to believe that they will be decoyed into this scheme. Were Methodism a feeble, unsuccessful system, it might be tempted to return to the mother Church for some of the old pap; but when Methodism even in America, looks at her 10,000 ministers, and 1,250,000 members, compared with the 1,500 ministers, and 75,000 members of the Episcopal Church, it is surely only a puling sentimentalist here and there, who would not prefer his own free-hearted independence, to the boddice and dimity of the dear old matron, whose rheumatic limbs are much better adapted to repose on the couches of royalty,

than to tread the broad stretches of this great American world. Indeed, we must be allowed to say, that this would be the worst possible alliance for Methodism, whose power lies in being *very unlike* Episcopacy. Quell her emotional gusts, and you leave her a water-logged craft, with no resource for moving her forward in the emulation of sects. She then has nothing that cannot be better found among other denominations. We have felt grieved to observe some subsidence of the peculiar tone of Methodistic earnestness, and an infusion of that worldly pride which is becoming too much the bane of all the Churches. Should that infection continue to gain upon the vitality of that denomination, the scheme of the memorialists may prevail with them, not so much by bringing them to the Bishop, as by leading them to adopt a liturgy, which would be an extinguisher of all their usefulness. Methodism, of all the denominations, would be the first to expire in the choke-damp of formalism. Like John the forerunner, her mission is to cry aloud in the wilderness, clad in her plain garb, and eating the wild meat of the wayside. When she does this, the vast crowds which follow in her train, and receive baptism for the remission of their sins, authenticate her divine mission. Let her do otherwise, and she is but a "root out of dry ground." John the Baptist, wrapping his body in pontifical robes, and compressing his great soul into a liturgy, would have had a lonely time in the wilderness, and in that case might have turned his attention to the study of ecclesiology. We beseech thee, brother Muhlenberg, not to pay thy bewitching addresses to our Methodist sister, lest she be undone.

We are not able to see the consistency of the memorialists in their scheme. They unequivocally declare, and Dr. Muhlenberg dwells upon it at great length, that the Episcopal Church, as at present constituted, "*is not competent to the work of preaching and dispensing the Gospel to all sorts and conditions of men, and so adequate to do the work of the Lord in this land and age*"—and yet, surprising to relate, they advocate maintaining "*the Protestant Episcopal Church as it now is—leaving that untouched.*" What! preserve intact a Church that you assert is unfit for the work she is commissioned and commanded to perform! Leave enshrined as the very Jerusalem of your love and admiration, a contracted, inefficient organization—a perfumed, garlanded Church-palace, left confessedly to indulge the luxurious tastes of the rich! Surely the monstrous impiety of this aspect of their scheme, did not strike our brethren, as it must strike all others who consider it. Dr. Muhlenberg hopes, indeed, that the masses may gradually be educated to appreciate the fine solemnities of this Holy of Holies. But where is the christianity of trying to educate men into an uncatholic, inefficient concern! Would it not be better to try to educate those now in the inner temple, to go forth into the court of the Gentiles? In other words, must not the real Church of Christ have an universal adaptation?

But Dr. Muhlenberg suggests that there is such a thing as a *preach-*

ing Church, and a *worshipping Church*—the former a feeder to the latter. His idea of the *preaching Church*, is a simple, flexible organization, adapted to success in attracting, converting, and indocinating the masses—whilst the ‘worshipping Church’ is more select, less given to the preaching of the Gospel, and not at all subject to the spontaneous desires of the people in prayer, and chiefly occupied with the liturgy, fast, feast, and Saints’ days. But he seems to forget that the ‘preaching Church,’ which he considers only the primary department, is really the Church of the New Testament—the sort of Church that has the promises; for it is the one that is doing the Apostolic work of preaching the Gospel to all and every creature, of teaching all nations—it is with these laborers that Christ is to grant his presence always, even to the end of the world. It is this Church which is the pillar and ground of the truth—where the whole counsel of God is declared—where the people are re-proved, rebuked, and exhorted with all long suffering and doctrine—where the souls of the people are pointed to the Lamb of God—where the Holy Ghost is sent down with mighty power. This clinging of good men to a system of seen and acknowledged imperfections, affords an apt illustration of the deceitful power of elaborate externalities once allowed, and of the difficulty of all reform.

Before laying down our pen, we volunteer one other suggestion. Why is it that gentlemen who lay so much stress on patristic opinion and precedent, should so disregard the views of the early fathers of English Episcopacy, and be vainly spending their time in ministering to a pretension which was an after-birth of pride, which the Church as such has never owned, which the English Reformers laid no claim to, and which the best men in the Church to this day, have repudiated? If asked for the *catena patrum*, refer to Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Jewell, Hooker, Bancroft—to all, down to the latter end of Elizabeth’s reign, and an illustrious line, still continued, even to John Byrd Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury—or in the American branch, from Bishop White down to Bishop McIlvaine. If the famous XXIII Article be the difficulty, appeal to the commentary of Burnet, and to the better commentary—the fact that Knox, Peter Martyr, Bucer, Whittingham, Morrison, Travers, Ochinus, Fagius, and hundreds of other ministers, who had received only Presbyterian ordination, received and held benefices, chaplaincies, and professorships, in the Church and Church Universities of England—whilst yet the doctrine of Apostolic Succession was classed among the drivelling arrogances of the dotard of Rome. The yearnings of our Episcopal brethren after a closer union with their non-Episcopal brethren, can never be satisfied, until they honor the doctrines of the Cross with an unrivalled place—as a sufficient bond of union among all who hold them in sincerity.

The thought with which we would conclude, cannot be better expressed, than in the following words of Bishop Eastburn, in his late consecration sermon. In apparent allusion to this very scheme, he says:—

“ No remedy will ever succeed, in the absence of the grand remedy—and that is, the more general prevalence of that preaching, which invites mankind to the Physician who is in Gilead. * * * But if on the other hand, there be a continual exhibition in the ministration of the pulpit, of the external polity of the household of faith, no sign of the Master’s approbation will accompany the message. And if this be true, still less shall we be likely to advance the interests of our Church, by the reiteration of those extravagant and exclusive claims in reference to our commission, which neither in the pages of the common Book of Prayer, nor in the history of the English Reformation, find the shadow of a sanction. * * We should avoid even the appearance of casting contempt upon the ministrations which hold up the bleeding Lamb. * * We should delight to say of all, and to all, to whom Christ is dear, “ Behold my brother, and my sister, and my mother ! ”

PAPAL ORGANS IN CONGRESS.

Our Catena has already far transcended the limits we had prescribed to it. Yet, for the sake of giving our readers a complete view of the reasonings and ideas of cotemporary Popery, we continue to extend it.

“ Religion was declared to have nothing to do with politics, and we were compelled to witness the strange and afflicting spectacle of men calling themselves Catholics, professing to believe in the Holy Catholic Church, who nevertheless declared themselves wholly independent of her authority in all matters temporal, educational, or political.

A popular vote, or the voice of a baptized radical, or an article in a paper controlled by a fallen Catholic, was regarded by some as a decision to which the priest, sent to preach and to teach,—the bishop, set by the Holy Ghost to rule over the flock,—the Pope, the very Vicar of Jesus Christ,—should submit. The radical, who seldom heard Mass, and never went to confession, volunteered not only to instruct, but to threaten the priest, and to tell him what doctrines he should not preach from the altar, and what decisions he should not give in the confessional. The fallen Catholic, it must be admitted, was logical in his doctrine. His democratic principles urged him to be consistent,—to apply them universally. They were Protestant,—atheistical ; and if they were true in the street, in the shop, in the house, in the town-hall, how could they be false within the walls of the “ Catholic meeting-house” ? They were adopted by him in the exercise of his sacred right of thinking for himself,—why should he give them up at the dictation of priest, bishop, or Pope ?”—(Br. Rev. April ’53, p.p. 245, ’6, 7.)

“ 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 even 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 law of God. If she have the right to judge, she has the right to pronounce judgement, and order its execution; therefore, to pronounce sentence of deposition upon the prince who has forfeited his right to reign and 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 her 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.

This power which we claim for the Church over temporal sovereigns and their subjects is neither more nor less than the simple power of the keys. Bossuet, indeed, in the first of the Four Articles, denies that kings and princes can be deposed, and their subjects absolved from their allegiance by the power of the keys, and maintains that these give the Pope no right in civil and temporal affairs; but in this he clearly places himself in opposition to some of the greatest and most holy Pontiffs that have ever sat in the chair of Peter. St. Gregory the Seventh expressly deduces his right to depose princes and absolve their subjects from the power of the keys, and the authority of this Pontiff, canonized by the Church, is greater than that of Bossuet, or even the whole thirty-five French bishops who made the Gallican Declaration of 1682. Bossuet also is easily refuted by the reason of the case, unless he can, as he cannot, adduce a decision of authority, disclaiming the power in question. Popes have claimed it, have exercised it, and have never disclaimed it. They have uniformly deduced it from the power of the keys, and none have ever denied it.

Assuming that we have rightly interpreted the law of nature on the subject, political power is a sacred trust from God. The prince, then, is responsible to God for the use he makes of it. If responsible, his abuse of it is a sin, and a sin which may damn his soul. How, then, say that the Church has not, by virtue of the keys, the power to take cognizance of his public acts, to sit in judgment on him in his public capacity, and bind or loose him as a sovereign? Does he not owe a duty to his subjects? If he deliberately neglects that duty, and tramples on their rights, does he not sin against justice, and sin grievously? How can you, say, as a Catholic, that the Church can take no cognizance of that sin, and deal with the guilty prince as with any other sinner? But how can she do this without judging his conduct as a temporal prince, and by what right can she do that, if she have no power over the temporal order? The power she has received with the keys is a power to take knowledge of sin, wherever or by whomsoever committed, and to bind or loose the sinner,—to acquit or to condemn him. The keys, then, do give her power to bind or loose monarchs as well as private persons, and in relation to sins committed by them in their public as well as in their private capacity. We must side with the Popes, then, even against Bossuet.

Infidel princes cannot be forced to accept and obey such law, because God has chosen that faith should be voluntary; but they can be compelled by Christian princes to desist from persecuting those who have received it, and to *leave their subjects free to embrace and conform to it if they choose*. The Church, however, cannot excommunicate them, for they are not in her communion, nor depose them, if their subjects are infidels, for then they do not own their authority. They are without, and those without she does not judge. But princes made her

subjects by baptism are to be presumed to have had the revealed law, the Christian faith, sufficiently promulgated to them to be morally bound to receive and to obey it. They are then bound by their office to profess it, and to protect with their power the Church, who is its depositary, and therefore the faithful in their respective states. If they do not, and use their power against her, to pervert or persecute the faithful, she as the guardian and protector of the faithful, and as authorized to interpret and apply the law of God, to bind and to loose, has the right, if no milder measures will answer, to declare them to have forfeited their right to govern, and their subjects to be absolved from all obligation to obey them.

Now people-god is no more to our taste than king-god, and it is no less idolatry to render supreme homage to the people than it is to render it to Cæsar. The people are as much in their collective as in their individual capacity to obey the law of God. We have been able, therefore, to refute the error of our age, and to oppose despotism on the one hand and anarchy on the other, only by asserting the supremacy of the spiritual order, and defending the right of the Church to judge the political power, however constituted, and by whomsoever administered; that is, her right to subject rulers as well as ruled to her discipline, which right were a vain word, or a mere abstract right incapable of being practically asserted, without the papal constitution of the Church, and the plenary authority, as Vicar of God, of the Sovereign Pontiff. The controversies of the day have forced us to go thus far, and therefore, what we always do with extreme reluctance, to take part in disputes among Catholics themselves. We have been obliged to fall back on the strong Papal doctrines asserted by the Gregories, the Innocents, the Alexanders, the Bonifaces, and the Piuses, in opposition to the Gallicanism so rife in all the courts of Europe in the last century and the beginning of the present, and which in this country, England, and Ireland has been carried to a dangerous extreme for the purpose of conciliating power, which in all these states is inveterately hostile to Catholicity."—(Br. Rev. July '53, p.p. 301, 302, 303, 307, 308, 309, 310, 313.)

"M. Gosselin knows perfectly well that there can be no discrepancy between history and Catholic theology, and therefore that, if he places history and any theological opinion in conflict, he necessarily assumes either that the opinion is not true, or that his history is false.

We should not like to assert that the doctrine of St. Thomas, of Bellarmine, Suarez, Du Perron, and the great majority of Catholic theologians, which attributes to the Pope, as visible head of the Church, temporal jurisdiction over sovereigns, at least indirect, by divine right, is a simple theological opinion, which may, as M. Gosselin represents, be held or rejected as the individual Catholic thinks proper. There have been some recent decisions and condemnations of Gallican works, at Rome, which may be thought to put a new face on the question, and to raise that doctrine to the rank of a *sententia Ecclesie* rather than of a *sententia in Ecclesia*. But however this may be, M. Gosselin, in so far as his theory excludes the temporal authority, at least indirect, of the Church, by divine right cannot make it incumbent upon us to accept it. If he is free to assert, we are equally free to deny it. Rome has never been partial to it, and has shown, on more occasions than one, what she thinks of it. We do not believe it. We believe, we have been forced to believe, after the fullest investigation we have been able to make of the subject, the direct temporal authority of the Pope, as Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. We do not put this forth as Catholic dogma, nor have we ever insisted on it in our pages, but we do believe Catholic dogma requires us to assert, at least, the indirect power contended for by Bellarmine and Suarez, unless, we would forego our logic. Without going thus far at least, all Catholic history is to us a chaos of unintelligible facts, and Catholicity itself sinks very nearly to the level of the Greek schism, and is not much better than High-Church Anglicanism. We do not question M. Gosselin's good intentions; we do not question his honest desire to serve the cause of religion, but his book is not a little repugnant to our Catholic convictions and feelings.

That the temporal authority of the Popes in the Middle Ages was a part of the

jus publicum, we certainly do not deny, but that it derived from the *jus publicum* we do not believe. The learned author seems to us, to use a homely illustration, to put the cart before the horse. The Pope preceded the constitution and laws of the states of the Middle Ages, and as a matter of fact, gave law to them, instead of receiving his title from them. They received their peculiar character from him, as the Vicar of Jesus Christ. They did not spring into existence without him, and then create him supreme arbiter of temporal affairs, but were made what they were under his arbitratorship.

He cannot adduce a single official act of Pope or Council which concedes that the temporal authority exercised was held only by a human title. On the contrary, he always claims to do it by the authority committed to him as the successor of the Prince of the Apostolic Ministry, by the authority committed to him of binding and loosing, by the authority of Almighty God, of Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords, whose minister, though unworthy, he asserts that he is,—or some such formula, which solemnly and expressly sets forth that his authority is held by divine right, by virtue of his ministry, and exercised solely in his character of Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. To this, we believe, there is not a single exception.

That the Popes wilfully erred, M. Gosselin cannot pretend; that they held the theological opinion which founds their power on divine right, that is, as private doctors so held, he concedes, or at least regards as highly probable. He will, then permit us to think that, even as private doctors, the opinion of such illustrious pontiffs as St. Gregory the Seventh, Alexander the Third, Innocent the Third, Innocent the Fourth, Boniface the Eighth, St. Pius the Fifth, and Sixtus Quintus, may weigh as much in the scale as that of the learned author of the work before us. We permit ourselves to believe that these illustrious pontiffs knew the origin and ground of their title as well as he does, and that, had they even been acquainted with his theory, they would have continued to think and act as they did. We mean no disrespect to the author, but really we have no patience with this manifest irreverence and want of filial respect and devotion to the Holy See.

Indeed, we can better endure open, avowed Protestantism itself, than stingy, narrow-minded, and frozen-hearted Gallicanism, always studying to split the difference between Peter and Cæsar, God and the Devil."—(Br. Rev. Jan. '54, p.p. 87, 88, 89, 93, 94.)

"The *Metropolitan*, by attacking us, has the appearance, in the popular mind at least, of taking the side of the temporal against the spiritual, of the State against the Church, of Cæsar against Peter, the people against God.

The opinions which we are assailed for defending, it is conceded, are not against faith, or in any sense incompatible with sound Catholic doctrine; and it cannot be denied that they have been and still are held by the great body of theologians most esteemed at Rome for their orthodoxy. No doubt Rome has tolerated the opinion held by the *Metropolitan*, but no one will pretend that it is the opinion which she favors, or that her sympathies are not with the doctrine we defend. She has never uttered a word in favor of the opinion espoused by the *Metropolitan*. Not a syllable in any official document from the Holy See can be tortured into an approbation of it; *Metropolitan* itself concedes that the language of the Popes on several occasions may seem to imply, and perhaps does imply, the doctrine we contend for.

No author was ever placed on the *Index* for asserting the indirect temporal power of the Popes, and yet Sixtus Quintus placed even Bellarmine on the *Index*, for denying their direct, and maintaining *only* their indirect, temporal authority. The presumptions throughout are unquestionably on our side, and if suspicion attaches to either opinion, it certainly is not to ours. It is they who take the contrary opinion that have the labor of vindicating their orthodoxy, not we."—(Br. Rev. April '54, p.p. 188, 189, '90.)

"Do you place, then, no confidence in what your good friends, the Gallicans, tell you? They, you know, say the Pope has no authority over temporals, and they tell you, in a bold and defiant tone, that in politics they recognize no spirit-

ual authority, and that, were the Pope to require of them to do anything against their country, that is, what they think would be against their country, they would be the first to bind on their knapsack and shoulder their musket, and rush to the battle-field to resist him? Place you no reliance on their hypothetical abuse of the Pope? And have their reiterated and most solemn declarations done nothing to reassure you?

Pshaw! you know that we are not to be come over with that sort of palaver.

I owe no duties to my country but such as are prescribed by the law of God; and the only authority the Pope has over me as a citizen is his authority as the spiritual guardian and judge of that law as binding on my conscience. He, at the very lowest, I think, is likely to interpret and apply that law justly, as is Franklin Pierce, or Chief Justice Taney, or as I should be by my own private judgment. My political sovereign has no right to demand my obedience to any order contrary to the law of God, and has not been constituted my judge to interpret authoritatively that law for me, or for any one else."—(Br. Rev. July '54, p.p. 296, 297.)

"It is of no avail for us to seek to refute this charge by loud professions of our loyalty, by abusing the Pope hypothetically, or by ransacking history to find instances of Catholics disobeying the Papal mandates. These instances our enemies are sharp-sighted enough to see are not Catholic precedents, and were in violation of Catholic Principles * * —we cannot conciliate our enemies. We may think to do it by professing extreme Gallican views, but the history of the Church proves that Gallicanism, if we so explain it that it remains Catholic, contains the offensive reservation of the freedom and independence of the spiritual order. If we so explain it as to yield that reservation, we explain away our Catholicity itself."—Br. Rev. Jan. 1855, pp. 88 and 89.

Thus have we extended our *Catena* to the very date of Chandler's speech—and shown that he quotes authorities, proofs—all of which have been denied, refuted *by authority*. What a picture the Papal organ in Congress, and the Papal organ in Boston, present of the *unity of the Church!*

We proceed to adduce other evidence, however, to show that Dr. Brownson speaks truly the Papal opinions.

We cite Rohrbacher's History—and the curious history of its endorsement, as we find it given by Dr. Brownson.

"ART. V. Both the sovereignty and the sovereign, and both the use which is made of it and those on whom it is exercised, are equally subordinated to the law of God. ART. VI. The infallible interpreter of the Divine law is the Catholic Church.

"Hence the consequences:—

"Therefore all that which regards the law of God, conscience, eternal salvation, the whole world, nations and individuals, sovereigns and subjects, are subordinated to the power of the Church, and of her chief. Hence, also, in all that which interests conscience, civil legislation is subordinated to the legislation of the Catholic Church. Hence the first axiom laid down by a French prelate, M. de Marca, in his book *De la Concorde du Sacerdoce et de l'Empire*, is, that the constitutions of princes and temporal laws contrary to the canons are absolutely null and void.

"To escape the conclusion, it is necessary either to deny to the Catholic Church the right in the last resort to decide doubts concerning the Divine law, conscience, salvation, or else to say that the temporal power and laws are not a matter which concerns the law of God, salvation, conscience.

"They will not allow that politics are subordinated to the law of God, interpreted by the Church of God; they insist that politics shall be the law to themselves; and after having thus indoctrinated kings, queens, and princes, they complain that kings, queens, and princes follow their lessons, and acknowledge, po-

litically, no moral law but their own interest. And what is most strange is, that they even blame the Church for their being no better,—the Church whom kings and princes would not suffer in the Council of Trent to proceed to their reform, as she did to that of the Popes and bishops.”—(Br. Rev. Jan. '53, p. 50, 52.)

We merely now add, to show how Rome feels towards this book, and its fundamental doctrine—the following letter from Rome:

“M. le Marquis de Narp wrote again from Rome, the 16th of February, 1847: ‘Cardinal Mai has spoken to me with the same interest of the great and admirable work of our dear Abbe Rohrbacher. “I continue to read it,” said he to me. “Will it soon be completed?” I believe it is nearly finished. “So much the better,” he added. “He ought now to experience no longer any opposition, for I have written to the Bishop of Liege to put a stop to it, and to come to an understanding with him. We have not up to the present found a word in it to blame.” Will your Eminence authorize me to say that to him? “Yes, that he may feel no inquietude.” He has for some time wished to make known the encouraging words which your Eminence has spoken in his favor. “He may do it,” said he to me.’ Such were the kind expressions of Cardinal Mai, Prefect of the Congregation of the Index, which we have been authorized to publish.”—(Br. Rev. Oct. '54 p. 430.)

We suppose we have made citations sufficient to satisfy any one that Mr. Chandler's deliverance in Congress, as to the general opinion of Roman Catholics on the temporal supremacy of the Pope, is not merely inconsistent with the whole theory of Romanism, and inconsistent with the official teachings and acts of the Popes—but more than this, that the opinions which he so solemnly avers to be the opinions of Roman Catholics, as he has gathered them from Popes, Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops and Priests, are opinions which are *denounced* and *scouted at*, as non-Catholic, semi-Protestant—nay, *atheistic*, by men formally having authority to speak, from these same Bishops, Archbishops, and the Pope himself. Who are we to believe? In this flat contradiction, which organ truly represents that unity and infallibility—the *semper ubique eadem*—the Congressman, or the appointed editor?

But this review suggests a still more curious question. How are we to account for the singular fact, that such a man as Mr. Chandler, in such a place, could have made so utter and notorious a misrepresentation. We have but one solution. His credulity was imposed upon by others less scrupulous, and that with a deliberate design to deceive the American people.

This will appear still more plainly, when we examine into the facts relating to the declarations and oaths of the Irish and English Bishops, cited by Mr. C. so triumphantly.

In order to a clear comprehension of this branch of the subject, it may be proper to premise, in a word, that about 100 years ago, Irish associations began to be formed, for the purpose of procuring relief for the British Catholics, from the civil and political disabilities under which they labored. After 20 years of agitation, a first partial relief bill passed the Parliament. After 20 years more of agitation, still further concessions were made, in 1793. After 36 years more of agitation, the final Catholic Emancipation Act, of the Peel and Wellington government, was passed in 1829.

The declarations and oaths cited by Mr. Chandler, were made in connection with these last agitations; and by way of guarantee to the Government, the emancipation act, as the relief acts before, provided that an oath be taken by Roman Catholics, on entering Parliament, declaring,—“*I do solemnly swear, that I will never exercise any privilege to which I may become entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant Religion, or Protestant Government, in the United Kingdom.*”

By the act of 1793, the Roman Catholic voter is required to swear a similar oath. Similar oaths, for other civil and ecclesiastical functionaries, were provided, all in accordance with the declarations cited by Mr. C.

Now let us inquire as to the views now taken of these declarations and oaths, once the British Catholics have gotten what they wanted.

In a copy of one of these *Declarations* of these Irish Bishops, now before us, we observe, that they repel, as a most unjust and cruel slander, the imputation, that they believe the church property of Ireland of right belongs to the Roman Catholics, who may hereafter set up a claim to it.

But in 1852, in a famous letter from the Irish Archbishop of Tuam, addressed to Earl Derby, first Minister of the Crown, that dignitary officially and publicly declares:—

“Those ecclesiastical funds, so long misused, should, after the life-interests of the present occupants, revert to their original faith. * * It is fortunate that there remains such a fund for the erection and endowment of Catholic Schools, and the building of Catholic churches. * * It will be an act of just and *tardy restitution* of property long diverted from its legitimate objects,” &c.

So much for the regard Romish Archbishops in Ireland, pay to the “declarations” quoted by Mr. Chandler. Nor does the Archbishop of Tuam have any more regard to the oaths above referred to. In the same letter, just quoted from, he declares, moreover, “that the days of the establishment are numbered.” That “they *instructed their representatives* not to wait, nor take office, nor favor of any kind, from any minister, until *the country is eased of the burden of that establishment.*”

Such is the Irish sense of the obligation of these oaths. Now, the London Quarterly Review, taking note of this *perjury*—the great papal organ in the U. S.—thus coolly discusses the whole affair, so confidently relied upon by Mr. C.

“Great Britain then threw open the Imperial Parliament to Catholics, as she had already done to Dissenters, and recognized them as subjects and free citizens of the empire. In so doing, she made her Protestant Church a monstrous anomaly in her constitution, and really committed herself to its annihilation as a State religion. A party resolutely opposed to it, strong enough in spite of its influence to recover their liberties as electors and senators, could have no disposition to sustain it, and could hardly prove unable, in the long run, to withdraw from it the support of the State. *C'est le premier pas qui coûte.*”

"It is not our province to criticize the declarations and oaths cited by the reviewer. We presume them to be such as a Catholic can take without heresy or schism, otherwise they would have been condemned by authority; but we say for ourselves, personally, that we would be hung, drawn, and quartered before we would subscribe to them."

"The tendency of English Catholics, as well before as at the period of the so-called Reformation, was to regard the Pope as an Italian potentate, rather than as their own chief, and to restrict, as much as possible without falling into absolute heresy or schism, the Papal authority in favor of the temporal sovereign."

"There are propositions in the illustrious Dr. Doyle's evidence before Parliament, which few Catholics in England or Ireland to-day would accept without important modifications. English and Irish Catholics have turned with renewed affection to Rome, and have drawn closer the bands which bind them to the chair of Peter. The Pope is not for them now a foreign potentate; he is their chief, their loving Father, to whom they wish to comport themselves as dutiful, submissive, and loving children."

"There are, no doubt, in England and Ireland, as well as in this country, some timid Catholics who retain their old prejudices, and who would feel themselves insulted if called Papists. These may think such Catholics as Cardinal Wiseman and the Archbishop of Dublin, with their true Roman spirit, are pushing matters too fast and too far; but though at times seemingly half prepared to give up Peter for Cæsar, they are after all Catholics, and will follow those whom they would never have the pluck to lead. They may grumble a little, but they will remain united with their brethren. As for frightening the others back into the Catholicity of the Gallican school, that is simply out of the question."

"This change, on which we congratulate our Transatlantic brethren, does not in the least violate the conditions on which the Catholic Relief Bill was granted, for it must be presumed to have been a contingency foreseen and accepted by the government. The government may have hoped, and even believed, that English and Irish Catholics would, as a matter of fact, remain Gallican, but it knew that NEITHER IT NOR ANY DECLARATIONS OF ENGLISH OR IRISH BISHOPS COULD BIND THEM TO REMAIN SO, BECAUSE IT KNEW THAT THE ULTIMATE AUTHORITY IN THE CASE IS ROME, NOT THE NATIONAL BISHOPS, AND THAT NO DECLARATIONS OF THE LATTER COULD BIND, AGAINST THE APPROBATION, OR EVEN PERMISSION, OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF. Ultramontanism, as it is called, if not precisely of faith, is yet, AS ALL THE WORLD KNOWS, not only permitted, BUT FAVORED BY ROME, as the very name implies, and no Catholic can be forbidden to hold it, or censured for insisting on it. The government could not, therefore, grant Catholic emancipation without conceding to every Catholic the right to hold and insist on it if he choose."—(Br. Rev. Jan. '53, p.p. 113, 121, 122, 123, 125, '6.)

Such of our readers as remember the disgust expressed by the great lights of English literature, in 1828 and '9—Brougham, Macauley, and especially Sidney Smith—at the narrow minded Anti-Popery suspiciousness of the English people—will probably come to the conclusion, that great men and politicians are not always infallible in their judgment of what human nature is. We commend this piece of history to our extremely liberal politicians.

While on this subject of Irish oaths—one other illustration suggests itself, as precisely to the point of the claims of the Pope in temporals. We refer to the oath so often pressed upon Irish Roman Catholics, in every reign, from James I. to George III;—and always steadfastly refused, until the beginning of the effort to get the Relief Bills passed—declaring, either in express terms, or in effect, that they held that the *Pope had no power to depose Kings for heresy*, (the very point Mr. Chandler speaks to.) That oath the Irish were

not allowed by Rome to take. It was *condemned at Rome* in the reign of James I. It was proposed in a milder form by liberal Catholics in the reign of Charles II, *and again condemned at Rome*. And though taken by the Irish gentry, and many of the clergy, at last, in order to aid them in getting the Relief Bill—*it has never yet been approved at Rome*. In 1835 the Bishop of Malta then become a British dependency, being invited to take a seat at the Council Board, declined this oath of qualification, and referred the matter to Rome. Near the close of that year, the Cardinal Secretary of State, Beretti, gave officially this answer:—

“The form of oath having been examined, *it is found that it is not approvable by the Holy See, and that IT NEVER HAS BEEN APPROVED.*”

Thus then, it appears, the parties to the solemn oaths and declarations, relied upon as a demonstration by Mr. Chandler, simply played a great trick upon the British politicians and the British government. Does Mr. Chandler suppose, that whilst the leaders of his sect, on both sides the Atlantic, are chuckling at the success of the trick, and not pretending to conceal it, that he—or rather those who speak through him—can repeat it upon the American politicians?

And now for the benefit of such of our readers as will have been shocked at the uncharitableness of our supposition, that Mr. Chandler, or more properly, those who used Mr. Chandler as their mouth piece in Congress, *designed* to practice a deception upon the American people, in reference to the opinions of the Papists on the subject of the Pope's supremacy in Temporals—we propose by way of supplement to show—that by some at least of their popular writers, the lawfulness of such deception is openly advocated, to an extent which fully justifies us in suspecting any such statements of Papal opinions as Mr. Chandler's—though enforced by all the solemnity of an oath, volunteered on the occasion. Our limits forbid the quotation of more than a few passages.

The first we take from a recent popular Popish work, entitled, “*Jesus the Son of Mary*,”—or the doctrine of the Incarnation of God the Son, considered in its bearings upon the reverence shown by Catholics to his blessed Mother—By Rev. John Brand Morris—now one of the Professors at Prior Park, London, 1851. Dedicated to Cardinal Wiseman.

The author having asserted, that when our Saviour (Mark 13: 32) said: “But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the Angels in Heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father,”—*He disguised His real meaning*, though he knew that people would draw a conclusion from His words, just the opposite to that meaning—and that this answer of our Lord is an *evasive climax*—thus proceeds:

“Hence it is clear, that if a number of passages can be quoted from the Fathers, in which the ignorance is ascribed to Christ's human nature without more ado, such passages may be nothing more *than a convenient answer to PRESENT DIFFICULTIES*, and not in the least a statement of their real doctrine upon the sub-

ject. Until the reverse of this can be distinctly proved, it will not avail to quote these passages in defence of the Ignorantists [Agnoetæ.] There is no Catholic divine now-a-days, probably, who would not admit that SUCH EVASIVE ANSWERS WERE NOT ONLY NO LIES, BUT ABSOLUTELY ALLOWABLE WHEN IMPERTINENT QUESTIONS WERE PUT. FOR IT IS ALWAYS LAWFUL TO LEAD A MAN AWAY FROM A GREATER SIN BY LEADING HIM TO A LESS. Now if the Fathers could lead the HERETICS TO BLASPHEME THE HUMAN NATURE OF CHRIST, to do so was to lead them to a LESS SIN THAN blaspheming his Divine nature, which blasphemy might never be forgiven, neither in this world nor in purgatory." Vol. I. p. 265.—Br. Rev. July '52, p. 308.

And now to show farther, that Mr. Morris is not alone in holding this Jesuitical doctrine, we adduce one more very high Papal authority, for the statement, that converts to Popery from Protestants—as a class—are all prone to this sin,—if so, the fact that Mr. Chandler himself is an apostate from Protestantism, is of itself a full and satisfactory solution of the whole matter. No less a personage than Dr. Brownson, in the great endorsed Papal organ, says:

"This is not the first time we have encountered this detestable doctrine, (i. e., the lawfulness of lying for a pious purpose,) among the Tractarian converts."

"We found it in Dr. Newman's Essay on Development; we have found it in some of their contributions to *The Dublin Review*, and it seems to have been adopted by the whole school, both before and since their conversion. THE MOST DISINGENUOUS PUBLICATION WE RECOLLECT EVER TO HAVE READ WAS THE FAMOUS TRACT No. 90, WRITTEN BY DR. NEWMAN BEFORE HIS CONVERSION. The position of the whole school was a PRACTICAL LIE, and its more distinguished members were laboring with all their might to teach their Church, while they confessed her right to teach them, and made as if they learned only from her. THEY THUS CONTRACTED A HABIT OF DISINGENUOUS WRITING, WHICH, while it suggested their meaning so plainly that nobody could really mistake it, yet did not often positively commit them to any thing for which their Church could call them to an account."—(Br. Rev. July '52, p. 313.)

"There can be no question that there is at this moment a strong public excitement against Catholics and Catholicity in the country. The very successes of the Know-Nothings prove it. As to the more immediate causes of this excitement, there may be some difference of opinion. Some Catholic journals have not hesitated to ascribe it to the inconsiderate zeal and ultraism of some converts, among whom the first rank is given to ourselves and our highly gifted friend, Bakewell, editor of the late SHEPHERD OF THE VALLEY. IT IS VERY WELL, NO DOUBT, TO THROW THE BLAME UPON US POOR CONVERTS, WHO OF COURSE HAVE NO PARTY TO PROTECT US, AND TO MAKE US RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HOSTILITY FELT TOWARDS CATHOLICS. There is something GENEROUS AND MANLY IN SUCH A PROCEEDING. At least, such a proceeding is safe. But if our Catholic journals had merely said that we and our friends have produced excitement amongst Catholics themselves by our fearless assertion of the absolute necessity of the Catholic faith to salvation, and our high-toned doctrines on the freedom of religion and the supremacy of the spiritual power, they would not have been far out of the way; but if they suppose that we, by the things that we allege, have excited the active hostility of the American people against the Church, we can tell them that they have fallen into a great mistake."—(Br. Rev. Oct. '54 p. 478.)

With such avowals before us, in the current writings of Papal authors—dedicated to Cardinal Wiseman, and endorsed by the Papal Hierarchy in the United States, we perhaps ought not to be surprised at such specimens of Popery as Messrs. Mallory and Chandler have given the Congress of the United States. We have submitted, however, the testimony—witnesses certainly unimpeachable as to the points before us—and leave it to our readers to determine how far we have made good the proof of our propositions.

WHO SHOULD BE JUST AND MAKE THE AMENDE?

STUART ROBINSON TO DR. MCKINNEY.

To Rev. David McKinney, Editor of the Presbyterian Banner:—

The Conductors of the Critic responded in No. 3 to your call for the *Amende* to Dr. Musgrave, by a simple denial that in so far as concerns the publishing by the Southern Presbyterian Review, or the re-publishing in the Critic of the article to which you refer, there is any ground for the complaint of *personality*;—independent of the aspect which the Watchman's Correspondent gives the statements of the article in repeating them, in another form, and adding to them; and farther by the declaration that the original article contains no statements of facts which you do not substantially confirm.

Feeling averse to occupying the Critic or troubling my associates with matters merely personal, either to myself or any body else, I had hoped the paragraph in No. 3 would be the extent of the demand of this subject on our pages. That, contrary to expectation, I now recur to the matter, neither my associates nor our readers will complain, when they shall have known the reasons which have led me to respond to you through the Critic.

Whilst the paragraph in No. 3 was all that the occasion demanded of the Critic, as such—yet as the author of the article in the "Southern Presbyterian Review," and therefore first responsible, I felt called upon to demand of the Banner to *do* justice as well as *claim* justice;—in so far at least as to copy the few lines from my article which gave rise to all this ado; in order that your readers might know what I *did say*. For it is somewhat remarkable, that after all the hue and cry raised against the article in the Southern Presbyterian Review, up to this time, not a Journal that has railed at it—has ever quoted from it in any intelligible and true connection, a single paragraph by way of illustrating to their readers its awful heresies.

This very reasonable request, to my great surprise, you saw proper in effect to deny me—and that too on grounds more surprising still than the denial itself. In order, however, that the church may judge fairly between us, I here insert in full my note, and your response, which (regarding it as official and not private) I feel justified in doing.

BALTIMORE, *March 12th.**Editors Banner:*

At the close of your remarks under the head "Be Just," in response to some anonymous correspondent of the "Watchman and Observer," last week you call upon the Southern Presbyterian Review which published, and the Critic which re-published certain remarks on the Boards of the Church to make the "*amende* which becomes Christian journalists"—for "giving form and currency to unjust and injurious allegations," &c.

As the author of the article in question—and therefore first respon-

sible for it, while I feel much obliged for the very kind and dignified manner in which you speak of the matter—you must allow me to ask of you to “be just,” and make the *amende* of which you will acknowledge the propriety and the justice, by publishing for the benefit of your readers the paragraph of my article to which you refer. This will be at once the proper *amende* to me, and at the same time, as I doubt not your readers will judge, the best *amende* from me to the party or parties whom you seem to suppose I have injured. Nothing more is needful than to call your attention to the paragraph as originally written, independent of any comment or addition by the writer to whom you respond, to satisfy you and your readers, that in that paragraph there is not a line which can, charitably, be construed into an offensive personality to any gentleman in the Board’s office. That it is wholly directed at things, not persons—“principles not men.” That it states as facts, nothing but what you fully confirm in your remarks. Nay, states them not even as strongly as you state them. That at most, the only error is in a perhaps, improper use of the technical term “protest” for a general expression of opposition to an election (*not the man.*)

In so far as concerns the application of your remarks to me, I am content to let the matter be determined by a candid reading of this paragraph,

Yours, truly,

STUART ROBINSON.

The paragraph to which reference is made, is as follows:

“And yet, while professors in Theological Seminaries must be called to their office by the voice of the whole church through the Assembly, these officers, to whom so much power is entrusted, are appointed frequently by the voice of a handful of men in one city. Probably no Secretary of any of our Boards has been elected for years past, by a vote of one-third even of the members of the Board whom he serves. The present Secretary of the Board of Publication, holds his office by vote of a majority of a larger meeting of his Board, than has occurred for years past, and yet that meeting consisted of less than one-third of the whole body. One of his predecessors in office, (Dr. Musgrave,) was elected at a smaller meeting, and then by a majority of *one* vote, which *one* vote was subsequently discovered to have been given in mistake by a gentleman who did not know even that he was *not* a member of the Board. We wish not to be understood as selecting this Board for illustration, because of anything peculiar in its history. This is contrary to the facts. The last election of a Secretary by the Board of Missions, was by a still smaller fraction of the Board, and that too, in the face of a protest spread upon the Minutes by some of the most influential members among even that small number. These facts are cited to show how little responsibility attaches to most important offices of the church under this system,—and that if, in view of such facts, there be those in the church who occasionally express doubts of the absolute perfection of the present methods, they should not be regarded in the light of enemies of the Boards, or of the men who control them.”

To this I received from you the following response:

Philadelphia, March 14th, 1855.

REV. STUART ROBINSON:—

Dear Sir—Yours of the 12th was received late last night, and I go to press to-night. It seems to me not to meet the case. If the “*Critic*” had simply quoted the “*Review*,” it might have passed. Then only the Board and a Secretary—the *one who preceded the then occupant*, would have been implicated. But *per-*

sonality is given by adding in brackets, Dr. Musgrave's name; making the impression that he accepted office when elected by a majority of but *one* vote, and that vote by a person not a member of the Board. Dr. Musgrave is thus presented, by name, in a most dishonorable light. This, if it were my case, would be deemed painfully personal. What I suppose the "Critic" would be pleased to state to its readers was, that Dr. M. declined the appointment of Secretary, till the Board reconsidered their vote and made the election *unanimous*.

Your article, while entirely kind and gentlemanly toward the Banner, perpetuates what I cannot but regard as a serious wrong to Dr. Musgrave, and if I give it a place I should feel bound to accompany it with remarks. This would complicate the matter, and I ask myself, *cui bono*?

If on reflection you insist on the appearance of your article, let me know at your *early* leisure.

With great respect, yours truly,

DAVID MCKINNEY.

I presume that you hardly supposed, that "on reflection I would insist on the appearance of the article." Under the construction of my note as an attempt "to meet the case" in a manner "that might have passed;" under this re-iteration of a construction of the paragraph you were requested to copy, which makes it place Dr. Musgrave in a "dishonorable light," and that too, by so nice a distinction between Dr. Musgrave "*in brackets*," and the Secretary of the Board of Missions *out of brackets*; and under this suggested hint as to what you suppose "the Critic would have been pleased to state to its readers," which indicates as one of the purposes of your article, to draw from the Critic some sugared compliment, (such as I am sorry to observe a growing taste for in Philadelphia;) my reflections on the subject have led me in an entirely different direction, as you will have discovered, before I close this letter.

You must pardon me for saying in all candor, that this response of yours, is so unlike the fair and candid Editor of the Banner, that suspicious inquiries flashed upon me in reading it, that had not before occurred to me. Was this editorial "Be Just," wholly spontaneous on Dr. McKinney's part? Why should the Banner volunteer so readily to step forward and take up the challenge thrown out to the Presbyterian by name, in the Watchman? Why this novel and surprising reversal, not only of the order of position of the combatants under the code of honor, but of *the order of nature*—the Banner fighting the Presbyterian's *battle as principal*—the Presbyterian copying and endorsing, so formally and cordially, the Banner? Is it, that the chivalrous impulses of my old friend of the Banner cannot be restrained by mere questions of form and courtesy, from the instant redress of injured innocence? Then what has become of the Presbyterian's better impulses, that though called upon by name, to vindicate injured innocence (if it be such,) he shrinks back until some truer champion steps forward to the lead? And then, too, this universal "passing round" of the Banner's article by every journal of the church, save perhaps the Home and Foreign Record, which though prompt to copy the Reportery's laudation of the Secretary's speech in the Assembly, has not yet ventured this? Then again,

how happens it, that "*one of the opposition*" as he calls himself, should suddenly be metamorphosed into the leading organ in defence of the administration, and that with a zeal that overlooks all obligations of justice, to an unfortunate unofficial like myself? Is rumor right then, in reporting such a re-arrangement of the elements in the Cabinet, since Dr. McElroy's projects of agitation have begun to alarm them—as changes "*one of the opposition*" into the favorite nominee (contingently) of the Secretary of the Board, for the Secretaryship of the co-ordinate bureau?

By this time you are almost angry at me, for suggesting such suspicions and such a clue to the article "*Be Just.*" Very well: I do not say that I continue to entertain these suspicions—or that I endorse these rumors. Even if I thought them well-founded they would not lessen my esteem for you—nor my confidence in the honesty and fairness of your intention; but only lead me to make the usual allowance, while reading your article, for the influences which such a change of affairs must naturally exert over your mind. It is no unusual thing for "*one of the opposition*" before the coming of an administration into power, to become less violent in opposition, or even friendly,—once the administration is in power. This is precisely the great trouble—the root of most of the trouble we find in all efforts to reform evils and abuses, in the executive departments of the Church.

But I have altogether another purpose, in suggesting these ungracious things to you. It is to enable you to comprehend the probable cause of your mistake in interpreting what I have said of the Boards and their elections—by illustrating how readily another sense may be put upon the written words of a writer, if "*oral tradition,*" in the shape of all manner of silly and absurd rumors, are to furnish the key by which his writing is to be interpreted. But for such silly gossip, touching my hostility to the Secretary of the Board of Missions, personally, current in Philadelphia, and through Philadelphia spreading elsewhere, ever since the day on which the Assembly, in obedience to the plainest calls of the interests of the church, but in opposition to the mere dogmatism and the wounded vanity of Philadelphia, formed the Synod of Baltimore, I and others have been held up as dangerous agitators—enemies of the Boards; hostile too, not from principle, but from *personal feeling*, to the Secretary of the Board of Missions; and in the light of that rumor any thing that I proposed in the Assembly, or since, in reference to the policy of the Boards, has been interpreted. I complained of this publicly on the floor of the Assembly, and disavowed any hostility either to the Boards or the men directing their affairs; and it is not in accordance with my notion of self respect, to be repeating the disavowal in every paragraph I may write on the subject. In so far as concerns the paragraph touching the three elections in the Boards, Dr. Musgrave was before my mind, as an individual object of like or dislike, about as prominently, as John Doe or Richard Roe, may be supposed to be individually, before the mind of an old fashioned lawyer, in draw-

ing up his pleadings. But as it seems impossible, in any other way, to point out to some of you, this cause of error in your interpretation of my article, I have taken the liberty of showing you, how this rule of allowing rumor and gossip to furnish a key, if a fair one, might give a new face even to your apparently candid article, "Be Just."

As, however, my remonstrances against such a construction, do not, in your opinion, "meet the case," and you seem disposed to force me into this issue on mere incidental facts, cited by me in illustration of the inconsistency, of so much care in the election of Theological Professors—and so much carelessness in the far more important election of Secretaries—I shall (without thereby intending to change my position in denying any personality in the article,) proceed to gratify your wishes, in so far at least as to show that every incidental statement I made is true; and more is true; and that the two elections of Dr. Musgrave fully verify all that I have asserted, as to the anomalous, and objectionable out-working of the present method of electing Secretaries of the Board. Recurring now to the original paragraph—let us examine one by one its several statements, and on what grounds I made them.

1. "That Secretaries of Boards are often appointed by a handful of men in one city—no Secretary for years past has probably been elected by a vote of one-third of the Board."

This general proposition no one has dared to deny. It therefore stands with all the important reflections which it suggests, admitted.

2. "The present Secretary of the Board of Publication, (Mr. Schenk) though elected at the largest meeting held for years, holds office by a majority of a meeting of less than one-third. This I say from personal knowledge, having been at the meeting—of 27 of us out of 104. Mr. Schenk was really elected by a vote of 14 out of the 104—but so far as I could learn, received the cordial concurrence of those who voted for others. This is not disputed—nor is the statement complained of as *personal* to Mr. Schenk. Why not, if the succeeding statements are unjust personalities?"

3. "One of his predecessors (Dr. Musgrave) was elected at a smaller meeting by a majority of one vote—which one vote was discovered to have been given by a gentleman who did not know even that he was not a member of the Board."

This is the statement which you volunteer to correct, as an "error into which I have fallen." Do you correct it? Does the Presbyterian mean to say that your response to this head is "full and satisfactory?" You represent me as saying that Dr. Musgrave was elected by a "*small majority at first.*" I said a very different thing—a great deal stronger thing—that he was *not elected* "*at first*" *really at all* as was "afterward discovered"—his majority of *one* being altogether fictitious! And I said it in proof of the fact—how little concern was had about these important offices. Do you pretend to deny the statement? Nay, you speak at random—as I shall show you—vaguely affirming, that "the nominee would not accept, till

the Board reconsidered its vote." The Presbyterian would never have made this representation of the case, nor will they "endorse its facts," except in the New School-fashion, for "substance of doctrine." For the Editors of the Presbyterian were present at that election—you were not. Now, sir, you having set the example of going into detail of the private doings and feelings of the members of the Board at these elections—will hardly complain of me, if in self-defence I follow your lead. I happen to know better than you, the facts in this case, and will return your kind endeavor to correct the "Critic" by mere hearsay—by correcting your errors from *written memoranda of facts*—which have been kindly furnished me by one who being on the ground at the time of that election had better opportunity than you to know, and by written memoranda to *remember*. For paper and ink do not, like treacherous memory, lose all details, and change with change of administrations and feelings. Let me give you the history of that election—as it lay before my mind when I wrote the paragraph you complain of—but which being altogether out of the line of my purpose and argument, I cited only so much of as bear on my main point. I condense into the briefest space possible the statement furnished me.

"The name of Dr. Musgrave had been rather suddenly proposed. There were 21 members of the Board present at the meeting, (21 out of 104). The two names canvassed were Rev. W. H. Ruffner and Dr. Musgrave. Three gentlemen intending to vote for Mr. Ruffner, gave notice at the opening of the meeting that they could not remain after 5 o'clock—and urged that if the election be gone into it shall be at once. The election however was put off. At 5 o'clock these gentlemen left the meeting, leaving 18 present. The election was gone into. One leading member of the Board nominating Dr. Musgrave—another equally prominent member nominating Mr. Ruffner. The vote stood for Dr. Musgrave 9, for Mr. Ruffner 7, for Janeway 1, Blank 1. The chairman (who of course must have voted) pronounced the blank *no* vote—and therefore Dr. M. elected!

"A day or two after, the member who nominated Dr. Musgrave, meeting Mr. Ruffner—informed that gentleman that there was much bad feeling in consequence of the proceeding—and expressed to him grave apprehension of painful consequences. That Dr. M. was obnoxious to some of the members—and particularly that the three gentlemen who had retired from the meeting were indignant that the election had been held after what had passed, and threatened agitation and exposure. And moreover that as it turned out, Dr. M. had not been elected at all; (you say, merely, *he would not accept!*) for one voter was not a member of the Board; and then appealing to Mr. Ruffner expressed the opinion that the peace of the church was in his hands. Another influential member who voted for Dr. M. called on Mr. Ruffner, and urged the same fears of trouble—that a new election must be had, and that the friends of Mr. R. were breathing out threatenings, &c. Mr. Ruffner declared that he had no re-

sponsibility for the use of his name at first—and if trouble must come from the use of it again—he would forbid his name to be used.

“At the meeting of the Board again, for an election, the same leading member nominated Dr. Musgrave—the same member again nominated Mr. Ruffner. The gentleman who last called on Mr. Ruffner arose and announced that he had authority from Mr. Ruffner to say, *that his name should not be used*. The election of Dr. M. was then of course carried by default—only the member who nominated Mr. Ruffner still voting for him, and declaring there was “foul play,” &c.”

Now sir, here is the statement of the facts as I had them before me substantially, when I wrote. This is what I had been told in Philadelphia, and the facts as they have been stated to me since in writing.

Am I to be held up as the propagator of injurious statements, when with such information, I refer to public transactions in illustration of what I conceive to be wrong tendencies in the church?

4. There remains yet the statement in my paragraph—“The late election of a Secretary to the Board of Missions, was by a still smaller fraction of the Board and that too in face of a protest spread upon the minutes by some of the most influential members.”

So far from attempting to show that this is an incorrect statement, you affirm every point still more strongly—(save a technicality about the “protest,”) a great deal more, and what is a great deal worse for the Board. You aver

1. That the Secretary of the Board of Missions, “the vast and irresponsible power” of which office, I was illustrating when I wrote my paragraph, *was elected by a not large majority of a meeting of 21 out of 96 members of the Board*, that is by the votes of about one-eighth of the body! “Here,” you add, “the facts end.” No, sir! according to your own showing, there are other not less surprising facts, connected with this election. You declare farther

2. That this election, by some 12 votes out of 96, was in the face of “an opposition to going into the election on that day,” on the ground of its being a special meeting, and the absent members not having been notified!

3. That this meeting of 21 members out of 96 was held to be “a meeting unusually large!”

Now in view of your own statement, I appeal to your own candor, was not my statement of these facts in illustration of my argument, extremely moderate?

You make the point indeed that there was no “protest.” There was not, technically speaking; but a demand for a record of the votes in opposition to going into the election, is certainly not far from a protest against it. As to your statements, that there was not any opposition to Dr. Musgrave—that the meetings were very orderly, and that Dr. Musgrave behaved himself very handsomely in the matter, and that he had the full confidence of the brethren, &c.—

these are matters of too vague a nature, to be subjects of specific proof, especially to find proof, now after a two years administration in the office. I said nothing about any opposition to Dr. M. personally, or any want of confidence in him. It was not in the line of my argument to have any thing to say of him. But now that you insist upon putting such construction on my remarks, allow me to say, that I have reason to believe that there *was* opposition felt. For though I cannot of course know as much of the matter from personal observation as you, who were a member, and present at the meeting, I remember very distinctly to have heard in Philadelphia expressions of strongest opposition at the time. And on referring to some private letters I find one from a friend, who is likely to be as well posted as yourself, and as worthy the confidence of the church, written too, before any dispute arose as to the facts, saying that: "On the transfer of Dr. M. to the Board of Missions, a *protest was talked of. There was a considerable* and very *influential* minority against him then, and some of them were full of ——." (the blank is the writer's own.)

I hope, sir, that by this time I have satisfied both you and the public that, whatever the state of case may be, and whatever light it may place any one in, I have not been guilty of "giving form and currency to unjust and injurious allegations, without due effort to ascertain their correctness." I had the very best reason to believe that all I stated was true. I have the best reason to believe it still. The information on which I rested, is on authority as respectable even as the editor of the Banner. So far, however, from any desire to give form and currency to injurious statements, or to reflect on the Secretary of the Board, I have desired simply the favor of having my very moderate and inoffensive statement fairly made in your columns, with the disavowal of any thing personal in it. This request you have chosen to interpret into an attempt to "meet the case" in a way "that might pass." I trust I have now met the case to the satisfaction of all parties. With your assurances to the church that the Secretary of the Board is worthy of all confidence;—of his manifestation of principle so "gentlemanly, noble and Christian," I have nothing to do. Personally I have no more objection to that gentleman than to yourself. If I choose to differ with you in opinion as to his eminent fitness and qualifications for what I consider the most responsible post in the church, it is my right and my duty, as a minister of the church, to express that dissent, on any proper occasion. No such occasion having occurred, I have not felt called upon to express my assent to, or dissent from, your high opinion of his merits, as an officer. I have spoken only of public affairs of the church as I had a right to speak. The Boards are public bodies—the Secretaries public men. Allow me to add, sir, that the interests involved in the Boards are too immense to permit any longer, this gingerly style of speech, concerning their public doings. The church will want some more tangible guarantees as the basis of her confidence,

than empty complimentary passages from the Banner. And though our Presbyterian people may for a while be kept quiet, by assurances echoed and re-echoed, that those who venture to protest and object against such proceedings, are mere disappointed revolutionists, who were "voted down," in the Assembly—in voting of which no record can be found in the journals,) yet they will in due time discover who are the true friends of the Boards and their work.

STUART ROBINSON.

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

THE CANT OF INFIDELITY.—*Westminster Review.*

The time was, when that vague and undefined thing called *cant*, was regarded as one of the distinctive marks of Puritanism, Methodism, and other forms of religion, which recognized the fact of supernatural communication between the soul of man and the invisible God: and every man, in the Church or out of it, who wished to be free from the slightest suspicion of vulgar fanaticism, and to maintain some degree of decent respectability before the world, cautiously abstained from the use of any modes of expression which smacked of the barn and the conventicle. Even John Foster employed his great powers in the production of an essay on "Some of the Causes by which Evangelical Religion has been rendered unacceptable to Persons of Cultivated Taste:" and among these causes, enumerates "the peculiarity of language adopted in the discourses and books of its teachers, as well as in the religious conversation and correspondence of some of its adherents." But now it has come to pass, through the efforts of that good man and other nervous people, equally afraid of shocking the sensibilities of men of taste:—that our discourses are laudably exempt from the offensive terms and phrases, and even the Spectator, if it could resume its sceptre over the domain of style and diction, would hardly deem it necessary to ransack the antiquities of the illiterate parts of Scotland, and bring to light "one Andrew Cant," a poor Presbyterian Parson, as the most eminent example of the despicable thing which bears his name. We think that "men of taste" ought to be satisfied now: since, in many pulpits, classic elegance is so firmly enthroned, as not only to exclude *cant*, but many of the ideas that our "illiterate" fathers canted about. Nay, the very term *salvation*—*cant*, thoroughly, as it is—is obsolete, in some quarters, in its old sense, as implying the alternative of a penal doom: and if this be gone, where is the need of retaining any other?

But what has become of cant, driven from its old quarters? It has taken refuge in the enemies' camp. Let any man read Newman's "Phases of Faith," the Westminster Review, or any writings of the "Chapman" school; and he will understand what we mean. Infidels, now-a-days, talk so very piously: they relate such savoury experiences; they are so "earnest-minded," so "spiritual," have so much "insight" into the soul, the universe, and God: that we might blush at our own low and carnal condition, if we were not, unfortunately, beset with doubts in reference to the sincerity of the men. It was fashionable with this class to stigmatize the old Puritans, and their ecclesiastical successors, as canting hypocrites. We shall not retort the charge, until we ask, in all seriousness, which of the two classes best deserves the name? "By their fruits shall ye know them." What have infidels, as such, done for the civilization and amelioration of their race? Do their doctrines concerning the nature of man, his origin and destiny, his obligations and his hopes, elevate him in the scale of existence, and inspire him with any cravings after real progress? What good has been done by all their cant about "insight," and "the higher regions of living faith?" If they had zeal enough to go to the Feejee Islands, with their "spiritual" gospel, would the cannibal abandon his monstrous notions about dietetics, on the information that he, the said cannibal, is inspired; that he has a dormant faculty of insight, and in sober truth, is a God? Of all the detestable forms in which infidelity ever presents itself to the miserable victims of delusion, the most detestable is that of "an angel of light:" coming with a halo of glory about its head, with pious phrases in its mouth, and a golden chalice in its hand: professing to give the "elixir vite" to the perishing children of darkness and despair, and, really, giving them the sparkling poison, which first exhilarates, then stupifies, then kills. It points to the forbidden fruit, beautiful to the eye, and, in

honeyed accents says: "Ye shall not surely die: in the day ye eat thereof ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil;"—men eat, their eyes *are* opened—the promise of the tempter is fulfilled—but opened to look upon irrecoverable and everlasting ruin.

These remarks have been suggested by the article on Contemporary Literature, in the last number of the Westminster Review. But there is nothing *especially* arrogant, supercilious, or malignant in it. It is only "instar omnium." We express our solemn conviction, when we say, that to a certain order of minds in this country, nothing can be more dangerous, than the extremely pious cant of this Radical Quarterly. It is a matter of just astonishment, that our religious newspapers, generally, notice it so often, without an adequate protest against its villainous hypocrisy.

AN HISTORICAL VINDICATION OF THE ABRIGATION OF THE PLAN OF UNION, *by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., by Rev. Isaac V. Brown, A. M.* Philadelphia: Wm. S. & Alfred Martien, 1855.

"Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?"—is the very pertinent question which Mr. Brown puts on the title-page of his book:—and by which he gives fair warning, at the start, to all men, whether in the Old or New School Body, whether Ministers, or Elders, or Laymen, that he intends to tell the truth; and if, now and then, the truth should bear hard or seem like a libel upon any of them—he is not to be blamed for it: they are not to make *him* an enemy, because *they* had not faith and firmness enough to contend for the right, in the hour of darkness and trial. We heartily approve of the following extract from the Preface:—"Since a considerable portion of every community cherish the impression that it is wrong to expose the errors and censure the characters of clergymen, as it tends to diminish their influence by lowering their standing in society, a question has been raised by some, whether it is right to execute such a sketch or volume, as necessarily involves these results. Is not the cause of religion, they ask, injured by such criticisms and exposures? It must be admitted, that it has a chilling influence upon the faith and manners of the people at large, and upon the church itself, to see those very men, who are set as patterns and defenders of truth, purity, and fidelity to trust; foremost in daring and prominence to propagate errors, violate pledges, rend peaceful communities, and shamelessly deny or pervert those great truths of the Christian religion, which they are bound by most solemn sanctions to cherish and protect. Truths and obligations which their leaders sport with, the people will lightly esteem. This dissatisfaction

with strict scrutiny into the *principles* and *conduct* of clergymen, is founded, in part, upon indifference to pure consistent religion; and still more, upon the false assumption that it is no matter what a man, or even a minister believes, provided he is tolerably correct in his opinions and actions. But sound theologians and moralists believe, that *truth* is in order to *godliness*, and that the life cannot be right where the head, if not the heart, is wrong."

The very fact, that the influence of clergymen is so great—that they are regarded as the highest representatives or exponents of the Gospel, in the departments both of faith and manners—that the tone of religion rises or falls with them—makes it all the more necessary, that their aberrations from the rule should be noted and rebuked; especially, if the rule be one which they have solemnly sworn to, before God and man.

"If thou, being a Jew"—said the noble Apostle of the Gentiles to Peter, when he saw that the Apostle of the Circumcision and Barnabas walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel—"if thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" Paul did not hesitate to withstand to the face and to blame before all, an inconsistency of conduct in the foremost of the Apostles, even at the imminent peril of shaking the confidence of the church in the infallibility of his *teaching* also. Why then should our nerves be so shocked, when the errors and weaknesses of those even who "seem to be pillars," are rebuked, seeing that infallibility is to be found no where on earth, save in the community of Rome? Let only this rule govern us:—"Whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God"—and no harm can come of calling clergymen, as well as other men, into question. We cannot read men's hearts, and, therefore, may not judge them: but we are required, by our Master, to judge their principles and conduct; and, if they speak not, and do not the thing that is right, to decline saying "God speed" to them.

In a case like this—a great controversy in the bosom of one of the largest and most powerful denominations in the country; a controversy, whose momentous issues, involving nothing less than the essential elements of the great scheme of grace and the fundamental principles of church-order, have naturally awakened the intensest interest of all concerned, and incidentally roused the lurking evil in the hearts of some of the wisest and the best:—a controversy, the nature of which, though it ought to be clear enough to all in its principles, and many of its beneficent results, a desperate attempt is now making to obscure, mystify and pervert—in a case like this, we say,

"plainness of speech" is greatly to be commended. And, if, in committing to the records of history, the details of so glorious a deliverance given us of God, as the Reform of 1837, truth and justice should require a black line, here and there, to be drawn around passages in the lives of brethren of our own church, whom we greatly revere and love—it must be done; with humiliation and tears, but it must be done. Let the Church learn again and again, that her faith "must not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God": that those, whom she most trusts and loves, and who are as worthy as any to be trusted and loved, may be the occasion of her going astray from Him, whose voice alone, she is to follow and obey: that it is the tendency of all corporations to make themselves ends instead of means, to look to their own prosperity and glory, and to forget the interests of the power that created them: that theological seminaries are not exempt from the operation of this general law, and may possibly pronounce, in grave emergencies, against the progress and purity of the church, either by open opposition, or by a determined neutrality, or, what is worse than all, by a languishing, half-hearted co-operation."

We ask special attention to what is said upon these points in this book. We honor Mr. Brown, because he has not written in a cautious, cold-blooded style, as if he were afraid of being considered in love with the doctrines of grace, and the principles of Presbyterian order; or as if he were more afraid of man that shall die, or the son of man, whose breath is in his nostrils, than of Him who commands us "to cry aloud and spare not." We have made no attempt to bring out the leading points of the history: because we are more and more anxious, that our brethren, who, like ourselves, have come into the church since the war, should study the whole subject. It is of far more consequence to us, that we should know these battles thoroughly, than those of our great political revolution. The principles, which, by the goodness of God, triumphed then, are the principles which will achieve the last glorious triumph, when the final stage of the Church's progress shall have been reached, and she shall stand once more, redeemed and disenthralled, upon the platform of prophets and apostles.

The Book can be had of Mr. Guiteau, Tract House.

THEATRICK REGENERATION—LAUDISM AND LUDISM—PRELACY AND PLAY.—We introduced to the notice of our readers—in the January number—a theory of regeneration, styled by its author, a "theandric regeneration:" and they have, no doubt, by this time, made up their minds in regard to its harmo-

ny with Scripture and with fact. This is the age of catholicons, panaceas and panpharmakons, of cordials, elixirs and restoratives, of patent remedies for the diseases both of body and of mind, an age, in which doctors, who cure always and kill never, are plenty as black-berries, or as the leaves of Vallombrosa. Let nobody be astonished, therefore, at our announcing a new theory of regeneration, which may, for the sake of brevity, be called, the *theatrick*. All will ask at once, from what quarter has it come? From Germany? that nation, "*raisonneurs, et mentem pasta chimæris*," where the philosophy of human life, in its last analysis, is summed up in the formula, "Bread and the Theatre?" From France? that people, "*qui sunt in consiliis capiendis mobiles et novis plerumque rebus student*," and whose philosophy of life is expressed in the formula, "The Theatre and Bread?" No; from Edinburgh, the city in which John Knox launched his thunders and blew his trumpet against all "false regiments," against all unrealities and shams, against Popery and "Popery-and-water:" the city which is famous, in all the world, for its physicians as well as for its metaphysicians—the Athens of Great Britain.

A writer in Blackwood's Magazine for March, whose aversion to *fact* is fully equal to Thomas Gradgrind's devotion to it, occupies several pages with "Civilization and the Census," and lets loose his wrath upon the Educational Statistics and the Educational theories of Great Britain. He thinks there ought to be less fact and more fancy, less of Long Division and more of Jack the Giant-killer, fewer Athenæums and more Theatres. The paper is in the form of a letter to the writer's friend, "Eusebius," who—if there be any thing in a name—is a man eminent for godliness, and therefore, the more likely to approve the new theory of education. The theory is thus stated. "That which I would propose, has obtained the advocacy of the wise in all times, but has encountered the wrath of bigots; and the bigots have been too many; and what then?—they have made for us 'a sad world, my masters.' The bolder way is the best; so, in a few words, Eusebius, will I out with the worst at once. Thus—I would that every village in England had a church at one end of it, and a theatre at the other." Then we have a defence of the drama—against the fools and bigots above mentioned,—"as a means of acquiring knowledge," "and as an ally and adjunct to religion." One ground of defence is specially worthy of notice, as it is identical with that assumed by the Corinthian free-thinkers, in defence of another thing intimately associated with theatre-going, (see 1. Cor. 6: 13, &c.) to wit: that the theatre gratifies a natural appetite of man; cu-

riosity and the propensity to imitate being essential elements of the human constitution. Again, says our Author: "years ago, Eusebius, when we (that is, you and I) were both of us not past the moulding days of our moral life, we were not only readers of plays, but frequenters of theatres; and often have we since then looked back, and studied our educational process, through a public school and the university; and agreed in this, that we owe much, perhaps the *best portion of our moral culture, to the play.*" Then finally: "I will end the discussion, as I began it, and with a wish that every village had a church at one end of it, and a theatre at the other; and I will add, a good parsonage-house in the centre, and a well-educated [that is, well-played] rector or vicar within, gladdening his flock by sympathising with them in their enjoyments as well as their cares and duties."

Now is not this a pleasant view of religion and the church? The village shepherd leading his immortal flock, six days in the week, to pasturage in the pit of a theatre, and, on the seventh, praying by Act of Parliament—that they may be delivered from the pit that is bottomless! This out-lauds Laud: for if our memory serves us, he never, with all his zeal for Maypoles and the Book of Sports, ordained a man and set him apart to the function of theatre-going, as a leader of the flock. But this is the nineteenth century! and Laud was an old fogey!

In order to show still more clearly the ecclesiastical and political affinities of the theatre, and how important an engine it is of king-craft in keeping the people from thinking; we quote still further from this *Tory Journal*:—"Bigotry of a new kind—puritanism—struck out too many holidays from the calendar; games and sports, and days of general cheerfulness, were not looked upon, as they should have been, *educational.*" Let the reader remember, however, that these "games and sports" are to be the education of the "masses," the "lower classes," who, if they are not "*amused,*" may work mischief to the state: it is they who are to be sent into the fields on the Sabbath, to smell primroses: or to the Crystal Palace, to gaze upon nude statuary: or, in the week, to the theatre, where loyalty, chastity and godliness reign supreme:—let him remember the pregnant passage from Hugh Miller, in the article on the Sabbath in this number:—let him also remember the use which tyrants have always made of *shows*—and he will not be surprised at the following additional sentences from our Blackwood writer:—"Show me your company and I will tell you what you are," is a truth. The play has its good companionships. Down went

the play, and down went king and bishops, and they were all restored together." Again, in another article in the same number, "A Peep at Paris,"—evidently from the same hand—the writer, like all theorists, rides his hobby again for the benefit of the "*lower classes,*" and closes with an expression of his preference for a "dictatorship over a free constitutional government. Louis Napoleon and the Theatre for ever! But hear his opinion of Puritanism:—"But in the lower classes, Puritanism has cut away from them all these unobjectionable sources of excitement [*scil. theatricals,*] and left them instead three of *equally unhealthy* tendency—the *conventicle*, the *gin-shops*, and the *beer-shop.*"

But enough. How long would the British Constitution survive the utter extinction of the puritan spirit, and the general prevalence of such sentiments as these? What say our countrymen to the political tendencies of theatres and Sabbath amusements? One thing is clear: the caption of this notice is fully justified: and we are to have a new reading of the old formula, "no Bishop, no King—" now, hereafter, and for ever, let it be:—*no Theatre, no Bishop, no King!*

SPEECH ABOUT COLLEGES—*Delivered in Nashville, on a Commemorative Occasion of the University of Tennessee.*—By Rev. Philip Lindsley, D. D.

This production, although not of recent date, yet like "old wine, keeps well." No man excels Dr. L. in fervent zeal in every good cause, and his efforts have doubtless contributed much towards the good result which has followed the discussion of the question of Education in the West. His efficiency is in no wise impaired by his transfer to the Seminary at New Albany.

A SERMON ON THE ROMISH CONTROVERSY—ITS PRESENT ASPECT, AND THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN REFERENCE TO IT.—*Delivered before the Synod of Virginia, by Rev. A. B. Van Zandt, D. D., Petersburg, Va.*

A well timed discourse, which first appeared as an article in the Southern Presbyterian Review. In these stirring times, it well behooves the ministry of Christ to know *their* duty; to understand that they are in no way relieved by the efforts of "outsiders," in any cause, no matter how faithfully those efforts may be directed, or efficiently prosecuted; and then to relax nothing in their "defence of the truth." We like the spirit that says it has "no patience with that maudlin charity which is too polite to be honest, or with that miserable expediency which claims to be wiser than God," and is willing to suppress the truth for fear of exciting opposition.

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 5.

MAY, 1855.

Vol. 1.

MORE BOARDS IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.—
SOME INQUIRY INTO FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

It seems as if this question of *Boards*—which involves so many other questions—stood erectly in the way of every theoretical investigation, and every practical movement, connected with the welfare of the Presbyterian Church. In one aspect, it is like a panacea,—to which every sickness instinctively directs itself,—when its pains can be assuaged by no other means : while in another aspect, it is like a settled chronic disease, which has fastened on the constitution, and which not only affects the character of all other maladies, but affects the type even of health itself. It is hardly possible to attempt any thing—or to say any thing—that is not liable to be resented as “*an attack on our Boards ;*” hardly possible to turn in any direction, that one is not encountered with some *caveat* warning you off as a trespasser upon some ‘float,’ or some ‘pre-emption,’ or some ‘right of way,’ or some ‘vested interest,’ or if nothing else can be produced, some ‘contingent remainder’—in which some Board already *in esse*, or some Board *in posse*, and nearly through its incubation—has a prior and exclusive interest—or at the very least, an eminent domain covering the territory. And there is this great matter about the whole affair—that by means of them, the church question itself, which for our generation is a question of exceeding great importance, is placed in a most peculiar position. For to favour *them*, is accepted as sufficient proof of favouring every good object they have in view—and as discharging the sum of our duty towards that good object : whereas, to act, or even to argue independently of *them*, easily passes into a proof of opposition, at once to the church herself—and to the particular objects you may be so unfortunate as to suppose you have liberty to love and promote, without an *exequatur* out of the chancery of some Board. And moreover, through them, ecclesiastical power is so directed and applied, that the very notion of a Church, as independent at once of the State, and of society itself, becomes a sort of illusion, which appears and disappears. just

as the exigencies of the argument may demand. For, if the argument so demands, the *Boards are the church*: if it so demands, they are merely the *religious element of human society*, acting voluntarily: if it so demands, they are *the State*, seeing they are nearly without exception, re-enforced with corporate powers, directly or indirectly, by the civil power: or if it so demands, they are a *combination of all three*,—the Church, the State, and Society—each contributing certain elemental qualities to them, and the combined result being—practically, a very peculiar engine of power—and theoretically, a very peculiar moral problem: a sort of *lap*, where Church, State, and community,—all cover the same territory. Considered from the church side of the question—the practical result—is multifarious. It enables the church to omit doing, a vast deal which otherwise, she would never think of omitting. It enables her to do by means of the Boards, many things she would never think of doing. And then, by means of corporations belonging to Boards—what is there, she may not find means of mixing herself up with?

Very lately, matters long pending before the Board of Domestic Missions, with regard to the best method of disposing of the question of Church Extension, have been brought, as we understand, to solemn debate, and decision; and the issues reached have been, in some degree, laid before the public, in certain statements, reports of committees, &c.; but, the whole matter is probably to come once more—with urgency, before the General Assembly—upon the Annual Report of the Board itself. Upon the subject of creating an additional Board for the express purpose of taking charge of the subject of Church Extension in the form of building new places of worship; we transfer to our pages, in the form of a foot note, an article which appeared, lately, in *the Presbyterian*; which presents briefly, some of the main objections, to such a proceeding.* Not intending to dis-

* "CHURCH EXTENSION—A Fifth Board!—A fifth Board is the suggestion, Messrs. Editors. A separate Board for the great matter of aiding all who want and deserve aid in erecting Presbyterian churches; the next Assembly to determine whether this fifth Board shall be erected or not. Meantime, you rather invite the expression of opinion through your columns. May I give mine, with some reasons for it?

1. If the Assembly creates another Board, no matter for what, we shall probably have such an explosion in the Church that the other four Boards may be excluded from more churches than the new one will be able to visit by all the agents it will deem it prudent to appoint. The *principle of any Board*, is not in such repute in our Church at present that it will bear pushing any further, without the most serious practical danger to great existing interests. Another Board—and at Philadelphia!

2. The subject of *church building*, any where, is not a subject of that character that it either ought to be, or practically can be made, in the existing condition of our Church and country, the ground of a successful general organization; even admitting the *principle of Boards* to be wholly unexceptionable and universally approved. Whenever the Church tries the experiment it will fail. The Church Extension Committee were distinctly told this same thing before they completed their organization.

3. Of all the ordinary interests of the Church of God, the building of meeting-houses is the most distinctly *local*. *When* one should be built, and *what sort* of one it should be, are exactly the things which a central Board, remote from the locality, cannot possibly decide wisely. And the larger the country is, and the more diverse the circumstances are, the more radically absurd it is to attempt a general, central organization for an object of this description. The chances are overwhelmingly against wise and efficient action.

cuss that particular subject, however ; nor the particular posture of the Board of Missions ; the occasion seems to call for some more general consideration of the whole question of Boards, in connection with the General Assembly of our Church. And upon that subject, we take leave to offer a few observations—in the most condensed form possible.

1. All Ecclesiastical Boards, strictly speaking—are based upon the principle of *Independency*. They are contrivances of imperfect union and concert of action, necessary in a form of church polity—that has no bond of stable union or concert, in itself. Therefore, also, they are a method—but a very imperfect one—by means of which, various denominations may act in concert ; precisely because, —as in the case of *Independency*—they have no permanent internal bond of concert and union, with each other.

2. In a system like Presbyterianism, such Boards, are like two powers, inconsistent with each other, placed in the same machine. They are heterogeneous to the fundamental principles of the system. They never can be worked, on their own principles, so as to be made completely harmonious with the principles of the Church. Their principles, and the principles of the Church, never can, by possibility, be in active exercise at the same time—without conflict. The Church never can, by any possibility, be made to do as much, by means of them, as she can be made to do without them. And ordinarily, and inevitably, the dead point of the opposing principles, is far below the real capacity of either machine separately ; is soon reached where the two machines act together ; and at it—further power being impossible—without violence to one or other of them—every particular cause comes to a dead stop—till the violence is applied ; and stops again at the same place, as soon as the violence is removed.

4. The cheapest, the surest, the most permanent church builders on earth, are *faithful ministers of the gospel*. Give these to the people ; and the people will give you houses for them to preach in. Withhold these from the people, and the best meeting-houses built and bestowed on neighborhoods will do little good. There may be exceptions, and, to a certain extent, large cities may be the most constant exceptions ; but the nation over, that is the common rule, and the hard-working, experienced ministers will tell you so. Shall we substitute a human scheme to ill-do, for a divine scheme to well-do ?

5. So far as the work of missions involves the work of new erections for public worship in destitute settlements, it is as much a regular and natural portion of the business of the Board of Missions as the providing of accommodations of a similar kind, in the foreign field, is the work of the Foreign Board. Why not organize a *sixth* Board, for church *extension* in foreign lands ?

6. We have about three thousand places of public worship in our connection. Who built them ? An immense proportion of these have been *rebuilt*—many of them several times—each time better and better. Who rebuilt them ? The Church may rest satisfied, when that answer is given, that one of those indestructible logical necessities has been made articulate, which is out of the reach of short cuts, clamour, idle wishes, and all manner of contrivances. Work, work, work amongst the people. Presently you will have three thousand more churches. But who will build them ? Must I answer ? *Your converts must build them*, or they never can be built.

7. There is a double—yea, a triple—delusion on this whole subject, which is diffusing itself through the Church, and which is pregnant with mischief. The first is, that meeting-houses, expensive as compared with the condition of those who are to occupy them, are really necessary ; the second is, that this growing clamour comes from

3. This inexorable logic of the nature of things, against which men are constantly wasting their strength, explains, in a great degree, the phenomena of the operations of the whole class of Boards. For purposes appertaining to the community of christians in general—like a Bible society; they work extremely well. For purposes appertaining to several sects, or to a particular sect that has no other and superior principle of union and concert,—like the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; they work better than anything else they could devise. For purposes appertaining to a church powerfully, thoroughly, and organically united for concert of action, they obstruct the free and natural action of the body: and just to the whole extent that their action—is a natural and vital *Board action*, the natural and vital *church action*, ceases. The Presbyterian Church has had this, *as an instinct*, so powerfully exhibited to her, that she has carefully excluded voluntary Boards, which operate for causes analogous to causes for which she operates; and she feels more and more restless, under the action of all voluntary Boards. There is but one more step—to wit, the clear appreciation of the real ground of the difficulty—and the application of the remedy.

4. It is very certain that there is a wide difference between *Ecclesiastical* Boards, and *voluntary* Boards; and that the Presbyterian Church clearly appreciated this difference, in the great Pelagian Controversy; and that she made a definitive stand against the latter, and for the former, as her own means of doing her own work, so far as she would use any Board. In all which she was, doubtless, wise and right. But this merely comes to the main point, without deciding it. It merely reaches the question of the inherent nature of Board action, of itself—and no matter if ecclesiastical. This question was seen clearly enough, and enunciated plainly enough, all through that controversy; but—in the midst of other questions, more immediate, and more important, it was, perhaps too entirely, remit-

self-denying, earnest, successful ministers, whose work is hindered by the want of such houses; the third is, that there is some sort of ecclesiastical pressure or contrivance, by means of which the piety of the Church may be frightened or caressed into diverting from more proper and more pressing *general* objects the immense sums of money which might be so readily lavished on this work. If I escape being torn to pieces for saying this, it will prove that the delusion has not yet extended with virulence beyond the north-western angle of the Church.

8. I have labored in the ministry for many years, and in many widely different places. I have had an opportunity, which not many have had, to see this very matter of church building—*extension*, as they call it now—in all its phases. It is a work, in its proper place, of vast importance; one that, rightly managed, cannot well be over-rated. But it is one that cannot be done by a central, general organization. Moreover, let me say, for the comfort of our young brethren, who are so urgent for good churches, the hardest thing in this world to kill outright is a Presbyterian interest, once cast into a community, even in the form of a single family. No doubt the rich, out of their abundance, and the poor, out of their poverty, even ought to send the gospel to the destitute. If the church will do that, it need not fret itself much, whether it be on Mars Hill, or in the upper chamber, or in the market-place, or in the school of one Tyrannus, or in the town hall, that its first utterances are made audible. Nor do I recollect a single place in the New Testament where the contrary is taught. Let us help every good work, according to its place and its degree; but let us have less clamour about schemes that are at once hazardous and impracticable, and no more Boards.

9. Nevertheless, I think it altogether probable that the Board of Missions will suc-

ted for future treatment. Everything admonishes the Church, that that future is fully come.

5. The best and most natural defence of Ecclesiastical Boards, as connected with our church courts, is that they are, strictly speaking, *commissions* of the church courts; say of the General Assembly. A *commission* is different from a *committee*, mainly in this, that the latter examines and *reports*, the former examines and *concludes*. The power of the Church court is complete in both respects; and one of the most curious freaks in the world, is the shyness of our Church, to the name *commission*,—even while habitually using the thing for every sort of purpose, except perhaps, the most appropriate purpose of all—namely, *judicial* business. But, upon what principle they who repudiate the clear power of the church courts to constitute commissions, whether temporary or permanent,—can defend our Boards, is one of those mysteries of logic, still buried in the brains of some great thinker, who has not yet delivered himself. For ourselves, we have no objection to the *name Board*; only we desire the *thing* intended, to be distinctly understood, and definitively constituted, according to the unalterable nature, duties, interests, and exigencies of the Church.

6. Mainly and fundamentally, we desire that the whole nature and pretence of true Board action and Board organization—as a principle of Independency, shall be extirpated, as a part of our ecclesiastical machinery, heterogeneous and hurtful of itself,—and not, by any means, sufficiently cured, by the amount of ecclesiastical control substituted for the voluntary control. And we desire, that church action shall be substituted for Board action: that it shall be substituted *directly*, in every case, where it may be conveniently, wisely, and profitably so substituted; and that it shall be substituted *indirectly*, as a church action through Boards, instead of a Board action through and upon the Church, (if the name, *Board*, must be retained.)

7. As to the present mode of organizing our Ecclesiastical Boards, and the principles upon which they are constituted, and act,—noth-

cumb to the urgency of a portion of its own missionaries, in a particular quarter of the Church; that the General Assembly will give way to the same urgency thus countenanced by the central power; that a combination of motives—some very good, some not so very good—will silence opposition; and that this fifth Board will be established and located at Philadelphia. I say I think matters look in that general direction; and it is because this is my opinion that I feel bound to say what I have written above, in the somewhat faint hope of causing the Church to pause and reflect before taking such steps. Disaster to the particular cause proposed to be promoted; peril to all the great objects committed to the other four Boards, and most especially to those already located in Philadelphia; commotion in the Church, and possibly much good as the collateral result, but in a way little expected by those who promote this new Board, and not congenial to the feelings of such as dislike violent and sudden changes, even for good, when they can be avoided: these will be, it seems to me, the probable, if not the necessary results of the creation of this fifth Board. How long will the Church, with its present notions of things, endure *four* Boards in Philadelphia? What likelihood is there of promoting peace, union, efficiency, or any other good thing, by applying a principle which is more and more distrusted in the Church, to objects utterly heterogeneous to it? What likelihood is there of increasing the liberality of the Church, by shocking its common sense, arousing its distrust of the wisdom of its rulers, and attempting to stultify principles and methods which have been commensurate with its own existence and by means of which its entire progress has been hitherto accomplished?

ing can be more obvious than the following results : 1. The control of the Church, is merely nominal : 2. The control of the Board itself, is merely nominal : 3. The whole immense power, is lodged, in a form nearly irresponsible, in one, or at most two or three officers—surrounded by three or four personal friends, and acting back upon the Church, and in the Church, by the most powerful means, which are furnished, and supported by the Church herself. 4. The single officer at the head of the Board of Domestic Missions—taking the case exactly as it stands, is only less dangerous to the Presbyterian Church, than Dr. Peters was in 1837, because he is a friend instead of an enemy ; because he is orthodox and not heretical : his *position*, of itself, is as perilous to the Church—or very nearly so ; and it is that of which we speak, and of that particular Board, as the one least in accord with the nature of church power. 5. And yet, after so great departures from fundamental principles, and so long continued—is the Church compensated, by the greatness of the gains she has made, above what she would have made, otherwise : or does she see the smallest probability of such a compensation, in prospect, by persisting in her present mode of treating these immense practical questions ?

8. How great the difficulty was, of getting the Board of Foreign Missions located in the city of New York—they who took part, in that attempt, cannot well forget. Does any body doubt, now, that it was a wise act ? How great was the difficulty of getting liberty for the General Assembly to meet out of Philadelphia ; and how much greater still to get out of Pennsylvania, who can forget : and yet who doubts the wisdom of that change ? How clear did it appear to all of us, in former days, that a Board located at Boston, could no more work, with power, in the Presbyterian Church, even if it were a Presbyterian Board, than the centre of motion of a great system, could be outside of the system itself ! How manifest did it seem, in those days, that every tendency to the centralization of power—was an evil tendency : that the *local* form of this centralization, was the worst form of it : and that when it became centralized, localized, and irresponsible—the very consummation of theoretical danger—was reached ? Were we all deluded ? If not, why do we continue for so many years, to make a point on one side of the Church, becoming more and more one-sided,—the permanent, local centre, of all our efforts, except in the single matter of Foreign Missions ? Nay, one hardly dares to whisper a suggestion of change, unless he is

10. It may be said no one has suggested the location of this fifth Board at Philadelphia. But has any one any idea that any other principal point in the bounds of the Church would cordially accept the burden of its management ? Has any portion of the entire Church, except Philadelphia and the North-west, systematically urged this general organization of the Church for Church building ? The scheme comes before the Assembly again and again, from the North-west, and from the bosom of the Board of Missions, and from the fountain-head of influence, through our religious press in Philadelphia. And so it is to come again, by these means, into the next Assembly. At Philadelphia, or in the North-west, the Board must be, if there is any Board about it. If at the North-west, where are the means to be gathered ? If in Philadelphia, how long will the other three Boards abide there ? If in either place, what can be done by it that cannot be better done without it ?

A WESTERN MAN."

ready for whatever may be cast at him, or upon him—from Quarterlies down to circulars, and from the thunder of Boanerges down to the pious whine of slick conservatism !

9. *Practically*—it may be properly enough demanded, what do we suppose can be done—or ought to be done? Simply and directly this : 1. Remove two of the present Boards, out of Philadelphia. 2. Place the two that are removed, in such positions, as the good of the particular cause each represents, shall indicate to the Assembly, that makes the change. 3. Organize all four of the Boards, in such a manner, that they shall be, really and truly, charged with the work committed to them respectively, and really and truly responsible for it. 4. Commit to them nothing, but the proper work belonging to each one of them, as immediate agents of the Church of Christ ; and let all they do, be done, with, by, and through, the Church herself—and not as powers, independent of the Church—nor for objects heterogeneous to the Church, nor by methods foreign to the Church. 5. Break up, utterly, *the one man power*, wherever it may linger in any part of any Board : our Church government is not hierarchic—it is a commonwealth. 6. Transfer the election of all the chief officers of all the Boards, to the General Assembly itself ; and, as far as possible, associate ruling Elders or Deacons, in the chief executive administration—especially the financial part of it. 7. By these, and similar means—as far as the habits, the necessities, the principles even, of the Church, may require the continued use of any portion of our present apparatus—let it be simplified, renovated, and brought into a workable condition, and placed in an advantageous posture : bad parts eliminated, good parts strengthened,—shocks and jars avoided—and a fair and complete opportunity afforded, without commotion or revolution, of bringing up the Church, with power, to her glorious work, in all its departments.

There is a sedulous, and apparently a concerted attempt made to convince the Church that she is not only perfectly satisfied with every thing, just as it is ; but desperately in love with it. This is all idle. Articles in leading Reviews, editorials in leading Newspapers, Reports from the Boards even, or harangues in the General Assembly, even from Secretaries, Agents, or Missionaries, are all very good in their way : but none of them have any marketable value ; none of them will support a beneficiary, or print a book, or send a missionary, or build a church. We must have men ; we must have means : without both—the work of these Boards must all cease. Therefore, after all the Reviews, and editorials, and Reports, and harangues, the question of men, and means—still recurs ;—and recurs in a manner most unsatisfactory—all the Boards being judges. The question of men and means, is not a question of Reviews, editorials, Reports and harangues ; but it is a question, simply, of piety and ability, on the part of the Church ; and nothing else, either more or less, can ever be made out of it. And whenever you put the means of reaching that piety and ability, on a satisfactory footing—there will be no need either of Reviews, editorials, Reports, or harangues,

to convince any body, that they are on a satisfactory footing. The result itself, will convince every body. But so long as the means by which you attempt to reach that piety and ability, are not only incompetent, but injurious—all the Reviews, editorials, Reports, and harangues, in the world will not supply that fatal defect. You will reach the *dead point*, first or last ; and there you must stop—till you change your machinery. Reviewing, editing, reporting, harangueing—or even making more Boards—might continue to the day of judgment, for that matter, without relieving the difficulty. You must change the machinery : or you must put up with what the machinery can do. We prefer to change the machinery.

[For The Critic.]

A DIORAMA OF THE CHURCHES.

WITHOUT invidiousness or censoriousness, and with a determination “not to set down aught in malice,” we desire to give a view of the various principal Ecclesiastical bodies of our country, with the intent of exhibiting their changes within comparatively a few years, certainly within our remembrance, and that not yet embracing the “threescore years and ten.” The changes have been various, both as to forms, ceremonies, customs, doctrines and other views, but all, as we think, verging towards a weakening of first principles and in the general, having a downward tendency.

The main reason which we think will be given for these changes, is, conforming the Churches more to public opinion. “Our country is improving. Our taste is becoming more refined. Architecture is altering its character, and our public buildings ought to exhibit its changes. Music is becoming more and more attractive, and where can it be better used to advantage than in the house of God. Oratory is more sought after, and the pulpit is the best arena for its display. The strict old Puritan notions are in process of explosion, and we must meet the charge. Religion ought certainly to be attended to by all, and more general good will be effected by avoiding singular habiliments, language, or even deportment;—in fine—while we take the “good old Book” mainly for our guide, we think there are some things in it that we have misapprehended, or misunderstood, and it will be more judicious to be guided by “the fathers,” or others, in connection with it.

These and other things of a kindred character are at the root of almost every change, and it will not take much to prove that the most potent ingredient, in the working of this change, is a growth of worldliness in the midst of God’s professed people. In many cases, the Church approximates so nearly to the world, that the line of demarcation is scarcely visible, and the wayfarer can pass from

the purlieus of the world to the church, and from the church to the world, and scarcely meet a single landmark, or beacon tower to apprise him of a separation ; nay he can alternate in his attendance at the ordinances of one, and the amusements of the other, and yet sooth his conscience by the idea that he is taking from religion the appearance of gloom, and thus winning souls by his example.

But to the proof, and in our statements we will confine ourselves to the strict truth, according to what we have seen with our eyes, and not what we have merely heard with our ears. We begin with

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

To this Church were we attached in our youth, and well were we acquainted with its ritual, its forms, its whole service, and its views as to other sects as expressed in its pulpits generally. With some exceptions an entire change has been effected, and symbols, and customs once considered as partaking too much of Rome, to be countenanced for a moment, are now introduced, upheld and enforced.

The practice of crossing the brow of the infant in baptism, has been used, as far as we know, always and everywhere throughout the church, while bowing at the name of Jesus, in the recital of the creed, has only been prevalent at the North. At the South, or at any rate most part of it, it has not been used, but is now fast coming into use. The cross as a symbol, on steeples, cupalos, prayer books, &c., would once have shocked the feelings of the people, to an extent hardly now thought possible, and yet it is now used even by what are called "low church" persons and congregations.

In most churches the pulpit has been removed and a larger chancel raised and railed in, where the *altar*, a place from which the elements of the Lord's supper are distributed, must be in the most conspicuous place, inasmuch as the Eucharist is not a commemorative ordinance as held formerly, but something of a higher order, possessing something of a mystical character, not exactly partaking of the fables of Romish worship, and yet not denying in express terms the real presence. The Scriptures are read from one small table, and the prayers from another on the opposite side ; the altar being between them, generally a little removed towards the back wall, the sermon is preached from behind the one from which the Scriptures are read, and in front of the rail stands the baptismal font.

The service was formerly simply celebrated, the only chanting being the short psalms after the lessons, the *Gloria Excelsis* occasionally, and in some few of the larger churches the *Gloria Patri* at the end of the psalms of the day—now chanting and intoning is introduced to a great extent ; and the service is a musical one, with the exception of the prayers.

The Communion Table was formerly covered, on all occasions of its celebration, with a white damask cloth, and the utensils were of such pattern and kind, as were generally used, and according to the taste or means of the congregation—now various colored cloths,

wrought of different emblematic patterns are introduced, according to the occasions ; one for Christmas, another for Easter, &c., and an association is formed, called the Ecclesiological Society, to determine upon, and regulate the proper forms and kinds of all things connected with the Church, Altar, and Clerical Dress, and some of her ministers will do nothing for their churches until the dictum of this society is obtained.

As to the preaching of those who fall in with their new measures and customs, strict observance of the ritual, constant laudation of "the Church," "Sacramental grace," and denunciation of every other denomination fill the major part of their addresses, and the plain, simple truths of the Gospel, with their faithful application to the consciences of men, are in many cases obsolete and forgotten. In these as well as in all other changes, there are many noble exceptions, in men who boldly and strenuously contend against these innovations and corruptions. We next look at

THE METHODIST CHURCH.

As few as the changes may appear at first sight, as having taken place in this church, they are yet many and great. These changes have all been from the original simplicity, plainness, and entire absence of show or ornament that was desired and enforced by Wesley, to a gradual conformity in costume, architecture, and other matters to those around them.

In our perfect remembrance, a member of this useful and exemplary body of christians, was known by the plainness of garb always exhibited, as well as a corresponding simplicity of appearance, manner and language. Both sexes maintained the peculiarity, and the world was shut out from their thoughts, at least in appearance, and their conversation was in general, such as to support this same character. Their "Meeting Houses" were of the plainest architecture and finish, exhibiting nothing of the luxuries, or even comforts of other places of worship. Their singing was "with the spirit, and with the understanding also," entered into with feeling by all the congregation, and their preaching, the plain enforcement of Gospel truths in simple language and in energetic terms and manner. While the singing and much of the preaching has remained the same, as far as our experience has extended, there has been much change in other things. Their churches have altered, their character *pari passu* with others, in many cases exhibiting a certain degree of splendor ; the interiors have been beautified and improved in comfort and luxuriance ; many having their pews with doors, linings, cushions, and plates with the names of the owners. The pulpits have been modernized, and even the books have been so beautified as to take away all appearance of the olden time. Of the doctrines of this Church we can make no record, as to a change. We are not aware that they have departed from their plain American views.

The changes we have noticed must be regarded by all, as produced by an increasing spirit of worldliness, and we cannot suppose

that any can dispute the fact that being a Methodist has not now the distinctive character, it once had, nor is it as much used to signify a person of peculiar strictness of religious manner, conversation and habits. We now turn to

THE BAPTIST CHURCH.

This Church never as we are aware, having professed a desire and determination to abstain from the general customs of those around them, as was the case with the one last mentioned, and others of which we shall hereafter speak, the changes in its buildings, &c., are not so noticeable. Not embracing plainness or simplicity as a part of their original regulations and rules, they would naturally exhibit the same changes as have been shewn in the general improvements of the age, and hence the changes in this Church are such as partake more of views and doctrines than of anything else. While there have been portions of the Baptist Church in other parts of the world, who were Armenian in their faith, that in the United States has been Calvinistic according to the creed laid down in their declaration of faith. Whether true or not, the general idea of the views of the Baptist Church was, that it was rather Antinomian than otherwise; this certainly was the doctrine held by many of their leading men; this view, and even that of moderate Calvinism has given way in many places to plain Armenianism, and some of their papers have advocated these views. Through a great part of the country, an entire division has taken place. By means of the celebrated Alexander Campbell, of Virginia, the whole of the church west of the Alleghanies, has been completely convulsed from this cause, and the gross-est errors have been promulgated and embraced. While these everywhere received the protest of the regular church, two organizations were the consequence. A recent movement (the Bible revision) has arisen, by which it seems probable that a union may again be made, and that the great question of Immersion, which has been so strong a point with both parties, may be the means of their future amalgamation. However common baptisteries may have been in former times, they are new in this country; the first was built to accommodate an excellent preacher, in consequence of his lameness preventing his conveniently going to the river; since that time, we believe the churches generally have these pools or baptisteries, and the rivers are in a great measure abandoned.

While the Baptists have generally been known for their tolerance and freedom of persecution, considering all 'evangelical churches as christians, and joining other denominations in all their religious services except that of communion—on this point keeping entirely aloof—they have lately, at least in some places, taken a different stand, declaring all other ministers of the Gospel as unauthorized to administer the word and ordinances, and even going so far as to advise that they should be forbidden to use pulpits: this movement is but recent, and perhaps will gain but little favor; but these things have been contended for, and the opinion that they may be made more general, is strengthened by the fact of a withdrawal of the cir-

culatation of the common version of the Bible, and making a version of their own, and forming associations among themselves exclusively for its completion, and distribution. On this question, this Church has entirely separated itself from the other parts of the christian world, and if carried out fully, must forever remain distinct, unless fresh and irrefragable evidence shall be adduced to prove to the satisfaction of those differing from them, that anything short of the *Immersion of adults* is sheer *heresy*, and by the power of this evidence, they shall all renounce their errors, and be received into the Baptist fold. In looking at

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

We see at first rather a conglomerated picture, coming out however, into more distinctiveness, and when exhibited in two separate bodies more easy of analyzation. While in union the two bodies were active, energetic, enterprising and useful, and entering with hearty concurrence, into the views of the independent voluntary societies of the day, they were nearly overwhelmed by the influx of, in some aspects a kindred, but really a diverse organization, and thus came well nigh losing their distinctive character as to church government or genuine Presbyterian doctrines.

A fundamental and vital doctrine had long received attacks from without, and had at length been weakened by professing friends within their body, while an essential point of their government had also been virtually abrogated, when the eyes of many of the best friends of the church were opened to the difficulty, and with bold hands and unflinching hearts, they met the crisis, and the danger was averted; a division was effected, and the Church remained intact. While changes have taken place in both these bodies since their disruption, the character and extent of these changes have been different in the two.

In the "New School" several alterations were made in the original constitution of the Mother Church, and modifications have also been made in their pulpits, and in their press, of the high toned and strict doctrines of her standards. While in these things they have been singular, in other matters they have found abettors in their brethren of the Old School. They have re-introduced clerical dresses. These dresses were universally prevalent some forty or fifty years ago, but since have been as universally abrogated. They make use of organs. Saints' and other sacred names for churches, and in some cases a liturgical service have been known to both, if not as common to one as the other; besides these the New School have abandoned some of the principles for which they contended at or before the disruption, and have formed Church Boards in preference to voluntary associations.

The Old School has gone before the New, in the alteration of the duties of Elders, both as to their character in the formation of a quorum, as also, to the laying on of their hands in the ordination of ministers. As to points of doctrine, we know of no change in the latter body.

These two bodies still remain distinct, the New School having lost, and still losing many strong adherents by their re-adhesion to the Congregational Body from whence many of them first came out, and many more by their return to the Old School. And the Old School with a feeling of right and power pursuing the even tenor of its way, willing to receive all who will accept the doctrines and government of the Church, as it is, without deception or mental reservation.

THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

Exhibits but few phases of change except those of the more prevalent sects generally. Its aggressive power was put forth with considerable success a few years since, when Unitarianism held a well-nigh undivided power in the metropolis of Massachusetts; church after church was formed, until orthodoxy was again in a degree triumphant in its old dominion.

More recently much surprise has been manifested, and discussion has arisen in consequence of a celebrated preacher in Connecticut, coming out boldly in the maintenance of views subversive of the Orthodox Faith. Frequent attempts have been made to bring him before the proper tribunals, but so far in vain, and the weakness of Congregational governments has been exhibited by a want of power to pursue this investigation freely and fairly. One consequence already has been to drive many faithful men from the connexion and inducing them successfully to establish Presbyterian churches in the strong hold of Independency.

OF THE DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH

We can say but little, as we are not aware of its having in any measure altered its character or customs. With the exception of the proposition in one of her synods for the adoption of a liturgical service, we do not know of any departure from her original simplicity and purity. We consider this Church to have maintained her character for sound doctrine and consistent practice and discipline, more inviolate than perhaps, we may say, any other in our country.

Organs and clerical dresses have always been used by this communion, and are still common, if not general.

Of the Associate Reformed, Seceder, and other churches of the same connection, we can make the same remarks as the last, they too, as far as we are informed, maintain their integrity in form and doctrine, and have been less drawn off by the fashions of the world in their buildings, and otherwise, but are exhibited in much of their primitive simplicity and purity. We now pass onward to

THE FRIENDS OR QUAKERS.

In this denomination an awful departure has been taken from the faith of its fathers and founders. From being entirely Orthodox and Evangelical in its views, a large, probably a major part, have become strongly Socinian, if not infidel. Elias Hicks, a leading man among them, became like Alexander Campbell, among the Baptists, the great Hierarch, and preached his doctrines with such success as entirely to divide the Church.

This people, have also, almost, entirely changed in other matters. They have probably ever since their foundation been remarkable for the greatest possible simplicity and plainness of dress, speech and manner ; this has in general almost passed away, and they cannot, except in comparatively few cases, be designated from others in either of these particulars. They have still a show of influence ; but have well nigh been shorn of their power for good to the general Zion of our God.

We pass over the minor sects and divisions of the Christain Church, as not possessing much to interest, giving it however as our opinion, that there has been rather a retrograde movement than otherwise, and that most have decreased rather than increased in their firm contending for the truth once delivered to the Saints. But for a moment we must take a glimpse at

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH,

If church it can be called. This Church has ever boasted of being "*semper et ubique idem*," and in one respect it is always, always the same, cruel, heartless, tyrannical, but not every where, or at all times exhibiting the same phases. Possessed of deep worldly wisdom, it well knows how to introduce its dogmas and its despotic rules. Like the venomous reptile, which has concealed itself within its den, watching the approach of some victim, and when within reach striking its fangs with dire and fatal precision ; this Church ever bides its time, and as it supposes itself sure of its object, issues its decrees. Sometimes like the reptile it may fail, and then it retracts to await another and a better opportunity, and sometimes it may encounter by mistake, a foe of unexpected strength and prowess, and feel itself not only foiled in the attempt at conquest, but wounded in its turn, and made to suffer by the conflict. Within comparatively a few years it has exhibited this character to the American people, and we will now endeavor to show how. Since our early remembrance, this Church has changed in its strict feeling of Bible reading among its members, and also of its use in the public schools ; it has changed as to its expressed views of sacred societies, and marriage with Protestants ; it has apparently changed as to its ideas of holding church property by the Bishop alone. It has interfered in elections, introduced religious processions, favored the Jesuits to such a degree, that the country now swarms with them, when it was once supposed they could never effect a foothold. It has made declarations through its public presses, that a few years ago would have been considered treasonable ; in fact it has shewn its errors and dangerous doctrines as a Hydra, and well nigh manifested the necessity of not only severing the heads, but also searing the wounds in such a way as to prevent the rise of others, or by one fell blow depriving it of vitality, and forever ending its influence.

Thus have the various churches passed in review with the changes that have taken place within them, and it only remains for us to notice the tendencies of these changes as to their effect upon true

religion with the ultimate results. What improvement has been made in the character of the churches? Have their disciples been more faithful? Has their preaching been more pungent and useful? Have they been better known for their simplicity and holiness and ardor, faith and love? Are they nearer to the Apostolic and primitive model? In fine, has the world that lies in wickedness been more aroused to a sense of its duty, and has God been more and more glorified as the Church has nominally increased and spread itself abroad? We would it were so, but we fear not, and an important question now is as to the possibility of recovering its pristine strength, and even approaching more nearly the character of the original Zion.

To us it appears more reasonable to suppose, that the changes which have heretofore been made, will be succeeded by others of the same nature, all having a downward tendency until such will be the deterioration that some great effort will be necessary, and in the reformation the really pious and faithful will band together from every denomination, and abandoning all their old and minor difficulties, will unite with one hand and one heart, and forgetting everything but their love to their God and Saviour, and their duty in living to His glory themselves, and using their best endeavors to bring others to the same feelings, will give themselves entirely to His service, and pass the time of their sojourning here in fear, in holiness and peace. Thus will the Church be cleansed—God's people revived, the world overcome, sinners saved and God glorified. Then will the Gospel find free course, and its glorious truths be spread until all flesh shall see God's glory, and His kingdom be spread from the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same.

[For The Critic.]

A RULING ELDER'S VIEWS OF PRESBYTERIAN FORMS AND DOCTRINES AS SUITED TO THE MASSES.

Excellent as our Church is, Apostolic in her forms and Scriptural in all her doctrines, yet she has never commended herself, in this country, in any adequate degree to the masses. Her adherents have been chiefly from the upper and middle classes; and even amongst those classes from the ranks of the reflecting, the intelligent and the educated. So marked has this state of case been, that it is coming to be considered as existing from necessity, and arising from something inherent in our system. Our enemies, it is true, attribute it partly to what they style our peculiar doctrines, which they perhaps lightly think are not suited to captivate the masses. But they charge it chiefly to our pride, exclusiveness, and bigotry; and in this latter the majority of outsiders concur. We, on the other hand, claim that

it requires a certain amount of intelligence to make a good Presbyterian ; a clear head and logical mind, as well as a new heart. Thus by common agreement, and by the existing state of facts, this thing is fixed upon us, and has virtually become a standing article of our creed, almost a *sixth* point of Calvinism ; and what is worse, we not only subscribe to it, but actually glory in what should be our shame.

From whatever cause this state of things may have arisen, it is most pernicious in itself, and most fatal to the proper action of our Church. It was to be the distinguishing excellence of the Kingdom established by our Lord Jesus Christ that to the poor the Gospel should be preached, and from this class it was to seek and to gain its chief converts. So it was described in prophecy, and so declared by our Lord himself and his Apostles.

When therefore we admit that our Church is not suited to the masses, we virtually unchurch ourselves ; and whenever it ceases to reach all classes, it fails to that extent to fulfil its mission as a Church of Christ. If all were true that is charged upon us, nay, if all were true that we ourselves admit, it would force us to conclude that we did not in any proper sense hold the Gospel at all, and would, at least, justify us in seeking for another Gospel, possessing the characteristics of the true. The Gospel we want, and that which the world needs, is the same Gospel that Christ preached to the multitude, and to publicans and sinners, when the common people heard him gladly ; the same Gospel the Apostles were commanded to preach to "every creature." If we have not this Gospel the sooner we get it the better. It becomes us then to examine this matter, to see where we stand, for we are placed in this dilemma : if our forms and doctrines are not suited to the masses then they are not the right forms and doctrines, and we are errorists. If they are the doctrines of the Bible, then we are guilty of gross neglect and presumption, in first withholding them from every creature, and then deciding that they are not suited to any and every man whom God has made. Either we or our doctrines are wrong.

Let us examine this matter a little, not so much to remove any grounds for our present position and belief, as to see if such grounds really exist, and to ascertain whence this opinion has arisen. This is all that we esteem necessary in writing to Presbyterians, and this we must do by brief suggestions.

It is needful here to draw this very important distinction—that when we speak of a Church or doctrine as suited to the masses, it does not imply that it should be *popular* or likely to become so. Such, in one sense, the Religion of Christ can never become. It is not suited to the soil of the heart of man, but is opposed to its natural lusts and inclinations, and cannot therefore be received or relished for its own sake. The soil must be prepared by the Holy Spirit, and the seed sown must be watered by the dews of Divine Grace, to enable it to take root and bring forth fruit to Eternal life. Some of the secondary or incidental truths of the Gospel may meet an approval in the un-renewed heart, where the judgment, or the intellect, or the senti-

ments approve ; but the grand fundamental doctrines of depravity, atonement, regeneration, and justification find no lodgment in the human breast. Some forms of Christianity may become, to some extent, popular, by presenting only their secondary truths, and thus appealing only to the intellect or sentiment, or by yielding to the prejudice, and adapting itself to the conceits of the natural heart, or by perverting or denying the odious doctrines of the Bible, while others may win favor and gain followers by relaxing the strict rules of the Gospel and substituting forms, ceremonies and ordinances for a change of heart and a holy life. But just in proportion as they gain in popularity they lose in efficiency, and as they become in the opinion of the world or the masses a better Religion, they become a poorer Gospel. It is in no such sense that we propose to speak of our Church and doctrines, as suited to the masses ; but only to consider whether they are calculated to accomplish that for which the Gospel was intended. Or rather to consider whether holding, as we hope and firmly believe we do, the Gospel in its essential purity, there is any thing in our non-essentials or anything peculiar in our organization to unfit it for its great work, so as to debar us from pressing it with hopes of success.

If we hold the Gospel pure and unadulterated in substance, and still our Church is not suited to the mass of men, the difficulty must exist either in the form of Worship, or form of Government, or in some peculiarity in our manner of holding and setting forth the Doctrines. If it exists in none of these, then there is no objection except such as lies against the Gospel itself.

We shall not waste our time in a defence of our forms of worship. They are of the simplest kind, the very simplicity of the Gospel itself. Their only object seems to be to enable us to worship that God who is a spirit in spirit and in truth. Simple yet sublime, plain but solemn—devotion without the aid of superstition, and aiming to elevate without undue excitement, not favoring any thing like mere formalism, and aiming to do all things decently and in order, it possesses all the requisites for a pure, spiritual worship. It requires no deep learning nor mental training to fit any one for its simple, solemn services. There are no liturgies to be learned, no complicated ceremonies to be comprehended. The simplest forms of prayer and praise, and expounding God's word, as it was done in the Synagogues of old, and after the manner of our Saviour himself, constitutes the whole of our worship. We might be tempted to write an eulogy upon it, but we cannot stop to write a defence. We might attempt to show that it is most admirably adapted to the masses in this country, but we only need to claim that there is nothing in our forms to unfit them for carrying the Gospel to the masses, to establish all we are aiming at.

The same may be said with equal truth and still greater force of our excellent form of Government. Simple, efficient and Republican, embodying as it does in Ecclesiastical Government what we boast of as the perfection of wisdom and liberty in the civil Constitution,

it cannot need any argument to commend it to Republican America. Under the Providence of God, the rule which has prevailed in the Old World has been reversed, and instead of making the Church model its Constitution after that of the State, here the State, by a wonderful coincidence, has conformed her Constitution remarkably to that of our Church. They are, in fact, nearly exact counterparts, not only modelled upon the same general principles, but arranged with precisely similar details. If history were lost, we should be unable to decide which was the original, but with Scripture and History open before us—we are certainly not the imitators. It can be shown conclusively that the great idea, and almost the exact language of that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence, emanated first from the Presbytery of Mecklenberg, in North Carolina. So we are almost led to suspect that the framers of the Federal Constitution had some knowledge of our Book of Forms, or that the whole was the work of Presbyterians—that the idea of magistrates and county courts was borrowed from our Bench of Elders and Church Sessions—that the plan of circuit courts was suggested by our Presbyteries—that the State government corresponded to our Synod—while Congress filled the place of our General Assemblies—so nearly parallel do the two systems run in State and Church Government, and so plainly do they coincide in details. We mention this, not so much as an argument for our forms, for they we hold are divinely appointed, but urge it to show that our forms, as far as we can decide by human reason, are precisely adapted to our people.

If then no objection exist in our forms of Worship and of Government, if it exist at all, it must be in our doctrines. In discussing this point we strike at the root of the whole matter, in its most important sense, when we say that these are the doctrines of the Gospel. Ours is emphatically the Religion of the Bible—receiving and embracing *the whole* word of God, rejecting and extenuating nothing, but giving to long revealed truth and doctrine its full bearing and importance, without addition or diminution from human reason. The Bible is our best and fullest expositor, and its writers our most able expounders. We preach the same Gospel that Christ preached upon the Mount and by the sea side, in the cities, and in the villages. We preach the same warnings he gave to Publicans and Sinners, to the Scribes and Pharisees, to his Disciples, and to the multitudes. We preach the same doctrines he preached to Nicodemus, when he said: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God.” The same doctrines he preached in the Synagogue at Capernaum, when he said: “No man can come to me, except it were given him of my Father;” and, “This is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all that he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.” We preach the same Gospel preached by Peter on the day of Pentecost, when he said: “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you and

to your children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call." We preach the same Gospel that Paul preached throughout all the cities of Asia and Europe, and expounded in his Epistles. It is this Gospel and those doctrines that we hold and preach. If any man preach any other let him be "Anathema."

But it may be said that notwithstanding the doctrines are Scriptural, they are still such as the masses will not or cannot apprehend in all their relations, as a Theology. To this we reply, that this we do not require, nor does the Scripture any where require it. We do not make it a condition with any man in receiving him into the Church, that he shall be able to explain all the mysteries of the plan of Redemption, nor to give a logical exposition of the summary of those doctrines as set forth in our Confession of Faith. We require just what the Bible requires, namely: faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. When an applicant comes for admission we require his assent to the great doctrines of the Gospel, and say as Philip to the Eunuch: "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." If there is any one thing required by our Church more than all others, it is *Faith*—a full, unreserved, perfect, and implicit faith in all the word of God. And blessed be his name, this is perhaps most frequently vouched to the humble, untutored soul. It is in fact not in the exercise of the higher powers of the mind that men are made Christians, but when they become as little children. They are not commonly reasoned into the Kingdom of God, nor do they soar into it on the wings of the lofty intellect or of genius, but they are led into it by the Spirit of God. A very small amount of knowledge is sufficient for this purpose, for "the Kingdom of Heaven is as a *little* leaven." He that knows no more of the Gospel than its simple story, and its simplest truths, knows enough, if enlightened by the Spirit, to make him-wise unto salvation.

But many who have assented to all we claim up to this point have still, back of all this, an apprehension that there is something in our manner of holding and setting forth our doctrines which unfits them for the masses. It is a partial, but still perhaps a proper reply on this point, to say that we have for the membership no such prescribed manner of holding those doctrines, provided they are held substantially. But this answer while it meets the objection does not reach the point we are aiming at, for we fear there is a very serious error lying far back in the minds not only of the community generally, but of many of our excellent and candid members. We mean a misapprehension of the place occupied in our system of Faith by our doctrine, or their proper force or bearing. On this we have space to say only a few words, but will try to make them to the point.

No Church or system of doctrines has been as much misrepresented and misunderstood as the Presbyterian. We have given to the world a far more full and explicit statement of our faith, than any other body of Christians, in fact, the only complete and logical summary of the doctrines of the Bible that has ever been made. This, our "Confession of Faith," we have never been permitted

ourselves to expound. Ignorant, conceited, and bigoted rivals or opponents have always insisted upon such interpretations as their ignorance or malice might suggest. We have thus been charged with monstrous and absurd doctrines, wrung from some isolated passage in our Confession of Faith, which has been misinterpreted, misunderstood and misapplied—some great doctrine wrested from its place in our great logical system of truth, has been exaggerated and perverted out of place and out of proportion until made to appear revolting. And we are not permitted to defend, scarcely even to object. We are hardly permitted to quote from the word of God, to prove or explain our meaning, and even Scripture will be denied if it sustains our doctrine. We are thus held responsible for all the vagaries of minds remarkable only for a lack of love, learning and logic, and to be judged neither by Scripture nor common sense. Hard requirement—to have our faith, extracted pure from the word of God, tried by human reason! Still harder fate, to be held responsible for the logical deductions of such minds! Yet such has always been our fate. It is no wonder that our doctrines have been misunderstood. It is no wonder that it has hitherto required a more than ordinary degree of intelligence to understand—we will not say our doctrines—(for they are not in the compass of the human understanding,) but to understand in the midst of so much misrepresentation, *what* our doctrines really are; and it is still less wonder that all this, added to the natural aversion of the human heart to the doctrines of Grace, has made our Church with many unpopular.

But we have exposed but half the evil, and that the least serious, when we have spoken only of the conduct of our enemies. The most serious source of erroneous opinions in relation to the doctrines of our Church, has sprung from ourselves; partly from a large portion not being thoroughly indoctrinated, partly from another portion being too zealous for doctrines, but chiefly from the want of a correct understanding of the place occupied by these doctrines in the Bible, and in our system of Faith. The great object of the Gospel is to bring the soul back to God through Christ the Mediator and Redeemer, and all the doctrines teach how this is done, revealing to us as far as it can be revealed, the manner and the plan, with reference to the attributes of God, and the nature and condition of man. The end and aim of all the doctrines is to point to Christ, and to procure his acceptance, and for this purpose they should be used. We are guilty of great sin when we stop to debate with the starving sinner about the chemical composition of the Bread of life; and it would be a still more presumptuous sin to require him in his dying condition to tell correctly the component parts of the only medicine in the Universe that can save him. The great object and end is deliverance, salvation. This is to be pressed first, and above and beyond everything else. Had we always borne this in mind we should have troubled ourselves and others much less about mere abstract views of these doctrines. And had we understood better another fact, which is the grand key to our Presbyterian faith, namely, that we believe certain

doctrines because they are taught in the Bible, and that they are set forth in the Confession of Faith, because it is intended to be a complete summary of the doctrines of the Bible ; and had we been content to leave the doctrines just where the Bible has placed them, we should have been still nearer our true position. We would then have been prepared to press the great point of the Gospel—the call to repentance and faith in Christ—and to urge to this because of our total depravity, and our rebellion against God ; and to encourage by the great doctrines of atonement, justification, and regeneration ; and still further, by reason of the sovereign grace and electing love of God. Then we think all the doctrines would have been presented in their proper place and for their proper end, and the enlightenment and the result is with God.

It is when we turn aside from this and attempt too much, that we fail. We are not called on to explain the mysteries of God, nor to make known his secret counsels. We are not bound to tell a sinner before he will accept of Christ, whether his name is written in the Book of Life ; whether he is of the election of grace, and will be led by the Spirit to repent and be saved ; or whether he will be permitted to go on in his sins ; to destroy himself, and be lost ; or what God's purpose may be concerning him. All this is between the soul of the sinner and God. It is ours to press the call in the way and on the terms that God has made it, and doing that to the extent of our ability, we meet all the responsibility resting on the Church. Had our Church always taken her stand here and fulfilled her duty in this respect, she would have been as to her doctrines not only impregnable, but unassailable ; for she would have had the sure word of God, unmutated and immutable, as a sure defence all around her. It is only when she has ventured without these limits and relied on human reason, that she has been assailed to her injury. And more than this, she would have insensibly drawn many true Christians to her ; for however men may reason and profess, yet when they come really to the work of salvation, or to preaching and praying to that end, it must be done in our way, that is, on Bible grounds ; and every man in such acts and at such times becomes a *Calvinist*. We repeat again, that on these grounds and within these limits our Church is irresistible and invincible. It embraces, in fact, the only system of Faith and Doctrines that can be sustained against all the forms of error, either open or insidious, by which the Church of God is beset and endangered in our day and generation.

It has been our object to suggest as forcibly as we could, to the minds of our earnest reflecting men, that the difficulties which have seemed to be in our way in gaining access to the masses, are to a great extent unfounded, and that none exist, except such as spring from the natural heart in opposition to a pure gospel. We might go much farther, and dwell upon the positive excellencies of our forms and doctrines. We think it could be shown that they are *better* suited to carry the Gospel to the masses than those of any other Evangelical Church. This we think could be shown by past history, and the experience of the present age. But this would carry us too far from our present purpose.

We have a great practical application in view in all we have said. A wide spread and fatally common idea has prevailed on this subject, which has led to inaction on our part towards the masses of our fellow men. We cannot attempt to paint the great and glaring enormity of our guilt in the sight of God for withholding the Gospel from any of our fellow men on these excuses. We say then to all our Sacramental host, you have the pure Gospel, which shall accomplish that whereunto it is sent; see to it, as you expect to answer at the bar of God, that it is, as far as in your power, preached to every creature.

[For The Critic.]

THE AMERICAN PARTY.

ITS CAUSE, PROGRESS, OBJECTS AND RESULT.

Politics have assumed a new, and to the old managers of parties and elections, a most unexpected phase. Many things have conspired to produce this result; and men will, no doubt, give this or that explanation of the movement we are witnessing, according to the point of view from which they consider it. Many effects may be produced by the movement itself; and men will appreciate those effects, and endeavor to promote or prevent them, according to their views of general politics, of the interests of society, and of the proper destiny of our great country.

The intense and pervading power of the movement itself can no longer be a matter of doubt. And to the calm observer various elements are manifest which render its future progress, altogether inevitable. Amongst these decisive elements may be stated, the augmented force of the movement itself, acquired by its own previous triumphs; and the greater homogeneousness of the spirit of it, to the portions of the country yet remaining to be subdued, than to the portions already conquered. It will encounter no difficulty equal to the intense Democracy of New Hampshire, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Michigan; the wide-spread political immorality of New York; the settled anti-slavery sentiment of Massachusetts; the hereditary whigism of Kentucky. Yet all of these—are mastered, by the grander spirit of the new movement. What barrier remains to arrest its irresistible career?

It is infinitely absurd for the opponents of this vast movement of the human mind, to attribute it to unworthy or insignificant causes. It is utterly ridiculous for its friends, to imagine that it can exhaust itself upon objects that are feeble and indistinct. It may aim at

what is wrong, or what is unattainable ; but it cannot avoid aiming at what is great and permanent—any more than it could have been produced by any thing that was feeble, indirect, or base. A great people does not receive such shocks, from such causes ; nor when received do they terminate without immense results.

What we behold is a vast, and apparently spontaneous and nearly universal uprising of the spirit of American Nationality. Beneath that, we behold the restoration of that primeval spirit of Protestant civilization, in which the country itself was originally created. And still beneath that, we behold the renewal of that profound sense of the overwhelming necessity of our National Union—which was the grandest outbirth of our National Revolution. These are the life, and heart, and soul of this gigantic movement—American Nationality ; Protestant civilization ; National Union. The country believes all three of these are in danger. Men may say the country is deluded. But that does not alter the case—so long as the country thinks otherwise. The country is resolved that all danger to all of these—shall be thoroughly removed. Men may say, the country is misled : but what of that, so long as the country is resolved to be National, Protestant, and United ? The country is thoroughly convinced, that it cannot trust the perpetuation of its Nationality, its Protestant civilization, and its Union as one people, any longer—to the keeping of existing parties, in their ordinary action—and so the country has, for the time at least, set aside all parties. Men may say this is mere fanaticism : but what does the country care for the sayings of men whom it rejects as unworthy of being trusted with its destiny, in so great a crisis ? The country resolves to perpetuate the Union of these States. They who are faithful to that Union, had better take up the same great parable : they who are not, ought, in the judgment of the country to be indiscriminately crushed. The country determines that its Protestant civilization is its original, its most precious, and its most vital inheritance ; and, believing it to have been betrayed, it purposes to surround it with adequate safeguards. They who participate in these opinions and purposes, will applaud this profound purpose : they who conspire to destroy that Protestant civilization, or who abet, or sell themselves to those who do, must abide the political overthrow which so justly, and permanently awaits them. The country cherishes its glorious Nationality—and believing it to be endangered, it has risen up in its majesty—to assert, to vindicate, and to develop still more powerfully that Nationality, without which, the country itself has no destiny—no mission on the face of the earth. They who are so lost to every exalted instinct, as to be insensible to the grandeur of such hopes as God has set before us, may also despise all the efforts by which those hopes are to be realized. Nevertheless, the country will guard and assure its Nationality, in spite, of its recreant children, as well as its open foes. This is one version of this good movement : one point of view from which its rise, its progress, and its aims are distinctly manifest. Let the country ex-

cute such a work in such a spirit; and she will be launched anew upon her high career.

It may be of less importance to determine by what means this great spirit has been aroused and concentrated. Yet that is not difficult. Manifestly whatever those means were, they must have worked long, and worked deeply. Was it nothing that in all parts of the country, and for years together, and upon the most opposite pretexts, the dissolution of the Union was constantly threatened? Was it nothing, that political corruption grown gigantic in the land, had shocked all honest men? Was it nothing that a stream of foreign paupers and felons flowed ceaselessly into the bosom of the Republic? Was it nothing that millions of foreign Papists, and foreign infidels, inundating the country like a flood of locusts, were openly organized into political powers, directed against the Liberty, the Religion, and the Nationality of the people? Was it nothing that political parties openly bought and sold the support of these fearful powers—contracting always for such payments, in return, as were the most humiliating, and the most fatal? Was it nothing that the voice of patriots, the power of the press, the importunities of the pulpit were directed, each in its own sphere and for years together, against this frightful and enormous wickedness? Was it nothing, that at length, men could neither vote, nor speak, nor preach, nor pray, without being liable to insult and violence—unless they would do all in such a manner as suited the tastes of foreign mobs, composed of foreign infidels and Papists? Yea, verily, they were deep causes, and they worked long, which wrought the American people to that earnest and fervid, but yet calm and settled enthusiasm, which pervades the nation.

No doubt Religion is an element of this wide-spread excitement. But it is not the only element, nor with all men the chief one. Either of the other elements, by itself, or this one by itself—ought to have been sufficient to have saved the country from the peril which now demands the power of all three to avert it. Because it is an element at all, they over whom long delayed retribution is impending—scream at the bare mention of it, as the demoniacs did when they saw Christ approach them. It is a persecution for conscience sake in their view, that we hesitate to surrender our Country, our Liberty, and our Religion to the guidance of corrupt men, banded with foreigners; and what makes it a persecution is, that these foreigners happen to be Papists and Infidels. If they had happened to be Chinese, or Mahomedans, the nation would have revolted much sooner. And yet without reason. For we and our fathers have an unsettled account with Popery, at least three centuries and a half long. At first, it was the Emperor and the Pope who trod us into the dust. Then it was Kings and Bishops, who burned some at the stake, and drove the rest out of Europe, from all lands into this wilderness. Now it is mobs and demagogues, who have followed us into our place of refuge—nay, our *last* place of refuge—and they renew here the combat of centuries—in a form at once more degrading and detestable, and more

likely to be fatal to us than in either of its preceding forms. Shall we be driven into the Pacific? Shall we succumb? Or shall we turn upon our relentless pursuers? They have followed the lion to his last den, and brought him to bay! Did they expect him to die like a stag in his lair?

The revolt of the country was wholly unexpected, by those who supposed they had already secured its final subjugation; and like every other great retribution, it takes those it falls on by surprise. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, that they execrate with peculiar horror the special means of success against them, which their own perfidy and ferocity had rendered absolutely indispensable. The country organizes itself for the great conflict—which, to those who first embarked in it, seemed well nigh desperate—in silence and without observation. That is the way in which all grand movements occur; even the Kingdom of Heaven does not come with observation. But the demagogues, the priests, the mobs, the foreign Papists and Infidels, are shocked beyond endurance—because the handful of devoted men who just combined to save the country, if that were any longer possible—did not call the whole of them, into council! For what? In order to be murdered,—or if not murdered, traduced;—and the very end for which they were willing to be traduced, and if necessary murdered—utterly defeated? Were *they* called into council, when their enemies bought and sold them? Were *they* notified, when corrupt bargains were struck, in which the liberties of the people were put up at an infamous price? Were *they* consulted when the atrocious schemes to break up the Union of these States were concocted? Were *they* advertised, when the overthrow of our Nationality, of our Institutions, and of our Religion together, was deliberately undertaken by the Popish Despots and Prelates of Europe? Was counsel asked of *them*, by foreign Papists and Infidels, when, throughout the whole land, they conspired, with the full assent of demagogues, to overthrow the Protestant civilization of the country? Were the secrets of the Confessional made known to *them*? Were the secret oaths binding every Papal Ecclesiastic with unlimited allegiance to a foreign temporal Prince—submitted to *their* scrutiny? *The safety of the State, is the supreme law.* And surely it is the first necessity of a State that is endangered, that they who would save it *must* consult, *must* combine. If the perfidy and ferocity of their enemies compel them to observe unusual caution—it only proves the greatness of their danger. In point of morality, it stands precisely on the same footing, as vote by ballot. The object of it, determines its lawfulness: and it is its success, not its nature, which makes it so hateful.

If the Nationality of America is to be sustained; if her Protestant civilization is to be perpetuated; if the Federal Union is to be preserved: there is but one possible method of dealing with the subject. The organized power of society must be taken out of the hands of those who have betrayed these vast interests, and must be put into the hands of those who will cherish them. Public opinion, is the

only instrument by which this great change can be effected. The first step of this revolution is political; the second is legal. The first step involves the organization, and the triumph, of a party commensurate with the country, *The American Party*: and that involves, the overthrow of every party that resists its ultimate objects, or resists the necessary means of obtaining those objects. Indeed if this step were fully achieved, it would be of less consequence to take a second one; since the laws tho' bad, are enduring; and society is safe, as soon as it has finally put out of power, all men and parties, hostile to our Nationality, to our Protestant civilization, and to our Federal Union—out of power, with an overthrow incapable of being repaired. And this is the reason why this great movement, excites such excruciating bitterness of hate, in its political aspect, on the part of all against whom it is directed. Its success, is seen to be a finality, and a fatality to them. For nations do not immediately incur the same peril, twice: nor do profound national movements, speedily exhaust their force. The Democratic party has survived the storms of a hundred years. The *American party*, strong enough to swallow up not only Democracy itself—but every other feeble excitement, will live forever. The *legal* revolution, therefore, which will consummate the political, will be only, but necessarily the outbirth of its spirit. Assaults upon the Union of these States, whether from the North or the South, must cease. Conspiracies against the Protestant civilization of the country, between demagogues on one side, and Papal and Infidel foreigners on the other, must terminate. Attacks upon our Nationality, by treaties made between foreign Despots and Prelates, under the sanction of the court of Rome; and executed by millions of foreign Papists and Infidels cast into our bosom—must be brought to an end. Foreigners, must be content to enjoy here the blessings of freedom—denied to them everywhere else; the benefits of a civilization more exalted than any they can enjoy elsewhere; the same civil and religious rights, which we ourselves enjoy. *They must cease to rule us. Americans must rule America.*

THE MISSION OF THE COMFORTER.

One of the most remarkable statements in the Word of God is that of our Saviour, in his memorable valedictory discourse to His disciples, concerning the mission of the Holy Ghost, as the comforter of His people:—"Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." The solemn form of asseveration with which the announcement was made

was eminently needful, and was designed to meet the incredulity of His followers and friends. It was painful enough to lose the personal presence of their Master, under any circumstances ; but to be told that, after His departure, they should be the victims of persecution, should be put to death with a remorseless zeal, springing from the imagination that their death would be an acceptable sacrifice to God—or, what was worse than death, should be accounted the filth and off-scouring of all things for His sake—and yet, notwithstanding all, it was expedient for them that He should go away :—this was enough to make their faith reel and stagger. How *could* they believe that any gift, however precious, could compensate for the loss of Him who spake as never man spake, and worked as never man worked ? “For never was there any intercourse or communion upon earth between man and man, the blessedness of which could for a moment be compared with that found by the disciples in the presence of their Lord. Although Jerusalem, with her priests and her doctors—the expounders of the Law which prepared the way for Him, and the ministers of the sacrifices which foreshadowed Him—would not listen when He wished to gather them beneath the wings of His love, the fishermen of Galilee had listened to His call, and had come to Him, and found shelter. As they had forsaken all for His sake, in Him they had found far more than all. They had found shelter, even as children find shelter beneath the guardian care of their parents. They had found every thing that a child can receive from the wisest and most loving of fathers, only of a more perfect kind, and in a higher degree—help in every need, relief from every anxiety and care, support under every distress, consolation under every affliction, an abundant, overflowing supply for every want of body and soul, of heart and mind. They came to Him for food ; and He gave them food wherewith to feed thousands : yea, destitute as they were, and although the wilderness was spread around them, He gave them spiritual food wherewith to feed the whole world through all the generations of mankind, and worldfuls over and above. They complained to Him of the fruitlessness of their labors, how they had toiled, and toiled, and taken nothing ; and at His word they drew in such a draught, that they were dismayed at their success, and began to sink beneath its weight. They cried to Him in their terror at the storm which was raging around them ; and the winds and the waves were hushed by the breath of His omnipotent word. In Him they had the fulness of Truth, and Grace, and Wisdom, and Peace, and Love : yea, the fulness of God, dwelling with them, talking with them face to face, bearing patiently with all their infirmities, upholding them against their own frailties and perversities, warning them against all dangers, and, when through neglect of His warning they fell, lifting them up again, strengthening their hearts and souls, pouring His light into their understandings, and guiding and leading them onward in the way of everlasting life. Time after time too they had been taught by grievous experience, that, safe and strong, and clear-sighted as

they were by the side of their Master, when away from Him they were still feeble and helpless, and blind. Yet, notwithstanding all this, notwithstanding all the blessings which the disciples were daily and hourly receiving from the presence of their Lord, notwithstanding the many sad proofs they had seen of their own ignorance and weakness when out of His sight, still, such was the riches of the grace which the promised Comforter was to bestow on them, that, for the sake of obtaining that grace, it was expedient for them, Jesus tells them, it was better for them that He should go away and leave them, so that the Comforter might come to them in His stead, and might dwell with them and in them.”*

No inquiry can be more interesting or more important to a student of the ways of Him, who is “wonderful in working”—than that which is suggested in these words of the Redeemer. The reigning sin of the Church from the beginning till now, has been to undervalue the Comforter, and to attempt to restore the personal presence of Christ—not indeed literally, but so far as was possible, by corruption in doctrine and innovation in worship. And we have yet to learn the meaning of those weighty words of Paul:—“Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more.”

Why then was it expedient that Jesus should go away? We answer: first, that the established order in the discharge of the offices of the Son and the Spirit required it. All the Persons in the adorable Trinity are represented, in Scripture, as engaged in the work of accomplishing the redemption of man—in like manner as they are all engaged in the works of creation and general providence. The word of the Father evoked the Heavens and the earth out of the abyss of nothing—all things were created by Jesus Christ—the Holy Ghost brooded over chaos and made it pregnant with all the forms of life and beauty. “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work”—is the language of our divine Master, describing the ceaseless operation of Providence. So also, the redeemed people of God are baptized “into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost:” they are addressed as the “elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.” Further, not only are all

*This long extract is taken from Archdeacon Hare’s Sermons on the “Mission of the Comforter.” It is gratifying to have such proof that the spirit of Simeon still lingers in the halls of the ancient University of Cambridge: and that while Oxford seems given up to *Patrolatry* and *Puseyism*—to the worship of lifeless forms and the belief of endless absurdities—her venerable sister has men within her walls, who glory in the doctrines of Grace as preached and defended by the early Reformers, and feel religion to be a power and a life. It is understood that the Archdeacon belongs, like Conybeare, Howson and Trench, to the “Broad Party” in the Church of England: and it is only necessary to name the “Victory of Faith,” the “Mission of the Comforter,” the “Life and Epistles of Paul,” the “Hulsean Lectures for 1845-6,” and the “Notes” on the “Parables” and “Miracles”—to show that we have ground to hope that this new school of divines will do good service, not only to their own Church, but to the world. The writer of this article gratefully acknowledges his obligations to them all.

the Persons engaged in this glorious work, but there is a certain order in which their respective offices are performed:—an order founded upon the order of subsistence of the Persons themselves in the unity of the Divine nature. Although the same in substance, and equal in power and glory, yet there is a subordination of *relations* among them: so that in the order of thought the Father is before the Son and both before the Spirit. Hence the Father is said to send the Son, and the Father and the Son, or either, to send the Spirit: and these relations themselves are never reversed, although the order in which the names of the Trinity are sometimes mentioned, unquestionably is. In other words, the subordination of personal relations is the foundation of the subordination of the personal offices. The Father—according to the view given in our Lord's Intercessory Prayer—gave His people to the Son, the Son lay down His life for them, the Spirit sanctifies them, quickens them, transforms them into the image of the First Born. This simple statement reveals at once the necessity of our Lord's death, resurrection and ascension in order to the descent of the Holy Spirit, as the Convincer of the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment. This three-fold object to which the Spirit's office as the Convincer of the world has reference, seems to correspond with the three-fold office of the Son, as Prophet, Priest and King. Christ, in all His offices, is the grand comprehensive object of faith: but the immediate object of faith, and therefore of unbelief, is His testimony as a Prophet. "Righteousness" belongs to Him as a Priest, and "Judgment" belongs to Him as a King.

If now we look into the Acts of the Apostles, and examine the outlines of Peter's sermons there recorded and preserved, it will be evident that the offices of Christ constituted the substance of the Apostolic testimony, and the prominent objects of faith which the power of the Comforter was manifested to confirm. Christ, the Prophet predicted by Moses (Deut. 18:15,) whom all the people, upon pain of excommunication from the covenant of God, were required to hear and to obey,—Christ, the Priest after the order of Melchisedek, who was to bring in an everlasting righteousness (Ps. 110)—Christ, the promised King who was to sit upon the throne of His father David (Ps. 89)—this was the beginning, the middle, and the end of that preaching, which, under the power of the Comforter, turned the world upside down. It is evident, further, that the fact upon which the witnesses of Jesus mainly relied to secure attention and claim obedience to their message, was the fact of His *resurrection* from the dead. It was this fact that fulfilled His predictions as a Prophet—that demonstrated the completeness of His righteousness as a Priest, that illustrated His power as a King. And as the resurrection implied His going away from His disciples, the expediency of His going away in order to the advent of the Comforter, becomes extremely clear. No man can read the Acts of the Apostles, and compare the condition of the Church, as set forth in that book, with its condition,

as revealed in the Gospels,—without seeing the vast superiority of the former to the latter, that is to say, the superiority of the dispensation of the Comforter to the dispensation of Christ's bodily presence. It was expedient that Jesus should be glorified before the Spirit should be given, according to the remarkable declaration in John 7:39,—more remarkable in the original tongue than in the authorized version.

But it may be said, it does not yet appear why it was necessary for Christ to go away and *remain* away; why the Heavens should retain Him till the restitution of all things; why He might not have died, risen again, ascended into Heaven, and returned Himself to earth on the day of Pentecost, signaling His return by showering upon men the Comforter's splendid gifts. In reply to this, it is enough to say, that the presence of the human nature of Christ on earth would have been inconsistent with the design of that dispensation which His personal advent was intended to introduce—and that, in respect of its *spirituality* and its *universality*.

First, with its spirituality. Whatever may be thought of the general theory of the gradual education and development of the race of men, it can scarcely be denied by any who admit the divine authority of the Old and New Testaments, and contemplate them as belonging to one and the same special scheme of Providence,—that there has been and was designed to be an education and a progress of the Church, from the days of Abraham till now. There has been many a long and apparently disastrous ebb in the advancing wave; and looking merely at the ebb, the hearts of God's people have sunk within them, and the cry has burst from their lips, "How long, O Lord, how long?" but in winter as well as in summer, in gross darkness as well as in the brightest light, the evolution of the comprehensive plan has been going on; and every event, great or little, auspicious or adverse, to the short-sighted judgment of man, has been one step nearer, not only in the order of time but in the order of the scheme, to the glorious consummation, the presenting the Bride of the Lamb faultless before the Bridegroom with exceeding joy. The process is analogous to that of the education of the individual man, under the existing constitution of Nature and Providence. This process is happily described by Archdeacon Hare in the Work referred to in a preceding note—"As it is expedient for children, that at first they should be carried in the arms of their mothers, and that they should walk in leading strings, or with some other like support, and so should learn by little and little to walk alone, and that for a long time they should do every thing in strict obedience, according to the commands of their parents, as though they had no will of their own, so, on the other hand, as they advance toward years of discretion, is it expedient that the human helps, on which they have been accustomed to lean wholly, should one by one be taken away from them. Constant watchfulness and directions are succeeded for awhile by occasional watchfulness and directions; commands are superseded

by counsel; and after a time we no longer have even the counsel of our natural monitors, but are left to the exercise of our own judgment, and to the advice of such friends as the course of life may bring across our path. Such is the order which God has appointed for the life of man—"Such is the care with which He has girt us round. 'Parents first season us: then schoolmasters deliver us to Laws.' These several stages however are not—at least they ought not to be—removals into a different region of life. They ought not to be cut off one from another. Rather should each succeeding state be an expansion of that which went before, even as the bud expands into the blossom, and as the blossom, after shedding its robe of beauty, expands into the fruit. At each step indeed we meet with sundry temptations to reject and look back with scorn on the past. Our vanity prompts us to do so, being flattered by the thought of our having recently achieved an emancipation from a moral and intellectual bondage, to which, through our feebleness and helplessness, we had been compelled to submit. Yet the only way in which we can make head against the crushing tyranny of the present, is by holding firmly to the past, to that which was *living* and *permanent* in it, merely casting away what was *outward* and *accidental*. That which has been the good spirit of the past, should abide with us as a guardian angel through life, manifesting itself more and more clearly to the soul, as we rise from one step to another."—"Thus the child is indeed the father of the man: and this is the true discipline and preparation for freedom; which none can enjoy *outwardly*, except he who *has it in himself*; and which consists in the orderly, harmonious, unchecked, unconstrained movement of the heart and soul and mind, in the path marked out for them by God."

These principles, which the Archdeacon applies especially to the case of the immediate Apostles and companions of the Lord, and which receive such striking corroboration from the history of the Acts—are applicable to the whole Church, considered in its largest sense. It was a favorite analogy of Paul. The Epistle to the Galatians turns mainly upon it: and in the 13th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, he transfers it to himself "in a figure," and urges it as an argument against the abuse of spiritual gifts. The Church, under Moses, was in a state of pupilage and bondage; in the care of a pedagogue; surrounded by carnal ordinances; possessing a temple made with hands; altars of burnt-offering and intercession; visible signs of the presence of God; the ark, the cherubim and the mercy seat. There were victims offered, which her eyes could see and her hands could handle: the priests, the atoning blood, the aromatic cloud of incense, were all things of sense. They were all helps in the education of her childhood, and designed to inculcate and engrave upon her mind those principles of truth and righteousness, which, in all ages, should be the constituent elements of her character as the offspring of God. The external scaffolding was allowed to stand till it was no longer needed: the integument

was allowed to remain upon the precious germ, till it reached that stage when it was ready to expand into the blossom: the external robe of beauty continued to adorn the hidden fruit, till the fruit was ready to appear and the blossom was about to become a barrier against the beams of that sun, under whose genial influences the whole process began and continued and is to be completed. The Church was no longer to live by *sight*, but by *faith*: she was no longer to be under the discipline of the flesh, but under the discipline of the Spirit. Not that she was to be wholly emancipated from the authority of God, and henceforth do what was right in her own eyes, as some even in our own Church appear to hold when they speak contemptuously of *jus divinum* theories—but that, with this principle of the supremacy of God's will in all things—the reigning idea of the Institute of Moses—firmly enthroned in the heart, and pervading and moulding her whole life, she should live by faith in an unseen God, a faith having no eyes, but ears exquisitely sensitive to the softest whispers of His voice. All that was *living* and *permanent* in her early stage, was to continue: all that was *outward* and *accidental*, was to be done away. She was now prepared for freedom: and it was her privilege to enjoy it. Let her stand fast in it.

Now if this be a just view of the relations of the Church under the Old and New Testaments, it seems very clear, that it was expedient for our Blessed Lord to go away, as to His bodily presence, from His people. He was the substance of all the shadows: the Priest, the Altar, the Sacrifice, the Temple, summing up, in His own exalted Person, all that was taught in the complicated ceremonial of the Law: but He was *visible*: He was the Word of life, “seen,” as John expresses it, “with their eyes, and handled with their hands.” Hence there was little room for the exercise of faith: so long as He was by their side, they were strong; when He was absent, or even asleep, they were helpless as children. The words of Peter, on the mount of Transfiguration, reveal the true state of feeling, which was likely to exist, so long as the Master was visible to the bodily eye:—“Let us make here *three* tabernacles; one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elijah:”—that is, let Christ, and the Law and the Prophets dwell together on earth. Well is it added—“not knowing what he said.” If it was expedient, therefore, that the Temple and the whole Levitical Ritual should be abolished: it was, for a similar reason, expedient, that He who was the substance and complement of all, should go away into heaven, and be “seen no more.”—“Thomas, because thou hast *seen* me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have *not seen*, and yet have believed.”

The expediency of our Saviour's departure is made manifest also, from the obstinate tendency in the church, since His ascension, to make such changes in His worship and in His doctrine, as to make his human nature visible and tangible, as far as possible. The Synagogue of Rome is the most conspicuous example, of what we mean. Architecture, Painting, Statuary, and Instrumental Music—this last

carried further than it ever was even in the Jewish Church—are all pressed into the service of making Christ “Known after the flesh:” and the result is, the Comforter is gone, and the miserable people are in helpless and hopeless bondage to ignorance, imbecility and pollution. The same tendency is at work every where: and nothing but the mercy of God prevents us all from converting ourselves, the free-men of Christ, into slaves of Moses.

But we have said that the continued bodily presence of Christ, was inconsistent not only with the spirituality, but with the universality of the gospel dispensation. So much space has been occupied already, that there is room only to state the leading thoughts. The more attentively we read the Acts and the Epistles, the more must we be impressed with the importance attached to the idea of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles. How the Apostle of the Gentiles labours when he attempts to express this sublime mystery! placing, in his description (1. Tim. 3.) of the “mystery of godliness,” along with “God manifest in the flesh,” the preaching of this Incarnate Word to the *Gentiles!* (and see the first two or three chapters in the Epistle to the Ephesians.) Now both Jews and Gentiles knew none but *local* religions: and at the time of our Saviour’s advent, the religion of the Jews was more intensely local than it had ever been before. The Temple was the grand centre, and the land of the Temple was the *Holy Land*. Upon the same principles of human nature, therefore, on which we have shown the inconsistency between a spiritual religion and carnal forms of worship, may be shown the inconsistency between a universal religion and local forms of worship. Both these points are brought out by our Saviour, in His conversation with the woman of Samaria, (John 4: 20-24,) and we beg our readers to turn to that passage; and then ask themselves how it has come to pass that the *least spiritual* of all the forms of Christianity boasts of being exclusively *Catholic*. But, further, as we have shown that the bodily presence of Christ was likely to have the same effect upon the spirituality of the church, as the Temple and all the symbolical ordinances: so it may be affirmed, that the effect was likely to be the same in *localizing* the church. Jesus in Heaven, within the veil, at the right hand of God, is in the best place for us, whose duty it is to bear His name to the ends of the earth: well assured as we are, that no where can we go beyond His omnipresent Spirit, the Comforter who abideth with us for ever.

The numberless important applications of these principles must be left to our readers themselves.

"SPIRIT OF AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM"—AS
PER THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

WE proceed now to the execution of the purpose announced in our number for March,—viz : to illustrate for the benefit of our readers, by full quotations from their own admired organ, something of the *spirit, style, and logic* of American Presbyterianism (so called) in 1855.

As the plain outspokening of the Old School-men generally, and of our Journal particularly—has excited the pious horror of the New School section of the Church, we shall first present to our readers, both as illustrative of the beautiful model of controversial style held up to our imitation,—and of the amiable, gentle and brotherly softness of speech with which they put to shame the fierce spirit of us excinders—some specimens of what we may term the Rhetoric *Epi-thetic*—in the writer's allusion to the division of 1837-8.

"But for this aggravation, the feeling which passed the Excinding Acts never could have been kindled. The next year the moderate portion of the more rigid party were overpowered in their turn, and forced to swell the ranks of a faction, which was a happy admixture of despotism and red republicanism, of the ferocity of the reign of terror and the petty chicanery of the very smallest kind of a county court. And this brings us to 1837."

"We should verily have honored our brethren, if they had, for the sake of what they believed truth and order, pursued any of these plans. But they did not. They carried measures through that were purely revolutionary, as really so as those of America in 1776, or France in her wildest hour, and then, with miserable hypocrisy, attempted before the Church, the people, and in courts of justice, to maintain that these measures were constitutional."

"With this premise, let us look at the plan of really effecting a revolution, and then by *chicanery and special pleading* of a legal and ecclesiastical nature, trying to make the impression upon the Church, the world and posterity, that the revolutionary action is constitutional. The first great objection to it is its entire untruthfulness. On the broadest scale, for the longest time, under circumstances the most efficient, while excited mind receives its impressions for life, and churches and nations for generations, is the impression made. By all the sacred sanctions of a pure, severe, Protestant, Presbyterian, Calvinistic religion, the plain man at his plough and in his workshop, the pious matron and the young maiden, the youth at college and the child in the Sabbath-school are taught—A LIVING LIE. Interwoven with the archives of the Church, and the records of courts of justice; argued by discriminating theological professors, and spoken by divines of popular eloquence; urged in church courts and from the pulpit, and plead by eloquent lawyers before masses of the most intelligent of the land is—UTTER FALSEHOOD."

"No thanks to them that God raised up men for the time, who, out of this very enormity, deduced high and glorious principle; no thanks to them that constitutional law stands higher and loftier now than ever—no thanks to them that THIS MEAN COMPOUND OF VIOLENCE AND SPECIAL PLEADING, can henceforth never be repeated. God cares for human rights, and therefore the American Presbyterian Church lives."

"We do not think there are ten men of good, sound, clear sense, in the excinding body, who believe that the real cause of excision was the unconstitutionality of the Plan of Union. It is the sheerest humbug of the western world, and the nineteenth century."

"The next attempt of the rigid party was, what has been called, the absorbing process. In different parts of the country they attempted to coax, or persuade, or bring over by some process our people and ministers from our Church to their own.

This operation showed itself almost simultaneously, especially in Virginia, at Pittsburgh, in the Peninsula between the Chesapeake and Delaware bays, and in East New Jersey. But nearly every man stood firm, and they are quite welcome to those who did not. They may love the treason, but they certainly do not admire the traitors."

"No method has been left untried to dismember us, and we have now the cheering and delightful consciousness that we have passed safely through the severest trial to which a Church can be subjected, under the most painful, harassing, and discouraging circumstances. *The men in our Church that stood firm from 1842 to 1852, by the grace of God can bear any thing.*"

Now we have no complaint to make of these, or any other such passages,—either in the Presbyterian Quarterly Review, or in Mr. Barnes' orations in the General Assembly. If that is their view of the case and their idea of what christian propriety calls for, they have a right to say it, and we may add, better say it openly and plainly, than *whisper* it. But we confess, we are at a loss to perceive the justice of the claim so uniformly set up by that section of the church, to all the meekness, charity, forbearance, mildness of manner, and fraternal kindness of speech, in view of such epithets and such declarations. And yet with a very considerable class of people, New Schoolism makes most of its capital out of its cant of liberality, forbearance, and brotherly love. Does this writer,—does Mr. Barnes, mean to tell the world of the overflow of their brotherly christian affection for men, whose formal and solemn acts, are a "*mean compound of violence, and special pleading*;"—men, who by "*chicanery and special pleading*" teach the "youth at college, and the child in the Sabbath school—a LIVING LIE"—an "UTTER FALSEHOOD!"—men, who, according to Mr. Barnes, perpetrate a "moral wrong, compared with which the dismemberment of Poland was a trifle;"—and who "entice away pure churches" from their allegiance, "with the hope of *absorbing* what they could not *destroy*?" As for ourselves, we must confess an entire failure so far to attain to their sublimated degree of brotherly affection for men, whom we should think guilty of crimes of such a dye; and a weakness of conscience which forbids us to give utterance to fraternal words toward those whose crimes forbid us to love them,—save in the sense in which we love the poor criminal at the bar of justice,—or the poor deluded gentile bowing down in implicit faith before the ugly creature of his own imagination. According to our notion,—if these gentlemen believe the Old School people to be half as bad as their rhetoric makes them, they ought not any longer, keep up that hue and cry about the refusal of the Old School to commune with them. For even if it were true, (which, as all intelligent Presbyterian people know, it is not,) that any such refusal to recognize them as christians had ever occurred, these gentlemen ought to be the last to regret the refusal. Would they commune with a church which by ecclesiastical authority dismembered Poland?—or a church which this writer declares—"by all the sanctions of a pure, severe, Protestant, Presbyterian, Calvinistic religion—teaches its plain men and youth," &c., a "*living lie*," and interweaves with the archives of the church, &c., "*utter falsehood*?" We have no very high opinion of the

clearness of this writer's logic,—nor did we ever consider this quality as among the eminent characteristics of Mr. Barnes' mind, and of course are not disposed to hold either of them to a rigid account for the logical *inferences* from their premises. We therefore take their rhetorical embellishments, not according to the "*ipsissima verba*," (as this writer so often hath it;) but suppose they are to be taken as admitting the Old School to be passable christians, *in their way*;—just as we are in the habit of regarding the great body of New School people. We venture to hint to them, however,—and we are sorry to think the hint may not be altogether out of place to other special friends of the Critic,—that after such specimens of conscientious faithfulness and plainness of speech in reproving the errors and misconduct of their brethren,—their homilies on the evils of controversy—the excellency of brotherly love and softness of speech—and the extra specimens of the dignity of silence, with which they are in the habit of favoring their weaker brethren, do not come in with so good a grace. And that furthermore, the church at large, though sometimes slow in learning it, is yet apt in the end to discover, that it may be Ahab and his prophets—not Elijah, that is the troubler of Israel; that denunciation of the plain out-spoken-advocates of the church's law, and that only, as revolutionists, may be no guarantee against counter revolution in favor of what is aside from the Church's law;—that harmony and union may be often fought for by fierce and divisive measures; that warnings against imaginary plots and conspiracies to disturb the Church's peace, may come from those even who very conscientiously can engage in counterplotting for the overthrow of important measures of the Church;—that the cry of peace! peace! comes sometimes loudest from those whose every act proclaims *no* peace except in submission; that cautious gentleness of speech, may be not always the sure index of gentleness of spirit, thought and feeling;—and therefore it may not always be those who talk loudest of brotherly love, and who are most gingerly and smooth in their manner of speech, that are surest to have the Church's interest and peace most at heart.

The truth is, the very prejudice in the Church, against controversy and strife, to which this too fashionable cant makes its appeal, is in a large measure, founded upon an assumption which the whole history of the Church, alike in the inspired and uninspired ages, goes to show the fallacy of. It is the assumption, that what is found in the Church, and especially—what *seems* to be doing good in the Church, must be presumed to be right; and that any expression of doubt in relation to the wisdom and quasi perfection of what has come to be generally received in the Church, is dangerous and sinful. Whereas the inspired and uninspired history of the Church, alike show, that from the remains of indwelling corruption, among even God's true people, individually and collectively, the constant tendency of the Church, is to error and corruption;—that perpetual vigilance is the price of purity; and that the Church, age after age, has passed through a constant succession of revivals and lapses. It is

therefore no strange thing that there should be discussion, opposition, strife, even among the best of men ; that those who love the Church most, should be found struggling against the wrong tendencies of the Church. The fear of discussion is ever just ground for suspicion.

We pass on to another illustration from the writer ; a specimen of what we venture to term the rhetoric *agonistic*. It is the writer's reply to our remark in No. 1, that the era of 1838, "will doubtless be called by the future German critical historian, the "Heroic Age" of New Schoolism." To this little sentence—mark the response:—

"He calls 1837 and 1838 'the heroic age of New Schoolism.'

I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word.

We accept it. No such great convulsion has ever occurred without action, heroic in feeling and in principle. It certainly was not the heroic age of "Old Schoolism," unless a mixture of brute force and low cunning may be so designated. It certainly was not the heroic age of New England, unless ingratitude and treachery deserve that name. But if there were men who were tortured, not accepting deliverance, except the truth were set free with them ; if there were men who deliberately sacrificed every prospect in life, rather than sanction enormous wrong ; if there were those who severed themselves from the ties of kindred, lineage, neighborhood, companionship, friendship, to stand up for the rights of strangers and foreigners ; if there were men whose hearts bled at every step they took, while they went forward in darkness with no voice but the Saviour's to cheer them ; if there were those who saw clearly that upon their courage then, whatever might become of them, hung the hopes of religious liberty for a great Church, and as that Church has been its bulwark since the Reformation, in a great degree the hopes of religious liberty itself ; if there were men who nerved themselves by gathering inspiration from every affliction of the righteous for truth, and every battle-field for liberty in past time ; if there were those who heard the voice of every confessor and martyr of every age and felt themselves encompassed by that amphitheatre of the holy Universe which gathers to the few and greatest crises of the world's history, and so filled and fired and nerved, resisted one of the most fearful tyrannies in the history of all time, and wrought out one of the noblest deliverances of the world, then do we say, that that sneer becomes the noblest eulogy. The honest conviction of our intellect confirms the thrilling of our heart while we say, that no period of the history of the Church deserves more truly the epithet 'heroic.'

How little thought we in penning those two lines in No. 1, that this should be the germinal seed, to produce so gorgeous a plant ! Nay, more, how little thought we, that we, all unconscious of being engaged at a great task, were settling at last for our New School neighbors, that question which for eighteen years has seemed to worry them—and trouble other people,—to wit,—the name by which they are to be called ! Henceforth, let it be understood as settled—that their's is the "*Heroic Presbyterian Church!*" We must remind the writer, however, that we did not aver this to be the proper title absolutely—but merely predicted that the future German critical historians, (of whose aptness at giving things their right names we have no high opinion,) would give them that title. Had we supposed the body already needed an addition to their numerous *alias-es*, we could have done much better in the way of suggesting a name. Taking this writer—especially this paragraph as a fair representative—we should have suggested "*The Quixotic,*" as more in accordance with the sobriety of history than "*The Heroic.*" It was to the *future*—a very distant future—an age to which new-schoolism

is supposed to have become, what the old mythologies are to this age, that we referred the application of the term "Heroic," on the principle that next after the *fabulous* ages, came the Heroic. While on this subject, we cannot forbear to call attention to this propensity among the New School writers to be ever coining new titles both for themselves and us. Whilst we have abided by our title as "Old School," and their title as "New School,"—both plain titles—they have put in circulation some half a score or more. "The New School,"—"The New Side,"—"The Constitutional,"—"The American,"—"The Liberal,"—"The Revival,"—"The Truly Presbyterian,"—"True American," &c.;—to which perhaps we are now to add—"The Heroic,"—"The Quixotic,"—and since the late act of the Pennsylvania Legislature, "The Presbyterian House Presbyterians." The world is always suspicious of men who deal in *alias-es*. As the Critic's suggestions in the way of title are so readily adopted, we venture to suggest, that, unless the "list of clerical authors" shall have become too long by that time, a page or two of the "American Presbyterian Almanac for 1856," be set apart for a "List of the titles of our Church," with explanations of the same appended. It would require some learning and more ingenuity to perform such a task; but the Doctrinal Tract Committee, to whom has been turned over the business of doing the *thinking* of the church by authority, would doubtless be competent to the work. It would be a "curiosity of literature." Thus—

"*American Presbyterian Church*—so called because confined chiefly to the State of New York."

"*Constitutional Presbyterian Church*—so called from its opposition to being trammelled by any constitution."

This title would be found perhaps one of the most troublesome to define satisfactorily to all parties. Here, in Baltimore, for instance,—after one hundred years or more of what called itself Presbyterianism,—grown up to thirteen churches—and in the seventeenth year of the "Heroic" era, we have just started the "*First Constitutional*" Presbyterian Church. How shall we explain the title, so as to avoid a chasm in the succession, and a turning out of all Presbyterianism of earlier date than 1854. Nay, Dr. Converse tells us the body would not have that name from the Pennsylvania Legislature, because it seemed uncharitable to the Old School. What say our Baltimore friends? Are they behind their Philadelphia brethren in that kind, conciliatory feeling, which would not for the world, make use of a title, "which would seem to say of the Old School, that *they* were violators of the Constitution?" Or has the astute editor of the Observer, in his desire to furnish an excuse for rejecting a name, the adoption of which would throw his Board at once beyond the reach of all its vaunted privileges under the "Old Charter," unwittingly wounded his own friends?

And if the work we propose should also include a list of titles to be applied to the "Old School" Church (so called,)—there would be the same difficulty. The titles—"the Exscinders,"—"The Ri-

gid Party,"—"The New Basis Party,"—"The Revolutionary Assembly,"—might perhaps be explained—but what would be done, for instance, with the more recently coined titles—"The Residuary Assembly?" This we confess it would puzzle us to define in a sense acceptable to the New School authors of it. *Residuary*, in the abstract, we understand to mean something substantial, that remains after what is more evanescent has passed away;—thus, for instance, the substantial beer, or cider, that remains in the barrel, after the effervescence by which the scum sputters out at the bung and scatters. In this sense the term is apt enough, as descriptive historically of the origin of the two parties;—but we doubt whether the New School would accept it in this sense. But do not our friends mistake *Residuary* for what lawyers call a *remainder man* as applied to persons, to denote one who comes in to take possession, after some transient claimant has passed out of the way. This we venture to suggest as the source in which the title originated,—the more especially when we consider the complaints of Mr. Barnes and others, lately, of the tendency of New School Churches to fall back to the *residuary* parts, and become "absorbed." Our limits restrict us to a single specimen of the Logic of New School-ism, which—as it must be but one—we select from what the author evidently regards as his logical *chef d'œuvre*;—the eleven propositions into which he "digests" as he tells us, "the sum of all his articles on the spirit of American Presbyterianism"—at the close of his very elaborate work. We cite the last four of the eleven in connection with the challenge with which he introduces them to the notice of the world at large—and we suppose to that "amphitheatre of the holy Universe" also:

"The sum of all our Articles on the Spirit of American Presbyterianism, we have digested into the following propositions; and we invite any one who can, to investigate and overthrow any one of them."

VIII. Collisions now arose, and the "Old Side" party, now calling themselves "Old School," acting precisely as did their fathers in 1736 and 1741, insisted on rigidity in subscription to the Confession, and in all ecclesiastical movements, which was resisted, as contrary to the spirit and history of the Church. Meanwhile the foreign elements from the Seceder and Congregational Churches entering eagerly into the strife, the rigid party succeeding in obtaining an accidental majority in the General Assembly of 1837, excinded unconstitutionally the four Synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee and the Western Reserve.

IX. The liberal or truly Presbyterian Division of the Church endeavored to bring the rigid party to correct views and feelings, but finding it impossible, they proceeded, just as did the so-called "New Side," or liberal and revival body in 1745, inviting all true American Presbyterians to unite with them, to continue the Succession of the Presbyterian Church in the General Assembly of 1838, which met in the old place of assembling, the First Presbyterian Church on Washington Square, Philadelphia. They retained as their only Basis the Constitution of the Church, as uniformly interpreted in our history.

X. The residuary or rigid body also organized themselves into a General Assembly, on the basis of their excinding and exclusive action of 1837 and 1838, retaining the Constitution as their basis only in a modified sense, viz: as interpreted by their acts of 1837 and 1838, authorizing unconstitutional violence, and demanding exclusive action, and rigid, or *ipsissima verba* subscription.

XI. A re-union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church is feasible whenever the "Old Side" repeal their unconstitutional action, and return to the liberal and noble spirit of our fathers, as shown in the main current of the Church from the beginning.'

We leave these propositions to the grave consideration of all concerned. As to ourselves, we confess honestly that we are unacquainted with any logical process by which to "investigate"—much less "to overthrow" them—particularly the eleventh and last of the series. We think it manifest that the writer, logically as well as theologically most cordially eschews the "*rigid* basis."

It would be injustice to the author of this article on the Spirit of American Presbyterianism, and perhaps still greater injustice to our readers to pass over in utter silence, the most remarkable portion of his work—the portrait of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, by a New School artist. We therefore append it as nearly as possible in full—even though thereby we exclude ourselves from any opportunity of remark and criticism upon the work.

"Dr. Breckinridge is the son of the Hon. John Breckinridge, who was Attorney General of the United States under Jefferson. His mother was of a distinguished Virginia family. After graduating at Princeton College, he was admitted to the bar in Kentucky, and entering eagerly into politics, was sent to the Legislature. After a time, peculiar circumstances turned his attention to the subject of religion. He united with the church, became very soon a ruling elder, and after a brief study of theology, partly in private, and partly, although for no very long time, at Princeton, he was elected the successor of his brother in the Second Church at Baltimore. Immediately upon his election as ruling elder, he began to be prominent in church courts. He was constantly and actively occupied after he began the duties of the ministry, with a large congregation, private affairs of considerable extent and importance, plans of general benevolence, and with the management of the entire Presbyterian Church, then entering upon the most exciting scenes of its great controversy. In addition to this, for some years, he was the principal editor of the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine. It will be seen that it was quite impossible that Dr. Breckinridge should have been a ripe theologian, or a mature ecclesiastical historian.

We must do this remarkable man the justice of stating, what may appear singular to those who have only seen him in church courts, or known him from his polemical writings, that in private intercourse, especially in his own house, he is a most courteous gentleman. As a companion, especially when he takes a fancy for any one with whom he associates, he is one of the most delightful of men. Full of sprightliness and wit, with a varied knowledge of men and things, a bright intelligence, a humor caustic and genial by turns, with a large-bodied and large-hearted kind of *Cœur de Lion* chivalry, with a peculiar picturesque style of talking, and a general Kentuckyesque manner that no language can describe—a style that no age or clime but Kentucky has ever produced—he is certainly, seen in his most favorable aspect, one of the most interesting men it has been our fortune to know.

The elements in Dr. Breckinridge, which wrecked the Presbyterian Church, were two. First, he was a bad leader in this, that he really did not understand the case. If the reader will look narrowly, he will see that the ripe and wise "Old School" men were not in the counsels of the violent party at first, and were only driven there by stress of weather. Drs. Alexander, Miller, Spring, Spencer, Nott, Sprague, Hodge, Dana, M'Dowell, Neill, Herron, Brown, Young, Matthews, Leland, Falmer, Post, and many others, who finally gave in their adherence with more or less reluctance, all were, at first, opposed to the Jehu style of reform. Dr. Breckinridge's mind, even with any amount of cultivation, would not have been specially adapted for theology. It lacks subtlety and discrimination; it is broad and bold, rather than fine and acute. With all his taste for learning, he is popular rather than scientific, discursive rather than profound or thorough. So far as he was a lawyer, he was not bettered as a theologian. We shall not stop now to give our reasons for it, but it is true, that legal training is so different from theological, that lawyers who become ministers are exceedingly prone to run after false scents in the way of analogies, fancied hair-splittings which split nothing, and technicalities which lead to sophistries. Life is too short to master the learning and the habits of two professions. A minister ought to be trained, in all ordinary cases, like Timothy, from a child, and taken, by the time he is of age, to the feet of Gamaliel.

With a mind thus not of the best construction for theology, Dr. Breckinridge's professional training, as we have seen, was quite imperfect, and after he entered the ministry he had about as much opportunity to become a profound theologian, as the stormy petrel has to rest. It must be added to this, that though Dr. Breckinridge's mind has flung over it a kind of sunlight magnanimity, yet in its structure and essence it lacks the mellowness and unction, for which nothing in the character of a minister can compensate.

The Virginians, Kentuckians, and all the people south and west of them, have a peculiar prejudice against Eastern people, or "Yankees" as they call them. It would be very curious, and yield, we think, a most unsuspected result, if some kind of a phrenometer could have indicated just how much of this prejudice there was in the measures of 1837 and 1838. Dr. Breckinridge had an intense horror of having the Presbyterian Church, as he expressed it, "Yankeefied."

Filled with these prejudices, and we see no reason to doubt, honestly supposing the doctrines and polity of the Church in imminent danger, Dr. Breckinridge took from the hand of Dr. Green the truncheon of command, led his party with an imperious will, quite equal to that of his predecessor—it could hardly go beyond it—but with a popular eloquence, and—how shall we civilly characterize it?—a recklessness to which Dr. Green could not aspire.

This was the other element which disqualified him for wise leadership. A man, who, like the chariot-wheel, catches fire as he goes; who rejoices in "the rapture of the strife;" who gathers a wild enthusiastic joyousness with every blow he strikes or receives upon his shield, may be a most efficient subordinate, but he is a bad leader. He may be victor in a battle or campaign, but he will peril the war, and probably sacrifice his cause. Such a man may be a Paladin of romance, a Charles XII., even an Alexander of Macedon, but he will never be a Frederick, an Alfred, or a Washington.

It will be seen that in many things Drs. Green and Breckinridge were curiously alike; in appearance of knowledge of everything, with a comparatively slender foundation; in broad and comprehensive methods of carrying out narrow ideas; in a liberal manner of presenting despotic plans; in a Norman-like method of putting those they were injuring in the wrong—a trait, however, possessed in more perfection by a man whom we cannot trust ourselves to describe, Dr. Miller, for we confess to an admiration of Drs. Green and Breckinridge, that we never could feel for the smooth professor of church history—and finally, in confidence well-nigh superhuman, in their own unerring wisdom."

"It must be remembered in accounting for the influence of Dr. Breckinridge, that he was not, like the recently introduced Seceders and Congregationalists, a stranger in the Presbyterian Church. Of pure Presbyterian lineage, the heir of the noblest Scottish recollections, of a thoroughly American family of Revolutionary memory, with the blood of the Old Dominion in his veins, with wealth which placed him above ordinary contingencies, allied to families of kindred importance, with a commanding presence, a popular eloquence, fluent utterance, belles lettres cultivation, with a general knowledge of ecclesiastical history admirably handled, a personal courage, which, though hardly up, as it generally is not, to so much bluster, yet which was probably up to the fair average amongst men, a temerity, certainly, which in a way perfectly marvellous, scoffed at consequences, as they might affect the Church and the world for all time, a practice in leadership gained on the stump, at the bar, in the legislature, in a country where the people are everything, in a sense hardly understood elsewhere,—a state of things compounded of English character through Virginia and the wild, jovial and eloquent ways of the West—and mingling with all this a scorn of opponents deemed disingenuous, a passion for a Church *his* in every sense that a great and mighty organization can be one's own, and an ambition which soared wild and high as the mountain eagle, and felt itself enacting history in the presence of the Western hemisphere,—consider we say all this, and can we be surprised that weaker men succumbed, and that the destiny of the American Presbyterian Church, which in 1837 was one of the greatest outgrowths of all human time, should have been for a brief space in the hand of this man!"

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

With a view to avoid all objection on the score of want of Editorial responsibility in the Critic, and at the same time to carry out our "free and equal" principles in reference to writers in our pages, we adopt the plan of distinguishing as "For the Critic" all such articles as contain, either opinions on important subjects, outside the immediate range of subjects which chiefly the Critic was established to discuss;—or opinions upon subjects within that range, which the conductors do not substantially agree with. Had this method been adopted from the first, we should perhaps have so marked several articles already published—as "Hints for the Times" in No. 1; "Relation of Seminaries to the General Assembly" in No. 2; "The General Assembly and the German Reformed Church" in No. 3; The "Proof and the Holding Fast" in No. 4;—and others, embracing even some articles in the "*Editorial Exchange*."

Our young friend W. H. STEVENSON, Esq., having kindly undertaken to relieve us in part of the greatly increased labor of the management of the Critic, correspondents may expect to hear from him in our behalf, in many cases, instead of from ourselves personally.

CATALOGUS COLLEGII NEO-CÆSARIENSIS.
—pp. 124. Princetonia—Robinson, 1854.

Glorious old Nassau-Hall—well done! This is a noble answer to all your adversaries;—even to such as would take away your good name, because you are not under the care of some presbytery or synod. You bear the name of the greatest patriot, who ever sat on a throne,—the purest man who ever raised himself from a private station, to supreme command—William of Nassau,—the last of the race of the great and good Coligny;—the incomparable, amongst the legitimate kings of England. And this list of your children for more than a century, is as proud a list, as the eyes of men ever rested on, or ever will. The hand that traces these lines must be stiff in death, before your high interests should suffer for one to defend them; albeit, you were but a step-mother to him who owns it, in his wayward youth, little heeded by you; and albeit, many changes, many years, and long distance, stood between this day and that. Thirteen out of thirty-three, *stelligeri*;—one more name, not of the thirty-three, had been there—if all your rulers had been wise. But no matter—many of them also,—*e vita cesserunt!* What shadows we are!—We hail thee, *magna Mater Virum!* Who can estimate, the service you have rendered—

to this great country! Who can calculate the good, you will yet farther do! Make scholars—make gentlemen—make christians: all else, is a base ambition. That is your crown: see that you let no one take it. Your rulers have done many foolish—and some wicked things. Nevertheless the sum of your work is very glorious. May it increase in glory!

SYNONYMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: By Richard Chenevin Trench, B. D.—Prof. of Divinity, King's College, London: 250 pp. 12mo. Redfield, New York.

Winer has well remarked, in his great work on the Idioms of the Greek Language of the New Testament, that we need as yet a *theory* of the Lexicography, not only of Hellenistic, but even of classical Greek. We need what may be termed a *Lexicology*. Every language—besides the Rhetoric of it, properly so called, presents two distinct subjects of enquiry—its *words*, namely, and its *sentences*. These latter, fall under its grammar; the former under its Lexicography. Towards the formation of a *Theory* of Lexicography—that is a *science* of the *words* of any language,—a *Lexicology*, the study of the Synonyms of that language, is an indispensable preliminary. This necessary work, notwithstanding the labors of Dodelein, Vomel, Pillon and Tittman, has made a most unsatisfactory progress: and, if for no other reason, every scholar should be grateful to Mr. Trench for the publication of his rather pleasant, than important volume. It is very agreeable light reading for the learned; very useful to beginners, as an initiation into a most important and neglected part of the study of the New Testament; and we the more readily commend it, because its doctrinal views are habitually sound, and often far more thorough than we are accustomed to meet with, from dignitaries of the church of England, of the present day. In one respect, an error of grave character which has pervaded all attempts to fix the Lexicography of the New Testament, and still more the synonyms of it,—defaces this volume of Mr. Trench, though in a diminished degree, and even with an express caveat on his part. We allude to the habit of fixing and limiting the sense in which words are used in the New Testament, by the sense in which they are used in classical Greek: which, so long as it is made the absolute basis of our exegesis, must necessarily prevent all true and real progress, in these important studies; and which, as much as anything else, accounts for the utter absence of any proper theory of criticism, in our entire Exegetical Theology. The parade of classical learn-

ing in Mr. Trench's book, we consider not only out of place, but an indication that he was not fully aware of the extent and importance, if even of the exact nature of the service which he set out to perform for Biblical criticism.—We think however, our pastors generally, would read his work with pleasure and advantage as we confess we have done; and we venture rather earnestly to commend it to them, as presenting in a brief compass, and in a very readable form, striking views of many things a little out of the range of books easily accessible to them. If the taste seduces them to drink more deeply, it will be all the better for that. For assuredly there can be no study, at once more necessary and more agreeable to him whose constant duty it is, to expound the words of eternal life to his fellow men; than the thorough examination and comparison of those very words. And we are persuaded, that less labor than ministers usually bestow on commentaries, and the like most unreliable helps to preaching—during the first five years of their ministry—would, if systematically bestowed on the study of the New Testament in the original tongue, fit them, beyond comparison, better for their great work; besides giving them the unspeakable satisfaction which must arise out of such a course of habitual and earnest waiting upon divine instruction.

MR. RAMSAY'S DISCOURSE BEFORE THE LEXINGTON PRESBYTERY.—This body convened this spring in the town of Lexington, Virginia. One of the very best sermons we ever heard upon a merely ecclesiastical subject, was the opening sermon on the subject of the Scriptural duties of ruling Elders. In the light of this excellent discourse, it seemed to be more easy to see than the writer ever felt it to be before, how much power there is in the Scriptural constitution of the Church, yet slumbering and latent in the most scriptural organizations, of the kind to give vitality, and deep, trenchant, efficiency to the cause of Christ, if we will consent, while we praise the past with thanksgiving, to press close up to Scriptural and constitutional marks, for the future.

The chief doctrine of Mr. Ramsay's discourse, was that all the functions enjoined upon the teaching Elder in Scripture, are also enjoined upon the Ruling Elder, save and except only the public exposition of the Divine word. The Ruling Elder is to shepherd the flock; he is to admonish, to guide, and to watch for souls, just as is the teaching elder. He is included equally with the teaching elder in the Scriptures which enjoin these duties. The preacher gave a very able clearing up of the subject of the authority for lay elders in Scripture. The difficulty lies just in calling them *lay* elders.

There is no authority in Scripture for *mere* lay elders. But there is abundant authority for elders charged with the double office, the mediating office, of assisting the teaching elder in the spiritual oversight of the flock, on the one hand; and of representing the people, standing for the people, being the tribunes of the people, on the other hand.

It was also clearly made good, that when the pastoral work of any congregation is faithfully performed, there is always enough of such work to occupy four or five persons. One reason, undoubtedly, why that great evil in the modern church, is becoming so common, the giving way of the health of the preachers before the ordinary term of life is half measured out, as to its days of useful labor, is that the preachers, by a traditional departure from the primitive plan, have consented to be expected to do the work of four or five men. Much, much is said and written about an earnest working ministry. And we need that thing cryingly. We do not affirm that our ministry is comparatively dronish, unworking, and cold. But we need every pulse of earnestness for the salvation of souls, that we can possibly get in the ministry. And we need an earnest, active, working eldership too. We much need it. It will not hurt to say a little on that subject, now and then. It will be no harm to say a good deal about it. The Scriptures say a good deal to and about the elders who, on the apostolic plan were to be ordained in every city. We do not say as much on this subject, probably, in proportion to our incultations from pulpit and from press on other subjects, as the apostles did.

The sermon of Mr. Ramsay pleaded for just one of that kind of "revolutions" after which the Critic earnestly breathes, a full coming up, in action, in life, and in earnest, practical, motive power, to the Word of God, and the Confession of Faith. We are most heartily glad that this discourse is to be published by private contributions, spontaneously, even eagerly made, chiefly by the members of the Presbytery. We hail, at once as an omen and a means of good, every such sermon, where there is freshness and power of thought, sound, ripe, scholarship, and firmness to stand just right upon the word, and cry aloud from that standpoint. Then there may be movement without revolution, life without fever and frenzy; active working, joyous thought, without new divinity or new measures.

A DISCOURSE DELIVERED IN THE LEACOCK PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, LANCASTER COUNTY, PA; By the Rev. P. J. Timlow, Pastor. pp. 40. Wilson, Philadelphia, 1855.

We could heartily wish that the pastors of

all our early churches would publish such discourses as this. There are precious materials for the history of Presbyterianism in this country, and of the early history of the country itself, preserved in the bosom of many of our congregations; of whose existence few are aware—and of whose value the keepers of the secrets they esteem so lightly, are often little informed. This discourse of Mr. Timlow, covers a period of nearly a century and a half, and condenses a great mass of facts, public and personal—civil and ecclesiastical, concerning a great variety of events, interests and persons, connected with the old Presbyterian region lying around him—and by that means, with our whole church and country. As an instance we select, the narrative relating to the family of Robert Smith, who was installed pastor of Pequa and Leacock in 1751; the father of those famous men, John Blair Smith, and Samuel Stanhope Smith. We are personally acquainted, at this writing, with descendants of the last named of the three, (whom we knew in his extreme old age, at Princeton, N. J.,) who are scattered throughout several states of this Union, widely separated,—and some of them in foreign lands; most of them persons of respectability—and not a few of them playing most important parts on the theatre of life; some of them, more so, perhaps, than their great ancestors. The blessing of God is with the seed of the righteous. We cannot omit, however, to take the same exception to Mr. Timlow's mode of treating the great Semi-Pelagian controversy in our church (1831—1839) which we took in a former No. of the Critic to Dr. John McDowell's mode of treating the same subject. In speaking of Rev. Joseph Barr (pp. 24—25) who was pastor at Leacock from 1823 till 1845, he had to slur over the most important events with which Mr. Barr ever came in contact, that he might, in a few lines, without comment and without elucidation, evade any statement concerning a controversy which rent our church, and will affect its destiny through all time. We protest against writing history after this fashion. We deny that this is consistent with fidelity to the church itself—or to the truth of God. We cannot connive at such things. Personally we esteemed Mr. Barr very highly. But surely the fact that he was, in all his sympathies, supposed to favor the New School party could not justify the historian of the church he happened to serve at the time, in suppressing all account of that controversy,—because every one esteemed him to be a good man! The facts are that while Mr. Barr was Pastor at Leacock—this great controversy arose—raged—and was disposed of: but a history of Leacock involving also a notice of Mr. Barr,

—dismisses that controversy in a few insignificant lines,—although it records nothing, more important, in the whole history of Leacock, than that controversy. We regret so great an error in a narrative so interesting on so many other accounts; and with the best wishes for Mr. Timlow, are obliged to note it the more distinctly, as it seems to be a growing fashion of the times. Would it not be a queer history of American Presbyterianism, from 1823 to 1846, which should omit all account of the Semi-Pelagian controversy?—And is it not, in its degree, an equally queer history of Leacock and Mr. Barr—which does the same thing?

JUDGMENTS, A CALL TO REPENTANCE.—*A Sermon preached by appointment of the Legislature, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, by Jas. H. Thornwell, D. D., President of South Carolina College, December 9th, 1854.*

The Sermon was delivered under very imposing circumstances. The occasion was suited to impress and subdue, for the time at least, the most thoughtless heart;—a sovereign people prostrating themselves before a sovereign God,—“South Carolina, by her trusted agents and chosen representatives, in her organic capacity, as a distinct political community; in the power of her honored Chief Magistrate, in the two Houses of the Legislature, and the venerable Judges of the land, presenting herself, in humility and mourning, before the footstool of Him who standeth in the congregation of the mighty, and judgeth among the gods.” It reminds one of those solemn seasons of humiliation, which distinguished the period of Puritan ascendancy in England, when Cromwell administered the affairs of the realm, and Owen lifted up his voice like a trumpet, and a genuine fear of God, as the Governor among the nations, pervaded all classes of the people. It is not to be wondered at, that the Preacher should have been afraid of giving “a wrong touch to the ark of God,”—of failing, “to speak those words in season, which, taking advantage of the interest naturally awakened by the scene, might contribute to guide the confused emotions, and vague and indefinite impressions it suggested, into the channels of salutary thought.”

The leading thoughts of the Sermon are as follows: The visitations of Providence expressive of the Divine displeasure are called “judgments,” because they are universally regarded as the penal inflictions of a Judge or Ruler. This implies the conviction of our nature that there is a *personal* God: and if God be a Person, then all his dispensations have some purpose or design, and this design is to be ascertained by

an observation of the tendency of the dispensations. The tendency of public, widespread afflictions is to create a sense of guilt in the bosoms of men,—to make them tremble at the anger, and dread the justice of their Judge; and so, to restrain transgression, and preserve the innocent in their integrity. There is an inseparable connexion between suffering and sin; and so strong is the conviction of the human mind upon this point, that there is always danger of misinterpreting Providence, by making the degree of suffering, the exponent of the measure of guilt. All, however, that we have a right to conclude from even extraordinary suffering, is the existence of sin, and the consequent necessity of repentance. And this repentance is the duty of the *spectators* as well as of the sufferers. "Except ye"—the spectators of the woes—"repent, ye shall all likewise perish." This repentance must be a personal and individual thing. No man can tell, but that his own sins have provoked the chastising stroke of Heaven; and, especially, if he be a Ruler, a Lawgiver or a Judge. Sin is the great source of weakness, and righteousness the great element of strength, in every community of men. Notice is then taken of some forms of iniquity, which prevail extensively in this country. Profaneness, Intemperance, Deification of the people and inadequate execution of the laws, especially the laws against crime. We regret that we have not room for what is said on all these points, particularly the last two, as they are sins growing out of the very nature of our institutions, and therefore common to the whole country. But the following weighty words in reference to the true theory of government in general, and the nature of our own in particular, together with the errors and abuses which threaten the overthrow and extinction of it, by the degradation of the people,—cannot be omitted:

"The sins which have been mentioned, and which confessedly prevail to a melancholy extent through the length and breadth of the land, though they call for humiliation and repentance here, are, perhaps, not so appropriate to this occasion, as those which spring from the tendencies and workings of our forms and principles of government. Bear with me in briefly stating what seems to me to be a species of idolatry which cannot fail to bring down upon us, sooner or later, the righteous judgments of God. I allude to what may be called the *deification* of the people. They are frequently represented as the source of all political power and rights; the very fountain head of sovereignty. It is their will which makes law; it is their will which unmakes it. A supremacy is ascribed to that will which he who reads the Bible and recognizes a

God that has dominion over the children of men, must feel to be shocking. They are really treated as a species of Deity upon the earth. Now this whole representation is not only inconsistent with religion, it is equally inconsistent with the philosophy upon which our popular institutions are founded. The government of this country does not proceed upon the maxim that the will of the people is the will of God, and its arrangements have not been made with a reference to the end, that their will may be simply ascertained. This legislature is not a congregation of deputies, or ministerial agents, and you have, and know that you have, higher functions to perform than merely to inquire what do the people think. I do not underrate their opinions; they must always enter as an element in sober and wise deliberation; but what I maintain is, that the true and legitimate end of government is not to accomplish their will, but to do and enforce what reason, conscience, and truth pronounce to be right. To the eternal law of right reason, which is the law of God, all are equally subject, and forms of government are only devices and expedients to reach the dictates of that law and apply it to the countless exigencies of social and individual life. The State is a Divine ordinance, a social institute, founded on the principle of justice, and it has great moral purposes to subserve, in relation to which the constitution of its government may be pronounced good or bad. The will of the people should be done only when the people will what is right, and then primarily not because they will it, but because it is right. Great deference should be paid to their opinions, because general consent is a presumption of reason and truth.

The peculiarity of a representative system is that it governs through deliberative assemblies. Their excellence is in the circumstances that they are deliberative, which affords a reasonable security that truth and justice may prevail. So far from being mere exponents of public sentiment, their highest merit is that they are a check upon popular power—a barrier reared against the tide of passion, to beat back its waves, until reason can be fairly heard. There is no misapprehension more dangerous than that which confounds representative government with the essential principle of a pure democracy. It is not a contrivance to adapt the exercise of supreme power on the part of the people, to extensive territory or abundant population, to meet the physical impediments which in large States, must obviously exist to the collection of their citizens in one vast assembly. It is not because they ought not to meet, that the representative council in modern times is preferred to the ancient convocations in the forum or market place. It is to be

prized, because it affords facilities and removes hindrances in the discovery of truth; the supreme power is truth, and not man; God, not the creature.

Now whatever representations diminish the authority of the Divine law as the supreme rule, and make the State the creature and organ of popular will, as if an absolute sovereignty were vested in that, are equally repugnant to religion and the true conception of our government. An absolute democracy is the worst of all governments, because it is judicially cursed as treason against God, and is given over to blindness of impulse and passion. I am afraid that in this matter we have trodden upon the verge of error—we have forgotten that the State is ordained of God, and that our relations to each other are those of mutual consultation and advice, while all are absolutely subject to Him.

In proportion as we lose the true conception of the State, we fall short of realizing in ourselves that perfection of development and happiness which it was instituted to achieve. Hence, it is not unusual that as extremes meet, those who in theory clothe the people with the prerogatives of God, practically degrade them below the level of intellectual existence. When we cease to regard the State as a great instrument of moral education, it is not surprising that the education itself should be disregarded, and these Gods be left to demonstrate that after all, they are but men.

Let it be once conceded that government is but an organ of the popular will, the business of the statesman is very simple—it is only to find out what the people wish; and as all courts are attractive by the patronage they bestow, we may expect to see a system in operation, whose only tendency is to secure personal popularity. The ambition of Legislators and Senators will be directed to the gaining of popular favor, and whatever arts promise to be most successful, will be held legitimate, as they are the customs and usages of the Court, whose seal of approbation is desired. The consequences must be disastrous to all the parties concerned. There will and must be corruption and bribery. There will and must be unbecoming condescensions. The aspirants for distinction, however they may abhor these practices, and reproach themselves in stooping to them, feel compelled to resort to them as the conditions of success, and it will always happen that where people are deified in theory, they will be degraded and corrupted in practice. Men will be promoted, not according to their wisdom and worth; not according to their ability to answer the ends of the State in eliciting the voice of reason and truth, and securing the reign of universal justice—they will be promoted according to their pliancy in

pandering to popular tastes. The demagogue will supplant the statesman—the representative be replaced with a tool.

These untoward tendencies should be checked in their very beginning: and the most effectual method of doing so, is that each and every educated man should feel the responsibility upon him of contributing to the moral and intellectual improvement of the masses around him. We are all brethren, and as members of the same commonwealth should aim at the culture of the whole community. No man liveth to himself; no man dieth to himself. Let every one who is blessed with influence, position, and power, use these advantages in bringing all classes to that point of moral elevation in which the ballot box becomes the exponent of worth, and office the badge of merit. What a blessed consummation! We may never see it realized, but we may see it approximated. The approximation must be made by the influence of the rich upon the poor, the intelligent upon the ignorant. Each man may do much, and it would be a glorious result of this day's services, if each should resolve that what he can do, whether much or little, shall be honestly and faithfully done among his own constituents.'

THE NEW-SCHOOL'S SECOND APPEAL UNTO CÆSAR.—In an article on the GREAT General Assembly of 1854, (Critic No. 1, p. 35,) we called attention to the singularly "happy arrangement" of the property and succession question of that Body:—First declaring the *Old (School) Charter* of 1799 all that is needful to them—and then instructing the Trustees of their Church Erection, and Publication Boards, each to obtain a charter with *general provision*, authorising them to hold property for the Assembly. Accordingly application has just been made to the Legislature of Pennsylvania for the Publication Board's Charter. We have no space now for the discussion of this question, but the history of the affair is in itself so curious, so illustrative of the modesty and saintly delicacy of New Schoolism, and so likely to be one of the points in the controversy, that we think it worth while to collect and print here, in convenient form for reference, the facts as we gather them from the public political Journals and reports of the Legislative proceedings.

Early in April, a bill was presented in the Senate of Pennsylvania, "to Incorporate the Presbyterian Publication House." No objection being made, it was passed, and sent to the other branch of the Legislature for concurrence. On the 13th ulto., the bill was called up in the House, and the following proceedings were had:—

Mr. M'Clean moved to postpone the bill for the present, and recommended it to the early action of the next Legislature.

The motion of Mr. M'Clean was not agreed to, as follows:—Yeas 42, nays 45.

Mr. Donaldson moved to amend in the first section by inserting the word "Constitutional" before the word Presbyterian.

The amendment was discussed by Messrs. M'Combs, Donaldson, M'Clean, Foust, Dunning, Simpson and Frailey, when

Mr. Donaldson withdrew his amendment.

Mr. Thompson then moved to amend the first section by changing the name of the corporation to the "Presbyterian Book and Tract Publication House," which was not agreed to, as follows:—Yeas 40, nays 45.

Mr. Kirkpatrick moved to amend the title by inserting the word "American" before Presbyterian; which was not agreed to, as follows:—Yeas 19, nays 56.

The question recurring on the adoption of the section, it was discussed by Messrs. M'Combs and Foust until the hour of one, when the House adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION.—The House resumed the consideration of the bill, to incorporate the Presbyterian Publication House, the question pending being on the first section.

The subject was discussed by Messrs. Foust, North and Frailey, when the first section of the bill was negatived, as follows:—Yeas 32, nays 44.

Messrs. Smith, (Philadelphia city,) and Ball, moved that the vote just taken be reconsidered, and Mr. Smith further moved to postpone the question of re-consideration.

The motion was debated by Messrs. North, M'Combs, Ball and Carlisle, and was postponed for the present, as follows:—Yeas 54, nays 21.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that the friends of the bill were willing to accept of the amendment offered by Mr. Donaldson, this morning, altering the title of the bill to "Constitutional Presbyterian Publication House, in view of its probable defeat without such alteration.

On motion of Mr. M'Combs, the vote by which the first section was negatived, was re-considered, and the bill being again before the House,

Mr. Donaldson moved to amend by altering the title to "Constitutional Presbyterian Publication House," which was agreed to, and the bill as amended was passed finally.

The next day the Senate concurred in the House amendments, the bill was signed by the Governor, and became a law.

This action of the Legislature, it was manifest, if concurred in by the Trustees of this new Incorporation, was a virtual and effectual retraction of all that had ever been

alleged about the rights and privileges they hold under the "Old Charter;" and word was soon communicated to Harrisburg, that the provisions of the bill passed, would not be accepted, under the title contained in it. Their united wisdom suggested another title however, which, whilst it was acceptable to them, they conceived would not interfere with rights vested elsewhere.

Three days subsequently, Mr. Ball read in place, in the House, a bill "to incorporate the Trustees of the Presbyterian House," which was passed finally. On the same day it was passed by the Senate, and being signed by the Governor, became a law.

—
The following correspondence of one of our secular papers is an interesting addition to this record:—

HARRISBURG, April, 14, 1855.

The contest in the House of Representatives on the bill to incorporate the "Presbyterian Publication House," was long and animated. It passed through the Senate without a word of observation, attention at the time not being attracted to the name which this corporation desired to assume. But after it had passed, and was deemed by the Presbyterian Board of Publication as an essential usurpation of their name, which would be productive of litigation and endless confusion, the attention of the whole Presbyterian community was drawn to it, and the influences of both branches of the church exerted, both for and against its passage. * * * * *

The course pursued by the party demanding this alteration was neither intolerant or proscriptive; on the contrary, they have manifested the kindest and most cautious feelings throughout the whole controversy, both in the memorials presented and on the floor of the House. By the friends of the bill, they were met with charges of sectarian intolerance, instead of valid arguments, until the impression gained ground that there was some prospective advantage to be gained from this near assimilation to the title of the publication house of the Old School Branch. They had a right to demand that no other denomination should be permitted to build upon the foundation which they have laid. It is rather singular, in view of the facts that a large sum of money is expended annually in Philadelphia by this board of Publication, and that a large majority of the Presbyterians of Philadelphia are attached to this branch of the church, that but one member from Philadelphia voted to protect their interests.

M.

The foregoing letter elicited the following reply from a "New School" man, which we publish to show the view their own body have of the matter:—

The Opposition of the Old School Presbyterians to the Charter of the Presbyterian Publication House (New School.)

At a meeting of the General Assembly, in Mr. Barnes' church, May, 1854, an offer was made by John A. Brown, Esq., and other gentlemen of Philadelphia, to present to the denomination, the large and beautiful house opposite the U. S. Mint, for purposes of publication. After a hard struggle with New York, the offer was accepted; trustees were appointed, and directed to procure from the Legislature of Pennsylvania a charter for "The Presbyterian Publication House." But, at once, the Old School "Board of Publication" took the alarm. Letters, memorials, agents, and every influence, city and State, that could be brought to bear upon the Legislature, was resorted to, as "M." admits, "against the passage of the bill." "They" (Old School) "had a right," says he, "to demand that no other denomination should be permitted to build upon the foundation that they had laid." That is to say, first, that the Old School are the Presbyterian Church! and, secondly, that "the New School," (as they are called by their enemies) are another denomination!!

Now, Messrs. Editors, I bear the name, and the blood of one of the old Presbyterian Fathers of the Church, that prepared the constitution, boils in my veins with utter indignation as I read such a statement as this of your correspondent. The forcible seizure and possession of the books and funds of the Church may constitute nine points of the law, but we have still *justice* left for the tenth. So, at least Judge Rogers charged, and a Pennsylvania Jury decided in 1838. So we hope the Court and Jury will one day decide again. Whatever your correspondent "M." may think of this matter, be it "known unto all men by these presents," that we still claim the OLD CHARTER of the Presbyterian Church as the lawful possessors. We claim it by the *regular succession* of the constitution. We shall only give up the name of "Presbyterian" when we give up life. Our opponents are indeed willing to accord us the name of "Constitutional Presbyterians," but we do not thank them for the name, when we already have the thing.

As to "M.'s" remarks about the relative proportion of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, I would only say, that like his "Majority," it is entirely *too small* to be worthy of notice. Take away from our Old School brethren the Scotch and "Scotch Irish" Churches, that have done all this mischief in this unfortunate controversy, and "M." will find that there are more "American Presbyterians" among the "New School" in Philadelphia than among the Old. Believing, gentle-

men, that at this particular juncture, you would not, knowingly, allow your press to be used for a partisan and sectarian purpose, I remain, respectfully yours,

"JOHN HAMPDEN."

Philadelphia, April 16, 1855.

The remaining letters are from the first correspondent, who, by the way is known to be unconnected with the Presbyterian Church.

Harrisburg, April 18, 1855.

I am astonished to find a fancied prototype of "John Hampden" so warmly espousing the cause of the New School Presbyterian Church; and still more astonished to find any person calling himself a Presbyterian and Christian, attempting to use the American feeling of the day to the prejudice of Scotch and Irish Presbyterians, when at least four-fifths of the Presbyterian Church of America are proud to own their parentage from these countries. M.

Harrisburg, April 21, 1855.

The difficulties which existed between the Old and New School branches of the Presbyterian Church, in relation to the title of the new publication house, have been amicably and happily adjusted. The word "constitutional" was a distasteful prefix to the party desiring this act of incorporation. So, after conference with the Old School branch, the simple title of "Presbyterian House" was agreed upon, as sufficiently distinctive from the "Presbyterian Board of Publication," and more acceptable to the friends of the New branch. The fact that the Old School interest, which has the power to prevent any change in the bill as it passed, were willing to accommodate their New School brethren by giving them a title more acceptable, is another evidence that they never desired to throw any obstacle in the way of this charter, but merely wished to maintain their own corporate name inviolate. This act is a sufficient answer to the charges of sectarian interference to prevent the granting of this charter. A bill was immediately introduced to effect this alteration, and passed unanimously through both branches of the Legislature. M.

One item more, taken from the 'Presbyterian Banner,' and our record is complete:

"We should like to know whether or not, when "JOHN HAMPDEN" had prepared his philippic against the *Scotch Irish*, he showed it to John A. Brown, Esq., and asked him from what part of Ulster he and the late Mr. Fleming came, as they were so munificent in their contributions to purchase the House for the New School body. Such respect was unquestionably due to him, and to all the Scotch and Irish who gave their money for the enterprise."

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 6.

JUNE, 1855.

Vol. 1.

“THE CHURCH QUESTION.”

We have read with great satisfaction, the VIIIth Article in *The Biblical Repertory*, for April, 1855, which is a Review of Bishop McIlvain's work, entitled “*The Truth and the Life*,” and which contains an explicit and—in some respects—very satisfactory statement of the Theology of Princeton, on the “Church Question.” The Review admits, and acknowledges to have been much pained, that its former articles on this subject, had been misunderstood. We are of the number of those, who have often had occasion to dissent from certain theories of Princeton, on the subject of the Church; while,—strangely enough we admit,—we have had occasion, about as often, to give our cordial assent, to certain other theories of Princeton, on the same general subject. Perhaps it would be more just, in both instances to say, *parts* of theories;—for we are not always able to see how all the doctrines from time to time enunciated on the subject of the Church, in that able periodical, are capable of being made to harmonize in a single theory; and yet the work is understood to aim at a unity of utterance on all subjects.

Comparing the above cited article, with a kind of supplement to it furnished to the *Presbyterian* of April 21st, by the *Rev. Dr. Henry A. Boardman*, over his own signature, as from “the Editor of the *Princeton Review*,” we find ourselves, once more, in the predicament in which, as before stated, we have more than once found ourselves heretofore. We agree with the greater part of the article in the *Repertory*, as not only clear, but true; while we object to the supplement furnished by *Dr. Boardman*, and to certain parts of the article too, as insufficient and inaccurate. As the shortest and fairest method of presenting the subject, we append the statement objected to, and by its side, one which we judge to contain the fundamental truth.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

Editor Princeton Review, through Dr. Boardman.

"The most important of the principles thus enjoined in Scripture are the following:

"1. The right of the people to take part in the government of the Church. Hence the divine right of the office of Ruling Elders, who appear in all church courts as representatives of the people.

"2. The appointment of Presbyters as ministers of the word and sacraments, with authority to rule, teach and ordain, as the highest permanent officers of the Church. Hence the divine right of the ministry as an office, in opposition to the doctrine of the Quakers, and others. And hence the parity of the clergy in opposition to the doctrine of prelatists.

"3. The unity of the Church; or the subjection of a smaller to a larger part, and of a larger part to the whole. Hence the right of appeal, and the right of review and control. And the authority of church courts, whether Presbyterial, Synodical, or general, in opposition to all the forms of Independency and Congregationalism."

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

The Church Question—Jure Divino.

1. The entire government of the Church is in the hands of Office-bearers—whose office is ordained of God: whose selection is of him,—their vocation by his people, and their ordination, by a church court.

2. The government is in their hands, not severally, but jointly, and by Tribunals. It is a commonwealth administered by courts composed of Presbyters, of two classes,—one class to Rule and Teach, the other only to Rule.

3. The whole church is one. There is in every Tribunal, all that can be in any Tribunal. The power of the whole, is over the power of every part.

4. The power of the Ministers to preach and to administer sacraments, is a *several* power, belonging to each of them, *ex ordine*, and is wholly independent of their power of government. Their power to rule and ordain is a *joint* power, *ex potestate*, and is wholly independent of their power to preach and administer sacraments.

5. The only form in which the power, invested by God in the body of his people, but to be administered solely by office-bearers, ever appears, is in the vocation of all those office-bearers, always elected by them. *Immediately*, in the first vocation of each one; *sometimes* immediately, *sometimes mediately* through other office-bearers, in all subsequent vocations of them. Without which vocation, by God's people, the foundation of the Christian Commonwealth is subverted.

The careful comparison of these two statements, will satisfy any one who understands the subject, and reflects seriously, that the principles on which they respectively rest, and the results to which they respectively lead, are very far from being identical; and that the difference, in both cases, is any thing but immaterial. Touching the Princeton statement, we offer a few brief suggestions.

As to the first paragraph of that statement; we deny that the *people* can take any part in the government of the Church, except by means of the election of all office bearers. But this divine and precious right, so often and so utterly taken from them by the money power, by ordinations *sine titulo*, and the like,—would, if sacredly guarded, put the ultimate control of the Church, where God has put the ultimate church power,—wholly in their hands. We deny, again, that the divine right of the office of Ruling Elder, rests on any such fallacious ground as that intimated in the statement.—And we assert, that as to *representation*, he who represents in any church court, nothing but his *office*, is in the court, in utter derogation of the principles of Presbyterianism, and is there on the principles of Prelacy; whether he be a Minister or a Ruling Elder.

As to the second paragraph of the Princeton statement ; it is true that the ministry of the word, is by divine authority,—as against Quakers ; and that the parity of the ministry, is of divine authority,—as against Prelatists; and it is also true, that holding the power both to teach and to rule, they are, that far, the highest officers of the Church. But it is not true, that the power to rule, or to ordain, (which is a mere function of rule,) belongs any more to them, than to any other church ruler : nor is it true, that either of these powers belongs to them at all, independently of their being constituted into a court, in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus : nor is it true, that their power to rule, depends on their power to teach. They rule, because they are Presbyters ; and they unite in ordination, because they are constituted into a Presbytery : not—in either case—because they are Preachers. The contrary doctrine, so far from being one of "the most important principles," of Presbyterianism, is wholly inconsistent with it ; converting ordination, from an act of government, into a sort of sacrament ; and transferring the power of the Church, organically, from a christian commonwealth, into a spiritual aristocracy of ministers of the Word.

As to the third paragraph of the Princeton statement ; all its assertions are true ; but the rational and scriptural foundation of their truth is not hinted at, in the definition,—nor apparently, perceived. Nor do we suppose any Prelatist, or even any Papist would hesitate to admit, the unity of the Church, and the supremacy of the whole over the parts, and the right of supervision, in the superior parts, and in the whole. But assuredly there is some distinct ground, for us,—different from Prelacy and Popery, as well as from Independency. We have intimated that ground in the third paragraph in our statement. If the entire Presbyterian Church throughout the earth were met in one place, there would be nothing there, but what is present in every well ordered congregation, namely—Ministers, Elders, Deacons, private christians. And no church court, can constitute or act, regularly, except there be there, all that could be there, if the universal church were met, in one court ; namely—Ministers and Ruling Elders, in whom alone is the power of rule. And if all these office bearers, in our church, could convene at one time and place, organically,—all of them have the power of rule. And every act of power performed by every court of the church, is in the name and by the authority, of the whole of them ;—and through them, of the whole church ; just as every lawful civil act, is by the authority of the free people, whose rulers perform it. Our General Assembly is the General Assembly of the *Presbyterian Church* ; one, not many. It is but one church : and therefore, large or small, one congregation or a million, there is but one power ; and that must utter its will, expressly or impliedly, before any potential will, at all, is uttered in that church. When this is brought down to a single congregation, it is plain enough, how absurd it would be, and destructive of all our principles, to question the rights and powers of Ruling Elders,

and set a minister up as the sole ruler. But the case is just the same in many congregations, and in all congregations united, as in one: and church courts without congregations, are no more possible, than a kingdom without subjects, or a republic without citizens. The authority of one tribunal over another, is nothing more than the authority of the church over herself; a manifestation not only of her unity, but of her freedom, under the headship of her Lord. And the manifestation of that authority, by courts, and not by persons, is the exhibition of her life as a commonwealth, and not either a hierarchy, or a pure democracy: and those courts, constituted not of Ministers, but of Ministers and Ruling Elders,—*all ordained Presbyters*,—is the specific form of her organic freedom, which pre-eminently distinguishes her peculiar unity.

We accord, therefore, with Princeton, very cordially, as we understand her views expressed in the article alluded to in the beginning of this paper,—*in her idea of the church of Christ*, considered independently of any notion of the *form* of the church; and we have experienced great satisfaction in the perusal of the truth on that subject, so finely stated therein. But we regret to be obliged to differ very essentially from her idea of the fundamental principles of *the form of the church*, as set forth in the supplement furnished by Dr. Boardman for publication, as intimated in portions of the article itself. Nor do we hesitate to admit, that the power and excellence of the statement concerning the *idea of the church*, in the article so often alluded to, is one reason why we feel called on to dissent in a somewhat earnest manner from the error and insufficiency, of other portions of the article, and as we apprehend, of the supplemental statement on the *form of the church*; lest, if the latter were to pass unnoticed, it might well be accepted the more readily under the genial impression, which every enlightened christian will receive from the former. Under ordinary circumstances, what was not written for publication, can hardly be considered sufficiently important for serious animadversion. Still however, we find in the Repertory's article, the seeds of the same general error which underlies the supplement furnished to the Presbyterian, on the *form of the church*; for it sets forth (p. 353) as the common opinion of Protestants,—and apparently its own opinion,—that Christ has only prescribed certain principles relating to the organization of the church, and left much, as to details, discretionary. Now what *certain principles* may mean, we find in the supplement; and find them as we have herein before explained. Moreover, we dissent from the correctness of the assertion, that Presbyterians *especially* hold that opinion quoted above from the Repertory: also from the assertion, that every religious denomination on earth acts on that opinion: and also from the assertion, that they who hold that the *form of the church is jure divino*, believe that all is *forbidden*, that is not *enjoined*. (Repertory, p. 353-4.) All of which are very strange statements, to come from learned men, and accurate thinkers.

It seems to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the human mind to master *practical* questions, from a purely *theoretical* point of view. A man to be a great captain, must practice the art of war: to be a great statesman, he must administer a government. It is, probably, on this principle, that so large a part of the exegesis of retired scholars, is so totally erroneous and distorted, according to the experience of christians, and the faith of earnest ministers of the Gospel; and that such singular errors disfigure the theories of learned men, about the form of the church,—concerning which,—having never been either Pastors or Elders,—they have little or no practical knowledge. Every thing, in this world, has to be acquired; and every thing, according to its kind. And the cases are extremely rare and remarkable, in which, a man who does not understand the use of tools, can build complicated structures; or a man, by the mere force of his intellect, be master of a profession which he never followed. Certainly the whole subject of government, civil or ecclesiastical, is one of the very last, to determine *a priori*.

WHO ARE THE REVOLUTIONISTS?—THE NEW CRUSADE AGAINST THE SYNOD OF BALTIMORE.

CHURCH politics, in the narrower sense, of something pertaining to measures to be carried or defeated before the Ecclesiastical tribunals, are not ordinarily within the scope of our Journal. The objects which we have chiefly in view, cannot be effected through Synodical or Assembly resolutions or enactments. The tribunal which we have in view in our discussions is not so much the Ecclesiastical Court, as the public opinion of the Church. Our aim is to secure attention—especially the attention of such as do their own thinking rather than employ a journalist to do their thinking for them—to certain principles which we think should underlie and control all the measures of the Church.

Manifestly, however, in such a work we shall often fall in incidentally with questions of current Church politics and measures, which embody in concrete form general principles of good or evil tendency—which therefore demand attention aside from any temporary interests with which as measures they may be invested. And moreover in case of controverted points, circumstances may often require a discussion of current facts and measures—either in the way of confirmation of the truth of principles, or of the trust-worthiness of the advocates of them. Of this latter nature is the controversy with which, somewhat unwillingly, we have recently occupied our pages, touching the mode in which the most important offices in the Church are filled, in the practical working of the Philadelphia Boards. Probably in no other method could the unreliableness of the Boards, as “intermediate bodies between the Assembly and the Executive Committee,” and as “serving the purpose of breakwaters,” have been more clearly demonstrated than by the simple statement of facts in detail, in the letter

of "Stuart Robinson to Dr. McKinney" in our No. 4. And we may add, nothing is better adapted to lead thoughtful men in the Church to profound reflection, than the circumstance, that this plain, distinct and definite statement of facts, has been permitted so far, to stand uncontradicted, and without even any serious attempt to challenge or explain the statement. For that Dr. McKinney's response to the letter, beyond the defence of himself against the imputation of interested motives in advocating the cause of the Secretary of the Board of Missions, is not either in contradiction or explanation, but rather in full confirmation of all the important statements of the letter—no one who has read both the letter and his response, can fail to see. That the dignified silence of the Presbyterian on the subject, is rather out of place,—after having the temerity to denounce as an ungracious and gratuitous attack, the statements as originally made in the mildest form, and after having formally endorsed the Banner's denial in the article "Be Just"—is equally plain. Nay, that this expressive editorial silence, is not even the silence of dignified repose, is evident from the unfortunate betrayal of the *animus* of that Journal, in the attempt to substitute for the editorial response which the public was impatiently looking for, the puerilities of some anonymous Genius, whose obtuseness in regard to the sacred obligations of truth (from natural infirmity of mind, we charitably suppose, rather than from the blindness of malice,) as seen in his singular tissue of garbled and falsified scraps from half a dozen writers in the Critic, contrasts strangely, with his cowardly shirking of the responsibilities of untruth, as seen in the cautious insinuation of his mendacious twaddle concerning the conductors, through "*anecdote*,"* as he calls it, and through an, "*it is said*," of the most vaguely anonymous and impersonal character. Is this then the best that can be done by way of response to the very grave statements concerning the working of cliqueism at our Ecclesiastical centre? Are the Editors of the Presbyterian content to meet so grave a statement on authority so tangible as that of a minister of the Church over his own signature, by such counter-statement, and that on authority, so shadowy as *the square root of an anonym*?—scandals that even a foolish anonymous writer is afraid to assert, except upon the authority of another anonymous "*it is said*?" We assure them that the "questions which have assumed a somewhat personal form," are nevertheless questions which have been so far "meddled with," and have put things in Philadelphia in so strange a light, that thoughtful minds are not to be diverted from them, by the dazzling wits of our Ecclesiastical centre—especially wits who seem to dissociate entirely in idea, what is witty from

* By some unaccountable freak of Munchausen-ism, this "*anecdote*" makes one of the conductors of the Critic report, as uttered by Dr. Breckinridge, in some fictitious conclave of conspirators against the Board, the very sentiment against disturbing the Boards, which the Presbyterian itself on the 10th of February last, reports Dr. Breckinridge to have uttered on the floor of the Assembly in Cincinnati, five years ago! Had the editors of the Presbyterian forgotten this? Or has wit become so scanty a commodity among them, that this precious *morceau* could not be sacrificed even for the sake of truth? Or is it that a hiss at the "Critic" is too acceptable a treat to be foregone—whether it be the hiss of the adder, blinded by rage, biting the file—or that of the poor goose performing the same feat through sheer natural folly? "We hear it intimated," says the Presbyterian's veracious correspondent, "that the conductors (of the Critic) begin to feel not a little mortified," and "would be glad to recall, &c." May we not hope to "hear it intimated"—and on better authority—that the conductors of "*the best paper in the Church or out of it*," feel not a little mortified at the blunder of admitting such a writer, at just such a time?

what is true. The bear hunters tell us of a favorite manœuvre of Bruin, who, when the cries of the dogs on his trail startle him out of his very grave and dignified pace, in order to gain time, adroitly manages to put between himself and his pursuers, a certain creature of the *cat kind*, whose scent shall divert the sharpest of dogs from any other object of pursuit. Is it by some similar instinct that "Inquirer" is thrust forward just at this crisis, and to serve a similar purpose? We have only to say, if these gentlemen can afford to let this matter stand here, we certainly can.

For somewhat the same reasons which obliged us to enter into the controversy touching the tactics by which elections in the Boards are sometimes managed, we feel called upon at present to make some plain statements touching the tactics which the same sort of Ecclesiasticism employs to overrule and thwart even solemn and formal acts of the Church courts. And if there seem at first sight, little connection between the matter just referred to and the Crusade against the Synod of Baltimore, we have only to ask the reader's patience till we have presented the facts in the case, within the briefest possible compass; and if we shall succeed in showing that the new Synod of Baltimore was, from the first, admitted to be in itself a most important and necessary measure—opposed only on grounds of mere form; that the new arrangement was cordially acquiesced in by the whole Presbytery of Baltimore, save one or two very unimportant exceptions—until within a few weeks past; that a most extraordinary re-agitation of the question, and by most extraordinary methods was suddenly begun in the Presbytery of Baltimore—and this at the instance of an agent of the Board of Missions; that this agent in connection with others without the Synod, have for the year past, been employed in endeavoring to stir up dissatisfaction in the Presbytery of Carlisle;—if we make good these several points, then, is it an unjust suspicion on our part, that something of the same spirit that rules at the Ecclesiastical centre, may be at the bottom of this new and singular movement?

As to the history of the creation of the Baltimore Synod, we find a condensed account thereof in an official paper of the Synod itself, in response to a paper on the subject from the Philadelphia Synod to the General Assembly, as follows:—

"I. The necessity and expediency of some division of the Synod of Philadelphia had been not only generally acknowledged, but the question had been agitated in that body, almost annually for twenty years, to no effect.

1. At the meeting of that Synod in October 1853, a plan of division agreed upon by a committee of one from each Presbytery raised for that purpose, was, without any discussion, once more rejected by a vote indefinitely to postpone; though at the close of the meeting, and, as there is reason to believe, chiefly with a view to relieve the apparent discourtesy of the previous vote towards the Synod's committee, there was a vote to refer the subject of a division of Synod, to the Presbyteries.

2. The subject was accordingly taken up by the Presbytery of Baltimore at an adjourned meeting of that body on the 27th of October, 1853; and information having been received that the Presbytery of Winchester of the Synod of Virginia, might be disposed to join in a new organization, it was proposed to solve the difficulties of the subject, by forming a new Synod out of such contiguous Presbyteries as would join in a petition to the General Assembly to that effect. A committee was appointed to correspond with some six neighboring Presbyteries, asking them to take action on this proposition.

3. Accordingly, at their regular Spring meeting in 1854, four of these Presbyteries, to wit: Baltimore, Carlisle, Winchester and Eastern Shore, after full and free discussion, voted severally, in the usual manner of their official action, to request the General Assembly—if the same request should be made by such other contiguous Presbyteries as might conveniently constitute a Synod—to be organized into a new Synod.

4. The General Assembly, as the Records of that body declare, on the formal and orderly request of the four Presbyteries above-named, and after an able and full discussion on two separate days, in which discussion the views of the members of the Philadelphia Synod from different Presbyteries (some of them the oldest and most experienced members of the Assembly) were very ably presented, passed the act constituting the Synod of Baltimore.

From this view of the facts in the case, facts which, it is presumed, will not be called in question, this Synod cannot perceive any just ground for regarding the action of the General Assembly, as either inconsiderate, uninformed or unwise.

II. Nor can this Synod, now that we have assembled together, and have seen the practical working of the new arrangement, find any reason for wishing for any material modification of the Assembly's action. We find, on the contrary, our comfort and our means of usefulness increased, our relations to each other harmonious and pleasant, with every prospect of continually increasing attachment between the members of our different Presbyteries."

We may here observe moreover, that it adds to the intrinsic force of this argument to bear in mind that the importance of some such Synodical arrangement, was fully admitted by those who opposed the creation of the Synod in the Assembly. For the opposition was mainly on the ground of form and etiquette, as between the Assembly and the Philadelphia Synod. In the debate on this subject at the Assembly of 1854, as reported for the Presbyterian, this admission stands out prominently. "Dr. McLean said he had no doubt that the Assembly had a right to divide the Synod. He had no doubt too that that body should be divided. *This was probably the conviction of almost the whole body.*"

"Judge Fine said it appeared to him that the Synod of Philadelphia was large enough to be divided. By whom should it be done? If the Synod was unable or *unwilling* to divide, the Assembly ought to do it."

"Dr. Boardman had no objection whatever to setting off these Presbyteries in itself. He had long thought that Synod too large, and had been in favor of a division when gentlemen who now favor it opposed such a movement."

"Dr. Musgrave. This subject has been agitated for eighteen years; from which we may see that the division is very difficult to adjust. The body is conceded to be too large, but the great difficulty is to make a convenient arrangement."

Such were the admissions on the floor of the Assembly by nearly every one who spoke in opposition to the new Synod. With such admissions it is not surprising that the Assembly proceeded to organize the new body— notwithstanding the complaint of discourtesy to the Synod of Philadelphia— and notwithstanding this protest from certain members of the Presbytery of Baltimore. For it is a fact worthy to be borne in mind, that the same gentlemen who are now memorializing the Assembly of 1855, were fully heard both by protest and by representation in the Assembly of 1854, on this same subject.

We have said that there was a general and cordial acquiescence in the new arrangement until recently. It was indeed to be expected that the new Synod should have its share of that sort of ministers, who realize Irving's account of the genuine yankee, "a man, who having no particular business of his own to take care of, patriotically takes charge of the affairs of the nation." By some two or three of this class, a fire of small arms—*very* small—was kept up through the columns of "The Banner," against the Synod. By one of them, an underground circular was printed and circulated, calling upon the disaffected to go up to the Synod of Philadelphia, at Easton, and there take counsel—though with no result that we know of. By others elsewhere, as we have been informed, private letters

were written to members of Carlisle Presbytery, urging them to absent themselves from the meeting of the Synod at Washington—all to no effect also. Meantime the active pastors in the Presbytery of Baltimore, even such as at first declined acting in behalf of the new Synod movement, expressed—some of them their delight—others of them cordial acquiescence in what had been done. Dr. Plumer in an address to Winchester Presbytery, congratulated them on the matter of the new Synod; and in his address announcing to his people his acceptance of his call to Allegheny Seminary, said: "Our Synod of Baltimore, will in my opinion, be one of the most pleasant and efficient organizations in our denomination." Even Dr. Smith, the writer of the recent very remarkable letter in the Presbyterian on the subject, expressed in the Narrative read at the meeting of Synod, the following view of the greatness and importance of the new organization:

"In looking over the large and important, and, in many portions, destitute field assigned it by the General Assembly—embracing the Capital of the Nation, one of our largest commercial cities, the Eastern Shore of Maryland, the mother of Presbyterianism in America, where the first church was founded and where the dust of its first ministers and members rest:—extending from the seaboard to the Alleghenies—embracing such large and influential classes of merchants, manufacturers, miners, agriculturalists, masters and slaves:—the Synod feels that a great work and a most solemn responsibility is laid upon her, and desires, in this her first Narrative, to confess her sense of entire and absolute dependence upon the grace of God to meet her responsibilities to the country in this time of increased and increasing agitation, to the thousands of precious souls committed to her oversight, to the church of God, and to the great Head of the Church."

Dr. Backus, who signed the Protest to the Assembly of 1854, took occasion both before the Presbytery in Baltimore and the Synod in Washington, to express his readiness cordially to accept the new arrangement—and so far as we know, the same is true of every member of the Presbytery with a single exception.

Such was the state of things—and such the apparent feeling generally prevalent on the subject till within a few days of the stated spring meetings of the Baltimore and Carlisle Presbyteries—both meeting on the same day. Our readers will be curious now to know, by what strange concurrence of events—what new discovery—what revolution in the views of the Ministers and Churches, it happens that a memorial claimed to be the expression of the true, against the "accidental" majority, is to go up to the coming Assembly, proposing in some form—direct or indirect—a repeal of the act of the last Assembly.

Our limits compel us to state the facts in the briefest possible compass. The detailed history of this memorial would form a curious chapter, and present some original phases of Presbyterianism, had we room for it.

Some two or three days before the meeting of the Presbytery, a memorial to the *Assembly* was gotten up and privately circulated for signatures of Ministers and Elders, praying *contingently*, (i. e. if Carlisle Presbytery should vote according to Dr. McKinley's prediction,) for a repeal of the last Assembly's action touching the Synod. Our readers are ready to ask—why this sudden haste *before* the meeting of the Presbytery—at which all could meet, and take any regular, ordinary, constitutional action which the circumstances might demand—whence the necessity to gain two or three days—that calls for this extraordinary method of getting at the sense of the Presbytery? Simply this:—

The instigating cause of this movement, (it is no secret,) was certain "definite and reliable information" *from the Agent of the Board of Missions*

in Carlisle Presbytery—that said Presbytery would surely vote to request to be restored to the Synod of Philadelphia. And this Agent having had it as a prominent object of his travels and labors for the year past in that Presbytery to secure such a vote,—his judgment in the matter was supposed to be very reliable.

But still why this haste in Baltimore? In a few days Carlisle Presbytery will have actually voted, and then so important an ecclesiastical movement, need not be grounded upon any contingency, or any body's shrewd guess. Why obviously this:—

Carlisle might possibly *not so vote*—and then the chance for agitation in Baltimore is hopeless. The members are nearly all well content with things as they are. There is but one string to pull, with any prospect of arousing them to dissatisfaction, viz: the nervousness and jealous fear of Southern influence on the part of some of the members. They may be induced to give a conditional signature and a conditional vote, under the alarm that Carlisle will withdraw and leave us with a Mason & Dixon boundary.

That the subscriptions to this memorial were obtained on private, *ex parte* statements, and chiefly under the false pretence that Carlisle would vote to leave the Baltimore Synod, is plain both from the avowals of some of the subscribers, and the well known antecedents and prejudices of others of them. And not only was the matter begun thus privately, in the face of the fact, that the stated meeting of Presbytery was at hand—but the advocates of it absolutely declined, even when called on, to bring the matter before Presbytery for discussion, and opposed in every way the introduction of the subject for discussion and Presbyterial action. Nay, when on going into the election of Commissioners to the General Assembly, some of those in nomination, being called on in the most kind and respectful way to make known their opinions in reference to the Synod—the party, as such, took the strange ground, that a Presbyter constituent had no right to question a candidate for election to the General Assembly! So again after the election of Commissioner, it was in the face of the strongest opposition that the Presbytery passed a solemn vote of Protest against disturbing the Synod. And now, strange to say, after this strong vote—and more than all, after Carlisle Presbytery by a similar "*accidental majority*," has voted against disturbing the Synod—a memorial *contingently* signed goes up to the Assembly for a dissolution of Synod!!

We have called attention to this curious history at this time, for two reasons chiefly. In the first place, no sane man can fail to see, that such a course of proceedings must produce troubles and alienations innumerable. We desire to call attention distinctly to the beginning and the true authors of the trouble before it shall come. Those who have undertaken this Crusade—at least that part of them within the limits of the Synod—have of course the right to strive to carry their measures; but with the right, they take also the responsibility of their conduct. We only ask in advance, that when the obvious consequences of these acts begin to work themselves out in turmoil and strife in the Church, they shall not turn in pious horror, after the fashion of New Schoolism in 1833-'38, to abusing the bad spirit of the dear brethren who have been forced into stern resistance of these measures. And we are the more particular in this case, from the fact of having already witnessed some specimens of driving the wedge of disunion while humming sweet airs of love and harmony—which would have done credit to the genius of Converse, in the days of '37.

We need hardly stop to point out what must necessarily ever be the result of this un-Presbyterian method of carrying on the business of Presbytery—outside of Presbytery—by private papers, and a committal beforehand of the members of the courts on ex parte statements. What must soon be the result, if the judges of our civil courts allow themselves to be approached one by one, out of court, and commit themselves to decisions of grave questions on ex parte arguments? And are the affairs of courts of Jesus Christ to be dealt with in this manner? Have members of Presbyteries duly reflected upon their official obligations, who can allow themselves to be so approached and thus committed? To say nothing of this even—what other consequence can follow from permitting such tactics as have been employed against the Synod of Baltimore for a year past—than an utter subversion of all order in the Church? Are those of us who have our work as Pastors to attend to—and scarce time for proper attention to the meetings of Presbyteries, when we have done our work there under the solemn sanction of the constitution—then to have our work sported with and set at naught by mere ecclesiastical *Loafers*, who have nothing else to do, the year round, than to plot mischief in the Church and execute it?

But a still more important reason for this special notice of an apparently mere local movement, is the very obvious fact, that there is some ground of opposition to the Synod of Baltimore that does not appear on the surface of the movement. It is not reasonable to suppose that intelligent christian gentlemen can, on so slight grounds as those in the arguments they use, prosecute so recklessly and vehemently, this act of violence to the feelings and common sense of their brethren. For what reason do the ostensible parties to this memorial demand the annulling of the Synod? Is it that violence was done to old and cherished associations by the separation from the Synod of Philadelphia—and their zeal is that of men whose hearts are sore? But singularly enough, one half of the sixteen ministers that figure so largely in Dr. Smith's famous Analysis of the Presbytery of Baltimore, have no associations older than a year or two, with the old Synod or any other Presbyterian Synod. Or can it be the strong partiality of their several pastoral charges for the old connection? No! Singularly enough again, one half of them have no pastoral charges;—and if those who have, will fairly make the issue before their people, we doubt whether a single congregation in the Presbytery will vote to give up the new Synod. Are they in search of more pleasant ecclesiastical associations—as might be inferred from the new move to divide the Presbytery also? What pleasanter—according to their own repeated avowals could they have, without the aid of the elective affinity principle;—and even then, so far as concerns the leader of this Crusade, we gravely doubt whether all the skill of that famous elective affinity General Assembly twenty years ago, could arrange the affinities.

Seriously, however, we are more and more convinced by every new development of this matter—that the amazing disparity of strength between the feeling and the logic which has characterized the opposition to the new Synod from the first—can be accounted for only upon the supposition of a hostility as yet inarticulate, and reasons felt which have not been spoken. The remarkable activity of the Agent of the Board of Missions in the matter, furnishes, as we think, the clue to the matter. It is probably not so much any opposition felt in the Synod itself, as out of the Synod. The fact is, in plain English, the opposition is mainly from the supposed

interference of the new arrangement, with the influence and dignities of what aspires to be the great ecclesiastical and theological centre. The question of the Synod of Baltimore is supposed to involve something more than any mere Synodical arrangement; and we can only regard this whole agitation, no matter though ostensibly stirred up by men out of Philadelphia—as after all, the outworking of that domineering and arbitrary spirit, and that passion for the display of ecclesiastical power, which of late years has begun to attract the attention of the Church to the unfortunate centralization at Philadelphia. A spirit which, chafed by the defeat which it met in its uncalled for and unwise intervention to prevent the formation of the new Synod, refuses now to be appeased except at the price of the Synod's destruction.

At this present writing, we of course cannot form any conjecture as to what the Assembly (*now in the second day of its Session in Nashville*) will do. On the one hand, it seems preposterous enough to suppose that an out-of-door memorial shall weigh against the solemn resolves of three Presbyteries. And yet on the other hand we reason, if signatures and votes for such a measure can be got by such means in a Presbytery, quite as intelligent on a fair average as a General Assembly—the same means might possibly secure votes enough for the purpose in the Assembly. Especially if the new method of ecclesiastical discussion shall obtain—if out-door canvassing shall take the place of in-door deliberation;—if the question be made with this man as a question of power between North and South—with that one, a question between Princeton and Union Seminaries—with a third, a question between the Critic Party (for we believe they have organized us into a party) and the Confidence-in-the-Boards Party—it is hard telling what may not be done. Indeed taking into the account some higher questions, we are not sure that we care much what shall be done. If there had been no Assembly of '35, there might have been no Assembly of '37. If the question of breaking up a young Board involved many important results—so may the breaking up of a young Synod.

We are free to confess that we have entered into this controversy with even more than our usual aversion to controversies. We have stood patiently a whole year of pop-gun firing at us and our Synod, rather than be involved in any strife on the subject. And moreover it now happens that the strife must be with friends and neighbors, with whom we have heretofore enjoyed most pleasant personal and official intercourse. But if they feel called upon to put themselves into such position towards us and declare war, whilst we shall do our best to admire and esteem them for their many excellencies, they strike out the "if possible" from the injunction "live peaceably." There are great principles at stake. We acquiesce in the "necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war—in peace, friends."

ABSTRACTIONISTS.

THERE are two ways of reasoning about human affairs. One is, to bring measures to the test of fundamental principles, and abide by their decision firmly. The other is, to inquire: "What is the dictate of policy, of expediency, of present utility?" There are two classes of minds in the world: the speculative, and the practical. The former seeks to analyse its objects of thought, to arrive at ultimate truths, and from those truths, to deduce its practical conclusions. The other only considers propositions, in the light of their practical consequences as perceived by itself. The former looks at general laws: the latter at immediate results.

Now the latter class of people have applied to the former, in these days of ours, a name, which is at least new in its present sense: *abstractionists*. It is subject of joy, for the sake of the credit of the Church, that this name was first invented among politicians: but it is to be lamented, that the Church's people have, to her disgrace, borrowed the name with its contemptuous meaning, from the politicians. An abstraction, properly understood, means, a proposition considered as naked and general, stripped of all the accidental circumstances which belong to any individual case under it. But the idea which some of those seem to have, who use the word as a term of contempt, is that it is just something which is abstruse. Those who know what they mean by it, if there are any such, probably intend by abstractions, *speculative principles*, as opposed to practical conclusions.

Among the many good results of popular government in church and state, there is this unfortunate one: that its usages tend to teach the governing minds to despise speculative thought, and reason only from present expediency. It is the popular mind, with which they have to deal: and that mostly in the fugitive form of oral address, or the flimsy newspaper argument, where the whole result intended, is a momentary impression. The minds addressed, are not trained to speculation, and could not comprehend it. Hence, public men are tempted to disuse it, till they become incapable of it themselves; and all profundity and breadth of view are neglected, or even despised, in reasoning of public affairs. Men aim only to catch the public ear by some shallow argument of present expediency; and brand all appeals to more fundamental truths "as abstractions,"—gossamer speculations unworthy to bind the strong common sense of practical people. Thus, it is proposed, in federal politics, to institute some measure, the argument for which is present utility. Its opponents object, that it is not within the legitimate scope of the federal institutions; and to institute it would be a virtual breach of constitutional compacts. "Ah," says its advocate, "that is one of your 'abstractions.' Isn't the measure a good one in its practical effect? Then

why not adopt it?" Or, in church affairs; one good brother proposes, that the Church shall take into its own official hand, the business of education, and imbue it properly with the christian element. Another brother objects, that to educate is not the divinely appointed function of a church. "Why," asks the first, "don't you admit that all education ought to be christian education?" "Oh yes," says the respondent; "but it is the function of christian parents; combining, if necessary; but as parents, not as presbyters." "What of that?" says the first; "our church schools are very good things: very harmless things as yet: and where is the difference between a combination of certain men as christian parents, to make and govern a certain sort of school, and a combination of the same men as presbyters to make the same sort of school?" "There is the difference of the principle involved," it is answered; "and it is never safe to admit a false principle." "Pshaw," says the first; "that is nothing but one of your 'abstractions.'

The term is intended to be one of contempt. It is supposed to describe something uncertain, vague, devious, sophistical: as opposed to that which is positive, sensible and reliable. The "abstractionist" is represented as a man, fanciful and unreliable; who pursues the intangible moonshine of metaphysical ideas, until he and his followers "wander, in devious mazes lost." But if any of the men who attempt abstractions are vague or sophistical, is it because they use abstract propositions; or because they misuse them? If men choose to be careless or dishonest in their thinking;—if they will mix or vary the terms of their propositions, or commit any other logical errors, they will be erroneous, however they may reason. And we assert, as an offset to this reproach, that no truths can be general, except those which are abstract: for by the very reason that concrete propositions are concrete, they must be particular, or individual; and therefore no deduction made from them, can have any certainty when it is attempted to give it a general application. The concrete is best for illustration, but for general reasoning it is useless: and all gentlemen who are accustomed to boast, that they are not "abstractionists," thereby confess that their arguments are only illustrations. If they wish to glorify their logic therein, they are welcome.

But that any *educated man* should indulge in this slang of the hustings and the demagogue, is derogatory to his own intelligence, and his fraternity. For every man of information ought to know, that abstractions are the most practical things in the world. His reading ought to remind him how directly the most abstract truths have led on to the most practical conclusions; how inevitably they work themselves out into practical results, and how uniformly the most practical truths depend for their evidence on those which are abstract. There is no branch of human science, which does not teem with illustrations of this. Our anti-abstractionists would probably consider it rather a shadowy question, if they were called to debate

whether or not Galvanism and Magnetism are generically distinct or like; two somethings impalpable, invisible, imponderable, which we hardly know whether to call substances or not. Yet, on the answer to that question depended the invention of the *Magnetic Telegraph*, with all its very practical results, in the regulating of the prices of breadstuffs, the catching of fugitive rogues, and the announcement of the end of dead Emperors. Latent caloric strikes us as a rather abstract thing: a something which no human nerve ever has, or ever will feel, and which the most delicate thermometer does not reveal. And about this shadowy something, a very shadowy proposition has been proved by your contemptible abstractionists: namely, that in certain cases, sensible heat becoming latent, increases elasticity. This is the abstraction which revealed to mankind the secret steam engine; and which now propels our boats, spins our cloths, grinds our flour, saws our lumber, ploughs the ocean with our floating palaces, whirls us across continents in the rail-cars, and sometimes scalds or cripples us by the score. A rather practical thing, is this abstraction.

Or, let us take illustrations from the moral sciences. Every well informed man ought to know that the abstract question, whether general ideas are substances, conception, or names, once almost threw Europe into fits, armed universities, and even commonwealths against each other, and probably cost John Huss his life. Whether what we call *causation* is a real and necessary connexion, or merely an observed sequence of events, is a very abstract question: but it makes all the difference between a God and no God: yea, all the difference between the blessings, civilization, wholesome restraints and happiness of religion, and the license, vice, atrocity and despair of Atheism. Indeed your thorough Atheist, is the only true and consistent anti-abstractionist. Jonathan Edwards' work on the will, is usually thought rather an abstract book, on a rather abstract subject. Its great question is, whether volitions are certain, according to the prevalent bent of the dispositions, or self-determining. But the answer to this abstract question decides authoritatively between Calvinism and Pelagianism. Presbyterians, we think, have found the latter quite a practical matter! Can human merit be imputed to another human being, in God's government, as it is in man's? "A very useless, unpractical question," you say. "I don't care to speculate in such unsubstantial merchandise." Well, from the affirmative answer to that question Thomas Aquinas deduced the grand system of *Papal Indulgences*. Here is an abstraction out of which grew a good many important matters: such as a good many millions of crowns transferred out of the pockets of good catholics, into those of "his Holiness the Pope;"—the zeal of Luther against Tetzal, and thence the Reformation—with English liberty and through that, American; with a good many other very practical affairs. But enough. The most abstract propositions have often divided nations, and led to wars, revolutions, and convulsions: just as that abstrac-

tion, "whether a man can rightfully own as property, the labor of a fellow man without his voluntary consent," now threatens our nation with fratricidal and suicidal war. There is no practical truth, in the evidence of which an abstract one is not concerned. There is no abstract truth which may not lead, by logical necessity, to practical results. How unthinking, and ignorant ought a man to be, in order to utter an honest, sincere sneer against dealings and dealers in abstractions? Very stupid indeed. Again; such sneers are always inconsistent. Every man is an abstractionist, except perhaps the materialist—atheist, who does not believe there is any God, because he has never seen him, or that he has any soul, because he cannot handle it. Those who contemptuously disavow it, only do so when the abstractions are against them; and strenuously use similar abstractions, on their own side. How literally has this been verified in federal politics? In truth, no man can help it; for the foundation of every man's right, theory, or project, whatever it may be, is on an abstract principle. And the veriest red-republican of them all, who thinks he has trampled down every abstraction, still relies on his own favorite ones, to sustain his radicalism. Says the Agrarian:—"Here is my rich neighbor, who has more than he can possibly use, or even waste. How much better to take away a part, and give it to me, who need a little capital to enable me to be a producing citizen. You will thereby benefit me, the state, and my rich neighbor himself: for he is so rich that it is an actual injury to him." You object, that the rights of property are in the way; and that it is of more fundamental importance to the State, that those rights should be protected, and that every man should be certain of the rewards of his industry, than that property should be equally distributed. These are in his eyes, nothing but abstractions. Why should a citizen be kept back from obvious and present advantage, by the gossamer threads of those abstract rights? So he helps himself liberally to his neighbor's property, and thus becomes a man of property himself. And now, lo! he forthwith invokes those abstract rights of property, to defend his new acquisitions against other red-republicans, as greedy as himself, but still poorer.

But the serious and lamentable point about all this decrying of abstractions is, that where it is intelligently and deliberately uttered, it is thoroughly profligate. What is it all, but a demand that principle shall give way to expediency? All the principles of morals, in their last analysis, are abstractions. The distinction between right and wrong is an abstraction, as pure and disembodied as was ever presented by metaphysics. And in short, the difference between an honest man and a scoundrel, is but this: that the former is governed by a general principle, which is an abstraction, in opposition to the present concrete prospect of utility; while the latter is governed by his view of present expediency, in opposition to the general principle. What else do we mean by saying that a man is *un-principled*? In the eyes of such a man, the restraints of a constitution which he has

sworn to support, are abstractions, whenever they seem to oppose the present dictates of expediency. All those broad and wise considerations, which show how much more important is a consistent adherence to general principles, than the gain of a temporary and partial advantage by their violation, are but abstractions. And with the same justice, though with greater impiety, it might also be said, that the immutable principles of eternal rectitude, to which God compels all the interests of the universe to bend, at whatever cost of individual misery, are abstractions. What, for instance, is the principle, which constitutes the necessity for an atonement? What, except that necessary connexion, which the unchangeable perfections of God have established between the abstract guilt of sin, and the penalty? "Now here is a penitent man," says the Socinian; "a wondrous pious, proper man: he is never going to sin any more: (the self-determining power of his own will has decided that.) Who will be the worse for his pardon? Why should he go to perdition, poor fellow, for a mere abstraction?"

All this sneering has ever sounded mournfully in our ears, as a revelation of the unscrupulousness of the age. And to be called an abstractionist, has we confess, been always received rather as a compliment, than a reproach. It puts us in admirably good company;—along with all the profound thinkers, and the stable, noble souls, whose brave motto has been "*Obsta principis.*" And when the philosophic historian shall come to write, in future ages, the history of the Decline and Fall of the Empire Republic, he will mark it as the most glorious tribute to the public virtue of one school of our statesmen, that they were branded by unthinking or unscrupulous adversaries, as *Abstractionists*. And let none say, that in these words, we have violated that delicate neutrality towards national parties, which becomes a religious periodical. The honor of both the great parties of the nation, equally approves and demands the sentiment. For the sneer would have seemed as profligate and odious in the ears of a Hamilton or a Marshall, as in those of a Madison or a Calhoun.

"But, is there not a style of reasoning, which calls itself general and abstract, which is, in fact, unreliable, misty, and deceptive? This," some will say, "is what we mean by abstractions." Well, good reader, you express your meaning very unfortunately. When next you hear men using propositions, which they suppose general, in a manner vague and sophistical, we pray you, in the name of intelligence, sound logic, and sound principle, do not express your dissent, by saying that they are *abstractions*; say simply that they are *untrue*.

**THE GREAT NEED OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
AT THIS TIME.**

The general condition of the Presbyterian Church at the present time is such as to be a subject of sincere congratulation to all who love it. The fruits of the great struggle of 1837 have in part been developed, and the extraordinary prosperity which has marked the progress of events, in her history since that time, indicate in the most cheering and conclusive manner, the approval by the *Great Head* of the Church, of the efforts then made, to purge out the evils which disfigured her beauty and threatened the integrity of her existence.

Her borders have been greatly extended. Her ministry and membership have increased in high proportions to their number when the separation was complete. Her whole system of measures for the promotion of the truth, has been in full and successful operation; the utmost harmony of belief in the established articles of her Creed, distinguishes the preaching of her ministry; and the whole aspect of affairs is such as to call for a devout acknowledgement of the goodness and grace of God. We do not mean that there are no occasions for feelings very different from the sentiments of gratitude and triumph, which we have just declared to be demanded by the present aspect of the Church. There are things which call for regret for their existence, and for effective efforts to remove them. The arrangement of the administrative policy of the Church, calls for modification and improvement. There is reason to regret the extreme positions which have been taken in some of the official documents of the Boards and that a system of action has been based upon these views, which has excited a just resistance in some quarters of the Church. There is also great reason to lament that so large a portion of the Church, seems to have failed in the most obvious duty of supporting the great mission enterprises in which the Church has embarked. But taking all in all, there is great and commanding reason to rejoice in the rapid development of the Church, and in the signals of prosperity that greet each other all over the wide and varied field of her operations. Let us thank God and take courage; and while we address ourselves earnestly to the rectification of all that seems evil, or susceptible of improvement, let us send up the incense of an unaffected gratitude that there is so vast a preponderance of good.

In looking over the articles in which there seems to be room for improvement in the present state of the Church, we are disposed to call attention to a deficiency which we presume no one will deny to exist, and which it is of vital importance to the success of all her operations, should be corrected. It is simply the deficiency of faith; the want of severity of conviction; the absence of a strong and vehement belief of the creed of the Church. Whatever difference of opinion may exist on the mere matters of policy, alleged to be susceptible of improvement, no one will affirm that the Church has been perfected

in faith. If not yet perfect, her faith may be increased: to the promotion of this end we address the considerations which follow, to the earnest attention of the reader.

We do not mean by this deficiency of faith, that the Church has departed from her creed, or that the spirit of scepticism has invaded her precincts. On the contrary, we do not believe there ever has been a period in which the great doctrines of the Westminster Confession were more universally and harmoniously held by the ministry of the Church than at present. The Church does not need to have *the objects* of her faith modified, but only the severity and completeness with which she conceives of them. Her faith itself needs the modification. That faith is defective in degree, not vicious in nature. She is chargeable with unbelief, not with infidelity: she needs a baptism of the Spirit; not a correction of her theology. Her great need is a deeper and severer conviction of the truths which compose the grand structure of her creed and policy—a more realizing sense of these great and wonderful realities—not only of the truths which she holds in common with other branches of the Church of God; but of those which are peculiar to herself.

Faith, as that term describes the gift of divine grace to the soul of man, on which the issues of salvation are suspended, is not the simple assent of the intellect to the evidence of a truth; it is a realizing sense of the truth itself. The one is the faith of the head: the other is the faith of the heart. In the one the mind assents to a statement as a mere abstract verity: the other assents to it as the presentation of a fact. Faith, as defined by Paul, is “the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen.” Nor will the Church of God ever awake in the full measure of her strength, until she can accept fully the articles of her own creed as descriptions of existing facts, and not the mere abstract verities of a systematic theology. Her ministry will never preach the gospel as they ought, until they are full of this faith: *they must believe and therefore speak*. Her eldership will never know their power for good until they believe with simplicity and severity of realizing confidence, the laws and relations of their official character. Her membership will never come up to the measure of their duty on the one side, or of their privileges on the other, until they are penetrated by the power of this great principle, and roused to comprehend the fulness of that vivid life of labor, tribulation, and joy unspeakable, into which they would be conducted by a compliance with their duty. There are truths solemn and truths joyful, truths full of awful and overwhelming grandeur, and truths full of the sweetest and most melting tenderness and pity, to be realized. A realizing sense of these will re-act with tremendous power on the nature of him who contemplates them; they will imprint themselves upon him; they will expand his intellect; they will rouse his conscience; they will break down his pride; they will teach him how to weep and to rejoice; they will fill him with the powers of the world to come. There is no such principle of education as faith: it presents truths under relations which are es-

sential to completeness of intellectual vision. No man can be an educated man in any complete or comprehensive sense of the term, unless he is possessed of this living faith. It will develop a series of phenomena in and before the mind, of the most wonderful description. It will pour a fiery energy into the soul, which will do more for the development of its faculties than any other stimulus which can be applied to them.

There ought to be in the Church a deeper and severer conviction of *the immortality and existing condition of the soul*. The great business of the Church is to save souls; not to become merely a conservative power in society—the teacher of morals, the upholder of law, the educator of the moral department of the human soul, the stimulant to the progress of all intellectual and spiritual improvement. These are its subordinate and collateral ends; ends too, worthy of the highest efforts of the highest intellects, and the highest degrees of virtue to attain. But the grand end of the Church is the preaching of the Cross of Christ, in order to the glory of God in the salvation of souls. What is implied in both of these ideas? Who really understands clearly what it is to seek the glory of God? Much more, who is it that *feels* it as well as understands it; whose heart expands to its great and mighty powers, giving a practical, daily and perpetual impulse in every thing he undertakes; present incessantly in the soul, and pressing it from one degree of advancement in practical holiness to another, until the whole character of the individual begins to glow with the fulness of that spiritual beauty which it is the privilege and absolute duty of every individual to seek? What is it to glorify God? It is not to make him glorious, but to display his glory, to unfold the secret splendors of his divinity, to display the real nature and effect of the various attributes which make him God, by giving samples of them. It is not to display these as abstractions, but as embodied in great and living realities. All the displays which God has ever made of himself have been embodied in great facts, and the chief end of man is to concur in the production of these results, in the use of appointed means. These results, when produced, are full of power to promote the well-being of the race of creatures; for the glory of God is inseparably linked, under various modifications, with the good of the universe. Thus is man to glorify God: it is to embody in our lives practical illustrations of wisdom, power, goodness, truth, justice and grace; to expound the great elements of infinite excellence, that the real nature of God may be seen, and in the brightness of the vision to fill the universe with joy. The vision of power, justice, mercy, beauty, intellectual and moral excellence, and in proportion to the degrees of each, or the combination of all, must be a fountain of infinite delight to man, and of glory to Jehovah.

Take the other grand end of the Church, *the salvation of souls*. What are the implied ideas which make this the most awful and sublime of all enterprises which can engage the attention, or enlist the energies of man? They are that man is a sinner, guilty, polluted,

condemned to suffer the wrath of God forever, and that the soul is immortal, to remain immortal even amid the gloom and awful corruption of the second death. Let the mind dwell upon each of these adjectives; let the nature of the faith required in them be deliberately exerted upon each. Realize that it is true—that all these are true—true of us individually, true of our wives, children, fathers, mothers, friends; true of all the race. Do not flinch: let the soul gird herself up with meekness and humility; with honest and inexorable resolution. Let the facts grow into the soul, until it is bowed down in tears, and unutterable pity; and see, Minister of Christ, if your preaching of the Cross, and your efforts to persuade men to escape from the wrath to come, will not be tintured with a tenderness, a solemnity, a fiery and vehement energy, a grandeur and pathos of appeal which it has never worn before. Think of the immortality of the soul, realize the nature of death, conceive the nature of that inevitable birth into a new state of existence which is before you personally, and all others, and let the grand idea pass from the abstract into the concrete form, and stand before you—a *reality*; not as the mere abstract verity of a *creed*. Do this, not once or twice, as a mere experiment, but do it *habitually*. You are not required to believe the facts of life and the doctrines of the gospel as a mere temporary experiment, but as the constant and abiding principle of life. It will take no profound philosophy to see, that such a faith, such a realization of truth, such an evident sense of things unseen, will infuse a far deeper and more serious life into the Church than she is now living. It will give a gravity, a seriousness, a weighty and prompt resolution, a fear of God, a contempt for the world, which will inspirit the growing selfishness and worldliness of the Church in these days of increasing luxury and splendor, with an element, which will utterly consume her shame, and fill her with the heroic spirit of her earlier days. Such a faith will do more to quench vanity, worldliness, ambition, and the worship of mammon in the ministry and membership of the Church, than anything that can be conceived in the way of a remedy. It will also have been perceived that it will require courage to exercise this faith. It will require courage: it will require a patience, a firmness, a fortitude, a meek and self-renouncing spirit; yea, there is room for the exercise of the highest heroism that ever animated the human faculties in becoming a deeply spiritual and an intensely believing follower of Jesus of Nazareth. But how glorious is the modification of character it will produce! Remember that this great principle of faith acts, not only on truths that are grand and awful, but on truths that are glorious and joyful beyond all expression: it realizes all; and each stamps its own image deep into the nature of the gazing and wondering spirit. *Sanctify them through thy truth*: this is the grandest utterance of all philosophy, replete with more practical power at once to rouse, to solace, to guide, and stamp with undying energy the enthusiasm of the human mind, than all the utterances that ever came from the shadows of the groves or marble colonnades of Athenian wisdom.

Take again *the power and willingness of our Master to save this guilty and dying, but immortal essence.* The gospel is glad tidings of great joy: it embodies elements of the deepest and most precious power: it is glad tidings to the lost, the guilty, the helpless. Who of the ministry in our day has any deep, abiding and growing sense,—the vivid conviction of the fulness of truth in each of these items? How often do they preach it with a listlessness, a want of confidence in the gospel as good tidings, a species of feeling, arising, it may be from the disciplinary delays of the Spirit of God, to give power to the truth,—a feeling, which seems to define itself in utter, practical want of confidence in the real nature of the gospel, as good news. Brother in Christ, do you *believe* the gospel? Then away with all such miserable, guilty folly. Sound the trumpet cheerily in the ears of the people. Do not flinch because you preach it to the guilty; for it is good news to the guilty. Do not blanch because you preach it to those who are unable to help themselves to a participation in its blessings; for it is good news to the helpless. Do not allow your hearts to grow practically under the conviction that the gospel is only designed for *believers*; it is a gospel for *sinners*: Christ, came to call—not the righteous, but sinners to repentance. The gospel comes to make christians *of the ungodly*; but its primary proposition is always made to man in his capacity *as a sinner*. Let your faith grasp deeply and comprehensively the real nature of the gospel as a system of remedies, based upon a pre-existing state of facts, in the nature and life of man, designed to remove and modify these ills, and full of preciousness in its power to accomplish all that it undertakes. The delusion which underlies and animates all the efforts of infidelity to overthrow the gospel, is one of the most remarkable that ever asserted dominion over the human understanding. The infidel thinks that it is to his *interest* not to believe the gospel. But the gospel is merely a system of remedies, based upon a pre-existing state of things in human life, and in this pre-existing state of facts lie the grand ideas which make the subject of religion so gloomy to the spirit of man. None disprove the gospel; but are men the less mortal, the less wretched, the less the victims of conscience, or the less certainly bound over to annihilation, or to an immortal existence beyond the grave? Let the sceptic study the effects of life, the phenomena of his own soul, the system of existence in which he is living, and when he has seen and *felt* the true necessity of the world, and of his own soul, let him return and begin to study the real nature of the Gospel of Christ. Believe the preciousness of the gospel, and you can make it appear precious to others.

Lastly, in general terms, whatever truth is embodied in your creed, or exists in the mass of realities, both within and without you, embrace it earnestly as a fact. If it be a duty, accept absolutely the obligation it imposes, and cease to exhibit the odious and grotesque absurdity of admitting things to be true, yet not believing them to be true. If it be a privilege, seek to estimate it as a privilege, and to use it to the uttermost. If it be a statement of fact, receive it as

such, and cease to warn men of a ruin which is accepted as true as an abstraction, not as a fact—true in the Bible, but not true out of it—a reality in the universe of realities which exists without us, and beyond the present grasp of our faculties. Preach the atonement, not as a mere metaphysical or logical expedient adapted to meet the conditions of the problem raised upon the facts of human life, by the issue of salvation to man, considered merely as an abstract question, but as a grand and vivid reality,—a provision made to meet a grand practical issue of unutterable importance to man,—an entity,—a thing,—a substantial verity of immense and glorious significance, on which the heart and conscience, not less than the logical understanding can rest with a deep repose of spirit in view of its relations to eternity and God, which is unutterably sublime and precious to the soul. How many of us think that our task is done, when we define, prove, and state the nature, terms, and logical limitations of the atonement! But these are but the frame-work, or steps on which we ascend till we are face to face, with the *thing* which we have proved, limited, and defined. The question still returns for a higher analysis,—*what is it we have thus limited and defined?* The man who stops short of this question and its answer, knows nothing of the atonement as he ought to know it, even though his perceptions of it as a logical statement may be absolutely complete. Has that man any just idea of the immortality of the soul who is perfect in the logic that proves it, yet has no just sense of what it is that is thus proved? Surely conceiving a thing as an abstraction is one thing; conceiving it as a fact is another. Believing with the head is one thing; believing with the heart is another. Viewing a thing in the abstract is necessary to completeness of insight into its proofs, evidences, limits and relations to other things: it must be taken to enable the minister to bring out the teaching function of his office,—the didactic side of his business. But the minister is not only a *mere teacher*; he is an *enforcer* of truth. He is not only to state and define, but to urge and apply the truth; and to do this effectually, he must *see and feel* the truth as a concrete and living verity: it must burn into his own soul, or this function of his office will be suspended. This deep sense of the truth is essential to the *completeness* of his character as a *teacher*, and to the very *existence* of his character as an *enforcer* of the truth. Let us remember that we, brethren of the ministry, are not merely teachers of a system of abstractions, but a system of living and vivid realities. Let us grasp this system we are set to inculcate, with a deeper and more intense comprehension of its real meaning. Shall we spend the whole of our existence in this inconceivably great and important period allotted to it here on earth, charged with the teaching of a system so awful and so glorious as the mysteries of life, and the great remedies of the gospel, without really *understanding* them more than we do—without entering more deeply into their real significance, without opening our eyes more fully on the gemmed columns, arabesque and massive, the gorgeous arches, the unutterable forms of beauty that stand around us, without opening our ears to the melodies that stream along the eternal col-

lonade of God's everlasting gospel? That gospel is the grandest system of thought, considered simply as an embodied aggregation of intellectual and imaginative, moral and spiritual conceptions, which the world has ever seen. The rapt vision of the grand old poetic sage of Greece, the deep and almost infinite analysis of the stern Stagyrite, never caught a beam that deserves to be compared with the truths of the gospel, as a great system of philosophic theology. Its truths are infinite;—so simple in their original statement that a child can comprehend them—so grand in their full and complete significance, that the eye of the tallest and brightest cherub trembles, as it ranges up above the higher stages through which they ascend, far beyond all adequate understanding, save the clear comprehension of Jehovah. How little do we understand it! How incomplete are even our merely logical apprehensions of the truth in its limits and its uses. How much more do we fail of that far higher and far more intense, that more animating and sanctifying view, which springs under the teachings of the Holy Ghost. If we will *really study and believe* the gospel, there is no need of perpetually seeking for novelties to interest and instruct the people. There is abundant room for growth in the knowledge and conception of the simple truths of the gospel. Though theology is not progressive any more than any other true science in leaving or abandoning its fundamental facts; it is progressive in that it admits of an eternal progression in the conception of its truths, and in the knowledge of its relations to other things. It is an absurdity, absolutely grotesque in its folly; for us to imagine that we have exhausted the ideas involved in the great system of Jesus of Nazareth. That system will expand before opening intellects of angel and saint, forever and forevermore: why should we be foolish enough to think we have mastered it, when we have gotten a complete logical outline of its various doctrines stamped upon our memory? Such a knowledge of it bears to the true and full knowledge of it, the relation of a three-inch map to the continent it defines. Go, study the system you hold; go enter deeply into it by that faith which "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen." We have pointed to the entrance, and shown you the way into the pillared aisles of this gorgeous temple of eternal truth; enter it, and study its manifestation for yourself. The simple secret of growth in piety as in intellect, is self-exertion,—self-development. There is truth for you, which no one but yourself can ever see in the exact forms in which it appears to you. The secret of originality of thought, is self-exertion: each man's mind has its own individuality as much as his face: it may not be a very great or wonderful peculiarity, any more than the countenance must be striking or beautiful, in order to be peculiar; but such as it is, it will come out if only the man will exert his own faculties. This is true of piety, as it is of the intellect. To grow in anything, we must give the virtue of exercise to the power to be enlarged. To grow in grace, it will not do for us merely to read and admire the attainments of others: we must work for our own. It is needless to do more

now than simply remind you of the mode in which these grand results are to be obtained : your creed furnishes you the simple guide all through the wonderful adventure. This knowledge can only be obtained under the teachings of the Holy Ghost : it is conditioned absolutely on those spiritual perceptions, which are only gotten as gifts from this divine agent. Faith is the fruit of the spirit : it is the gift of God. Go, seek it by prayer and incessant waiting upon God in the due use of the appointed means. Remember God is more willing to give his Spirit to them that ask him, than earthly parents are to give good gifts unto their children ;—that this is the very business which the Spirit accomplishes in the plan of salvation, *leading into the truth* and sanctifying through it. Go then and learn to believe the elements of your creed.

Nor should we do justice to the subject, should we fail to remind you of exerting this faith on those points, which are peculiar to your own creed, as well as those which you hold in common with other branches of the Church. There is a wonderful power in the Calvinistic theology. When it really penetrates the soul, and sends its living energies through all its faculties, it is like a fire in the bones : it girds up the soul with an inexorable and vehement spirit : it infuses a life which reaches every power of the intellect, and every feeling of the heart, with an extraordinary power at once to rouse and sober, to intensify and calm the tumult of its feelings. But to educe this power, the peculiarities of this creed must be embraced by this living and masterly principle of apprehension, which we have been endeavoring to illustrate. But it is shorn of its majesty when merely held in the cold solution of an unspiritual and unrealizing belief. Viewed only from this level, the natural hatred of the carnal mind to it, has great advantage in resisting all real and enthusiastic devotion to the creed. No wonder: such an apprehension of it leaves the real power and glory of the system unrevealed to the understanding, and no attachment can spring up to it, because no principle of counter-action is engaged in subduing the opposition which will inevitably meet the system from the carnal pride and guilt of the soul. It is only when the issue has been made,—when the conquest has been won,—when the power of the spirit has encountered the pride of the soul, and overwhelmed its opposition,—it is only in this attitude of profound and truthful submission to God, that the true nature of the sovereignty of God, in the salvation of sinners will appear. It is like one of those ingenious contrivances which at first sight seem only to present a mass of chaotic elements, arranged with no relation to each other, and exhibiting no trace of beauty, no sign of utility to the eye ; but when we assume a peculiar position, and take a view from a certain attitude or depression, the hidden relations of the parts start into sight, and we behold the elements of beauty and power, blended in the very chaos we were unable to comprehend before. Let the soul bow into this deep attitude of submission to the truth, and the hidden glory of the divine sovereignty will unseal its splendid mystery to the eye, and it will be able to

see the vision which David saw, when he exclaimed, "*the Lord reigneth ; let the earth rejoice.*" The church needs this baptism of the spirit, to lead her more deeply into the real meaning and power of her own high, severe and noble creed. There is too much disposition to blanch from the bold statement of our grand peculiarities of religious belief. It requires courage,—a calm, resolute, nay, sometimes a stern, vehement spirit, to encounter the universal storm of indignation and contempt, which greets the fearless vindication of the divine decrees. This opposition comes not only from the vicious and abandoned, but its most formidable form, is found in the vast multitudes of able and devout men, who flinch from the stringency of the predestination of the eternal King. Many nominal Presbyterians,—many who are sincerely attached to other elements of the order and creed of the Church, flinch from these. In almost all our congregations, persons are to be found, who seem to shrink whenever the terms *predestination* and *election* are heard from the pulpit. There is tremendous temptation in all this, either to soften down, or explain away, or altogether ignore these articles of our creed. This ought to be resisted. We have no right to blanch from the statement of God's own doctrines, or the use of God's own terms. The manner in which Paul uses these terms, defines the duty of the ministry with perfect precision ; nor can we prevent the observation being made by a shrewd and keen-witted intellect, that the entire abandonment of these terms, or the use of them only to be explained and apologized away, instead of being freely and boldly interspersed in the free preaching of our pulpits, indicates at all events a fear of the terms, if not a disagreement with the doctrine. Let us give the same positive and aggressive form to these doctrines, which they receive in the epistles. Let us not break the unity of the grand formulary of doctrine stated in Romans, and while we present in a positive form, the fore-knowledge of God, his calling, justifying and adopting the sinner, commit ourselves to the inconceivable absurdity of mentioning *the predestination*, which is stated in the series of doctrines, only in a negative form, as if it was to be stated only as a subject of limitation, and the theme for ingenious and subtle erasures. Let us not be ashamed of the truth: God has used these terms: they were right to be used, and we dare not encounter the responsibility of denying, or being ashamed of them. Let us not blanch from the vocabulary of the spirit ; nor yield for an instant to the idea that the sovereignty of God, mysterious though it be, is not as glorious as any other of his attributes, and that the foundation of all hope to man, is unworthy of a complete exposition, and an unqualified defence.

Lastly, let us bring ourselves to the apprehension of the evanescent nature, and the inconceivable importance of the period of time allotted to us here. We are standing on the borders of eternity, and weaving the web of its destinies on this side of the mysterious bourne. The seed time of eternity, a space brief at best, uncertain at all times, liable to be terminated every moment, how awful—how sublime!

The soul bows in mute and astonished awe before the solemn and overwhelming fact. Let us nevertheless believe it, and gird us up to meet its issues humbly, earnestly, affectionately, and with a meek, resolute trust in Jesus. All will be well with such a soul: the man is blessed who trusts in God. This period so awful as it is, is passing rapidly with its mysterious train of dim and infinite issues. The rapid revolution of the days, marks the cycle of the march: the thunder of the sun on its path in the heavens, is the music of the host, and the spirits of men are passing daily by thousands through the embossed and cloud-spotted archway of the material heavens. *The night comes when no man can work.* Let us be in haste to the harvest;—

“Let’s take the instant by the forward top,
For we are old and on our quickest decrees,
The inaudible and noiseless foot of time
Steals ere we can effect them;
Thus we play the fools with the time,
And the spirits of the wise sit in the clouds and mock us.”

THE OFFICE OF DEACON.

It is not proposed here to consider the issue between us and Episcopalians in reference to the office of Deacon; nor to test the views here presented by the teachings of Scripture; but simply to define the Presbyterian idea of Deacon.

In the 6th chapter of the Form of Government, we have the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. on this subject, which is precisely the doctrine of Calvin, Knox and the Reformed Churches generally. It is in these words:

“The Scriptures clearly point out Deacons as distinct officers in the Church, whose business it is to take care of the poor, and to distribute among them the collections which may be raised for their use. To them also may be properly committed, the management of the temporal affairs of the Church.”

As this chapter includes all that is taught in our constitution, as to the nature and functions of the Deacon’s office, let us analyse it closely.

1. Let it be observed that according to the book, Deacons have no doctrinal functions, so far at least as the congregation is concerned. Whether in “taking care of the poor,” is included anything more than seeing after their temporal or bodily wants, we shall not now inquire: but these officers are not, in any sense, congregational expounders of the word of God.

2. They have no legislative powers of any kind. Their powers are wholly executive or administrative, in the narrowest sense. They are, in virtue of their office, trustees and agents of the congregation as to a certain specified class of subjects.

3. They have no judicial or disciplinary powers. In former times they had certain advisory privileges in sessional matters—but even this was irregular, and not sanctioned by the constitution.

4. Their functions are bounded by the limits of the particular congregation, which they serve.

5. Hence, they are not in any proper sense *ecclesiastics*. They have no spiritual functions whatever. They neither rule, nor labor in word and doctrine. They have no part in the general work of the Church as have ministers and elders. They have no seat or voice in any court of the Church, even the lowest. They belong to the *popular* element, as distinguished from the ecclesiastical element, in Christianity. They attend to the business of the people who elect them, and to no other business. So far as their *functions* are concerned, they are no more ecclesiastical or spiritual officers than are the trustees who commonly manage our church temporalities; practically much less so.

6. But whilst Deacons are not ecclesiastics, they are subject to ecclesiastical authority, not only as members of the Church, but also in their official capacity. For any mal-appropriation of congregational funds, they are liable to censure, suspension or deposition as the case require. It is no anomaly in a republican system of government for an officer to be elected by one body, and to be under the discipline of a different body. It is so even with the President of the United States. The Deacons are chosen by the people, and governed by a body composed also of representatives of the people in session assembled. So that whilst the Church spiritual, in her organized capacity, is entirely independent of the State, and not liable to be called to account by the State, for the manner in which she manages even her temporalities, she can yet avail herself of the power and protection of the State in the free use of all the worldly goods placed at her disposal. The Deacons indeed owe a certain official responsibility to the State, but, as has been said, the Deacons represent the popular, as distinguished from the ecclesiastical element in the Church. Hence, powers being granted to the Deacons by the State, by no means "renders the Church a part of the State," any more than in the case of ordinary trustees elected by the congregation. All men who manage any sort of worldly property, whether it be money, personal effects, or land, are subject to the State in that regard, of necessity; for all property is controlled by State legislation. So that Deacons who do nothing more than receive and disburse contributions, do *ipso facto*, act upon powers derived from the State, and owe an inevitable responsibility to the State for the faithful application of the funds entrusted to them. So that if the "holding of a meeting house, and grave yard" by deacons, incorporates the Church with the State, the wedlock is accomplished the moment a Deacon discharges *any* function of his office. And if, as *some* have advocated, all the eleemosynary operations of the Church at large, should be committed to the management of Deacons, we should (according to that theory) have one of the grandest Church and State alliances known

out of Rome—indeed, we should have “Popery” itself! All of which shows the objection alluded to, as having no force, because it would prove too much. The truth is, that there can be no union of Church and State, as long as each party acts freely in its own province without interference from the other. When the State goes into the Church, and interferes with her elections, and foists officers upon her that form no part of her system, and are not under her control in any way, *then there is ground* for the cry of “Church and State;” but not when the State simply enacts laws, giving the Church liberty to manage her business in her own way, so long as she does not interfere with the rights of others, or with the well-being of the State. If the granting of powers or privileges to the Church by the State, incorporates the Church with the State, then the very toleration which we, as a Church enjoy, places us in bondage. What we supposed to be an act of emancipation, turns out to be an act of enslavement! The power to use the State officers to protect our freedom of worship is only an index of our degraded condition! Then the Protestant Church in the Pope’s dominions is in a remarkably free and happy condition, for it gets no powers or privileges from the State of any sort! Let us not be accused of obtuseness, if we cannot see the soundness of this view of the subject, and still cleave to the idea that the Church is freer when she manages her own business than when she leaves it to the State to manage it for her.

7. The first class of positive duties assigned to Deacons, is “to take care of the poor, and to distribute among them the collections which may be raised for their use.”

It will be observed that the framers of the constitution designed the Deacons to perform some duties with reference to the poor, other than, or rather, in addition to the distribution of alms among them. Let it be observed likewise, that whilst writers upon the office of the Deacon, usually confine the duties of those officers to the poor belonging to their several congregations, the language of the constitution is *general*; as if this office were meant to perpetuate in the Church that humane, sympathetic attention to the “wants, sorrows and sufferings of man,” which so characterized the life on earth of our blessed Lord. There was, no doubt, a deep providential design, in that ancient want and murmuring among the Grecian widows, which gave occasion for the appointment of these officers; a design which it becomes christians in all ages to study. When the day comes—and its dawn is now appearing,—in which christianity receives its proper development on the side of humanity,—the world, and possibly the Church too, will be astonished to find provided, by the forethought of the inspired Apostles of Christ, just the agency needed for carrying out the most enlarged conceptions of christian duty, in this bench of Deacons, who now seem to have too little to do, to render a separate office necessary at all.

8. The second class of duties declared in the constitution to belong properly to the *diakonate*,—but which are now generally ignor-

ed, and by some openly opposed,—is “*the management of the temporal affairs of the Church.*”

The exact nature of these “temporal affairs,” is not particularly defined. But it is here admitted, that the Church—as Church, has properly, yea, necessarily, temporal affairs, which should be managed by her own officers, the Deacons. If asked to state what these temporalities are, we would reply first, in general terms, that they include all temporal things, which are unavoidable accidents of the Church’s existence and progress; and then more particularly,—without pretending to state all,—that they include the support of the ministry, and the providing of houses of worship, and the appliances for making those houses comfortable. In those countries where the State provides both of these, the diaconate is certainly curtailed in its fair proportions;—but even in that case, the Deacons still manage the patrimony and revenues of the Church. That these affairs are designed by the language of our constitution, to be managed by the Deacons, we have never known to be denied, even by those who favored a different system of management. It is admitted that the book does not on this point express itself in the language of positive requirement. This was doubtless owing to the fact that at the time our present constitution was framed, the practice of committing the estate and revenues of the Church to Boards of Trustees had been introduced, and allowed by vote of the Synod of New York, and the evils of the system had not then transpired. But still, the conviction of the Church was clearly expressed in the constitution, that to the Deacons “may be *properly* committed the management of the temporal affairs of the Church.” And as long as this sentence remains a part of the constitution, it ought to command the obedience of every Presbyterian congregation, as much as if it were a positive enactment. The wish of a superior, has the intrinsic force of a command. But lest our interpretation be regarded as an evidence of “ignorance” or “treason,” we proceed to fortify our position by reference to the ancient symbols of Presbyterianism, and to the commentaries of authoritative expounders of Presbyterianism, both ancient and modern.

John Calvin declares that the proper province of the Deacon, is “to receive the daily contributions of believers, and the *annual revenues* of the Church, and to apply them to their proper uses.”

The Scotch Church believing that Calvin and the Reformed Churches of France and Switzerland had, in the duties of Deacon, copied the order of Scripture, did, under the leadership of John Knox, copy the order of the continental Reformed Churches. Hetherington tells us that, “following what they believed to be the Scripture, they required that each congregation should be taught and governed by Presbyters, and *that its secular affairs should be under the management of Deacons.*”

McCrie in his *Life of Knox*, and in his *Scottish Church History*, gives the same account of the functions ascribed to the Deacon in the first Book of Discipline.

In the Second Book of Discipline, the language is still stronger. The book declares "the deaconship to have the care of *the ecclesiastical goods.*" Speaking of the collections made in the primitive Church, under the eye of the Apostles, and committed to the Deacons, this book says: "these collections were not only of that which was collected in the manner of *alms*, as some suppose, but of *other goods, movable and immovable, of lands and possessions.*"

It is not necessary to multiply quotations, as it will scarcely be denied that *all the Presbyterian Churches* of Europe, the British Isles, and America, *have agreed* in declaring Deacons to be the proper managers of all the temporalities of the Church:—such was their doctrine, whatever is now or has been their practice. But lest our authority be not considered sufficient to establish that assertion, we quote a single sentence from "Presbytery and Prelacy," by Dr. Thomas Smyth, whose knowledge of the *facts*, in the case, no one will question. He says, (almost in the language of our book) "*All the Reformed Churches* agree in believing that the Scriptures clearly point out Deacons, as distinct officers in the Church, whose business it is to take care of the poor,—to distribute among them the collections, which may be raised for their use,—and generally to manage the temporal affairs of the Church."

Such being, undoubtedly the *principles* of Presbyterianism the world over, with regard to this officer, how is it that in these United States, the *practice* of Presbyterianism has allowed the Deacon almost every where to expire, from sheer idleness;—his business having been taken from him and put into the hands of a committee appointed by the State Legislature! And stranger still, how is it that many of the very ablest and purest Presbyterian ministers in the land, now argue that the Church cannot safely be trusted with her own business; as if she were a thief, like Judas, who carried the bag, that he might squander the money of the poor upon his own lusts?

It was not so in the beginning of Presbyterianism in this land; and the change was not made from any new light breaking upon the Church, as to the scripturality, or safety of Deacons managing the temporalities; but it was the first birth of that doctrine of expediency, which in its after growth, well nigh destroyed the Church utterly. A reference to the records of the Synod of New York in 1752, will show that in that first act sanctioning the introduction of Trustees into our system, there is no intimation that the Synod were smitten with any conviction of the danger or illegality of the old Presbyterian principles on the subject. We will quote the resolutions on the subject, and leave it to candor to say, if they did not as flagrantly violate the principles of Presbyterianism, as did the subsequent action of the Assembly, adopting the famous "Plan of Union;"—and hence was "null and void from the beginning."

"That it is not inconsistent with the Presbyterian plan of Government, nor the institution of our Lord Jesus Christ, that Trustees, or a

committee chosen by the congregation, *should have the disposal and application of the public money, raised by said congregation*, to the uses for which it was designed; provided, that they leave in the hands, and to the management of the Deacons, what is collected for the Lord's Table, and the poor. And that ministers of the Gospel, by virtue of their office, have no right to sit with, or preside over such trustees or committees. And that it appears that the Trustees of said Church, have faithfully discharged the trust reposed in them, with respect to its temporalities, *much to its advantage.*"

After what we have seen of the real principles of the "Presbyterian plan of government," does it not seem strange that the Synod of New York could have ever affirmed a statement so directly the reverse of the fact. If it is the proper business of the Deacons to manage the temporalities of the Church, it *cannot be* the business of an outside committee. Whether the last four words of the passage quoted from the minutes, furnish the clue to this whole proceeding, we shall not undertake to decide;—but history informs us of this fact, that the difficulty arose from an union having been formed in a particular congregation, between a feeble, Scotch, pure Presbyterian Church, and a Church neither Scotch nor pure; and hence the trouble. The old Scotch party never gave up the battle until the *Synod itself* was brought to pass another resolution, requiring the Trustees to be communing members, and to be under *the control of the "ministers, elders and deacons."* A most ridiculous farce it was: but it implied an acknowledgement of its own error by the Synod. With the exception of a single allusion to Trustees as distinct from Deacons in the matter of pastor's salary, in our form of government, (which is a palpable inconsistency in the book, foisted in by the influence of the anti-Scotch party,) we know of no other ecclesiastical endorsement of the views of the innovators.

A sketch of the progress of this corruption, is thus given by Wm. L. McCalla, in his work on the subject, entitled "*Cleansing the Sanctuary*,"—(a small book which all who feel an interest in this subject would do well to possess themselves of.) He says,—“Among the framers of our constitution there was no party, nor shadow of a party, in favor of these corruptions. The only thing then claimed by the anti-Presbyterian party, was a board or committee appointed by, and responsible to the consistory. This was their substitute for the consistory; while the Presbyterian party wished the consistory, of Pastors, Elders and Deacons, to occupy their own place. The latter party is now annihilated:—[not quite]—and the former party have shifted their ground, until they have taken away the body of Christ, and some know not where they have laid it. * * * And all this mighty change has taken place during my life, through the operation of the *Proton Psuedos*—a communicating trusteeship, supplanting the ordained Deacons. In my childhood, they existed in only one congregation, and were chosen by the consistory: in my youth, by the people: in my middle life, they obtained power over the consistory and people, and in my old age, they break down our wall,

pour in their hostile legions, and scatter the Church with a scourge of scorpions."

But general as is the practical defection of the Church, from our standards on this point, we still find that when the appeal is made to the Constitution, the truth is acknowledged. And is it not astonishing that this corruption should remain so long unrebuked, seeing that almost, perhaps altogether, the whole living generation of ministers were educated in the doctrine of the Constitution? We cannot speak for other seminaries, but it is evident from the writings of the learned Dr. Miller, that the doctrine taught in the Princeton Seminary, from its foundation, at least up to the time of his death, was the true doctrine of historic Presbyterianism. Dr. Miller says in one place: "The function to which the Deacon was appointed by the Apostles, was *to manage the pecuniary affairs of the Church*, and especially to preside over the collections and disbursements for the poor." And as if to put his meaning beyond all doubt, he says in another place: "It is a great error to suppose that Deacons cannot be appropriately and profitably employed in various other ways, besides ministering to the poor of the Church. *They might with great propriety be made the managers of all the money-tables, or fiscal concerns of each congregation: and for this purpose might be incorporated, if it were thought necessary, by law, that they might be enabled regularly to hold and employ all the property, real and personal, of the Church.*"

We have finished all that we designed in this article; which was, to prove that by the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, the Deacons are the proper officers to manage all the temporalities of the Church. We belong to the strict construction party. If the Constitution is wrong, let it be regularly and formally altered; but do not let us sneer at, and trample upon any part of that instrument which we have vowed to support entire.

[For The Critic.]

"THE AMERICAN PARTY."

For the great and distinguished name which has appeared in other quarters as responsible for the article in the May No. of the Critic, with this title, no man has more sincere and unaffected veneration than the writer of this reply. The very splendor which his genius and character will throw over this movement, and the impetus which his endorsement will give to it, only make us more anxious to protest against it, and if possible, to prevent the evils of the cause from being gilded by the virtues of its advocate. We hope nothing we may say will be construed into disrespect to him. With sentiments of unaffected and profound regard for his abilities and virtues, we must take the liberty, with perfect decision, to question the propriety of the whole movement, which he has so emphatically approved.

Let it be distinctly understood from the outset, that there can be no difference of opinion between us and the writer in the *Critic for May*, as to the enormities of the Papal community. No man on this earth regards Popery with more abhorrence than we do. We regard it as incomparably the worst system in all its parts, which the world has ever seen. We believe it to be the synagogue of Satan,—the religious department of the kingdom of hell. This singular organization, to which the name of a *church* is applied only by a violent accommodation of the term, stands alone in the history of the world, the grandest and most fearful combination of powers over the fortunes of humanity, which the world has ever witnessed. Nay more, we believe to the fullest extent to which the convictions of any man can go, that it is as much a temporal kingdom, as it is an ecclesiastical organization;—a hybrid monster, unique among the social organizations of men, partly ecclesiastical and partly political. It is an immense and powerful ecclesiastical body, stretching over the whole world to a certain extent, thoroughly organized and consolidated, and equipped with a full system of religious doctrines upon which rests the whole superstructure of its vast and complicated power. But it is more than this: it is a worldly kingdom, not confined like other states by geographical bounds, but co-existing with other kingdoms on the same geographical space, claiming power over all, and enforcing its laws, not mainly as other kingdoms, by a series of civil laws, but by the tremendous sanctions of religion. It has all the expansive power of a Masonic Order, or of the true Church of Christ. Popery, viewed in its completed theory, is an organization of men, partly ecclesiastical and partly political, whose audacious ambition, embraces the world to its remotest islands, claiming supremacy over all organizations, social or political, known among men; asserting power to dictate the policy and laws of every nation, which may affect its own interests, and not content with such absolute and unlimited submission in temporal affairs, it claims to dictate the terms of salvation and to decide the fate of every soul on earth for all eternity. All this power is sought to be centered in one man sitting on the seven hills of Rome, with the tiara on his head, and the keys of St. Peter in his girdle. It seeks to make a God out of the Pope: and when we view the complete theory of Popery, we are struck with the wonderful precision and force of the terms used by the Apostle, describing the Man of Sin, sitting in the temple of God, exalting himself above all that is called God. Surely such a scheme as this owns no mortal for its author. It is the master-piece of Satan: it is the chef d'oeuvre of that great and splendid intellect, who leads the columns of damned angel and cherubim, against the throne and works of Jehovah. It is sublime in its mystic, but sober aspirations,—in its grand and guilty conspiracy against the civil order of human life, the destinies of the soul in eternity, against the Cross of Christ, and the glory of God. Such we regard as the true, and undisguised character of the Popish communion. To say that such a system ought to be resisted, is to express in mild terms one of the most vehement and commanding duties which rests upon us. But still the question

returns,—*by what means shall it be resisted*, and all the great social and spiritual interests which are imperilled by its supremacy, be supported and preserved? This is the true issue involved in the recent political movements in this country. It is a question of *means*, not of *ends*; it is not whether the Catholic system ought not to be resisted, but whether it ought to be resisted, by *political* warfares. It is not whether the Popish system is not dangerous to the temporal, as well as the spiritual interests of man,—as hostile to political freedom, as it is to freedom of religious inquiry and belief; but whether, conceding as we do without limit or reserve, that it is dangerous to all the high interests of human life, *by what means are the liberties and religious rights of the country to be maintained against it?*—*by an universal political ostracism of the individual Catholic; or, by the universal and powerful support of the Protestant Church,—the great conservative element of our political institutions?* The latter is the position we affirm: the former is the policy which we deprecate, on grounds which to us seem to be controlling on the issue, immense as it unquestionably is—grounds which involve the great principles of religious liberty, and the fundamental principles of our political system.

We do not mean to say that no political opposition is ever to be made to the Catholic Church, or to any Protestant Church. Nay, more than this, we do not hesitate to say that the claims of temporal power which give a political complexion to the Papal organization, have laid a just foundation for the suspicion with which it has always been regarded by the friends of free government, and indeed with more or less of the sentiment by all political bodies under which this institution has been found. These claims to temporal power, based upon the previous claim to be the authoritative expounder of the natural and revealed law of God,* and the political character which they necessarily and inevitably engraft upon the church, have laid the foundation for that great difficulty which the greatest masters of the doctrines of civil and religious liberty have always felt, in applying the principles of toleration to the Popish body. Those principles have been slowly and painfully evolved from the mistakes, crimes, follies and bloodshed of a thousand revolutions. They stand before the world, the children of a birth, which agonized a world for a thousand ages, precious alike from their costly admittance into life,—more precious from their immense bearing on all the welfare of man, for time and eternity. We dread everything which even hints a modification of these principles, a reduction of their power—or an obscuration of their glory to the least extent. It has always been a problem of great practical difficulty, how to apply them to the Popish Church, owing to that double capacity in which it exists. If it is regarded solely as an ecclesiastical organization, there is danger of suffering under the insidious, presumptuous employment

* See Brownson's Review—at large; particularly the January No. 1854:

of its political influence. If it is attacked as a political body, there is great danger of trespassing on the great principles of toleration, to the protection of which it is entitled as an ecclesiastical organization, and as much entitled as any other ecclesiastical organization. In such a case, what is to be done? The answer which Milton and Locke gave to the question, was, that inasmuch as the Papal Church was *an imperium in imperio*, it ought not to be tolerated at all: and this is the legitimate inference from the popular construction of the maxim, that Romanism is incompatible with free government. But the modern adherents of the doctrines of civil and religious liberty, have not ratified the conclusions of the two great teachers of these principles just named: either because they have construed the incompatibility between Popery and liberty, in a different sense, or because they have relied more intensely upon the protection of the principles of free inquiry, and liberty of religious belief. What then is the maxim which has been adopted for regulating the application of these principles to the Popish communion? It is a simple off-shoot from the principle of religious liberty itself, which meets the conditions of the problem practically and logically, with perfect precision. It is a maxim too of universal applicability: it is applicable to one Church, as much as to another—to a Protestant, as well as to a Catholic Church; and as such, is free from any of that specific and confined applicability to the Papal community alone, which could give its adherents an opportunity to complain. It is this,—that wherever the Catholic Church is standing *practically on its ecclesiastical footing alone, and not attempting to put its claims to temporal power into effect, then it is to be treated only as an ecclesiastical organization*: but the very instant, and in whatever locality it begins to put its claims into practice, coming into the political field as such, its members voting on political issues, upon a principle discriminated by their ecclesiastical relation to each other,—then it ought to be met on political grounds, and be resisted with political weapons, just as sternly as any other element distinctively in the field. We would say this with equal emphasis, and for the same general reasons, of any Protestant Church. We would say without hesitation, if the Methodist, Baptist, or our own Presbyterian Zion, were coming into the political field as such, it is nothing more than they ought to expect, and ought to receive,—to be encountered by political opposition, and subjected to political punishment. We would say it of a Masonic Order, which had assumed a political capacity in theory, and was acting upon it in practice. There is this much of truth in the creed of the American, or Know-Nothing party—truth which we presume no man in his senses will question. But this truth does not sustain the conclusions, or serve the purposes of that party,—while it serves to give all of weight and power to its programme of principles which attach to it. The whole danger of error, is always to be found in the incomplete truth, which is mingled with its blunders. The truth we have stated, will not sustain an *universal and permanent political*

ostracism of the Catholic citizen, on [account of his theoretical principles. It makes political opposition to the Catholic or to any Church, local and temporary ; above all things discriminated by the practical action of the Church, not by its theories,—controlled absolutely by that previous action of the Church itself,—limiting itself to that action,—stopping when it stops, progressing when it progresses, and ceasing forever when it ceases. This principle saves the great doctrines of religious liberty, and yet makes every provision for checking the improper interference of ecclesiastical or social organizations, with the politics of the country. It takes away the vicious and dangerous principle of discriminating political action, by a mere theoretical heresy, and presents a ground, practical and sound, the propriety of which will be universally admitted. To ostracise a Catholic for theory not embodied in practice, no matter how objectionable that theory may be, on both political and religious grounds, is to punish crime in embryo ; it is to assume the office of Deity, and judge criminalities of the soul, before they are embodied in action, and as such, subject to the cognizance of human tribunals. Such a principle for the discrimination of political conduct, is the very essential impulse of religious persecution. The maxim we have enunciated, again, makes political opposition to the Catholic Church, local in point of application, and temporary in duration. We are deeply convinced that all political interference with principles of such magnitude as the liberty of conscience,—freedom of religious belief, independent of all civil or political responsibility, no matter to how limited an extent, ought to be rigidly adjusted to the strictest limits of the practical exigency that demands it. If the Catholic Church has been tampering with politics in any place, let it be met there, and let the opposition to it stop there : but it would be wrong to suffer the demand for such opposition to extend beyond the exigency which calls for it, and to call for the ostracism of the Church, in localities where it has not been tampering with politics. We have no doubt that there has been an improper interference in politics in New York, under the guidance of the saintly and unprincipled Archbishop, whose reputation for integrity has died so violent a death under the attacks of Mr. Senator Brooks. Let opposition be raised there ; but that is no reason why a permanent and universal ostracism of individual Catholics, grounded upon their theoretical views of the political supremacy of the Pope, should be set on foot all over the republic. There is no demand whatever, for a great national movement against the Catholic Church. The recent excitement in the country has been, in the main, the result of a corrupt movement of unprincipled politicians, to excite the Protestant feeling of the people, and to ride into power upon the tide. They have run foul of the great maxim, which they have so conspicuously set forward among their principles, as if for the purpose of exposing the profligacy of*

* See Macauley's Review of Gladstone on Church and State.

the whole movement, by violating in practice what they prize in theory. It is absurd to deny, that making the mere religious sentiments of a man, the reason of refusing to vote for him, is a violation of the great principle of religious liberty. It is allowing a principle of discriminating the political aspect of a vote to be sound and just; which would be wicked and unprincipled, if embodied in a law. If our neighbors make their dislike to our Presbyterian sentiments, the ground of their refusing to vote for us, it is perfectly useless to disguise, that we are under political responsibility for religious opinions—that, *quoad hoc*, we are suffering for them. The objectionable feature in this view of the case is, making religious opinion unattended by any viciousness of action growing out of it, a ground for *an universal* discrimination in political affairs, affecting permanently large masses of citizens. This is our first and great objection to the American or Know-Nothing party: it is violating the very principle of religious liberty, which it professes to conserve; and has adopted a construction of that principle which strips it of all practical force, leaving it a dead letter in the statute book, and *abandoning its control over the political action of the people.*

We object again to a political movement against the Catholic Church, because there is no necessity for it, provided the people of this country will properly employ the legitimate agencies of opposition which are in their power. The simple and sufficient condition of the preservation of the Republic from the arts of Romanism is, the full and efficient support of the Protestant Church—the complete and animated maintenance of the Domestic Missionary enterprises of the various Protestant denominations. This is the great conservative element of our political system: sustain and vivify it with the vigorous energy which it ought to possess, and it need not be feared that any of the great social or political interests that are conditioned upon it, will ever come to harm. It is the *only*,—not less than the *only legitimate* power which can be effectively employed to restrain Popery, and maintain the institutions of our government. Political disfranchisement will but increase the power of Popery. All persecution, no matter how disguised in form, or limited in extent, will enure to the benefit of the body enduring it. The policy then of restraining Popery by political disabilities inflicted upon the individual Catholic, is suicidal in the extreme. It will concentrate and intensify the attachment of its members, and render them more and more unapproachable by Protestant instruction. It will create sympathy, and thus open wide the door to proselytism, and it will put the Church in an attitude far more attractive, as the victim of an unjustifiable crusade, than it is at all entitled to assume from its intrinsic charms. How long is the world to be learning the lesson and never coming to the knowledge of the truth, that all means but reason and love, to affect the opinions of men, only result in strengthening attachment to their original convictions! The principle of this opposition to Popery is vicious, and the more completely it is carried into effect, the more disastrous will be the result. The more com-

plete the *political* victory over Popery, the more it will be benefitted. *The only effective*,—as it is the only *lawful, general and permanent agency* of opposition to the Popish Church, is the true Protestant Church of Christ under its various forms. We have no right to complain of the inefficiency of a means, until we have employed it fully, and tested all its capacities. Let the people of the United States double their support of the great Domestic Missionary work, and they may safely abandon all political agitations against the Catholic Church.

We object again to the American party, that it is condensing the Catholic and Foreign element in our population into a political body, distinct from the mass of our citizens, armed with all their power to do mischief, and animated by all that hostility which is natural to men suffering under an ostracism of their religion and birth, and provoked by an attempt to diminish their full equality with other citizens. Now what does Know-Nothing-ism propose to do for the remedy of this evil which it has created? It only proposes to render the Catholic and Foreign citizen, *ineligible to office*. It leaves them the power to vote, and the right of unlimited emigration in the future—the two great means of mischief, if they are pleased to use them. There can be no remedy for the Pope's control over the Catholic vote, except in taking away the elective franchise altogether. Now it is, to say the least of it, the most manly and honest policy, to prohibit the entry of a Catholic or a Foreigner altogether, into the country, and to the rights of citizenship, rather than invite them to come and then begin to annoy them by a whole series of political disabilities, which are assumed to be essential to a defence against them. Indeed, the inference of the Know-Nothing creed, on both the issues it has raised, is a logical and a practical blunder from its own premises. It assumes in the strongest sense of an *existing fact*, not as a logical inference from the Catholic creed, the absolute incompatibility of the Catholic Church and the free institutions of this country. This is its *premise*: its *inference* is, to render the individual Catholic ineligible to office: the true inference from the premise as they construe it is, that *the Catholic Church ought not to be tolerated at all*. On the other issue, *the premise* is, that the foreign element in our population is dangerous to the government: *the inference* is, the reduction of a *part* of the rights of citizenship,—the eligibility to office, in the foreigners already here, and an extension of the term of naturalization. The true inference is, *the prohibition of all emigration for the future, and the avoidance of everything that would exasperate the foreign element already in the midst of us; the careful observance of everything which would tend to strengthen their attachment to the institutions of the country*.—These are the results which logically issue from the premises of the Know-Nothing creed, and which they are logically required to assume. But they dare not do it: the measure they propose to adopt—the exclusion from office,—is ridiculously incomplete as a practical expedient: it is a most impotent and lame conclusion, as a logi-

cal inference. It is absolutely necessary, either to cease this political crusade against large masses of our people, or to make it effectual to accomplish, not only the ends it holds in view, but to prevent the incidental evils the effort at reform has created in its progress. Nothing short of a far more effective diminution of the common rights of citizenship than has yet dared to assume the shape of a public proposition, will meet the ends which the American Party are seeking to accomplish. It is absurd to admit large masses of men to all the common rights of citizenship, *except one, and that by no means the most important one.* If there is a reason why they should be deprived of one, it is a reason why they should be deprived of all. If it is right to allow them to vote, it is right to allow them to be voted for; the one right is almost, if not altogether, the correlative of the other. Any argument which would prove a man disqualified for office, would prove him disqualified to vote. There may be special reasons why particular offices, involving the representation of the national character, as well as the national policy, should be exclusively occupied by native-born citizens; but this is very different in nature, and proceeds upon a wholly different principle of political wisdom, from the universal declaration of ineligibility to all office, among large masses of citizens. That eligibility, attaches as an incident, or inheres among the mass of the common rights of citizenship; and it is absurd to admit the citizenship in general, and deny this single capacity which it involves. This principle of action involves the explanation of the difficulty raised by the writer in the Critic for May, in relation to the eligibility of a Chinese or a Mohammedan. This question will be settled by the settlement of a previous question, and that is, whether large masses of such persons, Pagans and Polygamists, are to be admitted at all to the permanent and general participation in the rights of citizenship in a Christian country? It is on this question, the great Mormon issue now ripening for trial, will be determined in a few years. Conceding this issue as determined in the affirmative, all minor questions, such as eligibility to office and propriety of voting such persons into office, are settled: it is absurd to question the ordinary propriety of allowing by vote, what is allowed by law. The whole question, as a general proposition, is determined by the permanent admission of large masses of the persons in view, to the common rights of citizenship. It is one thing to allow specific privileges to individual foreigners residing on our soil, for specific purposes; but it is altogether another, to disfranchise in part, and by a principle designed to be permanent, immense masses of men already permanently a part of the population, and so recognized. We insist therefore, that the whole movement must retrace its progress, or go forward: it is unwise in the extreme to leave all their power for mischief in their hands, resulting in part from their simple existence in the country as a part of its population, and in part, from the privileges which are still to be left them,—and then exasperate them to use it, by attempting to reduce their full political equality with citizens of other birth and other religious opinions.

We object in the last place, and with deep severity of conviction, to the principle of organization adopted by the American or Know-Nothing party, and to some of the particular features which they have embodied in their order. If ever any principle was at war with the very foundation of the American Republic, it is the principle of a secret, oath-bound organization of political parties. It is *unnecessary, dangerous, hostile to the fundamental maxims of republican liberty, and, in its existing aspect, demoralizing in a high degree*. It strikes a deadly blow at that great fundamental maxim of the government—the intelligence of the people,—an essential element of republican liberty. What matters it, how much intelligence the people may have, if political men will conceal from them the elements upon which to employ that intelligence, in the foundation of an opinion and the adoption of a policy. The duties of man are correlative. If it is the duty of the people to require knowledge of any party claiming their suffrages, before they endorse them, it is the duty of that party to give it. No party has the right to retire into the dark, bind itself to secrecy under oath, unfold what they please and conceal what they please from the people; nor have the people the shadow of a moral right to give their sanction to that, of the propriety of which, they are not informed. Moreover, this principle of organization will prove utterly subversive of the Constitution of the United States, by placing the legislation of Congress, in the hands of an irresponsible association of its members; in a body unknown to the Constitution, distinct from Congress itself, existing within but independent of it, and independent of all responsibility to any public or recognized law. The Congressional Council, itself at war with the Constitution, will be under the control of the National Council; and the result will be, that the Congress of the United States will become, under the full success of Know-Nothing principles, a mere registry of decrees to a body in the heart of the country—unknown to the Constitution—existing, no one can tell where—aiming at, no one can tell what. It is a principle of party organization, which, by demanding the unlimited submission of the minority to the majority, annihilates the balance-power of a Parliamentary opposition, and all the advantages that belong to it. It extinguishes the personal independence of the voter, destroys the jurisdiction of conscience over the political conduct, and makes it a condition to the preservation of his integrity, if the voter should happen to scruple a measure or a man proposed by the Order, that he absolutely abandon the party altogether.

Lastly, if this principle of secrecy and obligation under oath, is legitimate for one party, it is legitimate for all: every party may adopt it: the "Sag-Nicht" clubs of the foreigners of the West are wholly justified; and the whole political destinies of the country may be controlled by secret, oath-bound organizations,—a hybrid mixture of Masonry and a political caucus, with all of good in either, spoiled by the conjunction. Can any man in this nation contemplate such a prospect—the legitimate result of the principle of organization adopted by the Know-Nothing party—without emotions of alarm amount-

ing to terror? It is a principle, legitimate in a condition of society, where *the lives* of men are dependent on the fidelity of their political associates: it is utterly abominable in any other. Yet the accomplished writer in the Critic for May, would place such a principle, in point of political morality on the same footing with the vote by ballot!

We have only to add, that if the Nationality, the Federal Union, and the Protestant civilization of this country is dependent upon the conservatism of this new political combination, its past acts indicate most fearfully, that gloomy times are ahead.

~~~~~  
[For the Critic.]

#### SUGGESTIONS TOUCHING A UNION PROTESTANT INFIRMARY, ADDRESSED TO EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS OF ALL DENOMINATIONS.

1. The duty of extending relief to the indigent and friendless sick—especially those of the household of faith—is a cardinal point of religion. So manifestly such, that the corruptest forms of Christianity never become so corrupt as wholly to lose sight of it. Chiefly by means of an ostentatious display of her observance of this precept of religion, the Church of Rome keeps her hold—so far as she has a hold—upon the affections of the world at large. Chiefly by means of a similar parade of such works of charity, Infidelity, in many of its organized forms, in our times, insinuates into the popular mind the impression that modern Christianity is less Christian in spirit than Anti-Christ itself. Protestant Christians, whilst in reality doing more than either for the suffering poor, yet from perhaps an over-strict application of the rule “let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth;” or from rendering their aid in a form not distinctively Christian—but on the score of general philanthropy, fail to manifest as they ought, their obedience to the law of Christ in this regard.

2. The present position of this whole matter in most, if not every one of our large cities, should be extremely unsatisfactory to Evangelical Christians. There is a vast amount of unrelieved suffering among Christ's poor sick, as all those know whose duties make them familiar with the condition of the poor. And the relief which Christian love provides for them, cannot be economically administered. The sick of the family occupy the time and labor of the members in health, and thereby cut off the supply which their labor would provide for the household;—thus throwing the whole family upon the charity of Christian neighbors. The requisite medical attendance cannot be procured, nor the skilful nursing of the sick,—and in a large proportion of cases the sickness is aggravated and prolonged, and the health of the whole family endangered, from the want of comfortable apartments and proper ventilation. Now, a Christian institution, with all the requisite appliances for the relief of the sick, might be amply supported by a tithe of the funds now expended by individual charity on these families separately, and be able to extend relief to many more, who, under the present state of things, must be unprovided for.

3. Whilst this work should be done by Christians as such, and churches as such, in a form to make it manifest that it is done for Christ's sake and for the honor of His name,—there are two reasons why it should be done by some union of effort among Evangelical Churches. First, on the score of economy and efficiency: since one such institution, largely endowed and strongly supported in a large city, will manifestly be less expensive in its management and more efficient in the supply of the best methods of relief, than several smaller institutions under the management of the several denominations of Christians separately. Secondly, on the score of the moral effect of such a union, as a testimony to the truth, in a concrete form, of the oneness of all Evangelical denominations, in their views of the great practical duties of religion. Every reason that proves the importance of a union of Christians in the work of circulating God's Word, rather than separate action in the work, manifests the importance of such union in this work of ministering in Christ's name to the sick.

4. An efficient method of discharging this obligation of the Churches to the indigent and friendless sick, is presented in the scheme of a Union Protestant Infirmary, endowed by the several Evangelical Protestant Congregations of a city, with suitable grounds, buildings, and the necessary appurtenances, and then depending for its current expenses upon the charities of these congregations as such, systematically bestowed. Such an institution would stand forth to the world an impressive testimony of the recognition by the Church of God as such, of her duty to do such works, as done unto Christ, and for Christ's sake.

5. For the practical administration of such a charity, once it be so endowed, we have already in Baltimore, everything that could be desired in the way of an efficient agency, in the "Union Protestant Infirmary Association," composed of ladies from the several Protestant denominations. The great end to be aimed at in such an enterprise, is clearly to combine the efforts of those who have means, but no time,—and those who have time, but less means,—to devote to works of benevolence. Now, for the oversight and care of the sick,—and perhaps for the purpose of gathering and disbursing the current charities of the Church for such a work, Christian ladies are the best agents. And for the execution of the specific scheme now proposed, nothing better could be desired than the society of ladies referred to. But, in order to any general and permanent success, there must needs be a provision of at least \$30,000 to \$50,000, to be invested permanently in real estate, for the use of this enterprise. Such a fund cannot probably be raised without some more definite business form of organization, after the manner of a joint stock corporation. For something of this sort is needful as a proper guarantee for the permanent security of so large an investment, against either loss or perversion in the course of years. And it is needful, moreover, that the structure of this corporation be in accordance with this idea of a union of several denominations in the work; and that it provide specifically for a representation and control in proportion to the stock held by the denominations respectively. With such provision made for the care and proper control of the real estate as a permanent charity, the use of the property may be tendered to this Ladies' Union Infirmary Association, or any similar society, on condition that such society shall efficiently carry on therein, an Infirmary for the relief of the indigent and friendless sick, in accordance with the declared purposes, and the spirit of the parties who have provided the property.

6. We venture to suggest for the consideration of Christian philanthropists of the various denominations, the outlines of a plan for raising and managing such an endowment. Assume that \$50,000 be the amount necessary for the purchase and outfit of such a property. Let this sum be regarded as a capital stock, to be taken in shares by the several Protestant congregations of the city, and held as the property of the congregation, by their deacons, trustees, or other authorized representatives. Let benevolent men of wealth render their aid, by taking stock, and presenting it to such feeble congregations as are unable themselves to become stock holders, in order that the sick poor of such congregations may derive equal benefit and have equal rights with the sick poor of other congregations. Let the control of the property interest be committed to a Board of Trustees,—say ten in number,—chosen from among those nominated to the office by the representatives of the congregations, each nominating one, but elected from the several denominations in proportion substantially to the amount of stock held, and of their contributions to the current expenses of the institution. Let the property thus provided be given in charge to the Ladies of the Union Infirmary Association, or a similar organization, with the understanding, that they shall call upon the congregations concerned, for such annual contributions as shall be needful to support the indigent sick sent by each to the Infirmary, and that this Ladies' Society shall report annually to this Board, as the representatives of the churches and of the property, the receipts and disbursements, and the general condition of the institution.

7. This outline is designed to embrace only the more prominent points of such a scheme. Some of the obvious advantages of such a scheme would be: 1. That it commits the practical details of the work—the care of the sick—to those most competent, and most disposed to attend to it. 2. That it places the permanent property of the charity, in the hands of a Board, representing specifically the purchasers of the property, with every protection needful for the safety and proper use thereof. 3. That it leaves the several congregations to be practically, the almoners of their charities, and thereby distributes the benefits the more widely, and at the same time more judiciously. 4. That whilst it secures for the enterprise the strength which comes from the union of all, it in no degree lessens the responsibility of each one of the several congregations and denominations, for the support of the enterprise. And 5th, that it secures by its definite provisions of agreement, the rights of each denomination so fully, as to avoid all danger of jealousy and misunderstanding.

8. Can there not be found in Baltimore, one hundred subscribers, either representatives of congregations or personal, who will take each \$500 of this stock? Surely if the greatness of such a charity were properly appreciated,—if its immense direct benefits to the poor be considered,—and if its incidental value as a standing witness to the oneness of view and the faithfulness of Protestant Christians, were properly estimated,—twice the amount would be tendered cheerfully and cordially. We submit these thoughts in the hope of awakening attention to so important a matter. And if we shall be so fortunate as to secure that attention, we shall then be glad to hear of proposals for a conference of the friends of any such movement, from the various churches, for the consideration of this or any other more feasible scheme.

## EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

**MUSIC, MAN-MILLINERY AND MEEKNESS.**—**THE PAPAL COUNCIL.**—Our good Protestant City of Baltimore has again been honored recently by a Papal Provincial Council, assembled in the Cathedral. Being a very modest, unpretending people, we have, of course been very much impressed and indeed even excited, by the presence of such an array of Rev., Very Rev., Most Rev. and Right Rev. sinners amongst us. The Reporters of the daily papers, who make it their business to cater for the public taste, and consequently praise every thing, from an Archbishop down to a circus-clown, with commendable impartiality, seem to have summoned all their skill in eloquence, to celebrate, in a manner suitable to the dignity of the Church, the pomp and circumstance of the august occasion. Surely there can be no poetic fire burning in the breasts of that important corps, or they could not have been satisfied to pour forth their intense admiration in cold pedestrian prose. After all, however, we are not much the wiser for these copious effusions of the local columns. They have told us of "Volandt's Band" whose spirit-stirring sounds amused the crowd and dignified the march of the Church-militant—militant against truth, righteousness and liberty every where on earth—from one side of the Cathedral-square to the other: of the splendid robes which adorned the imperial persons of the Veroys, Rights and Mosts aforesaid: and of the exemplary humility and patience exhibited by these gentle shepherds under the bitter persecution of Messrs. Putnam, Brooks & Co.: we have had the most moving description of the music, the man-millinery and the meekness of the Council, but alas! they have told us nothing of what it most concerns the American people to know—the *doings*, the *decrees* of the Council, concocted in profound secrecy, sent beyond the seas to receive the sanction of a foreign tyrant, and then to be relentlessly executed in the midst of us. We knew nothing of the decrees of some former councils, till the attempt to plunder Papal congregations of their property, and to tax the Protestant community for the support of Papal schools, informed us what they had been doing. And if Americans will watch and keep their eyes open, they will perhaps, get an inkling before long as to the doings of *this* Council. Truly these have been, as the Reporters call them, "*imposing* ceremonies:" and if the American people allow themselves to be deceived by them, the insinuation of the pious Archbishop of New York when he speaks, in his letter to Mr. Brooks, of "the imbecile

credulity of a public calling itself enlightened,"—will appear to be not altogether a slander.

The impudence of the Papal priesthood in this country is absolutely amazing. Argument, raillery, law, every thing which is designed to resist the progress of their cruel bloody superstition, is set down as persecution. A few years ago in Charleston, a Very Reverend administrator, whined, through the press, and that too in the very bosom of a community containing a large number of the descendants of the *Hugenots*, about the persecution of the Church, because a Protestant had written an argument against the Apocrypha, which he could not answer! If unanswerable argument is persecution, then it must be acknowledged the Papists are the most persecuted people on earth. We Protestants do not consider *their* logic or even the *bruta fulmina* of the Vatican, very grievous to be borne. They ask us very politely to allow them to destroy our schools, or, which is the same thing, to tax ourselves for the support of theirs; and when we decline acquiescing to so modest a request, the cry again is, that we are persecuting them—the old cry of the wolf in the fable, that the sheep lower down the stream is defiling his lordship's drink and interfering with his rights. Samson is persecuting the Philistines, because he will not, at their request, put out his own eyes, and be set to grinding in the mill! Again, when the Legislature of New York, complies with a request made by a *Papal* congregation, and pass a law to protect their property from the rapacity of the Bishops, the cry is once more raised that they are persecuted! And is the American public so weak in besotted and "imbecile credulity"—as John of New York insinuates it is—as to be deceived by this bare-faced imposture? Have the children in our public schools forgotten that the history of Papal Rome is written in blood? Do they not know that fire and faggot are the strongest arguments, and where the power exists, the only arguments she uses, to stop the mouths of heretics? And yet this bloated iniquity, drunk with the blood of our fathers, dares to stand up here, in this last refuge of their children, and prate about persecution, because we are determined that they shall only have *equal* rights with ourselves, and that they shall never, God helping us, put their polluted foot upon our necks! Let the priesthood know that we are not so infatuated; and that before their plans are accomplished, the blood will come up to the horse-bridles.

"Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform, C hieftly from the Edinburgh Review; corrected, vindicated, enlarged, in notes and appendices. By Sir Wm. Hamilton, Bart.—"TRUTH, LIKE A TORCH, THE MORE IT'S SHOOK IT SHINES."—London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1852."

We quote this title page for the special benefit of the Virginia "Ruling Elder," who poured out his wrath against the "Critic" in the "Presbyterian" of the 19th ult. We take it for granted that he has never heard of the profoundest thinker and most accomplished scholar of the age: and as we have offended so grievously in the matter of grammar and rhetoric, and have unintentionally vexed the Ruling Elder's soul to such a degree, that nothing but a column in the Presbyterian could save him from a more dangerous explosion,—we hope he will forgive us upon the consideration of having introduced Sir William to his acquaintance. It is an acquaintance, we advise "R. E.," to cultivate. It may help him to reason better, improve his logic and metaphysics. His grammar and rhetoric, of course, cannot be improved.

"With a motto as ambiguous as it is peculiar, and which violates all rules of rhetoric and grammar, &c.," ("Ruling Elder," in Presbyterian of the 19th ult.)

Poor Sir William! When thou wast aiming after universal conquest upon the field of philosophy and science, why didst thou neglect rhetoric and grammar, and thus expose thyself, in an evil hour, to the censure of a Ruling Elder in Virginia? What avails thee now, thy world-wide reputation?—the unanimous applause of the vast community of scholars? Here is the fly that spoils thine ointment, and Butler's lines are verified in thee:—

"Honor is like the glassy bubble,  
That costs philosophers such trouble:  
Where one part cracked, the whole doth fly  
And wits are cracked, to find out why."

Alas! Alas!

"ADAM AND CHRIST; or, the Doctrine of Representation, stated and explained. A sermon preached before the Synod of N. York, October 16, 1854, and published by request of the Synod. By E. C. Wines, D. D. Presbyterian Board of Publication."

We remember to have seen a declaration by some writer—in satirizing the fashionable notices for Sunday sermons on all sorts of subjects, (except always the gospel,) that stand side by side with notices of quack medicines, Barnum shows, and Theatrical doings, in the New York papers—"How would it astonish the burghers of N. York city to see an announcement of a course of

lectures on Justification by Faith! Most of them would take it for a hoax,—a decided hit at the olden times."

Wherever the shaft of the satire may strike—this sermon furnishes satisfactory proof that the Old School Synod of New York stands no where within its range. Here is a discourse before that body, and published by request of the Synod, containing a view of that great subject, which for clearness of statement, and distinctness of outline, is not a whit behind the olden times. And at the same time we would suppose that the lucid exposition of Scripture, the manly argumentation, and the spirit and animation of style which distinguish Dr. Wines' discourse, might have interested even the lovers of Sunday sermons on the times.

We consider this discussion of his doctrine of representation, in its connection with all the great collateral truths of the gospel, not only well done, but also well-timed. The zeal manifested in so many and so various quarters, in opposing these views of the gospel mainly by caricaturing them, renders it essential to keep them in their true aspects before the public mind. In the hope of exciting a desire in our readers to read this sermon, we subjoin brief specimens of its logic and methods of scriptural exposition. The text of the author is Rom. v. 12-19:—

"The representative relation of Adam is evident from the whole drift of the apostle's argument. He reasons thus in v. 12—14: Sin was introduced into the world by one man. Death is the fruit of sin. All die, because all are sinners. But in what manner have all sinned? Multitudes have never sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. They have never violated, personally, either the law of nature or the law of revelation. This is the case of all who die in infancy. But sin is not imputed where there is no law. The very essence of sin lies in the transgression of law. Hence infants are sinners, since they die as well as adults. Hence, too, they are sinners by the transgression of some law. But there is no law, which infants can have broken, except the law given to Adam; and there is no sin, of which infants can have been guilty, but their sin in Adam. Consequently, Adam must have borne to his posterity the relation of representative; and what he did in that character, they did in him. In other words, and more concisely—where there is death, there is sin; where there is sin, there is law; where penalty is inflicted, there must have been a violation of law; where those are punished who have no personal sin, the sin of another must be imputed to them; and where the sin of one is imputed to another, the one must be the representative of the other.

The reasoning is from death to sin; from sin to law; from the infliction of penalty to the violation of law; from the punishment of the personally innocent to imputation; and from imputation to representation.

Moral arguments, do not, I think, admit of a nearer approach to mathematical demonstration than this. \* \* \*

In v. 14, the apostle affirms, that Adam was a type of Christ. With wonderful exactness do the type and antitype agree together. The comparison consists of five couplets; Adam and Christ, sin and righteousness, sinners and righteous persons, condemnation and justification, death and life. Placing the five terms on each side of the comparison together, the relation may be denoted thus: Adam, sin, sinners, condemnation, death—Christ, righteousness, righteous persons, justification, life. As Adam by his sin made sinners of all his natural posterity, involving them in condemnation and death, so Christ by his righteousness constitutes righteous all who believe in him, procuring for them justification unto life.

How exact the correspondence! Is Adam the author of sin? Christ is the author of righteousness. Is Adam the cause of other men's becoming sinners? Christ is the cause of other men's becoming righteous. Is the sin of Adam the ground of condemnation? The righteousness of Christ is the ground of justification. Does the condemnation through Adam bring death? The justification through Christ brings life. Are the many judicially constituted sinners by the disobedience of the one? The many are judicially constituted righteous by the obedience of the other. Does the principle of representation obtain under the one economy? So does it under the other. Is imputation the mode whereby this principle exerts its force in the one case? So is it in the other. Is the first covenant the ministry of death to all men descending from Adam by ordinary generation? The second covenant is the ministry of life to all men who believe in Christ. Was Adam the federal head of his natural children? Christ is the federal head of his spiritual children."

**REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH.**—A correspondent writes us, that in the following sentence, which occurs in a communication in our last number, entitled "A Panorama of the Churches," injustice is done to this denomination;—"with the exception of the proposition in one of her synods for the adoption of a liturgical service, we do not know of any departure from her original simplicity and purity." Although we do not conceive there is anything very grievous in the remark, inasmuch as it is

only intimated that a "proposition" to change was made,—not that any has been carried into effect, we cheerfully make room, for our correspondent's statement:—

\* \* \* From the beginning, the Dutch Church has been a liturgical church. Her liturgy was brought with her to this country from Holland; when the English language began to be used in her churches, it was translated into English. The Baptismal,—Ordination and Communion services are invariably used, their use being made obligatory by the constitution of the Church. In Chapter III, Article I, Section I, of the Constitution the following sentence occurs:—"The form adopted for baptism hitherto in use shall in every case be retained;" in Section II, the following:—"The form for the administration of the Lord's Supper shall be read;" and in Chapter I, Article I, Section XII, the following concerning ordination:—"the promises, directions, explanations of duty, with a laying on of hands, shall be agreeably to the form for that end especially made and adopted."

The other forms are used at the discretion of the minister. Until recently, the use was general, but in consequence of obsolete phrases, inconvenient arrangement, &c., they have gone into desuetude. Two years ago, the following resolution was adopted by the General Synod, (corresponding with the General Assembly,) of that Church.

"Resolved, That a committee of ten be appointed to take into consideration the whole subject of the Liturgy of our Church, and report such modifications as they may deem proper to the next General Synod; provided, however, that no alteration shall be made in the doctrinal sentiments contained in the forms now in use in the Church."

It is evident from the above statement, that, in regard to a Liturgical service, there has been no departures in the Dutch Church from "her original simplicity and purity."

*The Philosophical Tendencies of the Age; being four Lectures delivered at Edinburgh and Glasgow.* By J. D. Morell, A. M. London.

These lectures are suggestive of the characteristics and tendencies of the age, in more ways than one. The fact that Lectures on such topics have been delivered to the people, even in the cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, is of itself very significant, and admonishes all who, by virtue of rank, education, or official position, are the guides and leaders of the people—to take heed to themselves. Philosophy no longer conceals herself amidst the groves of the Aca-

deny, but walks in the market-place and into the workshops, and lifts her voice above the busy hum of men. They who have read Mr. Morell's "History of Modern Philosophy" and his "Philosophy of Religion," will find nothing new in this work: it stands, logically and chronologically, between the other two, and illustrates fully as much, the tendencies of the author as it does the tendencies of the age. "Positivism," "Individualism," "The Philosophy of Tradition," "The Principle of Common Sense as a Philosophical Tendency"—these are the topics discussed; one Lecture being devoted to each. It is needless to say, that in point of style and method, they are amongst the happiest specimens of philosophical lectures. In point of substance and truth, they deserve a very low place in the estimation of all who hold that any valid grounds of belief are to be found aside from the intuitions of the human race in its present fallen condition.

The *first* lecture is a noble and eloquent protest against the impotent and degrading conclusions of Mr. Comte's Philosophy. The *second* is a discussion of the principles of the extreme rationalistic school. The *third* is an assault upon all external testimony as the ground of religious belief, and, of course, upon the Word of God. The *fourth* professes to be constructive, as the three preceding were destructive, and expounds the philosophy of "common sense," or "of progress," or "of eclecticism," as

the criterion of certitude. The whole theory is founded—like the church-theory of Nevius in this country—upon an absurd *realism* according to which, humanity is something distinct and separate from every individual human being, and undergoes a process of development independently of all the particulars of the species. This realism rests again upon the pantheistic theory of the universe, which, in its time, hangs, like the universe, upon—nothing. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools"—this is the sentence which ought to be written upon nine-tenths of the philosophy of the times.

This book furnishes another illustration of what was said in a former number of this Journal, that the tendencies of the age seem to indicate the union, at no distant day, of infidelity and popery. Extremes meet: the extreme of implicit submission to authority—the extreme of explicit repudiation of authority. Mr. Morell and Trent are at one in the denial of private judgment: Vincentius and Morell are at one, in the "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." Superstition and infidelity are one, in rejecting all principles of evidence. The result in both cases is a reprobate mind, which puts light for darkness, and darkness for light, obliterates all the distinctions of truth and falsehood, reduces cosmos to chaos, and makes its miserable possessor, as accident may determine, the champion of folly, or the slave of fear.

#### ADVERTISEMENT.

The mark, "For the Critic," prefixed, or (in the Editorial Exchange,) a \* appended to an article, whether written by ourselves or others, is intended to denote neither disapproval of the article itself, nor disagreement with the opinions in it; but simply that the conductors judge it proper in the case, to give currency to the article as worthy of public attention, without assuming for the Critic, as such, any further responsibility for it.

THE  
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC  
AND  
MONTHLY REVIEW.

---

---

No. 7.

JULY, 1855.

Vol. 1.

---

---

[For the Critic.]

A LETTER TO THE HON. CHARLES SUMNER, A SENATOR IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS: OCCASIONED BY HIS ANTI-SLAVERY DISCOURSE, IN NIBLO'S THEATRE.

SIR: I have read with great attention a discourse of yours published in the New York Tribune of the 18th of May, which, according to the statements of that paper, was pronounced at Niblo's Theatre, in the City of New York, a few days before, to an immense and delighted assembly of the people. I will add that it is my habit to read carefully, whatever I find in the newspapers of the day, proceeding from you. For I observe in what falls from you, a more serious conviction, a deeper tincture of scholarship, a larger intelligence, and a more earnest manliness, than I have been able to discover in the utterances of those who seem to enjoy your confidence, and share your labors. It is no disparagement to you, personally, to add, that representing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, sitting in the seat of Daniel Webster, discoursing of the duty of the Northern States on the most dangerous topic of our day, and pleading eloquently for the Necessity, Practicability and Dignity, of an enterprise whose success involves the ruin of the country—your words have, for all considerate men, an interest and an importance which all your high qualities would fail to impart to them. if you spoke as a private citizen. It may be possible, also, that the words of a private person like myself, and a total stranger to you, by connecting themselves with the stirring and dangerous words spoken by you from the great position you have won, may obtain an audience, which, but for that, it were idle to expect for them. And you will yourself, perhaps, admit, that I have somewhat to say, worthy of serious consideration, and that my life long connection, in many forms, with most of the topics you discuss, entitles me, without undue presumption, to give utterance to some of the thoughts excited by your discourse.

Allow me, sir, to utter in one sentence, the substance of my whole thought touching the madness of the times, about this whole question of negro slavery. Here we are—a great people, with a glorious mission set before us. More than twenty millions of us—with whose destiny the des-

tiny of three or four millions of blacks is fearfully combined. One way or other, we must solve their destiny, when we solve our own. This is wholly unavoidable. But, the madness is, that every seven white Americans must needs cut each other's throats concerning the fate of one black African! Is there no solution of the problem of their destiny and ours, but that solution which destroys us, without benefitting them? And can statesmen such as I do not see sufficient reason to doubt you are,—and patriots such as I have not the heart to deny you to be,—find no better solution of this terrible problem—no nobler issue of our sublime hopes,—than mutual destruction by the men of the North and the men of the South,—for the sake of the African slaves, scattered thinly over the continent? Are we not able to bear through, by our invincible strength, even such a parasite as this black race, carrying them forward far beyond any thing they could have reached without us, and yet mounting up ourselves, far beyond any thing they may ever reach? Shame upon every American statesman and every American patriot, who is insensible to the glory of such a result! Infamy to every one, who conspires to defeat it!

And yet, sir, you, an American Senator, speaking in the name of that great Commonwealth in whose bosom stands Bunker Hill,—and sitting in the seat of that great Statesman and Patriot who saw no hope for public liberty, higher than that which rests upon the Union of these States; you, an American Senator, who have studied the past and who fear God, allow yourself to bring the whole force of your character, your position, and your great gifts, to bear directly upon the point at which alone it is possible to wreck the country, and to destroy us all together! The very madness of the times assumes in you, its most frantic aspect: and you openly avow, that slavery in America, is a wrong so grievous and unquestionable, that it should not be allowed to continue,—nay, that it should cease to exist at once,—nay, that a wrong so transcendent, so loathsome, so direful, must be encountered wherever it can be reached, and the battle must be continued without truce or compromise, until the field is entirely won. Such are your words: profoundly eloquent—unspeakably frantic!

Now, sir, this means, neither more nor less, than the edge of the sword. Lay aside the rhetoric, and the simple sense is, grape and canister, cold steel and stricken battle. Believe me, Mr. Sumner, when I state two facts, one of which I know better than you do, and the other of which you ought to know, better perhaps than I do. The fact, which I know better than you do is, that whenever the very faintest indication of the settled purpose of the men of the North to follow your advice becomes apparent to the men of the fifteen slave States of this Union,—a million of armed men, will be ready to receive you and your followers: and if you come not speedily thereafter to execute your threats, your coming will not be waited for;—but they will seek you on the soil where you now vainly suppose no danger will ever come. The fact which you ought to know better than I do is, that after two or three hundred thousand men are arrayed in battle, on each side, it makes no sort of difference, as to the probable result, whether one or the other party has the greater reserve of physical force, left out of battle: because, after two or three hundred thousand fighting men, in the present state of the art of war—every thing depends merely on brains. The sum of these two facts is very clear; namely, if the North wants to settle the slavery question by the edge of the sword, the North is in a very fair way to be perfectly gratified; and when she gets what she wants, there

is at least an exceeding great probability that the North will see reason to change her mind very materially, as to the wisdom of that method of settling that question.

Moreover, let it not escape your attention, that many circumstances aggravate the conduct of the men of the North, and exasperate the hearts of the men of the South, in this whole business: all of them tending to strengthen us, and to weaken you, at every stage of the bloody struggle to which you are driving the country. For, in the *first place*, let slavery be all that you assert it to be,—the time is long past when it was either honest, wise, or patriotic, for you to take that ground, even in an argument having merely ordinary political bearings, much less in one looking to bloodshed and conquest. All *that* was settled between us before the old confederation was formed: it was settled again in the common danger and common glory of our great Revolution: it was settled again in the Federal Constitution. I say nothing about the unspeakable folly of arguing as a Statesman, that a slave State and a free State cannot tolerate each other in one confederacy, supposing the question to be now for the first time considered. What I say is, that it is no longer possible for the men of the North to open that question, without revolution, and without disloyalty to every national act and movement of our past history: and what I mean is, that they cannot do this, without so weakening and disgracing themselves, and so strengthening and ennobling us,—that God, posterity, fortune, and the hearts of the combatants, must feel the effects of the opposite conduct and position of the parties. To which add, in the *second place*, that this conduct of the men of the North, besides being a base political afterthought,—is a deliberate breach of faith, cemented by the blood of our fathers; an ignoble retraction of plighted honor and truth and justice; a calculated sacrifice of those of their own race, and lineage, and house, and blood, for those of a strange kindred and clime,—without any new circumstance or additional reason, for so atrocious a perfidy against nature and against plighted troth. Add again, in the *third place*, the atrocity of that state of heart in which the North presses this bloody arbitrament, under the settled belief that she risks nothing thereby, and that we risk every thing: and the fervor of that state of soul, in which the South, roused by so much insult, injustice, and danger, really does risk all, with a sublime purpose, to the last man, to win all. And then, in the *fourth place*, add the sort of conviction, with which the two parties thus mutually range themselves, in that deadly strife; and if you be as wise as you are eloquent,—you may comprehend, what as yet you seem to have wholly overlooked—namely, the settled confidence of the entire slave States, that they are fully able to make the men of the North repent that ever they broke constitutions, and forgot ancestral ties, and outraged national obligations, in order to ruin ten millions of the most elevated race on the face of the earth, upon the hazard—if not the pretext—of benefiting the third part of that number, of one of the most degraded races in the world. You will have battle,—and that without truce or compromise,—and that whenever you can reach us,—and that until the field is entirely won? For my part, sir, I would gladly shun that battle; gladly give my blood to arrest it, if it were begun. But there mingles with this profound dread of shedding my brother's blood, not one apprehension of the result of the conflict. For whoever lives to see that battle fought, will see one more example added to the multitudes which already crowd the annals of mankind, that they who boast themselves when they gird their harness on, are apt enough to wail when they come to put it off.

So far then you may perceive, that according to the fixed and unanimous conviction of the fifteen Commonwealths you propose to conquer, your whole North, if it were united as one man, could no more do that deed, than it could make a world: and that, unless it were utterly lost to every glorious inspiration of the past, and every sacred impulse struggling for birth in all true hearts, the North would no more think of making such an attempt, upon such prettexts as you array,—even if those prettexts were all true and real,—than it would think of parricide followed by self murder. But, sir, I beg you to consider what I shall add to show that those prettexts are neither true nor real.

The very foundation of your discourse, as you distinctly state, is the grand principle, universal, as you assert, in the law of slavery, that man, created in the image of God, is divested of his human character, and declared to be a mere chattel. Now, Mr. Sumner, you cannot fail to be aware, that both parts of this statement are absolutely untrue: and by consequence, your whole plea for our conquest, is based on a double, perfidious quibble. There is not a single slave State in this Union, whose laws divest the slave of his human character. There is not a single one, whose laws declare a slave to be a *mere* chattel. No doubt, many of the rights which I believe with you, to be inherent in human nature, are wholly incompatible with any state of slavery. No doubt, if slavery exists at all, the right of property thus recognised by the local law, may be made analogous to the right one has to a chattel, just as it may be to the right one has to realty. But you have far too much sense and knowledge not to know, that these are widely different truths, from the abominable untruths upon which your whole discourse proceeds. Do you not perfectly understand, that every slave State in this Union shapes its entire slave code, upon the grand truths that a slave is *not* a *mere* chattel, and that his human character is *not* divested? Do you not know, that by the universal law of slavery, the slave is held to innumerable accountabilities, overriding all claim of his master; and that he is protected, not as a chattel but as a man, at the peril and profit even of his master's life? And yet, upon precisely opposite allegations, you construct an argument whose logical issue is the subversion of our National Union; and upon that argument you construct a code of morals, whose highest obligation is civil war! Sir, whatever may be my opinion of the fairness of such reasoning, I easily perceive its dialectic skill. But for your sweeping allegations, your argument had nothing on which to rest; for if the relation of master and slave be once admitted to be generically a relation of power and subjection analogous to those of ruler and subject, guardian and ward, parent and child,—then it demands far higher powers than yours, to show that as a mere relation it has any moral quality at all; and then your duty of murder on account of it, comes straightway to an end. Slavery, Mr. Sumner, is not a thing, which, even in its fundamental nature, much less in its more revolting aspects, I have any purpose to defend. But it is not, either in its nature or its manifestations, the thing you pronounce it to be; and this you could hardly fail to know. How then can I avoid saying, that the prettexts on which you counsel such insane proceedings, are neither true nor real?

What you say on the two vital objections, as you call them, to what you style the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, is not equal to the level of your ordinary thoughts. The *distinction of race*, as an obstacle to indiscriminate abolition, and the *sanction of christians* to the institution of slavery, as a plea

for its toleration, do unquestionably require to be put aside more thoroughly than you have succeeded in doing, before the terrible necessity of adopting your principles and following your counsel can be said to be obligatory on the conscience of the North. I will venture to suggest somewhat on both topics, which seems to have escaped your notice.

For my part, sir, I wish well to every country in the world, and to every race on the face of the earth. But I frankly admit, that I love my own country out of all comparison with every other; that I cherish my own race, with a fervor far beyond that with which I regard all others. Some people call this bigotry,—some call it fanaticism,—some call it narrow-mindedness,—and the like. I call it, an exalted duty, both of natural morality and of revealed religion,—whose neglect is incompatible with a pure heart or a right spirit in man. It has pleased God to create and to establish great diversities of race amongst men; diversities, which, if we could obliterate them completely, would, there can be no doubt, be re-established under the course of Divine Providence, whose grand designs in that, as in all things else, we neither fully comprehend, nor are able to defeat. This diversity of race, extending apparently to the utmost limit compatible with its generic unity, has been one of the most conspicuous elements in the destiny of mankind—and is so still. I beg you to consider that in all recorded time, but two methods have been found, whereby it was possible to solve that great problem of the general mixture of races in one community, on equal terms. It can be done—where all have a common master; that is, under a form, which indiscriminately enslaves all. Or it can be done, by means of the toleration of Polygamy; that is, under a form where the civil equality is preceded and co-erced by one of blood and household. Except by one or other of these means, or by both of them combined, the fundamental demand of your abolition hypothesis, after innumerable attempts, and upon every race of men, under every form of civilization,—has encountered only universal shipwreck. Your Anti-slavery Enterprise, therefore, as soon as it encounters the question of mixed races dwelling together, must demand that equality which is produced by the indiscriminate servitude of all; or it must demand the toleration of Polygamy; or it must succumb before the irresistible course of Providence and the invincible laws of human nature, as both are attested by the universal experience of mankind. That is, we must renounce our freedom and our actual civilization, to reach one solution of this problem; or we must renounce our christianity, to reach the other solution of it; or we must resist your Anti-slavery Enterprise, with its fundamental clause of equality of races, as tantamount to the utter disorganization of society. Sir, I have not one word to say about Shem, or Ham, or Japhet, or Canaan. But whether as a Statesman, as a Philosopher, or as a Christian, and with a sovereign contempt for all infidel theories of man, of society, and of virtue,—I calmly and sorrowfully tell you, there lies one of the grand and insuperable obstacles to that universal freedom and equality of man, for which man has panted from the origin of the race, but could never attain; and never will, upon such theories as yours. The pretext that the thing is attainable by civil war,—or is attainable at all except on the terms stated, or is either possible or desirable for us, is neither true nor real.

On the other point, your plea for the dissolution of society and the ruin of our country is still less satisfactory. As for me, Mr. Sumner, it has been the great business of my life to preach the Gospel of God: the great plea-

sure of my life, to do what I could to ameliorate the condition of my fellow men. And I need not hesitate to add, that while I have won neither Senatorial rank nor national notoriety thereby, I have endured more and risked more for the sake of the black race, by far, than either you or I have done for the sake of the white. Your fierce sarcasm, therefore, has no terror for me; nor can your pathos mislead a heart which has felt too deeply all the real evils of this pitiable case, to be susceptible to the influence of the most eloquent exaggerations; nor have I any sympathy with that state of mind, in which one can imagine that he is pleading the cause of Christ, while he is counselling the deliberate violation of the most sacred obligations. The life and the doctrine of the Lord Jesus, afford the only perfect illustration of every truth and every duty; and amongst the rest, of that glorious truth of the universal brotherhood of man, and that immortal duty of quenchless, mutual love, founded on it. But how utterly do we misconceive the life and the doctrine of the Son of God, when we advocate universal treason in order to redress partial oppression; or teach doctrines which lead only to universal rapine in order to rectify partial injustice! I wish, from the bottom of my heart, that every people were fit to enjoy, and did actually possess, public liberty and free institutions: but should I, therefore, urge an indiscriminate assault upon all nations which desire, but are denied these inestimable blessings? All duty is founded upon truths and laws, both of which are immutable; but every duty, is modified by circumstances which vary ceaselessly: and it is only as we comprehend both of these great principles, that we can ever attain any rational assurance that we perform a single duty aright. As a member of the human race, enlightened by the Gospel, I may have a particular view, of the general question of human servitude. Considered as a citizen of the United States, with the institution of slavery occupying the precise posture it does in this nation, my view of my own duty must necessarily be modified. Considered as a citizen of Kentucky, where much might be done towards the amelioration of slavery, my duty is modified again. And considered as a citizen of South Carolina, where probably it is hardly possible to conjecture how slavery could terminate peacefully and safely, my duty necessarily undergoes another and very serious modification. The religion of Jesus Christ is compatible with every condition in which God's providence constrains our fallen race to exist: and it is as absurd in reason, and as unfounded in fact, to assert that Christ and his Apostles required the indiscriminate abolition of human servitude, as to assert that they required the indiscriminate overthrow of any other form of despotic authority amongst men. 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 on it a power of their own; how surely they become heretics, apostates or infidels, when they begin to teach Christ, instead of setting down at his feet to learn

of him! What else can we say, but that all such pretexts, whether for public wrong or for private iniquity, are neither true nor real?

It was my purpose, sir, to have said something on the remaining topics of your discourse—the Practicability and Dignity of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, together with your view of the special duty of the North with regard to it. In your first topic, however, the Necessity of that Enterprise, the foundation of all lies; and having discussed, in some degree, your fundamental principles, I pass by what, when I was a younger man, I should have been more prompt to utter, touching some other portions of your discourse. For the rest, I will venture to add a few words, which, if you cared to do so, it would be your right to demand of me, in explanation of my own views, after having spoken so freely of yours.

Slavery, Mr. Sumner, is not a modern institution; it is as ancient as human society. And yet it is not a permanent institution, in the sense of being perpetuated in one particular race or country. We have the sad advantage of being able to contemplate it, in every age of the world, in every condition of severity, and in contact with every form of civilization. We ought, by this time, to be able to comprehend it. From this point of view I have two statements to make, both of which I fear may appear to you inaccurate. The first is, that nothing concerning the structure of human society is more clearly established by the entire career of man on this earth, than that, in some form or other, the social subjugation of one part of every highly developed community to another part of it,—that is, servitude in some form or other,—is absolutely inevitable; just as much so, as the existence of crime, or want, or sorrow. Let us bewail this as a badge of our fallen condition; let us seek its constant amelioration, as one of our clearest duties: but let us respect truth, and justice, and honor, and good faith, in all our attempts. The second statement I have to make is, that the general condition of negro slavery in America, so far from being particularly direful and loathsome, as you represent it to be, is really, and indeed, of necessity, in all respects mitigated and regulated after the pervading spirit of our protestant civilization, and is gradually acquiring a more endurable position, as the power of the Gospel gradually extends its influence, and as the slave states gradually settle into the conviction, that their duty obliges them to accept this institution as a permanent part of their social system. I do not myself believe that servitude in this particular form, is, as an original question, either necessary or desirable; and I am well convinced, that in many of our slave States, it might be gradually abolished, with great advantage; while in all of them it might be still further ameliorated without regard to the question of its ultimate solution. Nor is it my opinion, that the permanent continuance of this servitude, in its present form, is possible,—though its endurance may be protracted, and the methods of its termination extremely diversified, over the immense area covered by it. Your duty and mine, sir, as American philanthropists, each in his own sphere, is to accept this great problem as we find it, and by all the means in our power, assist its final outworking, in a manner most compatible with the interests of humanity, with the true progress and glory of our country, and with those internal principles of nature and of providence which our puny efforts may in some degree assist, but are wholly impotent to control.

There is an aspect of this whole question of negro slavery in America, extremely broad, and which you do not seem to have examined. It is not merely a question of slavery and the negro population on this continent;

nor yet, merely a question of bloodshed and conquest of your North against our South. It is a question affecting all of the Black Race throughout the earth—and all those vast interests of the whole earth, which the final destiny of that immense race involves. As yet, the Black Race has never had a nationality. As yet, there has never been a civilized state within the tropics. A hundred millions of the human race, and nearly a fourth part of the earth's habitable surface, around its very centre, await the issue of this question of negro slavery in America, and must be influenced greatly, if not controllingly by it. Rest assured, Mr. Sumner, whatever dignity you may persuade yourself to ascribe to your Anti-slavery Enterprise, and to your stirring speech at Niblo's Theatre,—nay, even to your Faneuil Hall eloquence, and your Massachusetts agitations over some poor fugitive slave,—there is an eternal logic in events, and there is an awful majesty in the sublime course of Providence, in the face of which, posterity will say, that men endowed like you, ought to have been ashamed to participate in such insane, fantastic, and ignoble revels!

However difficult the question of human servitude may be to solve, after slavery has been once fully established in the bosom of a commonwealth; or however men may differ as to the moral aspect of the actual questions now agitating the minds of our countrymen so deeply; it seems to me, that as a mere topic of National politics and National legislation, the whole question of American Slavery is one environed by no other difficulties, but such as have been created by our own evil passions. So far as the powers of the National Government are concerned—has not Massachusetts the unquestionable right to create slavery in her bosom—if she sees fit to do so,—and Louisiana to abolish it in hers, if she thinks proper? And is not this true of every State? What need then is there, in all soberness, for frantic contentions about Territorial settlements, which, in their own nature, can be only temporary? Suppose Missouri should abolish slavery? Suppose Illinois should create it? Suppose Kansas should decide the question, first one way, and then the other? Moreover, what essential difference does it make, whether it is upon a basis of fifteen slave States, or sixteen slave States, that the great problem of our National destiny is to be worked out? And as to its true bearing on the infinite mission of our country, what consequence can a rational mind attach to the temporary result of a fierce conflict for supremacy between madmen in one of our territories West of the Missouri River? What odds does it make, any way, as a National question, whether there are three millions of slaves, or three millions and a fraction over; whether six, or ten, or a hundred slaves, more or less, escape or are reclaimed? The power of the General Government over the whole subject is so extremely limited, and transient, and incidental, as compared with the absolute power of the States themselves; the good that can be done by the exercise of the powers actually possessed by Congress, is comparatively so slight and uncertain, and the danger which is obviously incurred is so real and deplorable; the condition in which the Nation stands with reference to the whole subject is so distinct and so peculiar; that, I must confess, it has always appeared to me unspeakably surprising, that any National party,—and especially any one at the North,—should be found capable of permanent organization in connection with such topics. Any honest, moderate, patriotic, consistent exercise of the powers of the General Government over the question of slavery, could hardly have failed to satisfy the nation to the end,—as it satisfied it during its early and most

glorious period. Whatever may have been the sins or follies of Southern Statesmen, or the Southern people, it would be hard to produce an example at once more flagrant, insulting, and unjust, than the discourse which suggested these remarks.

After all, I cannot persuade myself that God will allow us to degrade ourselves so utterly, as to break up this glorious confederacy on such a question as this. I do not allow myself to believe that the mass of the American people, are so utterly destitute of the sublime instinct of their country's mission among the Nations. Civil war is not a remedy; it is the most direful of all diseases. National strength, in a day like ours, and to freemen, is not so much a glory, as it is a necessity—the grand necessity of their liberty and independence. As to slavery, it is a question about which men may differ, according to the necessities of their condition and the point of view from which they consider it. But the cordial, and indissoluble Union of these States, is a matter concerning which no American who has a true heart in his bosom, can possibly have but one opinion—one purpose. If their be one political duty common to us all, and transcendently clear and binding, it is that we should visit with immediate and condign punishment, every party and every public man, who is not loyal to the Union and the Constitution.

Your fellow citizen and obedient servant,

R. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

*Brodabane, Ky., June 11th, 1855.*

#### CHURCH ELECTIONS.—WHO MAY VOTE FOR PASTOR ?

HOWEVER unsatisfactory may have been the discussion in the late Assembly as to the right of suffrage in our congregations, we are gratified, and grateful to the Head of the Church, that the venality which prevails in elections in some parts of the Church, is beginning to excite attention and alarm. We are duly deliberate in using the term venality; for, as shall be shown, it is the very term which describes the thing. The debate in the Assembly was interesting, but by no means exhaustive of the subject. In our opinion the wisest speech made on the occasion was by Dr. Plumer. The report of it, we give in full:

“It is clear we are not agreed. First, because the Book is a little ambiguous: secondly, our practice is widely different: thirdly, few have studied the subject much. I therefore move that the overture and other papers now before the body on this subject, be referred to a committee of three, to report to the Assembly of 1856.”

It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Plumer's motion did not prevail. The subject was laid on the table; but it will not be allowed to slumber there forever. It is enough for the Church to know that there are persons who advocate the extension of the elective franchise to all men, of every creed and character, who are willing to purchase it with money. We pause to notice particularly but one argument urged in the Assembly, against confining the priv-

ilege of voting to Christ's people. It is reported in these words, "Charters have been granted to many Churches, designating others than communicants, as voters; and by such decisions as proposed, we may interfere with vested rights." We do not propose to answer this argument;—we should be sorry to think that it needed an answer,—but to explain its meaning for the benefit of those who are not aware how completely decisions of the General Assembly on this subject, have, in some parts of the Church, been forestalled. The meaning of the argument is, that "in many Churches," the State Legislature has prescribed the terms of suffrage in the charters granted to those churches, and in most cases, placed it in the hands of the pew-holders exclusively; and that the General Assembly ought not to decide that believers alone should vote, because that might "interfere with vested rights;"—in other words, these unbelieving voters are invested by the civil law with this right of suffrage, and if an attempt were made to deprive them of it, they would appeal to the arm of the civil law, and the spiritual portion of the congregation, must either submit or vacate the premises. We leave our readers to judge for themselves of the force, and the *deep significancy* of this argument, asking them to weigh it well in the light of our articles, headed "Temporalities vs. Spiritualities."

We proceed to remark upon the general subject:—

1. The discrepancies of sentiment and practice among our congregations furnish, of themselves, a sufficient reason why this question should be authoritatively settled. The right of suffrage in matters ecclesiastical, as well as civil, is a precious right, which no one ought to be deprived of, who is entitled to it. And if men of the world have the right to vote in our ecclesiastical, popular elections, then in many churches they suffer great injustice from what one member rather satirically called, the "spiritual aristocracy,"—although Milton very reverently called the company of believers a "holy and equal aristocracy." If, on the contrary, unbelievers have no such right, it is surely no light matter that thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, do exercise this right in various parts of the land. The principle here involved, is precisely the one which has formed the basis of most of the revolutions of the world in all ages,—namely, the rights of the people in the affairs of the government. It was precisely here that began, and must ever begin, the worst corruptions of the Church.

In early times, the first evil tendencies were in the direction of a curtailment of the rights of the people. Ministers, forgetting that they were servants, began to "lord it over God's heritage," and then to lord it over one another. Here was the root of prelacy, which finally effloresced in popery. Luther, under God, restored the rights of the people; and now, in our day and in our land, we behold a tendency exactly the opposite of that which first corrupted the Church, but one which is not less injurious and enslaving,—namely, the widening and cheapening of the privileges of the laity, so as to merge the people into the whole mass of the community.

The student of Church History should not forget, that this evil, which we are quietly submitting to, was one of the tricks which the hierarchy in the 4th century resorted to, for the very purpose of destroying the liberties of the people. As in the recent history of France, despotism sprang full-armed from the broadest democracy, by successively corrupting, controlling and destroying the ballot-box, so in the age of Constantine, an ambitious hierarchy first corrupted the ecclesiastical, popular elections, then controlled them to subserve their own ends, disgusted the Church with "that worst of tyrants, *an usurping crowd*,"—then ruled supreme. The Council of Laodicea, in 361, made a feeble effort at reform, by passing an act to exclude *the rabble*, (*tois ochlois*,) from taking part in the choice of Church officers;—but it all ended in nothing, and before two centuries the ruin of the Church was complete.

2. It is almost an axiom in the science of government, that the source of power should be clearly defined, and jealously watched—to avoid usurpations on the source of power and on the objects of power. This is absolutely essential for the safety of all concerned. In all republican forms of government, the necessity for care and definiteness is specially imperative, for reasons, which are familiar to every thoughtful mind in this age of the world. We all know what earnest thought is always given to this subject in the formation of our State Constitutions; and how sedulously commissioners and judges, guard the purity of elections. Now every one who reflects upon the subject must see, that all such considerations apply with redoubled force, to popular elections in the Church. Hence we draw another argument, why the motion of Dr. Plumer in the Assembly, should have prevailed.

3. We wish to know whether the highest judicatory of our Church, is prepared to sanction the only abstract reason given, why unbelievers should be allowed an equal voice with believers, in the choice of pastor,—viz, that they contribute to the support of the Gospel. Whether, in plain terms, they consider the privilege of voting in the Church, a marketable article—a mere matter of bargain, fee, entrance-money, or whatever else you may choose to call the pecuniary consideration which purchases the right of suffrage, irrespective of all moral and religious considerations whatsoever. This is what we meant by calling such elections *venal*. We have no fear that the Church at large, is prepared to sanction any such *venal*—perhaps we might be justified in saying—any such *simoniacal* practice. If the money thus contributed were a tax imposed by the Church on the contributors, and liable to be collected by law, then the question would be different;—and we are inclined to think that some minds get befogged in this subject, by confounding two things which are entirely distinct.

4. If unbelievers are on an electoral equality with believers, then we have another question to propose, which the advocates of that idea have perhaps not thought of,—namely, whether their logic does not dispense with the necessity of believers altogether, in our popu-

lar Church Elections? If unbelievers and believers are on an equality in Church Elections, why may not unbelievers form congregations, elect pastors, and dismiss pastors, *ad libitum*. All qualified voters are equally the source of power in the State, irrespective of the grounds on which they severally acquired citizenship;—and this principle of electoral equality is the very essence of all republican government—civil or ecclesiastical. If the argument proves too much, it is not our fault;—logic is an inexorable tyrant.

5. But let us see if these enfranchised unbelievers really *do, or can do*, the thing that they *seem* to do, when they vote for pastor. The pastoral relation is not the mere thing of preaching on the one part and listening on the other. It is an intimate, confidential, spiritual marriage of the parties,—involving the most sacred reciprocal duties and responsibilities,—emblematic of the mysterious, holy marriage of Christ and the Church universal. Let any sincere mind read over the mutual vows exchanged between pastor and people,—and consider all that is implied in those vows,—and he will see plainly, that the unregenerate heart can have no part nor lot in the matter. The unbeliever is absolutely incapable of uttering a voice in the matter, which harmonizes at all with the solemn transaction. If men of the world intrude upon such proceedings at all, it must be the result, either of gross ignorance, or shameful hypocrisy,—usually the former as we charitably hope. And if ever the Church legitimate the suffrages of the ungodly in her popular elections, it will be because she has forgotten or contemned her own prerogative, and lost the spirituality of her character.

6. When we proceed to consider this subject in connection with the great idea of the relation of Christ and the Church, where heads the real source of all Church power, the truth stands out in clear sunlight.

What, at last, is our Heaven-taught philosophy, as to the essence of all Church government? Why did the great Head of the Church make the people the depository of ecclesiastical power? Was it a mere foreshadowing of universal democracy? Was it a mere compliment to man's natural capacity for self-government—and an intimation that he was capable of managing the Church, even without grace? Was it an expedient to aggrandize the Church as to numbers and wealth? These questions are easily answered, but it is not easy to understand how Christian men, could so far forget the vital elements of their faith as to ignore the fact, or the plainest deductions from the fact, that the people were made the depository of Church power, because they are also the depository of Christ's Word and Spirit, given to constitute them the perpetual agency of Christ upon earth—He abiding in them, acting by them and speaking through them. He is to the Church what the soul is to the body. The Church has no life, which is not derived; no power which is not administrative and declarative. Her elections are the utterances of Christ; her officers are the servants of Christ; her laws are the laws of Christ; all her conquests are the conquests of Christ. And

all this is true in a much more efficient sense than attaches to the human relation of principal and agent, proxy or ambassador. Christ, by the operation of His Spirit, expounds His written Word, and guides the minds of all His faithful people to carry out His will.\*

When any member of the body of Christ is suited to hold office, he is designated by the operation of the Spirit on the minds of the Church, and when placed in the office, he feels, or ought to feel, that he has received his appointment, not from man but from God. And it is precisely these congregational elections, which determine the whole matter of God's will. The matter of determining whether a man is called to the ministry, is not left to the man himself,—it is not even left to the representatives of the people, but to the people themselves in popular assembly. The Presbytery sends the candidate forth to be tried by the Churches,—and this very congregational meeting, met for calling a pastor, does, in calling him, indicate the will of Heaven that he should be commissioned as a Minister of Christ; and the Presbytery so understand it, and ordain and install him accordingly. We are incapable of comprehending the force of any argument, if this familiar consideration does not settle the question.

Unbelievers are manifestly out of harmony with the whole idea of Church power. They are not fitted to exercise that which they have never received. They have no estate to administer upon;—they have received no law to declare. They are not qualified to interpret the Word of God, and have not been selected as the channels of His Holy Spirit. They are as instruments without an operator;—as conduits devoid of water;—as agents without an employer. How great the profanity to call upon such men to utter the mind of God! Paul exhorts the presbyters of Ephesus—“To take heed to all the flock over which *the Holy Ghost* had made them overseers.” Would such an exhortation have been appropriate, if they had been chosen by the unholy and profane! The Holy Ghost speaks through no such channels.

We cannot suppress the conviction that in arguing this question, we are contending for the dearest and most vital principles of Christianity. We are striving to remove every impediment to the uninterrupted flow of God's grace into the heart of the Church, and through the Church into the world. Our desire and prayer to God is, that the Church may feel her dependence on Him, and keep herself unspotted from the world.

6. The precedents in the primitive Church, so far as we are enabled to learn them from the Scriptures, are strongly in favor of the exclusive right of believers. We have, first, the general spirit of the New Testament, which teaches that the line between the Church and the world should be very broad. The moral chasm between the receivers and the rejectors of Christ, is represented as infinite. Christ himself was separate from sinners, and Christians are com-

\* We beg our readers to peruse the lately published sermon by Dr. Hodge, in its bearing upon this question.

manded to come out and be separate—to hold no fellowship with the profane,—no, not so much as to eat with them, “For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? or what part hath he that believeth, with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them and *be ye separate*, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean, and I will receive you and be a Father unto you and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.”

The same reasons why Christians should come out from the world, should make them careful lest the world follow them with its intrusions.

The first act of the Church, after the ascension of our Lord, was the election of an Apostle in the place of Judas. It is evident that none were present but the faithful, for “they all continued with one accord, in prayer and supplication.” And it is said that Peter stood in the midst of *the disciples*, and addressed them as brethren; (there is no disjunctive between “men” and “brethren” in the original.)

The next act was the appointment of deacons. “Then the twelve called the multitude of *the disciples*,” and said, “*Brethren, look ye out seven men.*” No unbelievers were concerned in either of these elections.

The delegates, or travelling assistants of the Apostles “were chosen of (or by) the Churches,”—and thus it was with all Church appointments, so far as can be gathered. The elections were made by the company of believers alone. The testimony of all the Church Historians and Commentators so far as we have examined,—and we have examined not a few,—agrees in ascribing the right of suffrage only to believers, in the primitive Church.

7. So far as we are informed, the Reformed Churches of the Continent all adopted the primitive usage. The Church of Scotland, certainly has uttered a consistent and clear testimony on this subject, —although her practice has not always been precisely what it should have been. Hetherington is so explicit on this subject, that we quote his language. (App. No. III.) “The true subject of inquiry is, what the Church has always declared, maintained in theory, and striven to realize in practice, as the scriptural, and therefore the best, method of appointing ministers to the pastoral office. Beginning with the great and sacred principle that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only King and Head of the Church, the Presbyterian Church holds as self-evident, that the appointment of officers in His spiritual kingdom, must necessarily belong exclusively to its Divine King.

Hence the principle that there cannot be a scriptural appointment to the pastoral office, without the consent and approval of the Christian people, *that is, of those who compose the true flock, having been admitted to the privileges of Christian communion, and*

thereby made citizens of Zion, and members of Christ's spiritual body, the Church, of which he is the only Head."

As respects the Church in this country, we are not aware that any different doctrine has been taught, in any authoritative quarter. The text books in Divinity, used in our Theological Seminaries, all—as we believe—teach or imply, the view which we have been advocating. The same is implied in Dr. Hodge's late discourse before the Historical Society. Dr. Smyth teaches the same doctrine in his erudite work on Ecclesiastical Republicanism. (See p. 91 and *passim*.) Such too was the view of the late Dr. Jno. H. Rice. (See *Evangelical Mag.*, Vol ix, p. 535.) If there is a different doctrine maintained by any standard expounder of Presbyterianism, we should like to see it produced.

Now supposing it to be true, that respecting this point, as respecting many other points, the language of our constitution is ambiguous—have we not in the facts marshalled in this paper, an exposition which is free from all ambiguity. We hold indeed that whilst the letter of the Book may not be clear, the spirit and tone of the Book, gives no uncertain sound to those who give careful heed. The words "Church" and "Congregation," are used interchangeably throughout,—and the restrictions to the privilege of voting, refer to *members* of the Church who are insubordinate, or who neglect the Christian duty of supporting the Gospel according to their means. And the whole structure of the Book, is framed upon the scriptural and Presbyterian idea, that the Church, under Christ, is an entirely independent self-governing community.

We hence conclude, that the growing practice of extending the right of suffrage in congregational elections to all contributors, irrespective of their relation to the Church proper, is a *corruption*—a great and alarming corruption—and one demanding immediate, and yet prudent reform.

---

## THE WISDOM OF MAN vs. THE POWER OF GOD.

---

THERE is a very obvious sense in which the wisdom of man is not only not opposed to the power of God, as the ground of faith, but entirely consistent and even co-incident with it. The wisdom of man, so far as it is exercised in the production of mechanical results, has its foundation in the uniformity of nature, the order of established causes, the system of invariable sequences, in the material universe around us. The instinct of our intellectual constitution prompts us to expect this uniformity. We learn, by enlarging the sphere of observation and experiment, by accumulating a number of particulars, to distinguish between real and apparent sequences, and determine the essential conditions in which one event succeeds another. Experience modifies and corrects our confidence in the stability of nature, but does not originate or strengthen it. Now it

is this confidence in the laws of nature which gives rise to mechanical skill: without it, the right hand would soon lose its cunning. The desired results are produced by accommodating ourselves to these laws; to the properties of things, and to the conditions under which these properties manifest themselves: we become the *masters* of nature by becoming her *servants*, and *lead* her by *following* her. Hence the famous dictum—"Knowledge is power:" the wisest man is the strongest man. But whose power is this? Evidently, the power of Him who is the Author of the constitution and course of nature. What we call the "laws of nature" are only general statements of the divine operations considered as uniform and invariable. The highest wisdom of man, therefore, consists, in this department of his activity, in the nicest accommodation of his instruments to the conditions under which the power of God is exercised. This power is really, though perhaps unconsciously, the ground of our faith, when we trust in the elastic force of steam to drive our engines, or in the processes of agriculture, and the influences of showers and sunshine to provide our bread. In this aspect of the case, the wisdom of man and the power of God are in entire harmony with each other.

So far as the activity of man is concerned merely about physical laws, the result is always the same, under the same physical conditions whether his moral character be good or bad, whether he lives in the fear of God, or lives only to himself. But in the affairs of common life, the result often shows that there is no such necessary connexion between means and ends. God will assert His own glorious sovereignty, and will have that sovereignty to be recognized, and, therefore, where the *moral* agency of man is concerned, the very wisest schemes are often baffled and confounded. Even M. Comte perceived and announced the great principle, that "man's knowledge is in an inverse proportion to his power," that his knowledge is greatest where his control is least: so that while he can, with unerring precision, predict, centuries beforehand, an eclipse of the sun, he cannot tell whether he shall die a rich man or a beggar, nay, whether, the next moment, he shall be alive or dead. The laws by which the world is governed are sufficiently general, to lay the foundation for the exercise of prudence and foresight, but at the same time variable enough in their results—whether through the necessary limitations of the human faculties, or the exercise of the divine sovereignty, it matters not—to show that man is *not* the architect of his own fortune, and the arbiter of his own destiny. The race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favor to men of skill: but time and chance (the unknown or unacknowledged cause of these diversities) happeneth to them all. For man also knoweth not his time: as the fishes that are taken in an evil net, and as the birds that are caught in the snare: so are the sons of men snared in an evil time, when it falleth suddenly upon them. Consider the work of God: for who can make that straight

which He hath made crooked? In the day of prosperity be joyful, but in the day of adversity consider: God also hath set the one over against the other, to the end that man should find nothing after him. Even in the life that now is, then, God will have our faith to stand, not in the wisdom of man, but in His own power, who worketh, when, where and how He pleaseth. In the very midst of our mechanical and organic theories of the Universe and of Providence, He rouses us from our Epicurean dreams, by the frustration of our best contrived plans, and the disappointment of our most deliberate calculations.

But it is in reference to the life to come, and the manifestation of the divine glory in the conception and execution of the plan of salvation, that the opposition between the wisdom of man and the power of God, comes out most impressively. When the nation of Israel was about to be set apart as the witness of the existence and government of Jehovah, the only living and true God,—the dispensation was introduced and authenticated by *miracles*, by visible interpositions of the power of God in contravention of the “laws of nature.” Not that a miracle requires a greater, or even a more direct exercise of power, but power exercised out of the settled order. The agency of the Creator is alike concerned in the production of the grain from the seed, by means of the ordinary properties of the soil, and the influences of the atmosphere,—and in the multiplication of the loaves of bread (an artificial product of human skill) in the hands of the Saviour: in the production of the juice of the grape through the slow process of the vineyard, and in the immediate conversion of water into the artificial product we call wine: in the plagues of Egypt, and in the epidemic pestilences and desolating tempests of all times and all countries. But how different the impression made in the two cases! In the one, the finger of God is plainly seen, in the other, not. If the Israelites had been fed by the harvests of their own hands, as the Egyptians were, how would the world have known that their God was other and greater than the gods of their enemies? But fed and clothed, defended and delivered, *as they were*, the verdict rendered even by their enemies was, that their Rock *was* other and greater. Now why such a dispensation as this? Plainly, because the ancient Church was to live by faith in the power of God exercised in the way of an *extraordinary* providence, and must be educated to that end. The faithless generation quailed and sunk at the report of the spies. God swore in His wrath that they should not enter into His rest, because they still argued and acted upon the principles of human wisdom and worldly prudence. “The giants, the sons of Anak are there, and cities walled up to heaven: how can an undisciplined multitude like ours, cumbered with the care of women and children, hope to conquer a warlike race fighting for their homes and their altars?” Sound reasoning, truly, and commendable prudence in any other people, but not in the mouths of men who had witnessed the plagues of Egypt, the dry-

ing up of the Red Sea, and the instantaneous discomfiture of an armed and disciplined host with a powerful monarch at its head : of men who were at the very time miraculously sustained by food from heaven, and surrounded on all sides by multiplied evidences that the God of nature and providence was on their side. They ought to have believed that those impregnable walls would fall down, if need be, at the very blast of their horns, and the stout hearts of those sons of Anak melt like wax at their approach, under the secret touch of Him whose presence made the solid mountain to smoke and tremble. They had not the faith which was indispensably necessary to qualify them for the rest of God in the land of promise, and were therefore excluded. They *could* not enter in, because of unbelief. And many years rolled by, years of painful discipline, but discipline under the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night, before the younger generation were prepared, by faith in the power of God, for the conquest and permanent possession of that country in which the dust of Abraham had long reposed, the pledge of Jehovah's faithfulness, and the memorial of his own.\*

And how gloriously were these lessons renewed under the administration of the Judges, when, with the most inadequate military resources and the most contemptible weapons of war, with lamps and pitchers, with the jaw-bone of an ass and ox-goads, they accomplished their deliverance from oppression! And how certainly did disaster and disgrace befall them, during their whole history, when they forgot the King of Israel, who is spirit and not flesh, and trusted in horses and chariots for success in battle! Saul was one of the most conspicuous examples of confidence in his own wisdom, and, very naturally, was one of the greatest troubles of the people. He acted in the affair of the Amalekites with the best intentions—*ad majorem gloriam Dei* :—he saved the best of the spoil for the honor of the Lord. But how is his officious service received? "What meaneth this bleating in mine ears? and the lowing of the oxen which I hear?" "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold! to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He hath also rejected thee from being king."

Now these things were written for *our* learning : they are examples unto *us* on whom the ends of the world are come. The Church under the gospel is still warned, and warned by the delinquencies and disasters of the Church under the law, that her faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. The two great

\* The use the Apostle makes of this history in the third and fourth chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is very striking. In the case of the Jews, we have—1. A promised rest. 2. An extraordinary providence. 3. A faith in such a providence, contradicting the natural instinct of the mind, which prompts it to look for unvarying uniformity in the sequences of nature. In the case of men under the Gospel, we have—1. A promised rest. 2. The righteousness of Christ, imputed for justification. 3. A faith in that righteousness, contradicting the natural tendency to look to a personal, inherent righteousness as the ground of justification.

foes of the Gospel among the Jews, were the sects of the Pharisees and the Sadducees: the one making the word of God of none effect by their traditions, their presumptuous additions to the lively oracles: the other, making the word of God of none effect, by their rationalistic interpretations; but both making the word of none effect, by confidence in their own wisdom and ignorance or virtual denial of the power of God. "Beware," said our Saviour, "of the *leaven* of the Pharisees and Sadducees." This exhortation is not out of date: the leaven still works: the controversy still is, whether the word of God is the *only* rule whereby we are directed to glorify and enjoy Him—whether it contains *all* which is binding upon us in our relations to Him as our all-disposing Lord and all-comprehending Good. 'The Pharisees and Sadducees are not dead: they have only undergone a transmigration. The great enemy of the Gospel among the Pagans, was the sect of the Epicureans: not so much on account of the profligacy of their lives, as the licentiousness of their principles, the *abstractions* of their philosophy. If no *good* thing can come out of *abstractions*,—as some of our orators in Church and State seem to think—it must be acknowledged that they have been the prolific source of evil. The doctrine of Epicurus, that expediency is the rule of right, has been a Pandora's box to the world, with this difference, that there is *no* hope at the bottom of it. Since the ascension of our glorious Redeemer into heaven, there have been more good and true men, perhaps, sacrificed upon the altar of this infernal principle, than there ever were men of any sort sacrificed to Moloch. And it is for a lamentation that ministers of the gospel, publicly and in our Church Courts, substantially endorse it.\* We rejoice to believe that they are good men: we honor them because the Lord has honored them: we feel assured that they have not duly considered the meaning and scope of their declarations, or they have most incautiously expressed them. But *because* they are good men, *because* the Lord has honored them and given them influence in the Church, it is the more necessary that no man should allow such statements to pass without a protest. When the question to be settled is, whether the ground of faith shall be the power of God, or the wisdom of men—the wisest and best men that ever adorned the Church below,—no man, not the very least of all saints, can hesitate for a moment. Let God be true, and *every* man a liar.

\* There is such a thing as *christian* expediency: but the confusion of thought which exists, even among intelligent men, in regard to its real nature, is almost incredible. We once heard, in a debate in one of the largest Synods in this country, one of the leading debaters contend that a resolution which he was defending, and which made total abstinence from intoxicating drinks a term of communion in the churches of the Synod, was not at all inconsistent with the action of the General Assembly of 1848, which made the whole matter of total abstinence an affair of christian liberty. The argument was, that it was not expedient to drink; therefore, it was a sin to drink; and, therefore, a church-member should be disciplined for drinking. It never seemed to occur to him and the gentlemen on his side, that the Scriptures never spoke of expediency except in regard to things, the lawfulness of which had been previously, and upon independent grounds, established. "All things are lawful for me, but all things (evidently, all *lawful* things) are not expedient." The Scriptures know man too well, to allow him to judge of what is expedient in other matters; and the history of his attempts, in this kind, justify their caution abundantly.

Allusion was made to one of these statements, in the article on "The Church Question" in our last number: and since the article was written, the friends of the Board-system in the Assembly have talked still more loosely about the liberty of the Church under the Gospel, as if the bondage of the Jew consisted in being guided by the law of God, and the liberty of the Christian in being emancipated from all law. Such broad assertions indicate a sad deficiency of attention to the principle upon which all Protestantism is based, to wit: that the Bible is not only the rule, but a sufficient rule, and that no discretionary power in the ordinary sense, is given to the Church. We deem it important to notice the statement referred to, in order to call attention to the doctrine of our Confession in the premises. The statement is this:—

"Others hold that while Christ has prescribed certain principles relating to the organization of the Church, He has left much, as to the details, discretionary. This is the common opinion of Protestants, and especially of Presbyterians: and whether recognized in *thesi* or not, is practically acted upon by every religious denomination on earth."

Upon this statement, we remark—*First*, that it is extremely vague and indefinite: and there could be no better evidence of its vagueness, than the fact alleged, that while it is "*especially*" the doctrine of Presbyterians, it "is acted upon by every religious denomination on earth." *Second*, that on account of its vagueness, it is liable to endless abuse, as is evident from the fact, that "every religious denomination on earth" acts upon it. The Church of Rome for example—which, according to the same high authority, has something more than a mere religious *denomination*—has made herself drunk with the blood of thousands who would not submit to her authority about *details*. Who shall determine what are principles, and what matters of detail? The statement is liable to abuse in somewhat the same manner as the common distinction, touching fundamentals and non-fundamentals in doctrine. It will do, as a rule of charity by which to judge others, but is dangerous, if acted upon for ourselves. If a man—to borrow an illustration—should lose one or all his limbs, we might still acknowledge him to be a man, to possess the *essential* elements of humanity: but it would be a very serious affair to cut off our own limbs, to ascertain whether, after the curtailment of our proportions, we might not still be living men. A gangrene might kill us. If we determine for ourselves, that any doctrine or ordinance is a mere matter of detail, and, therefore, of little consequence, the state of mind is a morbid one, and may be fatal. The principle has been abused in our own Church, which "*especially*" holds it. She is extending her details: she is increasing her power, and "*enlarging the area of freedom:*" she would undertake to educate her children in all secular learning, and, by parity of reasoning, will before long, consider the *expediency* of establishing ecclesiastical workshops. We should not be surprised, if the institution of refectories and wardrobes for the children, were one day

discovered to be one of the details of her organization, and, as in ancient Sparta, the only office of parents turn out to be, that of supplying the Church with subjects for her care. She will then be a *University* in the largest sense of that term. *Third*, that the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church is *not* to be found in this vague form. *In thesi*, it is as follows: "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the spirit, or traditions of men. Nevertheless we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word: and there are some *circumstances* concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, *common to human actions and societies*, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed." (Con. of Faith. C. 1. s. 6.) The proof-texts on this section, in order to save space, we must ask the reader to refer to. (2. Tim. 3: 16, 17; Gal. 1: 8; 2 Thess. 2: 2; John 6: 45; 1 Cor. 2: 9, 10, 12; 1 Cor. 11: 13, 14; 1 Cor. 14: 26, 40.)

Now the indefinite "details" of the statement which is the object of these remarks, are, in our Confession, "some *circumstances* concerning the worship of God and government of the Church, *common to human actions and societies*." The circumstances here referred to, are the necessary adjuncts of human actions, such as time and place, decency and order. If there is to be social worship, there must be, as in assemblies for any purpose, an agreement as to the time and place. Every deliberative body, whether of human or divine constitution, must have a presiding officer.\* The fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians, as also the eleventh, which are referred to in this section of the Confession, in the way of proof and illustration, show what the book means by "circumstances." Our fathers

\* A very clear statement of the essential difference between these "circumstances," and those additions to the worship of God and government of the Church, which all true Protestants have united in condemning, may be found in the Spirit of the XIXth Century for 1842, p. 152, et seq. The writer quotes the following from Owen's Discourse, on Liturgies, "a Discourse," he says, "which, *mutatis mutandis*, may just as conclusively be applied to Boards." "Circumstances," says Owen, "are either such as follow actions as actions, or such as are arbitrarily superadded and adjoined by command unto actions, which do not of their own accord, nor naturally, nor necessarily attend them. Now religious actions in the worship of God, are actions still. Their religious relation doth not destroy their natural being. Those circumstances, then, which do attend such actions as actions, not determined by Divine institution, may be ordered, disposed of and regulated by the prudence of men. For instance, prayer is a part of God's worship: public prayer is so as appointed by Him. This, as it is an action to be performed by man, cannot be done without the assignment of time and place, and sundry other things, if order and conveniency be attended. \* \* \* There are also some things which some men call circumstances also, that no way belong of themselves to the actions whereof they are said to be the circumstances, nor do attend them, but are imposed on them or annexed to them, by the arbitrary authority of those who take upon them to give order and rules in such cases." (Works, vol. 10th, p. 437.) To the same purpose, Calvin, Instit. B. 4. c. 10. Sec. 28, 29, 30.

never dreamed that the formidable institutions called Ecclesiastical Boards, which have usurped functions belonging to the regular courts, and given rise to a practical hierarchy of perilous tendency in the Church, would be introduced as *circumstances*: that, under the color of the innocent phrases about "worship and government," a stupendous scheme of secular education, which, in principle, involves as extravagant assumptions as the claims of Rome, and, in practice, is injurious alike to the interests of piety and sound learning,—would be foisted upon the people of God. We are to be ruled by men *not* of our own choice; we are to have the Church converted into a university, or a mongrel something which is neither one nor the other; something which will be a feeble Church, and a very indifferent university, because, forsooth, there are some "circumstances common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence!" With how much more reason might the General Assembly ordain the use of Liturgies, according to the wishes of some brethren, or the use of organs and fiddles in *singing* the praises of God! 'These are mere "circumstances" compared with our system of Boards, and an indefinite number of Colleges, Academies and Schools.

Many other illustrations occur to us, of the leading topic of this article, but they must be deferred for want of space. In conclusion, let us remember that it is the design as well as the tendency of the Gospel, to honor God, and to pour contempt upon the glory of man; and all its arrangements are subordinate to this end. The most splendid exhibition of the wisdom of God, it nevertheless presents, to the wisdom of men, the aspect of folly, in order that they may feel the necessity of becoming fools that they may be wise. Human wisdom, in seeking its own ends, must have an apparatus commensurate with the greatness of the result to be achieved. Faith, in seeking to advance the glory of God, is satisfied with His institutions, however insignificant, despicable, powerless they may appear to be, and in themselves are:—because they are His, and He has made them what they are. that the *excellency of the power*, and consequently, the glory of success may be acknowledged to be His.\* The most worthless instruments, wielded by commission from God, will do more execution, than the best appointed armies of mere human equipment. Further, let us remember that it is the misplaced wisdom of *good* men, that has done the most serious mischief in the Church in all generations. We are in little danger of listening to the suggestions of the arch-adversary, when they come to us through his own servants. "In God's name"—the German proverb hath it—"all mischief begins." Once more—let us remember that this boasted liberty of the Church to make laws, seeing that it is a liberty in the hands of the Church officers, and chiefly in the hands of the

\* To all assertions, that the work of the Church cannot be done in any other way than it is done, we might reply in the very words of our Saviour—"Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the *power of God*:" or in the words of Paul—"Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that *God* should raise the dead?"

clergy, has the effect of circumscribing the liberty of the people. It will always be found, that, in the Church which makes the freest use of its own discretion about "details," the body of the people will be the most enslaved. When Paul cries to the Galatians—"Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free"—he refers to the dangers which threatened that liberty, from the freedom with which their teachers enacted observances. The *abstractions* of a constitution are the only bulwarks of human liberty, in Church or State.

---

### THE GOSPEL IDEA OF PREACHING.

---

FROM the days of Enoch, who prophesied, (Jude 14,) and of Noah, who was a preacher of righteousness, (II Peter 2 : 5,) to our day, God has employed "the foolishness of preaching to save those that believe." To us, who hold that "the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants," both the warrant for preaching, as a religious ordinance, and the model for its performance, must be given from the word of God. The patriarchs, the prophets, probably the Aaronic priests, and the pious kings, preached to Israel. But the first full description of the nature of the exercise is the oft-cited passage from Nehemiah, 8 : 1—8, when Ezra and his associates "*read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.*" Here we have the true scriptural idea of the preacher's function ; to make the people understand what is in God's word. The Christian minister's commission is in these words: "Preach the word ; (*herald the word*;) be instant in season, out of season ; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine." (II Tim. 4 : 2.) The object of preaching is the salvation of the soul ; and that salvation consists in a redemption from the guilt, love, and practice of iniquity. The instrument of this redemption is God's truth, *as he has revealed it*. "Sanctify them through thy truth." The preacher is most explicitly called a Herald : that is, the deliverer of a message. Now the herald does not make his message : he merely transmits it. He has nothing to do with judging its wisdom or fitness ; let him simply proclaim it as it is given to him. This was God's command to an Ancient Preacher : "Arise ; go unto Nineveh, that great city ; and preach unto it *the preaching that I bid thee.*" (Jonah 3 : 2.)

Or, the preacher's office may be illustrated by the work of one who uses a die put into his hands, to form impressions on some plastic substance. The sinful soul is that substance. The word of God is the die ; and the divine image of knowledge and true holiness is the impression to be formed. God, who made man's soul, and therefore knows it, made the die ; and of course he best knew how to

make it, to produce the impression He desired. Now the workman's business is not to criticize, re-carve, or alter the die which is committed to him; but simply to press it down, upon the substance to be shaped. In this view, how plain is it, that all preaching must be accurately representative of Bible truth, and in Bible proportions? Else it is not God's work. The preacher's business is, simply to take what he finds in the Scriptures, and as he finds it, and press it down upon the understandings, hearts, and consciences of men. Nothing else is his business as a preacher. The die is just so sharp and hard; so large, and so perfect, as God would have it. He judged it was the right die to produce the impression he intends. This is enough for us. Here we have a few obvious truths which none will dispute, who are known as evangelical christians. But if we are not mistaken, they contain the following deductions, by which many things very prevalent in the practice of persons considering themselves evangelical, are condemned.

1. Not only must Bible topics form the whole subject matter of preaching, but they must be presented in Scriptural aspects and proportions. God made the Bible for the people: not raw material which the religious philosopher is to work over into new forms. Here is a simple and admitted fact, which is full of neglected inferences. The book of God is not like the book of creation, a mixed and crude mass of the ore of knowledge, which must become the subject of scientific re-arrangement, to become intelligible to common minds. The Bible is for the people; this is the great principle of Protestants. And this implies that God, who knew best, has set forth the truth he purposed to apply, in such forms and aspects as, he knew, would best suit the human mind. There can be no other forms of presentation so suitable to the people; because God has chosen these. "The preacher's business is just to show the people what is in the Bible," as God has there set it forth.

2. These principles cut up by the roots, the whole fashion of "preaching up the times;" as it was quaintly called by our Scotch forefathers. If the preacher's business is the redemption of the soul, and his instrument is Bible truth, it is plain that he has no business in the pulpit, with Nebraska bills, Abolitionism, politics, Eastern questions, and all the farrago of subjects, with which infidel ministers of christianity essay to eke out, as they suppose, the deficient interest and power of the message of salvation. The Preacher's business in the pulpit is to make christians; and not to make free-soilers, Maine-law-men, statesmen, historians, or social philosophers. His message from the pulpit is that which God has put into his mouth, and nothing else. The question may be asked: "Are Bible principles never to be applied, then, to the correction of the social evils of the day, by those who are the appointed expounders of the Bible?" So far as God so applies them in the Bible, yes; but no farther. Let the Preacher take the application of the principles, as well as the principles applied, from the word of God: let him take, not only his

starting position, but his whole topics, from God's word, and he will be in no danger of incurring that sarcasm, as biting as it is just, directed against those who "take their texts from the Bible, and their sermons from the Newspapers." Many Preachers seem to think that if it is a Scriptural principle which they use, it matters not how unscriptural, or extra-scriptural is the use which they make of it. They forget that it does not follow, because a man has drawn his weapon from the king's armory, that therefore he is fighting the king's battle: soldiers have sometimes used the sovereign's arms to fight duels with each other. It may be asked again: "Is the Preacher to forego, and disuse all that influence for social good, which his christian intelligence gives him? Has he ceased to be a citizen and a patriot, because he has become a Minister?" No. But when he appears in the pulpit, he appears not as a citizen, but as God's herald. Here is a very simple and obvious distinction much neglected. The *other* channels of patriotic influence are open to him, which *other* citizens use: so far as he may use them without prejudice to his main calling. To cleave to this alone, is made his obvious duty by three reasons. The importance of the soul's redemption is transcendent. All social evils, all public and national ends, sink into trifles beside it. Hence God's Ministers owe this practical tribute and testimony at least, to this great truth: to devote all the machinery and power of religious ordinances,—that single domain into which the all-engrossing world does not intrude,—to this one grand object. That Minister is false to truth and to his Master, who says by his conduct, that there is anything on earth important enough to subtract one atom of sacred time or sacred ordinances, from their one great object. Again, by securing the redemption of the soul, the Preacher will secure all else that is valuable in his hearers. Let him make good christians, and all the rest will come right without farther care. If we have a nation of Bible Christians, we shall have without trouble, all the social order, liberty, and intelligence we need. And last, he who undertakes the work of the social philosopher, the legislator, the politician, will diminish his energies, zeal, time, and influence, for promoting his higher object. He will waste on the less, those energies of head and heart, which were all needed for the greater. He will shut up his access for good, to all the minds which are opposed to him on these secular questions, and thus incur a hindrance which will incapacitate him for his own Master's work, by undertaking work which belonged to other people. What is this but treason?

3. From the Scriptural idea of the Preacher's work, we may learn what is the true nature of that spirit in the Minister, which thinks it necessary to take a more ample range in preaching, than simply showing the people what the Bible means. How many are there, who would shrink back with dread, from what they consider so confined a walk of ministerial labor. "There is not interest enough! There is not variety enough! The Preacher would not have elbow-

room enough, to display his mental powers! It is too plodding and simple a business, for the theological philosopher! There would not be mental pabulum enough to feed the intellects of well-informed hearers!" And so, in some latitudes, we have, as a supplement to the leanness of the gospel, metaphysical discussions of the psychology of religion, or analytic dissections of the religious actings of the human soul. In others we have grandiloquent expositions of the moral system of the universe. In others, scholastic discussions of heads of divinity, splitting up "the bare bones of orthodoxy" into splinters as angular and dry as the gravel of the desert. Now what is all this but unbelief? Or else it is unbelief combined with ignorance of those treasures of heavenly wisdom which the word of God contains. God puts his sword into the Minister's hand; and tells him, that with this he shall conquer. He distrusts it, and endeavors to add something more trenchant. God tells him, "Take this die, and press it on the human soul: the result shall be the lovely image of God." He insists on re-carving it, before he will apply it. God says, in his infinite wisdom, "These are the truths which are quick and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow; and which are discerners of the thoughts and intents of the heart." "No," says the unbelieving servant, "they are dull; I can devise truths more piercing." This is the spirit of infidelity: and such preaching breeds infidelity. Such men are wholly unfit to do the work of that God, who "hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and base things of the world, and things which are despised, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are."

There have been two stages in the defection of the Church from the simplicity of the Gospel in past days. The first has been, when the Ministry have held to the truths of the Gospel system, but have insisted on arranging and presenting them, according to the methods of the fashionable, human philosophy of the day. The second, (and it is close to the first,) has been, when they have gone to human philosophy, both for their arrangement and their doctrines. The eras of efficiency and spiritual might, have always been prior to both stages: when the Ministry were content to set forth Bible truths in Bible aspects. The preaching of the primitive Church was simply scriptural and expository: and the word had free course, and was glorified. From Origen's day, we find the Christian Fathers constructing their discourses on the principles of philosophy, and a false, artificial rhetoric. Then began the season of shallow and heartless conversions, and of general corruption. And soon after, came Arianism, Prelacy, Neo-Platonism, Pelagianism, Popery. The same steps of decline were trodden again after the Reformation. Luther and Zwinglius, Farel and Calvin, Latimer and Knox, preached expository sermons, in which the word of God was simply set forth in

its applications to the soul; and the consequence was, a revival almost as wide as Christendom. In the next Century, succeeded the age of scholastic preaching and the bandying to and fro of Orthodox Symbols, under which the *odium theologicum* was far more cultivated than the love of God; and then came Rationalism. Many of us are now in the first stage of decline; and many more among us have illustrated its tendencies by passing down to the second. How many are the pulpits in New England, now Socinian, which fifty years ago rung with the metaphysics of religion! (*A la* Jonathan Edwards, as they vainly supposed. They forgot that Edwards wrote his "Freedom of the Will" for philosophers, and preached the simple Gospel for his flock.) This class of Preachers seems to have selected its favorite and prevalent topic, not by asking what is most nourishing to a believing soul, but "what is best adapted to display my powers of discussion, or of analysis?" And so, some have occupied the Sabbaths of their people with those polemics, by which the philosophic theologian has defended the outworks of Christianity, bordering on the foreign domain of human psychology, against infidel assailants. And thus they have committed the absurdity of *feeding* the flock inside the fold, with the bristling missiles which should have been hurled at the wolves without. Others of them have dissected, or sublimated, or evaporated, truths, which they should have embodied in the warm proportions of life; as though they would try to feed the sheep with an analysis of grass instead of the grass itself, tender, rich, and fresh from the green pastures; or would present a kind of chemical resolution into first elements, of skin, horns and hair, instead of pieces of the strong meat of the word itself.

4. If the business of the Preacher is simply to make the people see and feel what is in the word of God, preaching should usually be what is popularly known as "expository." In most cases, it is no fair exposition of the divine meaning, to single out a single proposition from its connexion, and fix the whole attention on it, to the exclusion of those truths which God has placed beside it. The Scriptures are a whole. To resume the illustration of the die; if we would produce a whole impression, we must impress the whole die. We shall never obtain a symmetrical image by detaching little fragments of a feature, a wreath, or a letter or two of the legend here and there, and enstamping them with great force. Passages of Scripture must be unfolded in their connexion. Yea, whole Books and Epistles must be so applied to the christian soul. And where we depart from this method, to preach topically upon a single proposition of the Scriptures, it should yet be a true exposition, an evolution of the meaning of the spirit in that text. There seem indeed to be but two classes of subjects, where such preaching is strictly consistent with the Gospel Minister's position. One is where a single proposition of the word of God contains a truth so fundamental, and so operative, that it justifies an unusual expenditure of time. Such are the cardinal doctrines of depravity, the new birth, faith,

repentance. The other class is composed of what we may call representative texts; where the single proposition contains the point of a discussion, or the *moral* of a story, stated for us by the Holy Ghost himself. Thus, Rom. 6: 1. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" states the subject of discussion of the whole 6th Chapter. We may take this one verse for our text. But in doing so, it becomes our duty to unfold the argument of the Apostle upon it, and not one of our own devising. The sermon is still a true exposition. So Luke 18: 7, sums up the instruction of the parable of the importunate widow. In preaching on it we expound that parable. The representative text may also be fairly used, though not in juxtaposition with the passages it represents; as John 17: 21, states what is unfolded in John 15: 1—8, I Cor. 12: 11—27, Eph. 4: 16, &c., &c. But still it is God's discussion which is expounded, and not man's.

---

#### BROWNSONIANA FOR APRIL 1855.

THE recent demand upon the few pages of the Critic which only can be devoted to the Papal Controversy, as well as our own want of leisure, have prevented us from calling the attention of our readers to the indications in Brownson's Review for April, of a "change come o'er the spirit of his dream." The relative position of this journal, in the American Papal Church—the apparent candor and intrepidity of Brownson's full acceptance of all the propositions logically involved in the most preposterous dogmas of Romanism, give him special claim to notice. Accordingly we have heretofore devoted a good many pages to the simple re-production of his views of the questions in controversy. We have preferred to give up the space to Brownson's statements of the Romish opinions, rather than to any response to him on our part; first, for the sake of gratifying the curiosity of our readers, with the somewhat rare phenomenon of a strait-forward and candid statement and exposition of Popery by a Papist, and secondly, because his attacks on Protestantism, need no response from us, since—however fierce and ingenious the attacks—they all seem to be based upon the fallacy, so natural to a quondam Yankee Unitarian, that Unitarianism is Protestantism,—or some important part of Protestantism, and that Unitarian Yankeedom is Protestant Christendom. And thirdly, because of the almost universal recognition of Brownson by the more intelligent of the Roman Catholic people, as well as of the Bishops in their letter, as par excellence, the "intrepid advocate" of the faith, and the opinion of his "intellectual gladiatorship," among the masses, which even in his lifetime seems to have become legendary.

Two matters in the April number of his Review have attracted our attention—and have so direct a bearing upon what we have heretofore said of him and cited from him, that we cannot refrain from some special notice of them. The one is, the manifest desire to absolve from responsibility for his opinions in any form, the Hierarchy who endorse the Review. The other, a tendency to “back down” from his own opinions—especially those heretofore cited so fully in the Critic—as manifest in his unjust complaints of misrepresentation and garbling on the part of writers who cite them. Of course we understand both these movements, as from no real change of opinion, or failure of the courage of the “intrepid advocate,”—but simply as a concession to the alarm of the weaker ones among the faithful. For he assures us in this very number, that he still, “just as much as Protestants, is disgusted with those Catholics who think to re-assure them (Protestants) by their big words about what they would do to the Pope if he should” &c. Indeed we are rather suspicious that these soothing concessions of the fierce champion, hitherto refused to the fears and remonstrances of the faithful, are even now made, rather for the benefit of political allies among the “Gentiles,”—as Brownson loves to call all without the pale of Holy Mother. We have recently had information from various parts of the country, that even the full extracts in the Critic, which Popery itself, though it had the hardihood, would not have the indiscretion to deny the fairness and fullness of, are declared by politicians who find them in their way, to be of no authority as expositions of Papal opinion,—but merely the eccentricities of Brownson and Blakewell of the Shepherd of the Valley !!

We propose to compare now the disavowals in his April Number with previous utterances—that our readers may judge for themselves. As to the pretended release of the Hierarchy from responsibility—we have the following note at the close of the April Number :

“\* \* We notice with pain a disposition among our Know-Nothing writers to hold the bishops whose names are on the cover of our Review, responsible for whatever sentiment or doctrine is found in our pages. This is wrong. The bishops have kindly encouraged the publication of our Review, having confidence in our loyal intentions, and believing it, upon the whole, useful to the cause of truth; but they *endorse* no sentiment or doctrine we advance. The whole responsibility rests upon the editor alone, and no bishop is responsible for anything that appears in our pages, and every one is just as free to controvert or condemn anything in our pages as he would be were his name not on the cover. We beg our opponents to bear this in mind, and to remember that our Review does not, in any sense whatever, speak by authority of the American hierarchy, and has no other indorser than its lay editor, who is free to write and publish, simply holding himself responsible to the proper authorities, what he pleases. The merit or the blame, if either, in all cases belongs to him, and the public cannot justly hold anybody else in any respect responsible. We commend this especially to the notice of Professor McClintock and Dr. Edward Beecher.”—(Br. Rev. Ap. '55, p. 280.)

Now we have a word or two to say here, with Dr. Brownson's permission—though we neither belong to the class of “Know Nothing writers,”—nor are called upon to take special notice as are Prof. McClintock and Dr. Edward Beecher. We have been in the habit

of reading Dr. Brownson regularly for four years, as of some authority, and of citing Dr. Brownson, perhaps more freely than either of those gentlemen, and as of high authority in the Politico-Papal controversy. If we have erred in so citing Dr. Brownson's Review, we shall show that it has been most innocently;—and that if we have been in error in this matter, it is because the confidence of ourselves and the public has been imposed upon, through the use of "letters of credit" in the commonly received form, which are so devised as to seem to be "letters of credit" whilst they are not. And therefore (if such figure be not too coarse for Dr. B's sublimated spiritualism) our "goods" in the shape of our subscription money,—given as we supposed for pages of reputable and current Popery,—not for the whimsies of a dishonored ecclesiastical Bankrupt—have been "obtained from us on false pretences."

Now in regard to this advertisement—we must be allowed to be a little inquisitive. If we have been deceived once by the letter of the Bishops on the cover—our weakness must be borne with, if we are somewhat suspicious of the note of Dr. Brownson inside of the cover. We are free to say we have more faith in Dr. Brownson's directness of speech and honesty, than of all the Bishops together who sign his letter—and would take his word quite as readily as their joint bond. But this note on page 280, happens to be, not only, as we take it, in face of the Bishop's letter of approbation on the cover, but against the "intrepid" Dr. Brownson himself, whom we have learned to admire somewhat in the dozen or more preceding numbers of the Review. It means nothing—or it is false. If its intent is, simply to say that Dr. Brownson's writings in the Review, are not of the authority of Dogmas of Papal faith,—it means nothing; for we presume that among all the Know Nothing writers in America, no one ever said or thought that Dr. Brownson's utterances were dogma. Or if its intent is, that Dr. Brownson's utterances have no official, ecclesiastical character, as a Pastoral letter,—it means again nothing—for nobody ever supposed they had any such character. But if its intent is, to say that the Bishops have not endorsed the writings of Dr. Brownson, in so far as to give them a fair current representation, as expositions of Roman Catholic *opinions*, it is utterly preposterous. "They *endorse* no sentiment or doctrine we advance!" True, neither does a "letter of credit" *endorse* specifically every particular note which a merchant gives for the goods he purchases. But for all that, the seller of the goods does not consider that "the whole responsibility rests upon the [purchaser of the goods] *alone*"—and that the purchaser "does not *in any sense whatever* [purchase] on the authority of" the giver of his letter of credit. The "Union" even in the days of Thomas Ritchie, did not speak by the *authority* of the Democratic party, or directly by the authority of the Democratic administration—yet "the public" did justly hold the *Democratic party* responsible in no low degree, for such political opinions as the "Union" continually urged and defended as Democratic doctrines. So of a score of parallel cases.

But even this case falls far below the formal letter of approbation of the Bishops—in the degree of endorsement. For as we shall now show, Dr. Brownson has himself declared, over and over, that *his opinions* generally, as well as his work of publishing a Review, have every possible endorsement needful, to give them currency, as the Roman Catholic opinions. Nay, that he has been placed where he is by “the proper authority.” Thus he tells us in January, 1854, page 100—101.

“These were the principles *prescribed to us for our guidance* when we commenced this Review as a Catholic Review, and on these principles we have endeavored to conduct it to the best of our ability. The age is latitudinarian, and thinks one religion, unless it be the Catholic, as good as another, because it believes in none, &c.”—(Br. Rev. Jan. '54, p. 100—101.)

So again in October, 1854, page 537.

“When we found ourselves providentially placed at the head of a Catholic Quarterly Review, we were almost totally unacquainted with the Catholic population of the country, &c., &c. Our position was new and strange, and what for any one would have been under any circumstances a difficult task, was more than doubly difficult for us. We felt our incompetency, but we felt that we had been placed by LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY in the position we held, and we looked for help to the only Source from which real help ever comes. The Bishop of Boston and his clergy treated us with great indulgence, and took unwearied pains to instruct us, and to aid us to think and speak as a Catholic, and we got on perhaps as well as could have been reasonably expected.”

“In May of the same year, the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States, who had met in council at Baltimore, generously addressed us a letter of approbation and encouragement.”—(Br. Rev. Oct. '54, p. 537.)

Moreover he specifically denies the right of a public Papal Journalist to publish without sanction, such opinions.

“Journalists are very prone to regard themselves as overseers of the Church, and as invested with a supervision of all orders of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But we need not say, that they have no authority in the Church, they are as journalists neither pastors nor doctors, and that our Lord has assigned them no place in the government of his spiritual kingdom on earth. *We have no right to publish a single word on religious and ecclesiastical matters without the permission of our ordinary, and even with that permission we should never publish any thing without the supervision of one who has authority to teach.* If we forget this, and assume to ourselves the right to give freely, at our own pleasure, our own views of the government or administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and to interpret Catholic doctrines according to our own private judgment, all our zeal, all our good intentions, and all our labors in defending religion and society against avowed enemies, even granting that we possess the most profound reverence for the Pope, will make but poor amends for the internal disorders we shall create, and the scandals we shall occasion.”—(Br. Rev. April '53, p. 264—'5.)

Nay, not only have we been assured that the Bishop and Archbishops, have endorsed him but the *Pope himself*. Hear Dr. Brownson's own glowing account of his exalted honor, even from the Pope. We give the matter as full as possible.

“Last December we gave to the Bishop of Boston a set of the volumes of the Review from the commencement, with the request that he would in our name lay them at the feet of the Holy Father, as a public token of our filial devotion and unreserved submission to the Apostolic See, and of our profound veneration of the person of the reigning Pontiff. These volumes, together with a letter from us, the Bishop on his last visit to Rome was so kind as to present to the Holy Father, who has deigned to acknowledge their reception in the most gracious and benignant terms. We hope we shall be pardoned for laying his Brief, with a translation, before our readers.”

“Beloved son, health and apostolical benediction. Our venerable brother, John Bishop of Boston, brought to us your letter of the 29th of last December, in which you offered us several works written by you. He spoke to us with merited praise of those

name books of yours, and therefore we are in a greater degree rejoiced and consoled by your sentiment of truly filial devotion, obedience, and piety towards us, and this Holy See, which your letter expresses throughout. With our suppliant vows and prayers we beseech the God of Mercies and Father of lights that with his celestial protection he may cherish and guard these sentiments, which we trust you will always preserve. And as a token of our so great benignity, and as a pledge of our gratitude to you for the service you have done us, we add our apostolical benediction, which we lovingly impart, with the poured forth affection of our paternal heart, to you yourself, beloved son, and to your whole family.

“Given at St. Peter’s at Rome, on the 20th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1854, and the eighth year of our Pontificate.

(Signed,)

PIUS IX. *Pope.*”

This is indeed no formal approbation of our Review, and no such approbation was deserved or expected; but it is *more than a simple acknowledgement* of the reception of the volumes and accompanying letter.”—(Br. Rev. Oct. '54, p. 538, '9.)

And then to crown all, in this same article, on page 540, Dr. Brownson clearly indicates that he is perfectly aware that the letter of approbation of the Bishops stands good against every thing else, save a *recall of the approbation*, and therefore, of course, stands good against the advertisement of April, 1855. When he is pleading his defence against the timid Catholics who abuse him for his intrepidity—when, as he tells us on page 539, “We have been assailed within the last few months with a storm of indignation from the Catholic press”—he not only quotes upon his Catholic revilers the above letter of the Pope, but tells them also:

“Because as yet no Bishop in the country has signified to us the withdrawal of the approbation heretofore given, and not a subscriber has asked us to erase his name from our subscription list in consequence of the excitement against us. On the other hand, the clamor raised against us has called forth numerous private letters expressing their full approbation of our course, and their cordial sympathy with us.”—(Br. Rev. Oct. '54, p. 540.)

Now we leave it to our readers and the public, to construe for themselves the meaning of this advertisement, according to these other declarations, and to judge how far they may confide in the assurances of such as tell them “Brownson is of no authority.” If a man’s own declaration, backed by the Hierarchy and then by the Pope, is of no force, how shall we get authority for a writer?

The other matter which has attracted our attention in the April Number, is a paragraph on page 174, in the Review of Rev. Rufus W. Clark’s “Romanism in America;” in which, referring to certain citations, in Mr. Clark’s book, from American Papal writers, on the subject of Religious Liberty and the power of the Pope, Mr. Brownson says:

“The authorities which the author here cites to sustain his accusation against the Church are all pure inventions, if not by him, by some of his friends. The pretended extract from the *Shepherd of the Valley* consists of certain sentences detached from their original connection, and so moulded together as to express a meaning never intended by the writer, and the reverse of the meaning he plainly expressed in the article from which they are culled.”

“The first passage from our Review is only a part of a sentence, and is made to convey a meaning which, in the very connection in which the words are found, we expressly deny. For the opinion we expressed, whatever it was, was expressed as our private opinion, not as a Catholic dogma, and whatever we meant by the *temporal* power of the Pope, it is well known to our readers that we have asserted for him as vicar of Jesus Christ no temporal or civil jurisdiction, outside of the Ecclesiastical States; that we fully recognize the distinction of the two powers, the autonomy of the

state, and the independence and supremacy of the temporal authority in its own order."—(Br. Rev. April '55, p. 174.)

The two citations by Mr. Clark, here referred to and pronounced pure inventions, are the following from Mr. Clark's book, cited by the writer as on pages 76 and 79 of the book :

"Hear, then, the language used by the 'Shepherd of the Valley,' November 23, 1851: 'The Church is of necessity intolerant. Heresy she endures when and where she must; but she hates it and directs all her energies to its destruction. If Catholics ever gain an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So our enemies say. So we believe.'"

"Listen to the words of Brownson's Review, which is the acknowledged organ of Romanism in this country, and is indorsed by nearly the whole Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States. Indeed, Mr. Brownson has asserted that he writes nothing without the sanction of his bishop. On the subject of the Pope's authority, he says, in his Review for 1854, page 57: 'We believe in the direct temporal authority of the Pope, as vicar of Jesus Christ on earth.' 'The Church (in the person of the Pope) bears, by divine right, both swords (temporal and spiritual.) The temporal sovereign holds it [that is, the temporal sword,] to be exercised under her directions.'"—(Br. Rev. April '55, p. 173.)

Now it so happens that we have some responsibility for the citation, also, of the Shepherd of the Valley's famous article, and these sentences from Dr. Brownson. We intend here, by no means, to defend Mr. Clark's citations as full enough and fair enough, when a man has the full space which a book offers for full citations. Moreover, it is manifest that Mr. Clark, from sheer indolence, or other cause, instead of quoting from original sources as any man that troubles the public with a book on any subject should do—has evidently quoted these passages from the speech of Rev. Stuart Robinson, at a public meeting in New York, held January 26, 1854. Now whilst, for want of space, in making a speech, it cannot be expected that a speaker can cite authorities otherwise than very briefly—if only he cite correctly as far as he goes, it by no means follows that an author making a book—with full space to quote—is justifiable in quoting second-handed, the fragments from a speech. We leave Mr. Clark, therefore, in this far, to the tender mercies of Dr. Brownson. We shall be glad to see this patent method of book-making, so popular in New England—this "*easy way to authorship*," rebuked as it ought to be. But when it comes to the declaration that Mr. Clark's citations in the two instances mentioned are "*pure invention*" by him, or some of his friends, we have a word to say. First, that the citation from the Shepherd of the Valley, as given by Mr. Clark, from Mr. Robinson's speech, though for the reason already intimated, consisting of sentences detached from their original connection, are *not* "*so moulded together as to express a meaning never intended by the writer.*" It so happens that the writer himself goes on to expound more fully his own meaning, as may be seen from the paragraph from the Shepherd of the Valley, of November 23, 1851, and we ask our readers to compare this full statement of his meaning by the writer himself, with the brief citation.

"If the Catholics ever gain—which they surely will do, though at a distant day—an immense numerical superiority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So say our enemies. So we believe. But in what sense do we believe it? In what sense

are we the advocates of religious intolerance? In the sense in which the enemies of the Church understand the word? By no means. We simply mean, that a Christian will not consider the ridicule of Christianity, the denial of its fundamental truths, of the immortality of the soul and the existence of God; the overthrow of all morality, matters beneath their notice and condemnation; *that the foundation will be laid for a legislation which shall restrain the propagation of certain doctrines*; that men will no longer be permitted to attack dogmas with which morality is inseparably connected; that the State will take its proper position as ancillary to the Church. It is useless to disguise this fact; every man's reason will tell him that it is true, and every Catholic will feel that he wishes that time were come, even whilst he wastes his breath in empty praise of liberty of speech. This is our answer to the attacks which have been made upon us by the religious press; we avow it as our intimate conviction that Religious Liberty, as at present understood, is inconsistent with the prevalence of any particular form of belief, and with the prevalence of Infidelity itself.

"We have said that we are not the advocate of religious freedom, and we repeat it, we are not. The liberty to believe contrary to the teachings of the Church, is the liberty to believe a lie; the liberty to think otherwise than as she permits, is the liberty to abuse the mind and pollute the imagination; from such liberty may we and those we love at all times be preserved."

This citation is from a copy of the Shepherd of the Valley's article as republished in full, in the St. Louis Intelligencer, during a controversy carried on between that paper and the Shepherd in 1853. Dr. Brownson, however, does not deny the publication of such an article, but merely declares the extract to consist of detached sentences, &c. We confess to some amazement, and we think our readers will sympathize with us, when they compare the detached sentences with the avowed explanation of the meaning of the author as given in the fuller extract just quoted. But what is more amazing, is that Dr. Brownson should except to the sentiment attributed in Mr. Clark's citation,—as our readers will perceive on reading the following, on the same subject from Dr. Brownson himself :

"All the rights the *sects* have or can have are derived from the State, and rest on expediency. As they have in their character of sects, hostile to the true religion, no rights under the law of nature or the law of God, they are neither wronged nor deprived of liberty if the State refuses to grant them any rights at all."—(Br. Rev. Oct. '52, p. 456.)

Nor are we less surprised at the cool impudence—if it be not the un-Brownson-like *craw-fishing*—of the denial of Mr. Clark's citation from Brownson's Review—which consists of two passages, made one, merely by Mr. Clark's blundering second-hand quotation of them from the speech, in which they are cited correctly, and simply in proof of the *opinion* American Journals teach, in which case Dr. Brownson's caveat which applies only to one of the two at least, has no force. We quote the two passages in full, that our readers may see the Dr.'s feat of "Gladiatorship," in the way of *dodging* :

"There have been some recent decisions and condemnations of Gallican works, at Rome, which may be thought to put a new face on the question, and to raise that doctrine to the rank of a *sententia Ecclesie* rather than of a *sententia in Ecclesia*. But however this may be, M. Gosselin, in so far as his theory excludes the temporal authority, at least indirect, of the Church, by divine right, cannot make it incumbent upon us to accept it. If he is free to assert, we are equally free to deny it. Rome has never been partial to it, and has shown, on more occasions than one, what she thinks of it. We do not believe it. We believe, we have been forced to believe, after the fullest investigation we have been able to make of the subject, the direct temporal authority of the Pope, as Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. We do not put this forth as Catholic dogma, nor have we ever insisted on it in our pages, *but we do believe Catho-*

*lic dogma requires us to assert at least, the indirect power contended for by Bellarmine and Suarez, unless we would forego our logic.*"—(Br. Rev. Jan. '54, p. 88.)

"All the arguments that can be adduced amount to nothing, for, if anything is certain, it is that Christ has instituted his Church to govern all men and nations according to his law, which she is alone competent to interpret and apply. We only ask our readers to bear in mind, that the Church is not herself the civil authority, and that, though she possesses the temporal authority *in ralice*, she ordinarily governs the temporal sovereign. She bears by divine right both swords, but she exercises the temporal sword by the hand of the prince or magistrate. The temporal sovereign holds it subject to her order, to be exercised in her service, under her direction. This is the normal order, and it is only an unmanly fear of offending, or an undue desire to please, secular governments, that has ever led any intelligent Christian to concede the contrary. That the Church has always been able to exercise her rightful supremacy, or that secular governments have in general shown themselves to be her obedient children we are far from pretending; but we owe it to her and to them to assert her rights and their duties, and perhaps in doing so we may aid in preparing a better future, and do something to enable her to check the reign of political atheism, and to save society, now threatened at once by both despotism and anarchy from utter dissolution."—(Br. Rev. Jan. '53, p. 60.)

It will be seen that so far from being "pure *invention*," the citations quoted by Mr. Clark are not only fair as to the spirit of them, but not even up to the full force of the paragraph quoted from. But what will our readers say to the following paragraph even from this April No. '55?

"However this may be, the Protestant has the right to hold us to the defence of the Papacy as defended by Bellarmine, because a Catholic, *may* hold Bellarmine's doctrine without suspicion of heterodoxy, and no Catholic has the right to insist that Protestants shall take Bossuet's, or even Fenelon's, as the only approved Catholic doctrine. All a Catholic can say to a Protestant is, a man *may* be a Catholic without holding that the authority exercised by Popes and Councils over temporal sovereigns in the Middle Ages was an authority inherent in the Papacy, but he cannot tell him, that to be a Catholic one *must* so hold. So, whether we are Gallicans or Ultramontanists, Protestants have the right, if they choose, to hold us to the defence of the Papacy on Ultramontane principles, and we must be prepared always so to defend it, till we are able to declare by authority that those principles are heterodox."—(Br. Rev. April '55, p. 257.)

One thing has struck us as very remarkable in all these denials of authorities cited; viz, that those who deny, are never ready to *produce the document* quoted from and *show that the passage* is not there, or if there, that it is falsely quoted. We have heard, indirectly, of some of the political Journals in the West, declaring on the authority of Papal dignitaries, that even our own full citations in the Critic, were garbled or "bogus" documents! Now it is to be presumed, that such Papal dignitaries have ready access to the Roman Catholic Journals. Could they not favor the Editors whom they thus authorize to pronounce such citations forgeries, or garbled, with the documents from which the citations profess to come? We cite page and dates carefully, they can easily expose us.

One other paragraph in this April Number of Dr. Brownson's has struck us as rather singular, when compared with some of his former utterances. We refer to the following triumphant query on page 269, in the Review of Dr. Beecher:

"If they can, by appeals to reason, history, and Scripture, convince the American people that Catholicity is from God, who has the right to complain? Reason, history, and Scripture are open to you to use against them, if you choose. They are

willing to meet you on fair and equal terms before the American public, and if you are unwilling to meet them on the same terms, or, so meeting them, are worsted, is this their fault?"—(Br. Rev. April '55, p. 269.)

Now we simply cite from the same writer, the following from Brownson's Review, July '52, page 286 :

"There is no Catholic dogma, taken apart from the authority of the Church, that is defensible. Deny or waive the commission of the Church, from God to teach, therefore her presence as infallible teacher, and there is nothing that she teaches us of faith that a wise man will undertake either to deny or to defend. To waive that authority, and to descend into the arena to combat with Protestants, is to concede them in the outset all they contend for, namely, the possibility of determining what is Christian faith without an infallible church. We can then combat only with arms borrowed from the Scriptures and the Fathers, and if with such arms we combat them successfully, the victory inures to them, not to us. We defeat ourselves by our very success, for our doctrine is, that, without the infallible authority of the Church, Christian faith is not determinable. We can, in our controversies with Protestants, appeal to the Scriptures and to the Fathers only to prove what the Church has always believed and taught as Christian faith; but unless the Church is already conceded to be infallible in believing and teaching, this does nothing to settle the question as to what really is Christian faith."—(Br. Rev. July '52, p. 286, '7.)

Verily, with all our faith in Dr. Brownson, we begin to think as little of his infallibility, or his "semper et ubique idem," as of his Pope's!

Having thus, incidentally given our readers an insight into the position of the "intrepid advocate," we cannot resist the desire to favor them farther with the solution of the mystery that puzzles so many—how Brownson, the Unitarian, became a Romanist. The conversion is a most philosophical one—according to his own account of it—which we append :

"The doctrine of the solidarity and communion of the race, which Leroux makes the basis of his socialism and the principle of his explanation of Christianity, has something which, perhaps, a Christian may, and even must, accept. If we may be permitted to refer to our personal experience, we must say that it was through that doctrine, as set forth by Leroux in his work on Humanity, that by the grace of God we were led to the Catholic Church; and we may add, that the same was true of several of our friends, one at least of whom is now a most worthy member of the Catholic priesthood, and one of the most indefatigable and successful Catholic missionaries in the country. We thought we saw a great and important truth in the doctrine, but also that, as Leroux laid it down, it was incomplete; and if theoretically and practically completed anywhere, it must be in the Catholic Church. We seized the doctrine with our accustomed ardor, and, developing it in our own way, found ourselves knocking at the door of the Church, and demanding entrance. Having been admitted into the Church, and commenced the study of Catholic theology in the scholastic authors, in whom we found nothing which seemed to us a recognition of it, we felt that it was our duty to waive its public consideration till we could have time and opportunity of re-examining it in the light of Catholic faith. We saw at once that the doctrine pertained to an order of thought far below Catholic dogma, and that we had erred in supposing it to be the explication and expression of the real sense of the Catholic mysteries; but how far it was or was not in harmony with them, we felt unable to say. It was a problem to be solved, and not by us till we had become somewhat more familiar than we were at the time with Catholic theology. The form under which we had entertained it was, in regard to scholastic theology, a novelty, and therefore to be suspected. It might conceal an error, and even dangerous error. It was certainly prudent, nay, it was our duty, not to insist on it, and to be content with using the language, arguments, and illustrations which we knew to be safe. Hence the trains of thought with which we made our readers so familiar during our transition state, and which had played so important a part in the process of our conversion, were suddenly interrupted the moment we entered the Church and began to write as a Catholic. They who had watched our course, and taken some interest in our progress from a

low form of rationalism to Catholicity, were unable to trace in our writings any continuity of thought between what was published the day before we entered the Church and what we wrote and published the day after. So abrupt and complete a change seemed to them inexplicable on any rational principles, and was of course ascribed to our fickleness, or to our no longer being suffered to have a mind of our own. People outside of the Church lost confidence in us, and if they continued to read us at all, it was mainly to amuse themselves with what they were pleased to look upon as our "feats of intellectual gladiatorship." This of course had its unpleasantness and its inconveniences, but it was not unendurable.

But we may say now, after more than ten years of silent thought and reflection on the subject, that, though not free from trifling errors, and much exaggerated as to their importance in our own mind, the principles which we learned from Leroux and developed and applied in our own way were substantially true, and we can, without lesion to our Catholicity, resume the train of thought which appeared to be so abruptly terminated on our entering the Church."—(Br. Rev. April '55, p. 201, '2.)

---

### THE CRITIC AND ITS CENSORS.

---

It has been our fortune from the commencement of our enterprise, to receive rather an unusual amount of the attentions, and awaken the anxieties of that very respectable class of men, who seem to regard it as their special calling, to guard the Church against all such sceptics, as doubt even that "whatever is, is right."

Had our censors chosen, either to accept of our own declaration of what we proposed to do just as we made it, or to have waited patiently to see what we actually should do, they might have spared themselves and some of their too credulous disciples, some unnecessary anxiety about the welfare of the Church, which we doubt not they sincerely love. But, determining that we must mean more than appeared in our own words, and apparently afraid to wait, till we should have space enough to give utterance to our views, lest meantime some evil should befall the Church,—they seemed to think it safest on the whole, to condemn us at the outset, and warn Presbyterians to be upon their guard.

At length we have the opportunity, at least so far as six numbers—a half-year's work—can furnish an opportunity, of comparing what we have done, with what we proposed to do. We venture to ask of all fair minded men, a single matter-of-fact comparison of what we proposed to do, and what we have done so far, on the one hand, with what, on the other hand, we have been represented as aiming at, and actually doing, by those who have so kindly volunteered to protect the Church against us.

At the outset of our career, we set forth, as we thought, plainly and fully, the motives which actuated us, and the objects we proposed to accomplish. It may be allowable here to re-state the substance of the announcement then made:

"If, in some of its aspects, our plan seems to be a novelty, it is to be borne in mind that the immense expansion of the Presbyterian body, and of the country at large, has placed the church in this country in novel circumstances. The necessity for a fuller and more general understanding of our principles, as a church, must obviously increase, and the proper application of these principles must become more and more important as the field of the church widens and embraces new and diversified interests."

"We propose a journal, which, whilst it shall aim to occupy, in common with others, the general field of doctrinal truth and religious literature, shall be more distinctively for the discussion and elucidation of the principles of Presbyterianism, as they bear upon the efforts and measures of the church for her own expansion."

"We offer our paper by no means as the rival of any of them for public patronage."

"It may be suggested further, that the region of inquiry, which it is a prominent object of this paper to aid in exploring—whether as regards the abstract theoretical principles relating to the nature and functions of the church, or the concrete forms of them embodied in her ecclesiastical acts, has not hitherto attracted the attention which its importance deserves."

"Though the controversies of twenty years past have very strongly and clearly developed many of the chief points in the doctrine and order of the Presbyterian system—yet the outworking of the Presbyterian polity so far as it relates to the measures of the church for her own expansion, have received little attention. Under the pressure of strong excitement in 1837 and 1838, forced into a system of measures for church expansion, devised, indeed, by wise and great men, but still, hastily devised, in the very nature of the case; since that time constantly employed in giving the system more efficiency; to suppose these measures perfect and in need of no farther examination, would be to claim for their originators, in effect, more than human foresight, and to suppose a direct Divine inspiration in the church ever since."

"As regards the particular views of church affairs to be advocated, and the tone and spirit of our Journal, we have little to say. Considering that the parties to this work are widely scattered through four or five Synods, and perhaps differing among themselves on most of the questions which from time to time divide the opinion of our body, we can hardly be expected to speak very definitely. We therefore say, generally, that it shall be our aim in all cases that may arise, to advocate "strict construction" of the powers conferred by the Constitution on the Judicatories of the church, and strict adherence to the provisions of our standard in all ecclesiastical measures."

"We shall by no means expect to confine ourselves to subjects involving these questions alone, but to illustrate and defend, as against all corresponding forms of error, the simplicity, the purity, and the peculiar adaptation to the American people, of the Presbyterian doctrine and polity. Our great practical aim shall be to set forth the duty and the peculiar obligation resting upon the office-bearers and leaders of our church, to evince in all their official acts, and promote by their personal influence intelligent, manly, and liberal views of the duties and responsibilities of the American church. As touching the spirit and tone which shall characterize the paper, we would here express, once for all, our high regard and strong fraternal feeling for all earnest-minded and sincere christian people of whatever name, in general, and for all Presbyterian people in particular. Also our high appreciation generally, of the learning, wisdom and piety of the many eminent men whom the church and the christian public honor and confide in. We are proud of our church, and of the great number of excellent and eminent men in it. And this expression of our heart's esteem and good will we desire to be taken once for all, as it will illy comport with our very restricted limits—and they possibly not paid for—to preface our every strong dissent from the opinion of others with long preliminary declarations of our exalted opinion of the men personally. We are free to confess, moreover, that it comports as little with our ideas of good taste—probably from our association of this style of controversy with a school of men who have given the church trouble in time past, and whose peculiar taste for very loving and brotherly prefaces to very un-brotherly insinuations, we have admired as little as their theology. We desire to speak and to be spoken of, simply in the open, manly, dignified tone that is becoming christian gentlemen."

"We have adopted a title simply expressive of our distinctive aim. The too common association with the word "Critic" of an assuming, cynical, fault-finding spirit, was felt to be an objection—but in the true and proper sense of "Critic," as a "discerner," a "discriminator," and therefore a "Judge," it describes our chief purpose more clearly than any other word—while at the same time, our title "Review," expresses the incidental purpose."

"We have a common aim in this, our work, and a common end to accomplish. Yet each writer is responsible for himself only. The peculiar views of the individual parties to the enterprise, touching questions which at present may divide the church, are not known one to the other. No member of the association possibly may agree with all that shall be published in any one number. We claim to be the organ of no particular ecclesiastical party in the sense of advocating one particular line of measures."

“Our aim is, by discussion and, if need be, by controversy, to explain and vindicate the great principles of Christianity, with special reference to the life, posture and active operations of the Presbyterian Church. So far as bitterness and asperity may be mingled with our work : so far as we may fall, through the infirmity and sinfulness of our nature, into the error of those sons of thunder, who, in their ignorance of “what manner of spirit they were of;” would fain have invoked the fire of heaven upon the enemies of their meek and lowly master; so far we trust we shall be willing to submit to the admonition of our brethren, while we ask forgiveness of Him who spareth us “as a father spareth his own son that serveth him.” It is our desire, however, and by the help of God we hope to be able to abstain from giving just occasion of offence to any human being, and, particularly, to any who love our common Lord. We cannot promise not to be in earnest and, it may be vehement: but we trust, it will be, according to a distinction which has been made, the vehemence of *sentiment*, not the vehemence of *passion*. The torch shall be shook only that it may shine.”

In pursuance of the scheme here laid down, we have published—aside from the minor articles in our Exchange—some forty short articles, by eleven writers:—three on the subject of Seminaries and Education;—three on the offices of the Ruling Elder and the Deacon;—eight on subjects relating to the rights, privileges and duties of Church members;—eight on the Papal, Prelatical and New School Controversies;—three on the Theory of the Nature and Powers of the Church;—four on the Boards of the Church;—half a score on topics of Abstract Theology and Metaphysics, and on miscellaneous topics.

With this brief recapitulation of the manner in which we have executed, so far, our proposed work, we are prepared to consider the various grounds of objection, which have been raised against us.

First, as to the charge insinuated in so many forms, as well as openly proclaimed on the floor of the Assembly, that the “Critic” has been established to make war upon our Boards—it is very obvious that in that case we have wonderfully failed in singleness of purpose. Even on the supposition, that, in face of our plainly declared intentions in the outset, such a secret purpose has been among our chief purposes, we have certainly given a most remarkable prominence to incidental topics. As, however, this view of our aims, seems to be so pertinaciously insisted on, in spite of our disavowals, we deem it worth while to give it special attention. In the first place, then, and chiefly, the recent revival of controversy concerning the Boards, did not originate with the “Critic,” nor by the spontaneous movement of any one connected with the “Critic.” It was begun before this journal was projected, and that too upon the part of those who do not agree with the views of the “Critic,” and was simply transferred to our pages. For it must be borne in mind that even the article republished in the “Critic,” on the subject of the Boards, is in the nature of a formal reply and defence, against misrepresentations in the “Biblical Repertory,” and would have been made if the “Critic” had never been established. In the following singular paragraphs is the real origin of this whole controversy :

“Mr. Stuart Robinson and Mr. Armstrong opposed the adoption of the above paper, and the latter moved a substitute, which was substantially the report of the minority. Both these gentlemen expressed the opinion, that there was a growing dissatisfaction with the working of our Boards. It was time, Mr. Robinson thought, to consider whether there was not a more excellent way. \* \* \* Mr. Comfort of Virginia, made a very forcible speech in defence of the Boards, denying, in behalf of the laity, any of the feelings of dissatisfaction, which a few of the ministers seemed to entertain. Dr. Spring spoke with much effect on the same side. Dr. Musgrave, Secretary of the Board, closed the debate by one of the ablest and most effective speeches delivered on the floor of the Assembly for a long time. The paper given above, was then adopted with scarce a

show of opposition. The sense of the House was so strongly evinced in favor of the Boards, and in opposition to mere speculative objections to their existence, that we presume the controversy will not be renewed. It seems indeed unworthy of debate, whether the body appointed to carry on our benevolent operations, be called a Committee, and be appointed by the Assembly, or whether it be called a Board. In the one case it would be a small body,—in the other, large. The former method has the advantage of simplicity, but the latter has considerations in its favor which are not likely to lose their influence on the Church. In the first place, they have been incorporated in our policy for years. \* \* \* In the second place, they are a necessary intermediate agency between the Assembly and its Executive officers. The Assembly cannot conduct its Theological Seminaries otherwise than through the intervention of a Board, \* \* \* neither can it otherwise conduct its Educational and Missionary operations. \* \* \* In a small, compact body, like the Church of Scotland, with a permanent commission, to refer to in every emergency, it may do for the Assembly to conduct all its operations by simple Committees. \* \* \* In the third place, the abolition of the Boards would throw a responsibility and power on the Executive Committees and Secretaries, which they ought not to be entrusted with. Their accountability to a body like the General Assembly, which, from its nature, is incapable of efficient inspection, would be merely nominal. The whole work would really be in the hands of a very few men, without any real supervision and control. Our complaints against the management of the American Home Missionary Society in New York, should make us sensible that any irresponsible power is a dangerous thing. And not to prolong an unnecessary discussion, it may be remarked that our Boards serve the purpose of break-waters. \* \* \* As to the objection that the Scriptures know nothing of Boards, that they are not Church Courts, &c., we would only say, this is the *jus divinum* theory in its dotage. God has not sent his church into the world, as an infant in its swaddling clothes, without liberty of action; he has given her a work to do, which requires the free use of her limbs; and it will be found hard work to bind her with split hairs.”—(Bib. Rep., July, 1854, pp. 559—’60—’61.)

No one who will take the trouble to consider this paragraph attentively, in connection with the circumstances which furnished the occasion for it, will be much surprised that one of the persons here referred to, as having assailed the Boards with “speculative objections to their existence,” should feel unwilling to allow this statement from such a quarter to pass unchallenged, especially so, if, so far from warring against their very existence, he did nothing more than propose an inquiry relative to the expediency of simplifying their structure, and changing somewhat the location of some of them. Nor is it wonderful, that the views here set forth, touching the necessity of something more than a committee acting ecclesiastically;—of the practical irresponsibility of the Boards to the Assembly;—of the relation of the Church under her great commission, to the work of missions, as no more direct than her relation to the matter of teaching young men Hebrew, or technical theology;—of the *jus divinum* theory of the Church, that demands a scripture warrant for all agencies employed by the Church, as a matter to be scoffed at;—of a power claimed for the Church, of ordaining—not indeed “rites and ceremonies,” but what is far more dangerous, a power to ordain, as of herself, agencies for doing her divinely appointed work;—that all this should seem to him to demand the most serious attention: especially so, seeing that these views came from a quarter to which the Church has been accustomed to look, with almost unlimited confidence, for orthodox views of the nature and duties of the Church, and as the hypothetical dangers herein admitted in regard to irresponsible power, are conditioned on what are actual, rather than supposable facts, in regard to the Boards. It is to be borne in mind then, that the article on the Boards of the Church, which gave rise to so much unkind remark, was not a spontaneous assault upon the Boards at all, but a defence and remon-

strance against such an exposition of the views, both of the advocates of inquiry concerning the Boards, and of the Assembly of 1854. It ought to be borne in mind also, that the suggestions in that article, touching the defects in the working of the Philadelphia Boards, instead of being volunteered in a fault-finding spirit, were in response to challenges thrown out and reiterated, over and over again,—“why are not the defects in the working of the Boards pointed out?” The author of that article, being called upon for candid criticism, something after the fashion, and in the spirit in which a certain hero of an old fashioned story, was called upon for free and candid criticism upon his master, the Bishop’s sermon, was guilty simply of that hero’s blundering simplicity, in responding according to request, and got for his pains that hero’s reward! The subsequent papers on this subject in the “Critic,” were all of them the natural and necessary out-growth from the article of the “Repertory” also. The indignation of the parties who called so boldly, and in apparent candor, for the pointing out of defects, being kindled at the too satisfactory response to the call, the author of the response was held up to the Church, as a reviler of faithful public servants, and in self-defence, he was compelled to *prove true* specifically and in detail, that which he at first delicately asserted in most general terms, for the very purpose of saving the personal feelings of those, whose acts were the subject of discussion. This, we take it, will be found to be the real history of the controversy, by all who will take the trouble impartially to inquire into it.

That the authors of the articles in the “Critic” on this subject, could not possibly be moved to write, as they have done, by any of the absurd reasons which seem to be insinuated in much that is said of them, is clearly manifest, from their peculiar relations to the whole matter. It cannot be, that they aim to embarrass the officers of the Boards in this round-about way, since for those officers longest in the service, and therefore most to blame, if the defects in the working of the Boards be attributed to them, the writers in the “Critic” are publicly known to entertain the very highest esteem personally, and a degree of confidence in their official integrity, which all the votes of confidence that the General Assembly could enact, could not increase.

That these two writers are not visionary and impracticable theorists on the subject,—ready to sacrifice substantial, practical good, for the sake of an abstraction, ought to be very manifest from the fact that they have each, in their way, been practical workers in the Church. That a passion for notoriety in the Church, especially of this cheap kind, could not be the inciting cause, is most singularly manifest in the case of one of them, who, as the “author of the Act and Testimony,” has surely achieved reputation enough among Presbyterians of both names, to satisfy the ambition of any reasonable man.

But enough on this head. We would say a word, touching another charge against us:—the vagueness and indefiniteness of our statements, particularly in reference to what is practically wrong in the Boards, and how it should be righted. To this charge we cannot respond better, than to cite a specimen of the style in which these things have been said in the “Critic:”

“We say the church is the *agent* of God to do his work : to do it—not to see it done : to do his work, and no other work. And this is of *Faith* ; and relates to every thing that is of Faith ; and relates to nothing else. Our brethren agree not

with this. They appear to say, in effect, the church is the counsellor of God; and as such, may omit to do his work—if she only sees that it is done; may contrive methods, to that end, never appointed by him; may give herself to work that is not of Faith—nor addressed to Faith. Here in its last analysis, is the difference between us. A difference radical in itself,—and fatal except only that they say *may*, while we say *must*. In its practical results—it is a difference presenting on one side, in the fruits which the church will bring forth, the precise measure of her ability and her piety combined; on the other side, the ever-fluctuating results of human contrivances acting and reacting upon the spiritual life of the church. A difference in its theoretical results on the one hand, planting the church in her Doctrine, her Form, and her Action, immoveably on the eternal Word. On the other hand, setting her adrift, amidst the rage and conflict of boundless carnal commandments.”

“9. *Practically*—it may be properly enough demanded, what do we suppose can be done—or ought to be done? Simply and directly this: 1. Remove two of the present Boards, out of Philadelphia. 2. Place the two that are removed, in such positions, as the good of the particular cause each represents, shall indicate to the Assembly, that makes the change. 3. Organize all four of the Boards, in such manner, that they shall be, really and truly, charged with the work committed to them respectively, and really and truly responsible for it. 4. Commit to them nothing, but the proper work belonging to each one of them, as immediate agents of the Church of Christ; and let all they do, be done, with, by, and through, the Church herself—and not as powers, independent of the Church—nor for objects heterogeneous to the Church, nor by methods foreign to the Church. 5. Break up, utterly, *the one man power*, wherever it may linger in any part of the Board: our Church Government is not hierarchic—it is a commonwealth. 6. Transfer the election of all the chief officers of all the Boards, to the General Assembly itself; and, as far as possible, associate ruling Elders or Deacons, in the chief executive administration—especially the financial part of it. 7. By these, and similar means—as far as the habits, the necessities, the principles even, of the Church, may require the continued use of any portion of our present apparatus—let it be simplified, renovated, and brought into a workable condition, and placed in an advantageous posture: bad parts eliminated, good parts strengthened,—shocks and jars avoided—and a fair and complete opportunity afforded, without commotion or revolution, of bringing up the Church, with power, to her glorious work, in all its departments.”

If this is hazy and indefinite, to any others than those who do not wish to see clearly, we must plead guilty, and give up the case. So in like manner, of the response to such as called for a specific pointing out of defects in the working out of the Board scheme. If in the statements we have made touching the election customs in the Boards at Philadelphia, we have not been distinct enough and specific enough, we give it up in despair.

In connection with this class of criticisms upon our work, we may notice the oft repeated displays of ingenuity, in showing, by comparing various essays, that the “Critic” is inconsistent with itself!—advocating inconsistent, and even opposite opinions, on the same general questions. Now we repeat, that we gave specific notice in the outset, that this freedom of discussion and opinion, within the range of our circle of subjects, was to be one of the peculiarities of our plan, when confined within such limits as to avoid protracted and formal controversy in our own pages; and we still consider this method best adapted to promote the cause of sound, intelligent Presbyterianism. We are happy at the same time, to inform the censors, who have been so much concerned for the unity of the “Critic,” that though, as at first declared, the prospective writers for this paper, were not aware of each other’s views upon the leading questions which divide the Church, yet the result of their better acquaintance, so far, has been decidedly, a tendency to unity of opinion. Though apparently coming to their conclusions from different starting points,—one by *a priori* reasoning, of the principles which should, in the nature of the case, control all Church

action;—another from a consideration of the practical out-working of certain measures;—a third from both combined,—yet all are found to be agreed substantially, in reference to a far greater number of the controverted questions, than was by any means anticipated when our work began. For the comfort and peace of mind of those who have been disturbed at the want of unity in the deliverances of the “Critic,” we assure them that the difficulty is not likely to be very formidable; and though we attach too special an importance to this free discussion feature of our plan, to give it up, so readily, they may feel assured that it is not likely to work out more trouble for our censors in time to come, than in time past.

We have a word or two to say in reference to the *bad spirit*, which it is the fashion in some quarters, to impute to us. That we should have given just occasion for any such charge, in any thing that we have written, would certainly cause us more regret than all other causes of complaint combined. If we have made such impression in any impartial quarter, we offer our humble apology. Certainly we have not the excuse of excitement and momentary passion to plead in extenuation. We are not aware of having written anything under the stress of wounded, mortified, or angry feeling, toward any body in the world. For even the specific things which seem to be referred to as evidences of our bad spirit, we are obliged to confess, we have no such apology to plead. We have gone upon the principle that in the differences which must necessarily arise concerning great issues in the Church, it is on the whole, far best in the long run, to accept at the start, the proposition, that “*war is war.*” We have never seen any good result—but often immense evil, in destroying all manly confidence in the sincerity of brethren, from the attempt to conduct controversy on great questions, in the whining tone and style so fashionable with a certain school twenty years ago. If we were disposed to apologize however, we might in our circumstances, make out a very fair case. We might refer to the fact, that the spirit which has set itself to oppose us, has not been the most amiable in all its manifestations. The things which we have been compelled to speak of, have been, in not a few instances, of that class of things, which the selection of smooth and gentle words to characterise, could not materially relieve the harshness of. To that very amiable class of censors whose taste merely is shocked at our plain, direct sort of speech, we have no apology to offer, nor any promises of amendment to make. We confess to an utter dislike of much of the style of religious writing which has become current in the religious publications of the voluntary societies popular on this and the other side of the Atlantic, during the last quarter of a century. We cannot understand why a writer must utter his thoughts, as though he felt himself an intruder in the world in which God has placed him, and his thoughts, a sort of speaking interpolation in the current text of humanity. We cannot understand why, in the higher matters of religion, a man must shrink from any bold and manly utterance, lest he violate the canons of a white-cravated mediocrity, or his enthusiasm in ecclesiastical politics, incur the cold sneer of a gloved and gowned moderatism.

But our limited space admonishes us to cut short these lucubrations. All we have to ask in conclusion is, that we be judged of by our work. If our views are heretical, or revolutionary, there is an abundance of logic and learning in the Presbyterian Church, to expose and overthrow them. If we do any injustice, let them show it, and the evil shall inure to us, not to

them. We begin our second half year's work, with the good feeling which naturally arises from having amassed some capital for more extended business in future. It makes us perhaps a little conceited, but disposes us to such high good humor with ourselves and all the world, that we "let by-gones, be by-gones," with all that choose it, and with new zeal go at our work—the advancement of pure Presbyterianism.

To our worthy cotemporaries—at first so ready,—of late so slow, to speak—we venture to suggest, that having now got more even with them in position in the Church;—having obtained a hearing, and the acknowledgment of our right to be heard farther,—we shall do our very best in the way of advancing our views. It shall remain with them entirely to determine our future relations. If they have changed their mind, and think now with Carlyle—"Speech is great, but *Silence is greater*,"—be it so. We only regret that they had not made the discovery sooner, and thereby saved us some waste of valuable space. If on the other hand, they have any thing to say of us, we hope it will be in the way of discussing our views of doctrine and order, and not in the way of attempting to destroy our hold upon the confidence of the Church, by forcing personal issues, and local questions upon us. Little is to be gained by farther effort to stop discussion—much may be lost. We have now our circle of readers;—our subscription list is as large as we can well afford to have it, for the present year. The field is thus fairly open to us; and with God's blessing it is our determination to make the most of the opportunity, to awake the attention of the people to some of those grand distinguishing truths of Presbyterianism, which have given our Church its chief power in time past, and without which, in our humble judgment, Presbyterianism must surely prove a failure in the end, however much it may, for the time, seem to prosper.

## EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

"WHICH: THE RIGHT OR THE LEFT?"—  
GARRET & Co's "CARD.—(*Confidential*.)"

We have had upon our table for a month past, a volume of some 500 and odd pages, which came accompanied by another of those remarkable New York documents, to which we have already had occasion to call the attention of our readers, in the case of Mr. John Livingston, Immortality Manufacturer, at 157 Broadway.

We have been somewhat at a loss to know what to do in the premises, as the printed Card, which accompanies the written letter, is specially marked "*Confidential*." We conclude on the whole, that as this must be intended to be one of the "confidentials" after the modern fashion—a sort of infinitesimal degree of the confidential, which one is to reveal only to one's 1000 particular friends, and in view, farther, of the peculiarly intimate relation between us and our readers—we are at liberty in this private way, to let them into our nice secret, in relation to what transpires behind the scenes in a great New York

publishing house, and therefore present them—first with the letter (the "sure enough" letter written with a pen,)—and next the "Card—(*confidential*)" printed on the other side of the letter:—

New York, May 5th, 1855.

REV. STUART ROBINSON:—*Dear Sir*,—With this please find, for your acceptance and perusal, a copy of a new work which we shall issue on the 1st of June, entitled *Which—the Right, or the Left?* It is the first of a series of six Reform Fictions upon the six leading evils of modern society, which we have in press, and which we shall take great pleasure in forwarding to you as fast as issued. The first illustrates the hollowness of modern religion as exemplified in the every day life of the majority of those who profess to be governed by its laws.—2dly, the difficulties which the world and worldly christians throw in the real christian's path.—and 3dly, the glorious triumph which awaits the heart that holds out faithfully to the end. It has been kindly suggested by a friend, that if the clergymen of the Union were made acquainted with the aim and character of the work, that they would heartily unite in securing for it a fair hearing. We should therefore, dear sir, be happy to learn, that its publication meets with your sanction and approval. Any assistance you can render us to that end, or any suggestion you may kind-

ly make in reference to bringing it properly before the christian world, will be gratefully remembered, by Yours, very truly,

GARRETT & Co.

Editorial Rooms of Garrett & Co's Publishing House, 18 and 20 Ann street, New York.  
CARD.—(CONFIDENTIAL.)

The vocation of the undersigned brings to them, daily, from various quarters, numerous literary projects, of every kind and character, of which scarcely one per cent. are found upon examination, to possess sufficient practical value to entitle them to an earnest consideration. During the past year we received and examined over four hundred manuscripts and literary schemes. Of this number, we discovered but one which, in our judgment, would warrant a prudent Publishing House in investing its time, capital, and business machinery, in bringing it to the attention of the public. This solitary exception was, however, like a priceless jewel, picked up from a bed of rubbish—a genuine diamond in the midst of a vast mass of pretentious but really worthless paste. It was in the form of a manuscript, prepared with the simple but modest remark that it was designed as the first of a series of six books upon the six leading evils of modern society. Upon turning back to the first page, we found that the work (the first of the series), bore the following simple but expressive title:

WHICH—THE RIGHT, OR THE LEFT?

The simplicity of the title, and the modesty of the brief preface, induced us to give a careful reading to the opening chapter; this led us on insensibly to the second, that to the third, and that onward till we reached the close, when on looking around, we found ourselves in the midst of silence so profound as to be painful. The gas-light was burning clearly, brightly, and distinctly over our desk, while daylight stole softly through the unclosed blinds of our office-window, which looked out upon the street. A glance at the clock announced the hour of five, and a sensation of faintness, told of a neglected meal. We laid down the manuscript, and prepared for home and supper. On reaching the street, we looked around us in surprise. The stores and offices were closed; the air was cool and dewy, and with the exception of a newspaper carrier and ourselves, no one was visible. In an instant the conviction flashed across us that we had, without knowing it, *been up all night*. And as we commenced the reading of the manuscript (which is necessarily done with far less rapidity than when in printed form) at eleven o'clock of the preceding day, we had consequently been engaged for seventeen hours in its perusal, perfectly oblivious of the wants of nature, of the flight of time, of everything in fact, except the fascinating narrative which had thrown around us the magic of its spell.

But they were seventeen hours which we never shall forget. It was not seventeen hours either—but a period of long years. It was not a book we were reading—it was a life, &c.

The impression made upon us by the manuscript was, as will be inferred from the foregoing, of an unusual character. To satisfy ourselves, however, that we had not been duped by any artfulness in its style, we subsequently read it three times, but on each occasion with the same effect as before. To thoroughly test the matter, and learn whether the work was likely to produce a similar effect upon other minds, we placed the manuscript without comment in the hands of a ministerial friend whose judgment and experience we have long known and prized. He returned it at the end of a fortnight with the following note:

"DEAR FRIENDS:—I have read your MSS. twice, once to myself and then aloud to my wife. Having by no means recovered from the

effect of the second reading, which only served to strengthen the first, I do not feel in a condition to analyze critically the cause of the agitation which it has produced in my mind. Be assured, however, of one thing: a heavy responsibility will rest upon the house that may undertake the publication of that book. To publish it, and slight it, though never so little, in the publication, would be a solemn outrage upon the whole Christian world. Although decidedly opposed to the dissemination of fictions generally, I would regard it as an honor to be permitted to share in the glory of bringing this important work before the church. If you should undertake its publication, be kind enough to let me know it in a few weeks in advance of its issue, so that I can prepare my friends and congregation for its reception. If, in addition, you would bring the work, or a fair description of its aim and character before my ministerial brethren, generally, throughout the Union, I feel confident they would deem it a pleasure and a duty to rise as one man, shoulder to shoulder, in its favor, and exert, both in their pulpits and their daily walks, their highest influence in securing for it the widest possible circulation."

This flattering letter strengthened our original impressions of the power and importance of the work. Still, we feared that a kindly feeling for one of our firm might have had some influence upon the mind of its writer, and we concluded to subject the work to an ordeal whose opinion would only be governed by the character of the work itself. With this view we forwarded the manuscript to one high in the church as well as in the confidence of the community, with the request that he would read it at his earliest convenience and favor us with his opinion of its merits. Many weeks elapsed, and we had begun to fear that the work had been read and "found wanting," when we were agreeably surprised by the following:

"GENTLEMEN:—I herewith return you the manuscript of "Which—the Right or the Left," which I have read and re-read with a pleasure that I shall not attempt to express. I must, however, decline to furnish a critical opinion of the work. I have no heart for such a task in my present frame of mind, (I write this at two in the morning, after my second reading,) with the image of SAMUEL before me. Still I will give you my impression of the book in a form which I deem more important than a mere written opinion. If you publish it, as I presume you design to do, you may set down my congregation and Sabbath-School for at least five hundred copies—more, if I can influence it as I shall strive to do, &c."

This note determined us. We put the manuscript in the hands of our printer, without a moment's delay. May we hope that SAMUEL will find a friend in every pulpit and every Sabbath-School?

Respectfully,

GARRETT & Co.

Now we have a crowd of things to say touching this wonderful Book, or rather touching the still more wonderful Circular. Indeed we consider the Circular superior in power to the book; for the genius displayed in the Circular, though it is of the same order precisely of that in the Book, viz: the genius for fiction—yet there is a great deal *more of it* in the Circular.—The Genius both of the Circular and the book, is of a highly cultivated order too, bearing indubitable marks of long training in one of that class of New York trading houses, whose eminence in the realms of Creative Fiction, is the wonder, if not always the praise of the American Continent

—from the heights of Abraham to the Halls of the Montezumas. We have a strong suspicion (though aware of the folly of guessing after the "great unknown") that the author of the Circular is the author of the book; the book being composed in one of his nodding, and the Circular in one of his happier moods. Both have the impress of genius of a given order, trained under a given counting-house discipline; the voice of both has the same metallic clank.

Be this as it may however, we have somewhat to say of the Book—more to say to the Journalists, who either from want of care, or want of genius, countenance such imposture, by letting it run through their daily or weekly Critical grist-mill into the (hopper) Book column. But still more have we to say, if space permit, to those grave Clergymen, who are silly enough to allow themselves to be used as drummers for vendors of every sort of Literary Cod-fish spawn. For though we of course understand Messrs. Garrett & Co's letters recommendatory from Clergymen to be part of the machinery of the Fiction—a sort of "Poetic license," in which their fruitful fancy indulges—yet it is only because such letters are an every-day matter-of-course occurrence, that the fiction builders find it expedient to use such material.

But of the book: As to literary merit, as a fiction, we have already characterized it. It is just about such as we suppose a smart first Clerk, well trained to the business of such a house as from the letter we would take Garrett and Co's. to be, (of course we know nothing of them,) would be supposed to have written as the result of his observation on religion and men, from going to Church occasionally, chiefly with a view to show Messrs. Garrett & Co's. country customers, the partnership pew—(if they happen to have one;) from going to the theatre pretty regularly every night in the week, by way of showing Garrett & Co's. Country Customers the city—and from semi-annual visits to the country towns of New England, for the purpose of seeing after Garrett and Co's. debtors. Just such a genius, of just such a cultivation, and of such opportunities to study men and religion, we would suppose wrote this book—"Which: the Right or the left?" The incident of this fiction is far below the level of what any shrewd, and at the same time, sympathizing observer of men and things might gather any day in a walk from the Battery to the Crystal Palace. And though, as we are aware, the critics tell us, that the progress of national civilization may be marked, in the constant tendency in the fictitious literature of the people, from superabundance to penury of incident,—yet the penury of incident in

the fiction of the higher civilization, is to be more than compensated by the intenser dramatic power of the author in portraying the profounder out-workings of human passion. But in this author, the scenes are as undramatic as the incident. His men and women and boys have none of the dramatic element about them. His paragons of virtue and religion are all the marvellously proper sort of good Yankee people: white-oak-faced men, with conscience located in their solemn phiz, rather than down among the sentiments of the soul; merchants, who have taken to religion as the next thing in regular order, after they have gained the world—at least as much of it as their not very capacious souls can hold; marvelously proper women too, versed in all the moralities and intensified ethics, after the models of the ancient virtuosos found in the school-books; all these robed in dullness as in a garment, and made to come forth as the puppet-show-man brings out his wire-fixed nerves, to converse sentimentally, religiously or otherwise—is about the amount of the tragic element in this book. The comedy of his Satanic characters, a due proportion of which are sprinkled in as a matter of course, is far below the level of what might be any day enjoyed about the shipping in the New York harbor.

We found therefore different results from our experiment in the reading, from those described so graphically by the literary member of the firm of Garrett & Co., after "seventeen hours" of trance in reading. "*A sensation of faintness told of a neglected meal.*" With us in far less than seventeen minutes, a sensation of dullness told of a neglected nap,—and we are not often caught napping over a book.

All this however is waste of space. Our purpose in this notice is something higher than this. We desire to give expression rather to our disgust, at the brazen impertinence of this swindling honest and pure, but credulous and weak people out of their time and money, by such villainous compounds under the garb of religion!—Mammon, feeding his rapacious maw with the proceeds of observations "*on the hollowness of modern religion!*" Modern religion—much of it—is hollow enough; just as much as ancient religion was. In all times—among all people—much of the religion was hollow;—necessarily so from the Bible account of man, as a being whose moral nature is such, as makes some religion necessary for him,—but at the same time, with a depraved soul, that tends even to cheat his own conscience with a sham—a hollow religion. Hence in all societies of men, there have been hollow religionists,—and not less hollow-hearted sceptics to scourge and lash their hypocrisy.

But up to this case of Garrett & Co., we have not a hypocrisy of hollowness, barefaced enough to assume for lucre's sake, to scourge into piety, all the moderately hollow hypocrites in society. The author of this book has about as much idea of what the religion of the gospel is, as a remedy for the sin and misery of the world—as the horse that draws the drug cart of one of his heroes, may be supposed to know of the merits of Townsend's Sarsaparilla. Whilst religious cant is loathsome enough in its nature, there are phrases of the thing to us peculiarly loathsome. We can abide the vagaries, the superstitions of some poor negro, who knows nothing more of the Gospel than a vague idea of the one proposition—"Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." That one idea, though dimly conceived, yet sincerely embraced—he is a Christian man;—yea, even though many a vagary of his fancy cloud it. But this cant of religion—that *converses* in fine sentimental phrase *about religion*—about Christianity—about the Redeemer even—without the least element of the spiritual feeling that gives it all its power—we cannot bear with. Above all, when it takes airs upon itself, and in its utter heathenish ignorance, undertakes to lisp its emaculated malice at the modern Church, our critical stomach begins to feel as did the natural stomach of the literary partner of Garrett & Co., when a "sensation of faintness told of a neglected meal."

We regret that we have not space for what we intended to say, of the editors of papers—especially religious papers, who allow themselves to be fooled into aiding and abetting such unscrupulous swindling. Much more do we regret the want of space for a proper notice of the current fashion of using ministers of the Gospel, as decoy-ducks, for any and every sort of book swindle. That it is too current, as a fashion, is manifest from the impudence of the attempts of book-peddlars of all sorts, to make use of them. Indeed we have been tempted to think, that in that portion of the country most given to book-making, the primary idea of the minister's office, in the popular conception, is of a man set apart—not to preach the Gospel, so much, as to be, by virtue of his position, a drummer-general, for all sorts of book-ware. We shall expect to recur to this matter again.

**SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH RE-CONSIDERED AND OTHERS STATED,** by Robert L. Breck, *Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Macon, Geo.* Baltimore: Mills & Cox. 1855.

If a reading layman may be permitted to express the gratification he has experienced in the perusal of the little volume just issued, bearing the above title,

it may induce in some others the inclination to seek a similar pleasure, and we are constrained to think they will meet no disappointment.

The tract was elicited by the publication of a volume by the Episcopal Clergyman of Macon, in defence of his Church and its claims, wherein he professes to reply to all the objections which are urged against the Episcopal Church—roundly charging, as Episcopacy is so fond of doing, all who are not of *them*, as holding views in violation of the teachings of the Primitive church, and of the word of God.

The pamphlet of Mr. Breck takes up, and re-states with additional force, these several objections, with others, and most thoroughly disposes of the triumphant "*answers*" of his Episcopal neighbor. Plain and concise, yet powerful and convincing, we have never seen a work of its kind, more complete in all its parts; and if there is a man who is undecided as to whether Episcopacy (not to speak of its heretical notions and Papal tendencies) is the divinely constituted form of the Church upon Earth, a perusal of this little book can hardly fail to satisfy him how far it is from it; whilst the firmest in the faith, will here find "Some objections," it would do them no harm to consider. For ourselves, we have only to say, if any one is willing to undertake a reply to Mr. Breck, we want to see it.

*Semi-Centennial Celebration of the South Carolina College: the Baccalaureate Address; the Semi-centennial Oration, by Hon. Jas. I. Pettigru, and Answers to Letters of Invitation.* Charleston, 1855.

It would be difficult to overrate, in a country like ours, the importance of a great literary festival, such as that which is commemorated in this pamphlet. Amidst the diversities of opinions, the varieties of social condition and the clashing of contending interests, we need the aid of every sort of bond, to preserve our union. And not the weakest of these bonds, is that of a common liberal education, by which, in all parts of our vast country, so many—to use the words of the illustrious Legare—"are let into that great communion of scholars throughout all ages and all nations—like that more awful communion of saints in the Holy Church Universal—and feel a sympathy with departed genius, and with the enlightened and the gifted minds of other countries, as they appear before them, in the transports of a sort of Vision Beatific, bowing down at the same shrines and glowing with the same holy love of whatever is most pure and fair, and exalted and divine in human nature." In such fellowship, the petty jealousies of trade, the ravings

fanaticism, and the schemes of demagogues who would build their greatness upon their country's ruin—are all alike forgotten, or remembered, only to be denounced; and the noble desire fills every heart, that the land of their birth, may long be the abode of that liberty, which the great masters of eloquence and song have tasked their powers to celebrate. Letters were received from Hon. Edward Everett, Hon. R. C. Winthrop, and Saml. Tyler, Esq., of this State, all breathing the enthusiasm and liberal spirit of true scholarship.

The South Carolina College, though much younger than many of her sisters, need not be ashamed to compare her "jewels" with their's. She has given many names to the country, which the world will claim for its own: names which will last, till statesmanship, and eloquence cease to be regarded among men.

## NOTE.

Rev. Drs. BACKUS and SMITH, and Messrs. HITCHCOCK and CARNAHAN, have called upon me, as the author of the article in the June No. of the "Critic," entitled, "Who are the Revolutionists?"—The new Crusade against the Synod of Baltimore," denying, and remonstrating against positions of the same as derogatory to them personally. The sentences to which they take exception, as containing the statements complained of particularly, are the following, on pages 251 and 254:—

"And if we shall succeed in showing that \* \* \* a most extraordinary re-agitation of the question, and by most extraordinary methods, was suddenly begun in the Presbytery of Baltimore, and this at the instance of an agent of the Board of Missions: \* \* \* if we make good these several points, then, is it an unjust suspicion on our part, that something of the same spirit that rules at the ecclesiastical centre, may be at the bottom of this new and singular movement. \* \* \*—Some two or three days before the meeting of Presbytery, a memorial to the *Assembly* was gotten up and privately circulated for signatures of ministers and elders, praying *contingently*, † (i. e., if Carlisle Presbytery should vote according to Dr. McKinley's prediction,) for a repeal of the last Assembly's action concerning the Synod. Our readers are ready to ask—why this sudden haste, before the meeting of the Presbytery, at which

† These four gentlemen, as the authors of the memorial, deny that it contains any *contingent* clause; and consider as especially offensive, the use of this word, as they connect it with the term "false pretence," in a subsequent paragraph. The writer of the article used the word, "contingently," in reference to the reasons in the minds of the signers; and inadvertently used the technical term "false pretence" for "mistaken expectation," as to what Carlisle would do.

all could meet, and take any regular, constitutional action?—&c. \* \* \* \* \*

—"Why, obviously this:—

"Carlisle Presbytery might *not so vote*; and then the chance for agitation in Baltimore is hopeless. The members are nearly all, well-content with things as they are. There is but one string to pull, with any prospect of arousing them to dissatisfaction, viz: the nervousness and jealous fear of Southern influence on the part of some of the members. They may be induced to give a conditional signature and a conditional vote, under the alarm that Carlisle will withdraw, and leave us with a Mason and Dixon boundary.

"That the subscriptions to this memorial were obtained on private, ex parte statements, and chiefly under the false pretence that Carlisle would vote to leave the Baltimore Synod, is plain, from the avowals of some of the subscribers, and the well known antecedents and prejudices of others of them."

Now, whilst wholly dissenting from the opinion of Drs. BACKUS and SMITH, and Messrs. HITCHCOCK and CARNAHAN, that these sentences fairly bear a construction, which gives them the force of statements as of personal knowledge; yet, out of regard to our relations to each other as ministerial neighbors, and from a desire to guard against any possible misconstruction,—I deem it proper in this manner, with their concurrence, to disavow any imputation of dishonor upon the acts of these gentlemen individually, in the matter referred to.

So far as concerns Messrs. HITCHCOCK and CARNAHAN, it was not the purpose of the writer, as is manifest from the tenor of the article itself, (if interpreted by the circumstances, which alone can give it any personal reference,) to ascribe to them any active participation in the effort; nor was he aware that they even shared the responsibility of the memorial. This, it seems to me, renders any further explanation as to them superfluous.

With regard to Drs. BACKUS and SMITH, who might naturally suppose themselves to have been among the persons before the mind of the writer of the foregoing sentences, it is but just to say, that though the statements above recited, in relation to the party opposed to the new Synod, are, in their nature, inferential, from information and circumstantial evidence, which, in my opinion, fully justified every remark made by me,—yet, it was not my purpose to impute to them personally, even inferentially, anything dishonorable in action; and I most cheerfully accept as sufficient, their denial, for themselves, of any unworthy motive or ground of action in the part taken by them.

STUART ROBINSON.

87

THE  
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC  
AND  
MONTHLY REVIEW.

---

---

No. 8.

AUGUST, 1855.

Vol. 1.

---

---

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1855.

---

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

THE sources of information upon which our remarks are founded, are the minutes of the body—the Reports of its Proceedings and Debates in the *Presbyterian*, of Philadelphia, the *Presbyterian Herald*, of Louisville, and the *Nashville, Tenn. Whig*, a secular newspaper; to which may be added some personal knowledge of one present at many of the sessions, and information derived from many members of the body. With regard to the Minutes of all our Church Courts, it is to be regretted that they are always incomplete. Omitting to record most of what *passes in the negative*, they necessarily afford a most inadequate idea of the full sense of the bodies whose records they profess to be; and being mere *minutes* and not a complete *Journal* of the proceedings they actually relate, they are inmethodical and defective even in what they purport to give. The printed Reports of Debates are habitually meagre, often erroneous, and occasionally, though it may be discreetly, deceptive in omitting the very gist of the utterances made. It is on these accounts, mainly, that personal knowledge and information are so important and that they ought to be annexed when they exist, on the part of those who undertake to review the proceedings of our church courts.

This was a very large Assembly; one of the largest that has met since the disruption of the Church in 1838. A number of the more distinguished ministers and elders of the Church were members of it. And its business was dispatched with good temper and diligence. Its standing committees were very singularly constituted, and apparently without any fixed principle either as to numbers, geographical position, or any thing else, except the old rule of making ministers the majority of the standing committees, on which any minister was placed. For example, the committee on Bills and Overtures had twenty-three members; and yet fifteen out of the twenty-nine Synods present, had no member on that important committee—while some Synods had three, and still more two, each. On the other hand, the Committee on Theological Seminaries, heretofore one of the largest and most dispersed committees of the body, and certainly one of the most im-

portant, had only five members, (fewer than on the committees for the Boards,) and of these five, the three ministers were from one Synod, and the two elders from another, and an adjoining one. We have no complaint to make of the labors of these or any committees; but it seems to us that a very simple rule ought to be adopted and adhered to on this subject, and that the attention of the church ought to be called to it—for that reason. The rule should be, to appoint large standing committees, on which every portion of the church should be fairly represented, and, as far as possible, every member of the Assembly should be given due labor and due honor; no man or section specially burdened or specially distinguished—none wholly passed by. By this method, and by devoting a few afternoons in the early part of the sessions of the body to committee work exclusively—every member of the body would necessarily become well and early acquainted with certain parts of its important business; and then, by adhering, in the house, to some simple order of business, immense loss of time would be prevented, and numberless idle motions and useless harangues be avoided. All of which are considerations of the highest importance, especially in a large body, whose sessions are necessarily short.

The main control of the business, in the house, seemed to be in the hands of a very small number of persons; who, though repeatedly and occasionally, signally outvoted—did an immense over portion of the rhetoric. It is observable from year to year, as the great size of the body makes its free action more obviously difficult, that a class of leaders of the house becomes more and more a settled part of its machinery; and that the discussions become more and more set harangues. The habit of mounting the platform, to speak, in order to be heard in the immense churches where alone the Assembly and the audience can be accommodated—is becoming the confirmed habit of the body; and must ultimately change entirely the ancient character of its deliberations; and change it in a manner pre-eminently to the injury of the body. At first, a few old men were allowed the privilege; then little by little others assumed it; until at length it not only threatens to become universal,—but certain members prepare, beforehand, moveable conveniencies which can be carried up to the platform with them for effective oratory. We must put an end to all this in some way; or we shall pass immediately to the method of the French Tribune; a method utterly repugnant to all the ends we have in view; as well as to all our hereditary notions and habits. We respectfully suggest that our brethren in New York shall take care, next spring, that the moderator's platform shall be too small for such proceedings; and thus give the church a chance of reviving its old, simple, modest, and true form of conference, as opposed to harangue. Having said so much, as to the principles involved, we feel obliged to add, that some of the platform discourses in the Assembly of 1855, were among the finest of the sort, (indeed of several very different sorts,) ever listened to on similar occasions, and would compensate, if any thing could, for such a method, in such a body.

The truth is the General Assembly is far too large. And to keep it in its present limits, the greatest inequalities are obliged to be tolerated in the bodies of representation; an inequality which is obliged to become more glaring as long as the Lord increases the Church and the present method is adhered to. A remedy, at once simple, effectual and permanent, has been, long ago, suggested. Let the number of members be limited, say to one hundred. Let these be distributed amongst the Synods, fairly, say once

every five or ten years, upon some uniform and just rule, previously laid down, say the number of ministers. Let the Synods, respectively, elect their share of the members of the Assembly; or if another method is proposed, let the Synods distribute amongst their Presbyteries, as often as the Assembly distributes amongst the Synods, the number of members to be elected,—upon some fair and uniform rule, previously settled. These three alterations cover the whole subject—correct for all time every evil of our present method—and yet every principle of our system is not only preserved, but purged from the inconveniencies which our great prosperity has occasioned.

We cannot omit to say a word about the place of meeting of this Assembly. When our General Assembly was organised, the State of Tennessee was far more an Indian than a white settlement; and Nashville was probably, either a forest, or at most a log fort, or a cluster of rude pole cabins on the bank of the Cumberland. At present, the residence of one President of the United States is in the city, and that of another is a few miles from it. A beautiful, nay an illustrious city, the growth of half a century—into which the chief tribunal of a great church commensurate with the whole nation, comes to transact the business committed to it by God's people—and to receive the kind and elegant hospitality of a refined Christian people. In no other age or land have men ever witnessed such amazing results of an exalted Christian civilization, effected with such rapidity and completeness. We ought not only to be careful that the impression of such conquests are cherished in our hearts, which, indeed their very commonness around us may make difficult; but we ought to be stimulated by them to efforts bearing some just proportion to the astonishing successes by which God has honored all our faithful endeavors to honor him. And there is a narrower light too, in which such scenes are inexpressibly important to the Presbyterian Church. Our Assembly has been to Baltimore, Richmond, and Charleston, on the seaboard; to Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville, and St. Louis, along the central line from our Northern frontier to the mighty river of the great central basin; and now, penetrating deeper into the South West, it has just finished a session at Nashville, and adjourned to meet next year in the city of New York. With all due respect to Philadelphia, where it tabernacled under the "red tape" system so long, and from whence the first suggestion of an exodus was received and rejected with horror and scorn by united "red tape" throughout the church; we must be allowed to believe that the present plan of meeting compares with the former plan, just about as those ten great cities named above, compare, unitedly, with the city of brotherly love. For its own sake, this immense and endless result, from an apparently small and deeply hated cause, is worthy to be kept in the remembrance of the church; but as a type, as a moral, as a test of administrative capacity on one side and official routine on the other, it stands boldly and continually before the face of the church, as a means by which to estimate the value of all "red tape" denunciations of all administrative reforms in the bosom of our church. "Red tape" does conscientiously believe that the pantaloons which fit his fair proportions when he was a child, do really fit him still; and that men are enviously blind, or wickedly perverse, who venture to suggest that decency requires him either to enlarge the pattern of his inexpressibles, or submit to destiny and put on petticoats!

## ACTUAL ORGANIZATION.

Dr. Boardman, the last Moderator, opened this Assembly, on the 18th day of May, in the immense church of which Dr. Edgar is Pastor, with a sermon from 1 Tim. iii. i : his theme being, *that the Christian Ministry is not a Priesthood*. We confess to a decided satisfaction at the habit grown up amongst us of using occasions like this to illustrate and enforce the great principles and duties of the church. The Assembly, by a vote, expressed the desire that the Board of Publication should publish Dr. Boardman's sermon in the form of a tract; a distinction conferred upon the discourse, of which its tolerably sound doctrinal orthodoxy, its plain and clear style, and its good intentions, rendered it as worthy as most tracts are. Like all the efforts of its author which have fallen under our notice, it is highly respectable—but not thorough; and the only objection to this rather unusual act of the Assembly towards a retiring Moderator, is that any one should suppose the body meant to stake the great issue discussed upon this very insufficient presentation of it. One sentence of the discourse we quote as peculiarly important in our day—though we admit not specially in place, where we find it: "It behoves all churches to consider that their purity and safety lie, under God, in a *scrupulous adherence, as well in government and worship*, as in doctrine, to the "canons of the New Testament." The italics are ours, and their significance, as well as the justice of our remark which precedes them, will appear from two other quotations, namely: "They (Ministers) are its (the Church's) principal officers, to whom he has delegated, in common with the *Christian people*, the actual oversight and government of its affairs." Again: "*It is the right and duty of the laity and of the Eldership as their representatives*, to insist that the ministry shall at least possess the general character here delineated." Again these italics are ours; and are made to particularize the error couched in all that part of the discourse to which the two sentences quoted appertain. We refer to the first article in the June No. of the Critic, on "*the Church Question*," for a more particular elucidation of the error held by Dr. Boardman, and made uselessly prominent in this discourse; the subject matter of which did not require, or even logically tolerate, any expression of opinion on these questions. In the meantime, we simply remark, in the first place, that there is no "canon of the New Testament," which shows that the oversight and government of the affairs of the Church, are committed to ministers in common with the Christian people; or committed to the Christian people at all; and that, if there was such a canon, Independency and not Presbyterianism, would be the divine form of church government. And, in the second place, we add, that the laity, as such, have no right of rule in any church court; and that to place the right of Ruling Elders to be there, and their duties when there, merely on the ground of their representing the laity, is a gross perversion of a single sentence in our church constitution, which shows nothing so plainly as the desperate shifts to which a false theory compels a man to resort, in upholding dangerous errors. No doubt there is a difference between a spiritual aristocracy of priests, and one of ministers. But neither one nor the other, is the form of the church established by the "canons of the New Testament." Nor is there a Protestant Prelate in America, who does not admit representatives of the laity to church power, upon principles fully as broad as those on which Dr. Boardman's church theory logically rests.

Dr. Rice, of St. Louis, was elected Moderator. Several other members were nominated, most of whom were withdrawn before a ballot was taken.

The Rev. Mr. Phillips, of New York, was elected temporary clerk. Dr. Rice appeared in poor health, during the sessions of the Assembly; but he discharged with energy, promptitude and good temper, the duties of the high office to which his great labors for the church, no doubt, elevated him. The Presbyterian church seems to have made up its mind, definitely, on several points connected with the election to this very highest distinction it can confer, upon the wisdom of which, we think there can be no dispute. In the first place, under no circumstances to confer this office a second time, on the same person; choosing rather to condemn herself to the immense probability, and very serious evils of having comparatively new Moderators always and incompetent ones very often, rather than forego this decisive exhibition of the purity of her ministers. In the second place, to confer great distinction on what she judges to be real services to the church; doubtless erring sometimes in her estimate, and at other times having rather narrow limits, at the moment, within which to choose. And in the third place, distributing the honor, as far as circumstances allow, throughout all sections of the church, in just proportion. It will be a sad day for the church, when any man can be the Moderator of the General Assembly, except after great services, and for high character.

One incident attended the primary proceedings of the body, apparently small in itself, but really of some consequence, and having an ill look in consequence of the appearance it wore of outside interference. At the Assembly of 1854, a motion was made and carried, directing that in making up the roll of the Assembly, the Presbyteries should be entered under their respective Synods, according to the seniority of the Synods to which they belong; so that the roll should always exhibit the chronology of the Synods, instead of mere geography or the mere fancy of the clerk. This seemed so just to that Assembly, that no serious opposition was made to the change. And it was only forborne to be ordered with regard to the printed minutes of 1854, in consequence of the statement of Dr. Leyburn, the stated clerk, that the minutes of that year, were so far made up, as that the change would occasion serious inconvenience. On that account only, the change was ordered to commence with the minutes of 1855. On the morning of the second day's session at Nashville, and therefore after the *Roll of the Assembly had been made up by the stated and permanent clerks*, it was moved to rescind the order of 1854, as contrary to long practice, and as founded only on an illusory apprehension, that a certain mode of calling the roll, influenced votes in the body! And, thereupon, for such reasons, and in such circumstances, the order was rescinded—and the fancy of the clerk, which leads him to jumble up church courts, according to geography, in preference to the standing order of the Assembly for 1854, for chronological sequence, was re-instated. The gentleman, (Dr. Krieb's,) who made the motion to rescind in 1855, was not a member of the Assembly of 1854; and as appearances indicate, probably made the motion on the suggestion of the stated clerk. The Assembly,—acquiesced—and as far as anything appears, every thing was in readiness for an anticipated change. We must confess that this mode of treating important standing orders of the Assembly, is a very strong appeal against the granting of indulgences which may be thus turned against the wishes and convictions of those who grant them. Here we have Buffalo, one of the youngest Synods, set down as No. II, Philadelphia, the very oldest, set down as V, Baltimore, the youngest of all, as VI, Virginia, one of the oldest, as XIX, after

Illinois, Wisconsin and Iowa. And so on through a roll, remarkable only for confusion and obscurity; even geography and the alphabet being both despised, since Buffalo is placed between Albany and New York, and Nashville between the two Carolinas.

#### THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

Amongst the earliest matters brought regularly before the Assembly, were the Reports from the Theological Seminaries at Princeton, Alleghany, Prince Edward and Danville; three of them being under the direct control of the Assembly, and the remaining one, (Union Seminary, at Prince Edward, Va.,) having a qualified dependence on it. There does not appear to have been any thing of serious importance done, or required, concerning either of these Institutions. There was a proposal from the Directors of the Seminary at Princeton, to increase the salaries of the professors there; which appears to have attracted no attention. And a submission from the Directors of the Seminary, at Danville, of a practical question, about the proper mode of treating certain difficulties concerning Beneficiaries of the Board of Education, was arranged satisfactorily to all parties, and a general rule applicable to all Seminaries, agreed on by common consent.

The question which was brought forward in the Assembly of 1853, and so urgently pressed upon the Assembly of 1854, and so decisively rejected by it, touching some sort of transfer of its Seminaries to some of the Synods; seems to have expired in a few articles, pro and con, in the *Critic* and the *Presbyterian* before the meeting of the Assembly of 1855. A new proof of the wisdom of treating all impracticable questions with decision, at the start. For good or ill, the General Assembly is so embarked in the great work of Ministerial Education, and so committed to it, both legally and morally, that any drawing back is no longer possible without consequences too immense and too disastrous, to be thought of for a moment, unless under the pressure of the clearest necessity. It is greatly to be questioned whether any single duty rests upon the Church, whose performance is now clearly binding on her, than the duty of providing, to the very utmost of her ability, for a perpetual succession of able and faithful ministers of the Gospel. And having, with great deliberation, at enormous expense, for a long course of years, and with results eminently satisfactory, on the whole, adopted and pursued a particular line of policy on this vast subject; every dictate of prudence and wisdom urges her to steadfast perseverance in the course she has matured. There are, no doubt, various portions of the subject which admit of advantageous modification; some, which require considerable changes; a few, still oppressed with grave difficulties. But all this is widely different from the fundamental denial of the right, or duty of the church, to do the thing, through its own proper organization; the fundamental demand to cease from doing it directly, any longer. This spirit, we trust is laid; and so we gladly mark its end.

If these Seminaries do their duty, the mission of the Presbyterian Church in this country is, as yet, hardly fairly begun. Communities can do what individuals cannot do; they can perpetuate their glory and their strength. Every man must be a child at first; but every age may start where the preceding age ended. The hand of death need not arrest the career of multitudes united, as it does the career of individual persons. When we are gone, mediocrity may start where genius ended in our day. Let us comprehend our work, our resources, our power. What are we without our

preachers? Nay, our great preachers? If each of these Seminaries will only make for us, a few, a very few, transcendently great preachers, from generation to generation, *they* will make all the rest. Some church or other must lead the van. Why not ours? What madness is it to withhold any thing, that can give us out of a thousand men, one like Owen or Whitfield? We would not depreciate the very feeblest and humblest, so that they be good and zealous. But we must not, if we will do God's great work, content ourselves with this. That we dare not do so, is the reason why we have endowed, and are still endowing, all these Seminaries. Let those to whom we have entrusted them, beware how they allow the church to be robbed of her great hopes.

The Seminary in Virginia, though it has a qualified relation to the Assembly, belongs, in effect, to the two Synods of Virginia and North Carolina; as the Seminary at Columbia in South Carolina belongs, entirely and independently of the Assembly, to the two Synods of South Carolina and Georgia. Firmly believing that it is the imperative duty of the General Assembly to provide for, and to superintend ministerial education, and that the more directly and the more thoroughly that body does this, the better for all the great interests at stake; we are yet equally persuaded, that they who think differently ought to have, as they have always had, full liberty to adopt some other method of promoting and superintending this great work. No good or enlightened man can fail to rejoice heartily at the greatly increased prospects of usefulness and success, at present enjoyed by both of these Institutions; the more so, as in both of them, as well as in those under the immediate care of the Assembly, the tone of true Presbyterianism, in its best sense, seems to us to occupy a more distinct position, and to be gaining a chosen prominence. Latterly, no interest in the church has been more thoroughly roused, than that connected with all these Institutions for training ministers; and no one can doubt, that the aggregate result, is eminently promising. As to the Seminary, which it has been attempted, in defiance of so many pledges and obligations, to continue at New Albany, we have hesitated whether it were not best to pass it over in total silence. Thoroughly disapproving the course of those who have controlled the interests of that Seminary since the Assembly of 1853, and perfectly convinced that it is of no value, and that its success under present circumstances is impossible; we suppose that the best thing which could now be done would be to remove the Institution, or found one to supersede it, in a suitable location in the great North West, in whose development the Presbyterian church has so great an interest.

#### COMMISSION OF THE ASSEMBLY

This question came up on a motion of Dr. Wines, directing the judicial committee to enquire into the expediency of giving the Assembly some relief in the trial of judicial cases. That committee subsequently reported that the Assembly had no power to appoint a commission; and that it was not expedient to send down any Overture to the Presbyteries asking for any change in the constitution. A minority of eight, in a committee of twenty-one, reported through Judge Fine, recommending an Overture to the Presbyteries, that all appeals from church sessions, should terminate with the Synod, and all appeals from original cases in Presbyteries should go up to the Assembly. After some discussion, the whole subject was, on motion of Dr. Krebbs, indefinitely postponed.

It will be observed that the subject came before the Assembly only on

the motion of a member in his place ; and that the action he proposed was merely to remedy a special evil, by appointing a commission to try judicial cases. And the minority report was still narrower ; for it virtually conceded the want of power in the Assembly to appoint a commission ; and proposed to ask the Presbyteries to change the constitution ; not so as to allow the Assembly to appoint a commission ; but so as to prohibit any one but a minister of the Gospel, to carry an appeal higher than a Synod. Considering the extremely insufficient presentation of the real question, by these motions throughout, it is not clear what the final vote of the Assembly actually meant. Logically, the vote of *indefinite postponement*, of the whole subject, as it then stood, meant that the Assembly rejected the reports of both the majority and the minority of the judicial committee, which, in our poor judgment, was extremely wise ; dissenting as we do from the principles of both reports, and from most things printed in the meagre reports of the debates, in support of both.

To every experienced Minister and Elder in our church, one thing is perfectly obvious, namely, that as discipline is now administered in our superior church Courts, including the General Assembly, it amounts either to a denial or a perversion of justice, full as often as to a complete and righteous application of the law of God to the case on trial. We have seen and known things done, again and again, in our General Assembly, and in more than one of our best Synods, under the pretence of deciding cases of discipline, which we will not allow ourselves to characterize by using the terms of unqualified condemnation which alone could set forth their real nature. And this state of things is getting worse and worse—until the whole thing is becoming a scoffing to the wicked, and a deadly heartse to good men. Nor is this only a shame and a sin ; it is an infinite danger too. It can have no other result, if it be not effectually amended, but to fill the church with wickedness—to drive the righteous out of it, and away from it—and to bring down the just wrath of God upon us. We have seldom uttered words with more pain, or deeper conviction ; and we solemnly believe that no living Minister has had a better opportunity of knowing the width and depth of the evil complained of. We would undertake to screen any offender before the General Assembly more certainly than before any jury of twelve upright men ; or to convict an innocent man upon a quibble—or to drive an aggrieved party from its bar, upon an untenable pretext—more certainly, than in any honest secular tribunal in this broad land. And yet, under such enormous practical evils, men occupying high stations in the church, are found from year to year to palter about the perfection of our administrative system, and to resist by harangues more worthy of a cabal of political partizans, than of a court met in the name of a righteous God—every possible form in which it is proposed to apply a remedy—when any just remedy would be a mercy, and every effectual remedy is a most solemn duty.

We confess ourselves to be averse even to the appearance of stripping the church courts of the exercise of any power vested in any of them by the Lord ; *we say by the Lord*—for it is mere jargon and trash, to talk about our church constitution vesting power in any of them—any otherwise than as it is a human covenant, in which we define the will of God, and bind ourselves in its terms. We therefore greatly prefer to reduce the church courts, all of them, to denominations in which they will be masters of their time and business, and every member feel his proper responsibility ; rather than keep

them at an unwieldy size, and appoint commissions to do any part of their work. Every Presbytery and Synod should be divided as soon as it becomes difficult for it to do wisely, deliberately and righteously, every part of its work. And the General Assembly should be reduced without a moment's needless delay, to such number of members, as would be able effectually and in the fear of God, to discharge every duty laid on it by him; and these ought to be appointed in such a manner, as to secure the attendance of persons willing and competent to do their whole duty. We say we prefer this method of dealing with the subject—by far to any other, and think we could show abundant reason for that preference.

As to the power of the church courts, however, to appoint *commissions*, that power is just as clear as their power to appoint *committees*; and it has been as invariably exercised—and is now regularly exercised by the Assembly from year to year. A *committee* is a servant of the Assembly, made up according to its constant practice, of its own members, or otherwise, to *examine and report*; a *commission*, is a servant of the Assembly, similarly made up, to *examine and conclude*. And with all due respect to all the authors of all the wisdom made articulate on this grand mystery from year to year—it is simply ridiculous to deny the existence of the power in the Assembly, which resides in every tribunal on the face of the earth, that exercises any function or authority known under the sun, except in cases of the merest and strictest personal truths; a distinction we dare say wholly unintelligible as to its nature, and wholly unknown as to its existence, to divers and sundry who imagine themselves profoundly skilled in all laws and constitutions. We should like to know what the church extension committee appointed by the Assembly of 1855, was appointed for, if not to examine and conclude? And if so, what would be the difference if it had been called a commission? And if the Assembly has power, and exercises it every year, to appoint many such bodies—call them Boards, or committees, or what you like—to perform duties a thousand-fold more difficult and responsible; what utter folly is it, to pretend that it has no power, and ought not to have any, to appoint a similar body to ascertain and determine, whether a certain Minister got drunk, or a certain Elder is dishonest—or a certain woman is a termagant? Is it so excellent to keep drunkards, thieves, and termagants in full communion—that we violate all laws human and divine, by pretending to try them before two or three hundred Presbyters, when in fact, by that pretence, they are prevented from being tried at all? Is it so very righteous to convict the innocent, and to deny justice to the wronged, that we carefully contrive these results, by sending them before tribunals which we have personal knowledge, after long attendance on those tribunals, are utterly indisposed, and hopelessly incompetent to administer justice.

We add two statements. The first is, that of all parts of the duty of the General Assembly, the one to which the use of a commission is most peculiarly appropriate, is the only one concerning which our great church lawyers have received that glorious illumination, wherein they pronounce it illegal. The loudest lauders of commissions, when called Boards—are the most furious denouncers of commissions to try cases of Discipline. And yet no sane man, who had a just cause, but would prefer that any ten, of three hundred respectable gentlemen, should *try* his cause—rather than let the whole three hundred try it. The other remark is, that notwithstanding all the twaddle about the limited, delegated, and defined power of the General Assembly—the Presbyteries being the source of all its powers, &c. &c.;

these, following facts, are thoroughly, fundamental, and undeniable. 1. *Historically*, the General Assembly, and not the Presbyteries, is the successor of the original church session planted on this continent, by MacKemie—and of the first Presbytery ever set up, on these shores, of our order; and is therefore the true successor, and real depository of all the powers vested by God in that original church, our Presbytery. 2. *Theoretically*, the General Assembly, is the general gathering of all the Presbyterian congregations—connected with us—all forming one church; and as such, has all the inherent power over the whole body, that any part has over itself. 3. *Divinely*, the General Assembly, ordained of God, is but the universal Presbytery of the church—and God's Bible is the source of its powers; the church constitution did not make it—but it, when it was in the form of the mere Synod, made that constitution, according to the word of God. 4. The sole object of the existence of that General Assembly is to do God's work in the world; one of the most thoroughly important portions of which is the righteous administration of discipline. This part of its work the Assembly grossly neglects, and is no longer competent to perform aright, by reason of its enormous bulk, the vast accumulation of its business, and the necessary shortness of its sessions. The conclusion is irresistible. And they who oppose and defeat some adequate reform, are to be held justly to a rigorous account for all the evils that may follow. For the Discipline of the church of Christ bears to the threatenings of the Law of God, a relation not less intimate and important than the Sacraments of the Gospel bear to its promises; and its righteous administration not only is, but has always been held by every pure church to be, one infallible proof of the true church. It is high time for the piety of the church to take the alarm upon this most painful subject.

#### THE SYNOD OF BALTIMORE.

The great importance attached to the erection of this new Synod in the Assembly of 1854, and to the effort to destroy it in the Assembly of 1855—renders it proper to say something on the subject. Moreover, there are general principles of lasting value involved in these discussions and the acts to which they led; and there are interests of immense import connected both with those discussions and those acts. Nor could this periodical, after all that has occurred, review the acts of the last Assembly, and remain silent on this subject, without the greatest affectation. What has now to be said, will, however, take no cognizance of any difficulties which may be supposed to exist within the bounds, or amongst the elements composing the Synod itself.

Those who are conversant with the temper of the two last Assemblies on this subject, are aware that the one of 1854, created the Synod by a very large majority, on the direct vote; and that the one of 1855, refused to do any act looking towards its dissolution, by a vote still more overwhelming. Both votes were taken after protracted and earnest debates—and upon reports of committees which had examined the whole subject; and in both instances, the majority of the house was so great, for the erection of the Synod and against its dissolution, that no division of the Assembly was asked for, in either case. The presumption, therefore, is extremely violent, that it is the deliberate sense of the church that this Synod is necessary and shall exist; and that the further agitation of that question would be merely factious, and without the slightest prospect of success. Under these circumstances, it is, of course extremely desirable that the churches and

office bearers of the new Synod, should conduct whatever plans, or even discussions, they may think proper to carry on, under the settled conviction, that the continued existence of this Synod as an organic element of the church, is no longer a question of any more doubt, than the similar existence of the Synod of Philadelphia.

The conduct of certain persons representing the supposed local interests of Philadelphia; that of the Synod of Philadelphia itself, and of certain leading members of that body; and that of certain officers and special friends of the Board of Domestic Missions—connected with this whole subject, has been alluded to heretofore in this periodical. We shall say nothing at present, which is not purely public, and in some degree of general import, connected with any of these topics.

The Synod of Philadelphia, we may admit, is not only entitled to all the rights and all the respect belonging to any other Synod, but to somewhat more consideration than any of the others, on account of its age, the number of its churches and office bearers, and the immense services it has rendered to the church in past days. But it is not entitled to be considered an independent power in the church, which may seek to maintain a position incompatible with the complete control of the church itself on one side, and hostile on the other side to the free action and perfect development of any portion of the church that may happen to be under its care, or any part of the country that may choose to be in its bounds. Any pretension of this sort is unworthy of it, is insulting to others, and is intolerable to the whole church. In this case it has happened that the venerable Synod is represented by those who assume to shape her action and speak in her name, to be outraged by a *disrespectful* action of the common mother of us all, creating a new Synod without her consent, mainly out of a part of her churches, ministers and territory. The new pretext is an absurdity, unworthy of that grand old Synod; for no human being in the entire bounds of our church would have done any act, merely or even mainly, out of disrespect to her; and a motion so destitute alike of truth and reason, fact and sense, never would have been charged by any one, except that he was utterly without sufficient reasons to allege for conduct which his passions urged him to pursue. The Synod may judge of the value and propriety of such pleas put forward in her name, by the reception they met with in two Assemblies, every member of both of which probably revered her great past. It was the deliberate sense of the church, twice uttered, that the thing done was a useful thing, done in a lawful way. As between the Synod of Philadelphia and the General Assembly, that is the whole case. And the Assembly never did a wiser or more proper act, than to vindicate to itself, on its own responsible discretion, the absolute right, to make a new Synod, even if every Synod in the church were silly enough to think it disrespectful not to be consulted beforehand. What renders the absurdity doubly gross, is that the Synod of Philadelphia had, for probably above twenty years, been consulting about its own division, and had repeatedly voted, that a division was necessary. That Synod must be what it used to be—if it would be revered as it used to be. If it sees fit to forfeit its ancient wisdom and magnanimity and shape a new course for itself under the guidance of a new sort of leaders; it cannot be surprised that new ideas concerning it and its objects, will finally supplant the old ones. It is one thing to defend the truth; quite another to resist progress. One thing to battle heroically for the church a very different one to oppose its necessary development.

As to the *city* of Philadelphia, the case is different. That city is not the Synod of Philadelphia; and Baltimore and Washington are not its suburbs; and the Presbyterian church has no imaginable interest in helping that city to domineer over surrounding cities and even States. On the contrary, it is the clear duty of the church, and one of the highest points of its permanent policy, to prevent the accumulation of undue power and influence, even in the most competent, generous and wise heads—far less in such as, to say the least, are no whit superior to the fair average of their brethren all over the church. We doubt if any proposition concerning the administration of the affairs of the Presbyterian church is more absolutely proved by experience, than that every thing has prospered during the past twenty years, precisely in proportion as the principle of *general* as opposed to *local* aggrandizement has been steadily pursued. And we are thoroughly convinced, that so far is Philadelphia from having any right to complain of the General Assembly for erecting a new Synod independent of it; that if the Assembly would go at least two steps farther, and remove two out of the three Boards accumulated there, the same sort of benefit would immediately and permanently result, as has resulted from refusing to put the Board of Foreign Missions there, and taking the General Assembly itself away. We say this upon general and unalterable principles, and would say as much if the leading ministers of Philadelphia, had forty times as much administrative capacity as the very greatest of their predecessors ever had. The organs of opinion in Philadelphia are greatly mistaken in their fancy, that any one thinks it worth while to conspire against them; but they are equally mistaken when they suppose that the permanent interests of the church are to be regulated by the probable bearing which any measure may have upon any interest of theirs—whether personal or local.

This periodical has heretofore alluded to certain acts connected with the attempt to destroy the Synod of Baltimore, which seem to implicate the Board of Domestic Missions, through the proceedings of persons intimately connected with it. At present we have only to say, that the Board of Missions and all its officers of every kind, would assuredly have kept clear of the conduct complained of, but for their connection with the city of Philadelphia; and that this affords a very clear illustration of one aspect of innumerable evils resulting from the practical outworking of the principle so long pursued in our church, of localising power in that city. And in this aspect of the case it is worth all the trouble it has cost, by showing not only the evil of that absurd principle, but by showing that it is already so weakened in its practical bearing, that it may be successfully resisted, upon a case made, even when it puts forth what it might be supposed to be irresistible force. The mere fact of the continued existence of the Synod of Baltimore, is one of those *great test facts*, which mark the progress of principles in their fundamental changes. And we venture, upon the basis of many such facts, to predict, that there must be a speedy change of the administrative policy of the church with regard to these matters; or the church must make up her mind to be content with results bearing no proportion to her capacity, her interest, or her duty. In the meantime, how deplorable is it, to use no stronger term, that the great organization contrived by the church for the very purpose of strengthening and extending its own organization throughout this great country, should justly expose itself to the charge of forgetting its great mission to gratify a local fanaticism, and should appear arrayed against a great movement whose immedi-

ate object and permanent effort were to promote the very cause it was itself constituted to advance!

The State of Maryland, in which Presbyterianism was first planted in this country—is the basis of the Synod of Baltimore; a nationality, worthy, one would suppose, of a distinct preservation in our ecclesiastical organization. Baltimore, the third city of the nation, and Washington, the capitol of the confederacy—two of the most important centres of influence on this continent, are seeking, by this means, to become a new and powerful spiritual centre for us; a prospect sufficient we should imagine, to justify some effort on the part of the church to organise an influence likely to be so immense. Four Presbyteries—unitedly covering a very large territory, and embracing a great Presbyterian force, ask to be organized around these great cities—and if this be granted—each of the two Synods from which they are taken, will remain greater than the new one—greater than the average of our Synods—greater than their own convenience demands. And one of these, (the Synod of Virginia,) cordially, though sorrowfully, agrees to part with her share, for so good an object; though in doing so, a great breach is made upon the hitherto united territory of the ancient commonwealth covered entirely by that Synod. It is only the city of Philadelphia, the Synod of Philadelphia, and the Board of Missions, located in Philadelphia, that make any outside opposition!—Is it worth while to argue a case, whose bare statement presents it in such an aspect?—*Disrespect to the Synod of Philadelphia!*—That must indeed be a heinous sin, to justify its punishment at so great a cost. And the General Assembly must be composed of heinous sinners, to perpetrate such a sin, deliberately in two successive annual meetings; without having any higher temptation than the desire to promote the glory of God, by the clear exercise of its high and plain powers, upon a case palpably obvious, made at its bar!—In good truth, can any one who has had occasion to be made aware of what has taken place at the Assemblies of 1854 and 1855, and between the two, fail to see, that these Assemblies instead of doing too much, have really done the very least that was possible, under the circumstances; and that what may be called the incidental revelations of the case show conclusively that a good deal more will have to be done, before the great interests of the church concentrated at Philadelphia, are placed on a footing safe from all perversion to improper local objects, and commensurate with the real design of the church in locating them there. Philadelphia has made it a necessity of the church to reduce her organised influence over the affairs of the church, still further. And the only question any longer remaining to be decided is, whether the really enlightened men in our church, there, will take care that this shall be done gracefully and with the consent of those who long held too much power, or whether it shall be done, by successive struggles, every one terminating in the defeat of pretensions, unreasonable and unequal in themselves, and incompatible with the prosperity of the church. We utter these things, not as threats, much less as ebullitions of ill humor; but simply as final truths, long working out in many minds, needful to be distinctly stated, and perfectly certain to become practical. If, as it has been rather publicly and ostentatiously intimated, the real ground of all such ideas as we have now uttered, were only the restlessness if not envy of an ordinary mind, under the inevitable control which God ordains to follow unusual endowments; our brethren could only more palpably exhibit their great superiority, when they shall have laid aside some

portion of the enormous power and patronage, which now raise them as far above the lot of ordinary ministers,—as the skill and knowledge claimed for them, elevate them above the common level of their brethren.

[To be continued in the next number.]

---

CHRISTIANITY, ITS ESSENCE AND EVIDENCE: OR AN ANALYSIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT INTO HISTORICAL FACTS, DOCTRINES, OPINIONS AND PHRASEOLOGY. BY GEORGE W. BURNAP, D. D.

THE author of this work tells us, in the preface, that he offers it “to the Christian public as the fruit of the toil and thought of thirty years;” and thus unintentionally reminds us, that he resembles the famous author of the “Analogy,” in one important particular beside that of having a name which begins with B. Nay more, he not only resembles that great master of thought, but has the advantage of him by the space of ten years; the “Analogy,” if our memory serves us, having been the fruit of the toil and thinking of only twenty years, while “Christianity, its Essence and Evidence,” has undergone the process of gestation and been struggling to the birth, for thirty. We are inclined to the opinion, however,—an opinion which it becomes us to express with great modesty, since the Unitarians have a monopoly of all the intellect current in the world,—that the mental calibre of the old Bishop of Durham more than makes up for the loss of the additional ten years; and if his venerable shade could confront the author of “Christianity, &c.,” he might accommodate the celebrated sarcasm of Demosthenes, addressed to his great rival, and say, “Indeed, the things which you and I do, in the course of twenty years, are very *different*.” Justly and truly spoken. The fastings and vigils, the agony of the mind and the wasting of the body may have been the same, but the *thinking*, we may say, by a very expressive meiosis, is “different.” There is a smoothness of style here, which any diligent student of Blair might hope to acquire, but beyond that, there is nothing which ought not to move our compassion. *O quanta species est, ast cerebrum non habet!*

The great Apostle of the Gentiles, for whom Dr. Burnap and all others, of genuine Unitarian culture, have no great admiration, speaks of some men who are “*ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth;*” and here we have four hundred mortal pages, written or dictated, and sent to the press, as the fruit of the toil and thought of thirty years, which are a sheer and wretched compound of ignorance, inanity and fatal error, in regard to the most momentous concern which can engage the attention of dying men. We have no words to express our abhorrence and contempt for a vanity of authorship, which can be gratified by such a publication; a pub-

lication, in which all that is true may be found in the commonest elementary work on Christianity, and the most that is false, beside being old, is deadly poison to the soul: a book on the "Essence," in which the essence is denied: a book on the "Evidence," in which the laws and principles of evidence are totally disregarded: an "Analysis," the last result of which is a *caput mortuum* of Christianity without Christ; "the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out." Such will be the verdict of every man who has the slightest respect for the Scriptures as the *word of God*.

That the author of this book has no such respect for the writings of the old and new Testaments, is palpable on almost every page; and whoever has read those letters of Thomas Jefferson to John Adams and Thomas Cooper, contained in his published correspondence, in which he lauds the morality of Jesus, ridicules the doctrinal expositions of Paul, and congratulates his friends upon the prospect of Unitarianism being one day, the prevailing, if not the only religion of this country, will be able to understand the following passage in the preface to the work before us, in which the author appears to give us the *primum mobile* of his speculations. And we may add, the speculations, according to the established law, have been in the direction of the original force. His words are these:—"About that time, (twenty years ago,) he fell in with a book of a very interesting and extraordinary character, written by the famous Jeremy Bentham, and entitled, "not Paul, but Jesus." In this work, that distinguished man attempted to show that Paul had corrupted Christianity, and that the Christianity of the Church had been any thing but Christian since his time. The works of Jefferson were published almost contemporaneously, and they were found to contain nearly the same sentiments." Again:—"In this state of things, it occurred to the author that the time had come for a new analysis of the contents of the new Testament. On the *old hypothesis of making it a homogeneous book*, all doctrine, all equally essential, it must encounter such serious objections as to over-task, the faith of an enlightened age. On *this hypothesis*, the main objection of Gibbon *never has been, and never can be, answered.*"

Now we beg our readers to consider, that the "*old hypothesis*," of which this man speaks so contemptuously, is simply the hypothesis of the whole Christian Church from the beginning, that the Bible is the Word of God, and a homogenous book in the sense of having been written by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, though written in different ages, in different countries, and by different individuals; that it has but one purpose and but one plan, and in every part is clothed with the authority of God, to regulate the faith and command the obedience of mankind; and further let them consider, that this charter of their hopes, upon the supposition that it is such a charter, is pronounced to be utterly indefensible against the assaults of the most maligniant infidel, who ever attempted to overthrow the Christian religion by a sneer, an infidel of whom Porson said, "that his hu-

manity never slumbered except when Christians were persecuted or women ravished ;” and then finally consider, that the man who introduces the atheist and infidel to our acquaintance in this fashion, or rather thrusts them into our faces, and tells us virtually, that the Bible, as a standard of faith, is good for nothing as against them, is, we blush to record it, a minister of Christ. Tell it not in Gath !\*

It is a capital deficiency in Dr. Burnap’s plan, that no place is assigned for the discussion of the question, as to the nature and extent of the rule of faith. He gives us, in the title-page, “doctrines” as well as “opinions” as to the result of his analysis of the new Testament; but how are we to determine what belongs to the one class and what to the other? Shall we say that the discourses of Christ are the repositories of doctrine, and the writings of the Apostles the repositories of opinion? Is the dictum of the atheist, Bentham, “not Paul, but Jesus,” the standard by which we are to judge? Or is it the intuitional consciousness, the spiritual sensibility in man, in all the stages of its development, from its extreme dormancy in the Feejee Islander, to its full manifestation in the man who has discovered that “most of the issues which have been raised in the Christian Church are false and irrelevant?” Does not the author know that the Christian Church, and many of the common people in his own little sect, hold the whole Bible as the authoritative rule of faith? Why then does he not, in a manly way, assert his standard to be a different one, and tell us what it is? Of how large a portion of the new Testament does he allow himself to speak as he does of the epistle to the Hebrews? † Let him come out like a man and say what, in his opinion, the word of God is, if indeed, he recognizes any such thing at all. We can understand the infidelity of the lecture room, the club room and the coffee house, but we cannot understand the infidelity of the pulpit. A celebrated Unitarian writer is reported to have assigned as a reason for abandoning the profession of the Christian ministry, that “it was a very poor business.” In this we agree with him. Upon Unitarian principles, it is poor indeed.

\* The question is often asked, why Unitarianism does not flourish in the Southern States, the churches of that denomination being few, and those few composed, for the most part, of New England people. The true answer, we imagine, is, that in the South, an infidel is an infidel, and is not ashamed to proclaim his principles on the house top. In New England, such is the tone which was given to society by the early settlers of the country, a religion of some sort, a church to go to, seems essential to respectability; and the problem to be solved is, how can a man be an infidel and a Christian at the same time. Unitarianism is the solution.

† In the 23d discourse on the Priesthood of Christ, after professing to give an outline of the argument of the writer of this epistle, he adds: “It is scarcely necessary to say, that all this comparison of Judaism with Christianity, considered as logical reasoning, has no validity. Nothing whatever is proved by it.” “The second argument to show the superiority of Christianity to Judaism, by proving the superiority of Jesus to Moses, is exceedingly ingenious; but logically considered, must be confessed to have but little force.” He puts his own construction upon the Apostle’s middle term, and then charges him with inconclusive reasoning. He never seems to dream that his own presumption has any thing to do with the halting of the syllogism. The gist of his objection is, that upon the Unitarian view of the Son-ship of Jesus, the argument of the epistle is inconclusive. An assertion we are not inclined to dispute.

Would that all who hold such principles could see it to be so, and betake themselves to a more reputable vocation.

Our author indulges the hope, that by means of his "Analysis," "many who are embarrassed by the commonly received hypothesis may see their way clear to retain a firm faith in Christianity as a religion of supernatural origin and superhuman authority." Now it is indispensably necessary to such a faith in such a scheme of religion, that two things should be done. *First*, that we settle the question, as to what is the ground and source of faith—what is revelation? *Second*, that we settle the principles upon which that revelation is to be interpreted. What is the word of God, and what does it mean? these are the only objects of reason in regard to revelation. We have seen, that in respect to the first, Dr. B. leaves us totally in the dark. He rejects the "old hypothesis," but omits to inform us which of the thousand and one new hypotheses, he himself adopts. If the critical *Gefuhl* of scholars is to be the standard, we are in a very hopeless condition, for it is different in every individual. If it be a matter of *Gefuhl* at all, every man must take his own as the standard, religion becomes a matter of mere taste, and as there is no disputing tastes, all discussion is at end. We have, therefore, and can have, no manner of controversy with Dr. B. We have no common standard to be the arbiter between us. But even if the question of the standard were settled, there remains the other question, of the principles of interpretation. Our author has a theory touching this point, which leaves us as far asunder as we were before. In order to give our readers some idea of it, it will be necessary to recur to his "Analysis," which, it is scarcely necessary to say, is made as much according to his taste, as according to any scientific principle.

It is an "Analysis of the New Testament into Historical Facts. Doctrines, Opinions and Phraseology." The *facts* are:—the Resurrection of Christ, Reality of Persons, Time and Places, the Consciousness of Christ, the Claims of Christ, Christ without sin, Faith of the Apostles, Perfect morality of the Gospel. The *doctrines* are:—Personality of God, Paternity of God, the Efficacy of Prayer, Forgiveness of Sins, Immortality, Retribution. The *opinions* are:—Interpretation of the old Testament, Demoniical Possession, a Personal Devil, the Return of Christ to the Earth. The *phraseology* contains:—the Kingdom of God, Christ a King, Jesus the Son of God, Priesthood of Christ, Sacrificial Language, Regeneration.

Now to say nothing of the merit of this classification, which the reader will perceive at a glance is, logically and scientifically considered, utterly contemptible and absurd, and could not be "satisfactory" to any but those perhaps, whose misfortune it has been to listen to the author's stated ministrations: to say nothing of the audacity of referring to the category of "opinions,"† the great doc-

† "By opinions," says the author, "I mean the impressions and habits of thought which were current at the time of Christ, upon subjects collateral to religion, which he did not deem it expedient to criticise. Concerning these matters, he did not consider

trine of the "Return of Christ to the Earth," which has been the "blessed hope" of his suffering people, since the day the heavens received him until now: to say nothing of his denial of the personal existence of the Devil, of the reality of which, this book alone might beget a shrewd suspicion, if there were no other evidence; notice how he sums up, under the head of "Phraseology," some of the most fundamental and glorious doctrines of Christianity. Let it be remembered, that in spite of the "Analysis," the "phraseology" is not a distinct department of the new Testament, but, of necessity, pervades the whole, "facts, doctrines, opinions *and* phraseology," and that in the author's hands, it becomes a kind of magical incantation, a "presto! change!" by which the most precious truths are spirited away; and we must either abate our abhorrence of Talleyrand's maxim, that "language was intended to conceal, not to convey thought," or—our compassion for the author prevents us from stating the alternative. Here then is the state of the controversy between the friends and foes of the Gospel. We quote the word of God in proof of some doctrine. "Oh!" says the ecclesiastical Talleyrand, "that was intended to conceal the true idea." "You must consider," says Dr. Bushnell, "that language, from the inherent vice of its constitution, *cannot* convey thought." "There is a distinction to be taken," says Dr. Park, "between the theology of the intellect and the theology of the feelings; and those terms of yours no more express real ideas or existences, than Ursa Major denotes a real bear travelling round the north pole." And faintly amid the chorus of these louder voices, may be heard the feeble utterance, "that it is all Jewish phraseology and Christianity has superseded Judaism."

The result of the whole matter is,—to accommodate the words of John Randolph, in a debate with Clay,—we labor under two very great misfortunes with respect to these honorable gentlemen; one is, that we can never understand them, and the other is, that they can never understand us. We are and must be, now and always, barbarians to each other. To talk of discussion and controversy, when there is neither a common standard to decide between us, nor a common tongue by which we may communicate, is supremely idle.

Thinking is but an idle waste of thought,  
Nought is every thing, and every thing is nought.

The social relations of Unitarianism, however, make it necessary for us to enter our solemn protest against the infamous morality of the system. Whether there be a personal devil or not, cannot be determined, so far as the determination of the question depends upon the teaching of Christ; until we have settled the question as to the moral perfection of Christ. Dr. Burnap admits, nay more, asserts the sinlessness of Jesus, and so do most of the fraternity to which

it the dictate of wisdom to make issue with his contemporaries." Disc. 15th. The reader will perceive from this statement and the subsequent illustration of it, that "opinions" is only another word for "errors" or "superstitions." To this class belongs the "Return of Christ to Earth."

he belongs. Francis Newman, whose liking for Unitarians and "serious atheists" he takes no pains to conceal, is of a different opinion, and has written a chapter in the last edition of his "Phases," which will cover his name with an infamy beyond the power of multitudinous seas to wash out. But the saddest thing of all is, that upon the Unitarian hypothesis, Newman is nearer the truth than James Martineau or George W. Burnap. If Jesus, of Nazareth, was not "over all God blessed forever," then we avow our deliberate conviction, that he said many things, which no man of ordinary integrity, not to speak of moral perfection at all, would have said. Could a man of "oceanic knowledge,"—to use Dr. B.'s elegant expression,—and at the same time of perfect integrity, have uttered what is recorded in the tenth chapter of John's Gospel, or in the eighth? "If ye believe not that *I am*, ye shall die in your sins." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, *I am*." Could a mere creature say without blasphemy, and, if his knowledge was "oceanic," without conscious blasphemy,—“He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.” “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.” “I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.” “No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.” Could a mere creature die, in his sound mind, under the charge of having made himself equal with God, without repudiating the charge with horror? Especially would it be possible for him to do it, if his knowledge was "oceanic" and his morality perfect! Whatever answer Unitarian theories of phraseology may give to these questions, we confidently appeal to the moral sense of mankind for a righteous judgment in the case. If Dr. B. pronounces the conduct of Jesus right upon his principles, we can only confess, that we have no more sympathy with him than with the inhabitants of those fabulous regions of space, "where all moral relations are reversed, and a crime of unusual turpitude inspires absolute envy." We could sooner believe the disclosures of Voltaire's Micromegas, than the conclusions of "Christianity, its Essence and Evidence."

But to pass over this view of the subject, our author presents us with another appalling aspect of Unitarian morality. In his chapters on Demoniacal Possession and the Personality of the Devil, he represents the belief in both these things as a Jewish superstition, and Jesus as giving systematic countenance to it! That Jesus, be it remembered, whose integrity was perfect and whose knowledge was "oceanic," who knew therefore that these were mere delusions, while he sanctioned them as real. According to Unitarianism, then, a long and systematic course of fraud is entirely consistent with perfect integrity. With regard to the unhappy demoniacs themselves, Jesus is represented, with all his "oceanic" knowledge, as acting in contradiction to the soundest principles of science, by treating their

delusions as real; and in regard to the unpossessed spectator of the woe, as acting, with all his integrity, as an impostor. But Dr. Burnap says, that this was an affair of physical science, and Jesus came not to teach physical science or to banish erroneous opinions concerning it. This is pleasant. In one aspect, that of mere being, mere existence in *rerum natura*, all things belong to physics. The pick-pocket, the volition which moves his muscles, the muscular motions involved in thrusting his hand into his neighbor's pocket, may all be *physically* considered. But is this the most important consideration? And can any man be in earnest when he talks of the doctrine of a Devil, or of demons, being only or chiefly an affair of physical science? We feel that we are degrading ourselves, in condescending to notice such a quibble. But he will say again, we use the term "lunacy," without sanctioning or intending to sanction, the popular superstition, which ascribes madness to the influence of the moon; and why might not Jesus speak of the sufferers in question as "possessed," falling in with the current language of the times, though no such possession existed? To this we answer by the following passage from Trench.\* "This had been no more than our speaking of certain forms of madness as *lunacy*; not thereby implying that we believe the moon to have, or to have had, any influence upon them; but finding the word, we use it, and this the more readily, since its original derivation is entirely lost sight of in our common conversation, its first impress so completely worn off, that we do not thereby even seem to countenance an error. But suppose with this same disbelief in lunar influences, we were to begin to speak not merely of lunatics, but of persons on whom the moon was working, to describe the cure of such, as the moon ceasing to afflict them; or if a physician were solemnly to address the moon, bidding it to abstain from harming his patient, there would be here a passing over into quite a different region; we should be here directly countenancing superstition and delusion; and plainly speaking untruly with our lips; there would be that gulf between our thoughts and our words, in which the essence of a lie consists. Now Christ does every where speak in such a language as this. Take, for instance, his words, Luke 11: 17-26, and assume Him as knowing, all the while he was thus speaking, that the whole Jewish theory of demoniac possessions was utterly baseless, that there was no power of the kind which Satan exercised over the minds of men, and what should we have here for a king of truth?"

But enough. Such is Unitarian *morality*, to say nothing of *logic*. We lay down the book with a loathing, mitigated only by the reflection that there are no signs of vitality about it, and that it will speedily find its appropriate place in that limbus of oblivion, to which so many better books have gone before it. We conclude with an apology to our readers, for aiding "in conducting it to that land of forgetfulness with the pomp of criticism."

\*Notes on the Miracles, p. 152: 2d Lond. edition. We commend that whole discussion to those who have any difficulties upon the subject. It is contained in his notes on the Demoniacs in the country of the Gadarenes.

---

**SUGGESTIONS TOUCHING THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM FOR SPREADING THE GOSPEL.**

---

No question can be raised before the mind of man of such unspeakable importance as the extension of the Gospel. This importance invests with a kindred value all questions concerning the means to this end. The reason which constitutes the immense significance of these issues, is found in the fact, that the Gospel of Christ is essential to the salvation of the soul; that without it men are inevitably damned; and that means must be used to send the truth to all who will perish without it. It is a brief and obvious result from the importance of the issues involved, not less than from a clear principle of the Law of God, that we are bound to use the very best means in our reach for the extension of the truth, and to use those means in the very best manner of which they are capable. To use inferior means when superior instrumentalities are at hand, is synonymous with treachery to the cause. Nothing short of the very highest exertion of all the capacities by which man can effect the end, will be accepted as a fulfilment of his obligations in the premises. Hence, we advance to the conclusion, that if there is any defect, either in the general system which any part of the Church has adopted for the extension of the truth, or in the particular modifications, or detailed management of that system, we are bound to seek its reform by all the weight of obligations which binds us to the work at all. Let us inquire into some aspects of the great Presbyterian system of ecclesiastical order, in its relations to this subject. We premise a few preliminary remarks on general principles involved in this issue.

*First.* The Church of Christ is a missionary association by the very law of its existence. It is an organization of the People of God, for the purpose of extending the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. This obligation, a unit in itself, binds them to the double aim of maintaining the Gospel among themselves, and of sending it to all who are without it. To suppose any necessity for another, and a distinct association or organization of men for these purposes, is to suppose an absurdity. It would be as reasonable as to organize an order of Masons for masonic purposes, and then to proclaim the necessity of another and a distinct organization for the same ends, leaving the first standing vacant in solitary and useless dignity, bearing a name, yet divested of a function. The creation of the original organization for its own ends is sufficient. To demand another to carry out its purposes, is absurd. Hence, the Church alone, is the great authorized source for the extension of the means of grace, and the knowledge of salvation.

*Second.* We remark that the Church has been furnished with all the means, agents and powers, necessary to the accomplishment of her ends, and that *these are the best adapted of all conceivable methods for this purpose.* The Church is an organized and finish-

ed kingdom. To deny it, is to impeach the wisdom of her Head: it is to declare him guilty of the folly of organizing an institution for the attainment of an end, and yet leaving it unequipped with the officers necessary to attain it. To deny that the order imposed by the Head of the Church is better than all modifying schemes of human wit, is to degrade the legislative wisdom of Christ beneath the level of mere human and limited faculties for government and legislation. However superior the devices of man may seem to the wisdom of God, the appearances are utterly delusive. All such inferences are based upon an incomplete induction of facts; upon a narrow view of the relations of causes to effects, and an inadequate conception of the real results as ultimately and completely developed, at the end of a period of time, and over a field of operation sufficiently large to test the genuine nature of the supposed improvements on the legislation of Christ. The final result of all such experiments will terminate on the same point on which a wiser and more reverent spirit would have rested before the experiment began:—that the order which God had imposed, in the organization of His visible Church, was far the best for the attainment of its ends. The very foolishness of God, is wiser than men, in this as in other things.

*Third.* The third principle we announce is, that the order of the Church is not only adapted to its ends; but it is *paramount*. The array of means is to continue until the end is attained. To deny this, is to nullify the entire system of the great agencies of the Church. The Church being then an organization for the extension of the truth, with suitable and permanent power for the purpose, must see that her ends are all attained, without exception, and that all her means are employed for this purpose regularly, systematically, and with a constancy of action, corresponding with the incessant pressure of her obligations. She is to *make*, as well as *retain* her conquests. She is not merely to retain what she gains, and establish her institutions wherever she plants them; but she is to go forward perpetually and by a regular system, to the conquest of new fields and the enlargement of her borders. This obligation to *expand*, is co-existent, both in permanence and in time, with the obligation to *establish*. Both must be met as *the regular and constant work of the Church in all its parts*. The officers have been appointed for the discharge of both. The conservative end, is to be met by the settled or pastoral ministry; the aggressive element, by *a regular corps of outworking agents*. Without both of these great classes of officers, these ends cannot be attained: one or the other must be neglected, without them; and no church is completely modelled, in which either are absent. If the Church is only furnished with a settled ministry, with no outworking corps based upon an organized footing, or with only an incomplete or occasional development of such a system, it can only be a conservative, or in the main, a conservative and edifying church. If, on the contrary, she is chiefly furnished with the outworking corps of officers, her great characteristic will be the *aggressive*, to the neglect of the *conserva-*

*tive feature.* To combine the two, there must be a *combination of the two great classes of officers.* This was done in the Apostolic Church. When the Apostles planted a church in any place where they had brought the gospel, they ordained elders in every place to remain in charge, and strengthen the interests committed to their care. These ordained and permanent elders, form the New Testament precedent for a settled ministry. But when this had been done, when the Apostles had thus organized and furnished the church, *they themselves went forward on new fields, and to new victories* Hence, the rapid extension and the firm consolidation of the churches of the Apostolic era. Here again is the Apostolic precedent for a regular body of outworking and aggressive ministers. Both parts of this precedent are *equally binding, and are equally permanent.* A precedent of a settled ministry, is not more binding than the precedent of the aggressive corps; if indeed it is as much; for a question might be raised whether the example of the Apostles in their personal discharge of duty, did not carry more weight, than the example of the unknown pastors they ordained over the churches. At all events the parts of the precedent are equally binding: and this is enough for the purposes of these suggestions. It follows resistlessly from the various propositions already submitted, that all parts of the Church of Christ are bound to have two great co-existing classes of ministers, each on a footing, as permanently a part of the ecclesiastical system, as the other. The full success of each branch of the Church is conditioned absolutely upon an unequivocal return to the precedents of the Apostles.

*Fourth.* Let us inquire now whether there is in the great system of Presbyterian ecclesiastical order, anything like such a complete system of combined conservative and aggressive action. To this question we are compelled to answer, not only for our own Church, but for all others, that *there is not.* In some churches, one of the great classes of an active ministry is to be found on a footing co-extensive with the Church: in others, the other class; while in both, there is an incomplete, and occasional instance of the class opposite to the one prevailing in the body. In the Presbyterian Church, the class of a settled pastorate is the grand leading form of the ministerial service; while the outworking corps of evangelists, is small in comparison of numbers, and only occasional in existence. There is no organized form of this branch of the service, co-extensive within the bounds of the Church itself. On the contrary the Methodist Church has organized its ministry mainly in the form of the outworking corps of evangelists; its located ministry is but a collateral and subordinate branch of its service, holding no part in the government, and exerting but a comparatively small influence in shaping the character and amending the spirit of the Methodist body. The consequences of this similar, yet opposite policy, in these two great branches of the Church of God are marked, and so significant of the causes in which they originate, that it is impossible to mistake the connection between them. The Methodist Church has copied one part of the Apostolic

model : the Presbyterian Church has copied the other. The consequences are plain. No candid Presbyterian will hesitate to confess, that for all the purposes of an aggressive and propagandist body, the Methodist Church is incomparably the most efficient of all parts of the Christian Church. No candid Methodist, on the other hand, will hesitate to admit, that for all the purposes of a conservative and constructive body, the Presbyterian Church is equally as far in advance of his own, as it is behind it in the other particular. There is nothing in the system of either, to prevent the engrafting of the element which is lacking upon both ; nor is there anything so essential to either in its peculiar feature, as to require a radical revolution in the system, in order to secure the element which is wanting. How often do we hear the remark made in the courts of the Church, or in the conversation of our ministry.—how desirable it would if we had the Methodist circuit-riding system? To all such remarks we have ever felt an objection. Not because we are jealous of the great Church of Wesley, or are either unwilling to acknowledge its glory, or to follow its example ; but because these remarks do injustice to our own grand system as modelled in the Scriptures. Far from us, and from all who are disposed to bless God for raising up a glorious agency for the extension of the Gospel, be any jealousy or want of appreciation of the invaluable services of the great Wesleyan body. In spite of its avowed and settled aversion to the precious doctrines of the sovereignty and grace of God, in the election of the sinner, we have ever regarded with deep veneration, the noble order which sprang forth to restore the light of a vital and saving faith to the dead establishment of England, and which has since borne the ensign of redeeming mercy, with the most extraordinary energy and faithfulness to millions of dying men over all the earth.

All praise to the gallant cavalry of the sacramental host. But while we are eager to do full honor to the Methodist Church, we object strongly to any insinuation that the system which we receive from the Scripture, as the order impressed upon the Church by Christ and his inspired Apostles, could be improved by the genius of Wesley, or any other legislator endowed with mere human and limited powers. So far from saying it is desirable that we should have the circuit system of the Methodist Church, we prefer to say it is desirable we should have a *completed model of our Presbyterian system*. The aggressive form of the Methodist ministry, is no more *essentially peculiar* to that system than to any other system of ecclesiastical order. The *essential* peculiarity of Methodism is, not in the existence of this great class of aggressive ministers, *but in the particular mode in which this class is organized*. Whether this mode of organizing the outworking corps of the ministry is the best, is a question upon which a difference of opinion would exist between a follower of Wesley, and an adherent to the freer system of the Presbyterian polity. On this question we express our opinion by a mere reference to one of the general principles already discussed : the order which Christ has ordained for his Church in the organiza-

tion of both of the great classes of his ministers, is unquestionably the best for the purposes in view. The great success of the Methodist body, as an aggressive organization, is attributable to the possession of the great class of aggressive officers to which we have so frequently alluded, and not *specifically to the mode in which they are organized for service*. A similar class of officers, organized on the freer principles of the Presbyterian system, would prove even more efficient. The difference between a system of evangelism, animated and guided more absolutely by a spirit of individual enterprise, and a system governed by rules which allow but little room for the exercise of individual convictions of expediency and right, or for the personal adaptation of individual ministers to particular communities—would display very clearly, in the long run, the superiority of the freer system of New Testament order, to the great system which sprung from the administrative genius of John Wesley. At all events, it is certain that neither of these systems are necessarily cut off from the adoption of the peculiarity in which both are wanting. Both can go back to the Apostolic precedent of Church order, in both parts of it. The Methodist system, can engraft, and ought to engraft upon its system of aggression, the class of permanent and regular pastors. The Presbyterian system can adopt the great corps of the aggressive ministry, in addition to her present system of a settled and stationary ministry. In doing this, the Methodist system would become far more effective in its conservative influences, and the Presbyterian system infinitely more effective as a system of aggression and progress. Then it would be brought to a fair test, whether a class of aggressive ministers, organized on the free forms of the Presbyterian polity, would not prove more effective than a similar class, organized on a more arbitrary and a mere human plan. Let the Presbyterian Church imitate the example of the Church of Wesley, in a more literal adoption of the Apostolic organization for spreading the Gospel. In other words, let her come back to the complete model of her own system. The Church has long been operating with only half a system. It has been often cited to her reproach, that she falls far behind the great sister with whom we have been comparing her, and the efficiency of her Apostolic forms has suffered in the comparison; thus bringing reproach on the legislative wisdom of her adorable head. But the reproach has been misdirected. The power of the free system of Presbyterian order, has never been tested. She has been working with a half model, and how can her system be charged with inefficiency, when, through the unaccountable negligence of her children, it has only been partially employed? The Presbyterian Church has been content with only a single class of official agents: her employment of evangelists for the purpose of entering into untried fields, and extending the Church, has been only occasional and incomplete. She has utterly failed to organize a great system of outworking officers, co-extensive with the Church itself, on a footing as solid and permanent as the other classes of her ministry. Her Presbyteries have failed to organize such a corps for

the occupation of their fields. She has utterly failed to see that this class of aggressive officers, is to be as permanent as any other ;—to exist until no work of aggression remains to be done, until the whole of earth is full of the knowledge and glory of God. Yet the demand for such a class, from the duty of the Church to advance her borders perpetually until her victory is complete, is just as clear as the demand for a settled ministry, for the retention of her ground, and the establishment of her conquests wherever they have been won. *The Church has as much right to abandon a settled ministry, or to allow it to become a mere occasional and infrequent thing, as she has to abandon, or allow to become disorganized, the great corps of her outworking evangelists.* Let the Church return to the full model of her own system ; let her accommodate her policy, in fact as well as in form, to the whole Apostolic precedent for the propagation of the Gospel, and we shall cease to hear of the failure of the Presbyterian system of ecclesiastical order, as an aggressive, or as a conservative system. Her triumphs as to the one, will be as complete as her admitted triumph to the other. Her success is owing to her adherence to the Apostolic precedent in part : let her return to the *whole* of it, and the result will be equally as successful.

*Fifth.* The next suggestion which we propose to submit, relates to the issue touching the organization of this system of domestic missionary effort, under the Board of Missions, or under the care of the Presbyteries. We do not hesitate to affirm, that as a general system, it ought to be under the control of the Presbyteries, to the exclusion of the Board, and within the bounds of the Presbyteries themselves ; that when the support of the Board is necessary to the maintenance of the evangelists within the bounds of a Presbytery, the connection should exist between the Presbytery and the Board, not between the Board and the individual missionary ; and that the official connection of the Board with individual missionaries, should be confined to frontier fields, where no regular or efficient system of ecclesiastical government has yet been organized on a self-sustaining basis. The great centre of the Presbyterian system of church order, is the court called the Presbytery. To this body is conveyed all the more important powers of the ecclesiastical government. The maintenance of the legitimate power and influence of the Presbytery in our system, is essential as a preventive of the tendencies to consolidation of power in the higher courts, and particularly in the Assembly. That the aggressive system of the Church should be as much under the immediate control of the Presbytery, as the other class of the stationed ministry, is obvious. The fields to be occupied, are within the bounds of the Presbytery according to the supposition on which we are arguing, and that court is the nearest, as well as the most efficient, ecclesiastical authority, to which the operations ought to be referred. The Presbytery will naturally have more information in relation to the fields, and can therefore distribute the agencies of occupation, with far more judgment than any body farther apart from the field itself. Besides, the natural connection of the missionary

with the Presbytery, points out the legitimate source of direction and control over his official action. The dependence of the Board on information derived from the Presbyteries, in the appointment of its missionaries, indicates with perfect clearness, that the power of appointment itself, ought to be with the Presbytery, and not with the Board; and that the only connection of the Board with the subject, should be the power to communicate of its funds to the Presbytery, in aid of its own operations. But to return more closely to the point in view.

The adoption of this system, of a systematic and permanent corps of outworking officers, would tell with inconceivable power upon the interests of the Church at large. It would greatly and rapidly extend the bounds and members of the Church. Indeed, without a modification of this idea, the Church can never be extended beyond its limits already attained. The present attainments it has made, are owing to this principle, under partial employment, and the only question really at issue is, whether a plan shall be adopted co-extensive with the Church, and sufficient to meet her obligations, or whether we shall submit to a mere accidental or occasional use of this great power of propagating the truth, the offspring of mere contingencies, and not the creature of *a wise and consolidated system* in the use of this means. The Church can never be made to do her work, or fill the measure of her duty or her glory, until this plan is adopted. Let it be done, and in twenty years, her increase will be immeasurably superior, in actual and relative proportion, to all she has ever been able to accomplish before.

The adoption of this plan of regular, missionary, aggressive movements, as a part of the regular business of the Presbytery, is essential to the utility of the plan of pastoral, missionary labor, adopted by some of the courts of the Presbyterian Church. We do not know to what extent the practice may prevail; but in some of the Presbyteries, there is a regular distribution of missionary labor to be performed for two or three weeks in the year, in the missionary fields of the body by the pastors and members of the Presbytery. But unaided by a regular system of permanent labor in these fields, it is obvious that this missionary, pastoral work, is well nigh entirely thrown away. A pastor leaves his charge, and for two or three weeks itinerates through two or more vacant counties, in which he finds no co-laborer to prepare the way, or take care of the fruits of his works, if God should be pleased to bless his efforts. Let us suppose his labor to be successful; sinners are converted, and material is gathered for a Presbyterian Church. But he cannot remain there to take care of it: he is compelled to return home; and the consequence is, that even where such missionary efforts are blessed with success in the salvation of men, they are utterly lost to the extension of the Presbyterian Church. That there is any degree of success in the conversion of sinners in these pastoral, missionary labors, is abundant reason why they should not be given up: but it is certainly no reason why they should not be so supplemented, if possi-

ble, as to result, not only in the salvation of men, but in the permanent extension of the Church. We are discussing the issue of the extension of the Church, and we must therefore consider the means to that end. If therefore the means used for this purpose result in the salvation of souls, and not in the extension of the Church, they do not answer our purpose. They only give us a reason for so adding to the agencies employed as to secure both ends in conjunction. But, in addition to all this, the success of these pastoral, missionary efforts, is conditioned, to an immense extent, on the adoption of our plan, not only in regard to the extension of the Church, but to the salvation of men. These efforts are often lost, because no one is left on the fields to second and deepen the impressions which have been made. Now let us reverse the picture : let us suppose a field occupied by a regular, active missionary. He can prepare the way for the pastoral missionary, select the fields, appoint the meetings, and will remain on the ground when the pastor has returned, either to deepen impressions, which have not ripened into conversion, or to secure the results of the effort, if it has proved immediately successful. Thus pastoral co-operation would be brought in, to second and sustain the outworking agent in his field of labor, and the existence of that agent, would enhance the efficiency, and secure the results of the pastoral missionary service. The two plans condition and support each other : neither can be omitted without loss to the other. This loss of the pastoral, mission work, is almost absolute, unless sustained by the auxiliary agency of the regular missionary. As at present directed in some of our Presbyteries, this pastoral mission is the most absurd of all schemes for the permanent extension of the Church.

Again, the control of the Domestic Missionary work, chiefly by the Presbyteries, would result in a great increase of the interest of the people in the work of missions, and in their contributions for the support of it. The work to be done, will be comparatively at their doors : they will see the practical employment, which will be made of their contributions ; and men will naturally feel more interest in results which are visible, and in efforts to build up interests in which they are more immediately concerned. They will give more for such a scheme. The most liberal and far-sighted elder in our Church, will give more to sustain a missionary in his own Presbytery, whose labors are to result in the increase of his own immediate ecclesiastical connection, than he will to the general fund for the domestic field, from which his money will be distributed, no doubt wisely and well, but still so far apart from his own sphere of observation, that it will be impossible, in the nature of the case, to excite his interest to any special fervor or activity. There is many a man, who will give double as much to secure a mission in his adjacent county, as he would to a mere general fund. Let each part of the Church, so far as it can, do its own work ; and if it can do more than its own field demands of it, let it then give aid to the great central agency of the Assembly in Philadelphia. But to excite the

permanent interest of the people to any active degree, it is assuredly the wisest expedient, to make the work appear as practical, and as personal in its bearings as possible.

Lastly, the influence of such a system would re-act wonderfully on all the existing interests of the Church. It would improve the character of the ministry. It would stimulate the settled pastors to redoubled zeal. It would rouse a more intense interest in every department of the enterprise of the Church. It would create an immense amount of co-operating labor, which is now entirely undeveloped. The sounds of revival, the tramp of the awakened host in the mighty field, moving with redoubled energy against the powers of darkness, would be heard gloriously in all parts of the refreshed and invigorated Church.

Upon the question, how we are to secure a consolidated system of aggressive agents, we have only time to submit a solitary hint, which we throw out, as we do the rest of the suggestions in this article, merely by way of awakening the attention of the Church, to the general consideration of our system of evangelism, as the views which have occurred to us. It is possible that some modification of our licensing system might be adopted, by which probationers for the ministry might be required, under certain conditions, and with certain limitations, to serve a specified time in a distinctively missionary field, previous to their induction into office. But an equally, if not more effective expedient would be, to offer to the missionary the assurance of a certain and ample support. Let him be paid, if it is necessary to secure his services, \$800 or \$1000; and let this be guaranteed to him by the Presbytery, and not left contingent in whole, or in part on the contributions in the field itself, until it is perfectly safe to do it. Why adopt one rigid rule of \$400, as a missionary salary, when the expenditure of that amount may secure only an incomplete and insecure occupancy of a field, by a man not competent to the post, and when the guarantee of \$800 or \$1000 may secure the services of an able man? If it is necessary, in order to secure an able occupancy of a missionary field, to compete, in point of salary, with the settled churches, *let it be done*. Men of the right capacity can then be as easily obtained for a mission field, as for an established congregation. We had infinitely rather pay \$1000 or more, to secure an able and active agent in a missionary field, and retain him, by making him feel that his support is at once ample and secure, than to see the same amount expended in maintaining an inefficient, and insecure occupancy of two or three fields. It is sound policy to do it. The Church will make more real, and more rapid progress to occupy a single field strongly, than several after the mode which has been but too current among us. Our people will give more to a system thus managed, and the result would be, the rapid and consolidated extension of our borders. Lastly, the whole scheme could be inaugurated, with brilliant prospects of an assured success, if the spiritual life of the Church were expanded, her faith increased, zeal purified,

her whole courts brightened by the cloud of fire resting on the roof, and pervading the chambers of her sanctuary. No doubt some will sneer at many of these suggestions; but we are too deeply convinced of the intense significance of the examples, and teachings of the Bible, and too profoundly impressed with the necessity of a simple and rigid adherence to its obvious meaning, to be afraid to endorse the wisdom of its precedents in policy, or the truth of its declarations of doctrine. We believe the Apostolic precedent of the outworking company of aggressive agents, is just as much binding in permanence of obligation, as the apostolic precedent of the settled elders, ordained in every Church. Admit this, and all the principal conclusions we have announced must be admitted. It is time we understood more of the real significance and force of the teachings of the Bible. An era of unprecedented splendor has dawned upon the earth, and is rushing rapidly forward towards its magnificent consummation. Unless the energy of the Church equals—nay surpasses the energies of the roused and animated world, she will fail of her mission. To expect any large or rapid conquests for the Church, with her present incomplete system of purely aggressive action, is utterly irrational. When the prophecy shall be fulfilled, and a nation shall be born in a day, it will be because that nation will be swarming all over, with the eager heralds of salvation, proclaiming the glad tidings on hill-top and valley, and bringing the truth directly to the heart, and conscience of each individual man. Is it not time, at least to begin to inquire, how her forces can be most effectually marshalled for the field?

~~~~~  
[For The Critic.]

STATE EDUCATION RADICALLY WRONG.

WE base our present argument on the now generally accepted principle, that the great aim of all human arrangements should be the development of the *individual man*. All forms of social organization have real value, only so far as they minister to that end: and the moment society lays such exactions as tend to confine the *healthy* growth of its members, it becomes an evil just to that extent. Human growth, whether it be physical, mental or moral, is always contingent on energetic, free, healthy exertion. Exertion is an effect conditioned on the laws of being, and graduated by appropriate causes. Exertion will not be energetic unless excited by strong motives: it will not be free, if cramped by over-legislation: it will not be healthy, if the natural laws of being be denied their legitimate force, either absolutely or relatively.

The Creator has placed man in natural circumstances, which afford him the proper and sufficient stimuli for self-development: the

Gospel system does in no way contravene these natural conditions of human growth, but is designed to impart additional force to them: and all social arrangements should be calculated to foster the strength of these natural appeals, to interfere only with their abuse, and not in any way to weaken or divert them. The very animal necessities of man, which drive him out to hunt and toil for the means of subsistence for himself, and for those naturally dependent on him, contribute so largely to the development of body and mind, as to discover to us the benignant design that was wrapped up in the forbidding curse of labor. And for all the possibilities of man's dualistic being, we find corresponding inducements suited to educate him to heights beyond heights, and heights above heights, stretching and rising forever.

This indefinite individual attainment is promoted by a certain degree of concert with other men. We say *concert*, as implying the consent of all concerned, and as distinguished from all sorts of despotism, which, although in some states of society a frightful necessity, is never consistent with the highest education of its subjects. Voluntary organization is an advantage to its members, when used to check the abuse of each one's liberty, and to systematize the labors of its members, in the production of some great common end, not within the reach of individual exertion: and when thus used, freedom of growth in the individual is promoted. Society is one great school, and the education of its members goes on perpetually. Education, (good or bad,) begins with the beginning of life—it terminates never. We are apt to talk of the education of children, as if children were the only proper subjects of education. We hold that the education of parents is of greater importance than the education of children—because without the former, the latter is unattainable. This statement is not meant for a smart catch in terms, but for the enunciation of a solemn and neglected truth. Early education is of unspeakable value, but no early education can suffice for the experience of married and parental life. The unfoldings of man's nature in childhood, are not to be compared in rapidity and conscious meaning, with the unfoldings of his nature when he becomes the head of a family. He finds himself then consciously a more bewildered novice, than when he first opened his eyes on the green earth, or first sat at the school-boy's desk. Unknown fountains of love well out of the depths of his soul; life becomes earnest, and is for the first time understood. It is like a new birth to his soul. No previous training could have taught him those fresh feelings, those altered views and relations; no limner could have portrayed the scenes of that mere microcosm in which he now lives and moves; nowhere could he have foretasted those joys, those anxieties, those temptations, those responsibilities, which now stimulate his mind, and must either energize his nature to the noblest endeavor, or debase it to deeper crimes than would be otherwise possible. When all the motives which naturally appertain to this near relation, are allowed their normal force, the parent finds himself in a school well adapt-

ed to call into vigorous exercise all his noblest powers. No occasion beckons him so forcibly by prayer and high resolve, as when he beholds first the child of his youth laid in his arms to be fostered and guided along its endless pathway. He thinks not, that in the manifold thoughts that troop through his mind in that sacred hour, there lie the most potent earthly means for elevating, purifying, strengthening, and expanding his own individual nature. Whatever he esteems a blessing, he wishes his child to possess—and to possess to the fullest possible extent. He gives himself to patient, persistent toil and self-denial, that he may afford his children every advantage that is needful to advance them in the scale of being. His labors draw him still nearer to his children, and his enhanced affection redoubles his labors. And the feeling that so many lives are bound up in *his* life, affords to his manhood a perpetual stimulus, which is as valuable to him as a man, and a member of society, as it is to those dependent on his exertions. And his children grow up with some appreciation of the value of the advantages, which they see purchased for them at such cost, and with some feeling of filial gratitude.

Now the system of State Education breaks up this school of Providence—steps in between parent and child—cuts a thousand tender ligaments—sweeps away a class of the most powerful incentives to manly exertion—teaches the child, at an expense to the parent, greater than any pecuniary consideration—in a word, emasculates the present generation in the vain effort to stimulate the manhood of the coming generation.

It would seem that the whole theory of State Education is based upon a false idea of what a true, serviceable, ennobling education is—upon the idea that information is education. But of what value would be a generation of “learned pigs” be to a State! A living dog is better than a dead lion. A manly, thinking squatter, in the midst of his swarm of children, with no knowledge of letters, may be a more truly educated man, and a more valuable citizen than many an owlish “scholar,” whose cerebrum is stuffed with other men’s ideas, until all the contents are packed away as immovably as the cargo in the hold of a merchant ship. It does not follow that the people of Virginia are badly educated, because there are a great number of men in the State who cannot read and write: nor does it follow that the people of Massachusetts are well educated, because they can all read and write. Reading and writing are valuable instruments in education, but they are not education. Instruments are dangerous possessions in awkward hands. Some of the worst farmers have the best agricultural implements, and *vice versa*. The worst citizens may have the most literary furniture. The end to be sought is the development of a true, symmetrical manhood. And if all else be sacrificed to the mere acquisition of knowledge, the result is a race of parrots and not men. On this plan it is quite possible to “educate” children to be dunces as to power of thought, and heathen as to social affections and moral perceptions. On this plan men

are "educated" into Popery, Jesuitism, despotism, and all manner of slaveries and stupidities, using the same Roman letters and Arabic figures, that are now by many supposed to be such excellent Republican diet, that you have only to cram children with A, B, C, and 1, 2, 3, to make them healthy, smart, well-mannered, well-moraled republicans, and a hopeful generation to manage the destinies of a great Christian nation. These publicly educated children undertake the business of self-government full early. Discipline in public schools is apt to be lax : because school commissioners are placed in the room of parents, and they do not *love* the children enough to insist on strict discipline : and moreover, because parents and public authorities become rival powers as to jurisdiction over the children, which engenders a jealousy on the part of the parent highly injurious to the conduct of the school, and the welfare of the child. When the teacher is the delegate of the parent, and responsible directly to the parent, there is unity of feeling and action, in all ordinary cases, highly beneficial to all concerned.

Whatever tends to relax the nerves of family government, injures the parent as well as the child. It disqualifies him for citizenship, as well as for the parental relation. This principle is taught in the Scriptures, where it is said that when a man cannot rule his own household, he is not fit to have charge of the Church of God. In our nation, where we are all "sovereigns," it is specially important that every citizen should "rule well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity : for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of" his country !

Again, State Education is but *educational communism*. They are both based upon the same philosophic fallacy, and are equally opposed to the nature of man. When the direct results of a man's labor are placed beyond his personal control, his great motive to exertion is taken away, and he feels but little inclination to labor at all. All can see how this is in the matter of property ; why can they not see it in the matter of education ? Let a man's children be fed and clothed by a public provision, and the proceeds of his labor be taken from him, and thrown into a common stock ; and it is easy to imagine that he will depreciate as a man, and a member of society. The same error is seen in the English Poor-Law system ; and in all general state provision for the ordinances of religion. Pauperism in England grows by what it is fed upon. And when the State provides liberally for the religious wants of the people, the effect is corrupting upon the Church, collectively and individually ; and that just in proportion as the provision is liberal. The whole system is calculated to withdraw the incentives to individual effort, and thus to weaken and emaciate the religious nature of the people. These have become familiar truths to us in America, and we are prone to wonder at the obtusity of other nations on this subject. Why then will we shut our eyes to the fact that the whole fabric of State Education rests upon the same sort of plausible argumentation, that sustains the Church and State system of the Old World ? They

there say that religion is indispensable to the well being of the State—and that the work of enlightening the masses is too great to be left to private means: ergo, the State must undertake it. The advocates of State Education reason exactly so: education is indispensable to the well being of the State: the work of enlightening the masses is too great to be left to private means: ergo, the State must undertake it! If the latter argument is sound, the former is sound: but if the former is fallacious, the latter is fallacious! If a state provision for religion has proved an injury to the cause, and a curse to the people,—so a State provision for education will prove an injury to the cause, and a curse to the people.

The life of the State, is in the life of its individual members. Take away from the head of the family, all direct concern in the education of his children: let the school house be built for him, the teacher furnished, the whole routine of studies prescribed, length of session and hours of study all mapped out by commissioners, it being left to him only to take what is offered, to drive his children away from home early each morning, and to pay the tax-gatherer when he comes round, and as certain as is the connection between cause and effect, his soul will be congealed, his interest in his family diminished, those ennobling affections which spring up spontaneously along the pathway of parental toil, will in a measure wither and die, and those tender solitudes which were meant to divert his mind from sordid pursuits, will be turned in to deepen that love of money for its own sake, which they were designed to check. He toils not now to educate his children, but to pay his taxes and accumulate a fortune. Were the money he pays a spontaneous offering for the good of his family, he would experience pleasure and enlargement of heart: but he instinctively hates a tax laid by government, even when he can but approve the object, and he is made a worse man by the visit of the sheriff. Of all taxes, that laid for an eleemosynary object, is the most revolting: because there is an instinctive feeling in the human breast, that charity in every form ought to be free and not coerced; that it ought to be individual and not governmental.

The work of educating the entire population of our land is certainly a vast undertaking: but not as vast as the work of christianizing the same population. And the latter is in every view, the more important work. Does that prove it to be the business of the State? But there is a statistical blunder in the reasoning of the friends of State Education. They would have us to believe that the number of children not likely to receive an education, is much greater relatively than it is in fact. Take the State which has the largest proportion of adults, who are unable to read and write, and how small is the number, compared with those who can read and write! And how little additional effort from the community at large, would place the means of education within the reach of all. There is no moral cause in our land, which has so many workers to push it onward, and so many natural motives to stimulate its workers, and assure

them ultimate success. The same amount of voluntary effort required to inaugurate and keep in action a general public school system, would accomplish the same end far better by unincorporated means.

We would, however, once more record our protest against the idea, that "popular education" (in the vulgar sense) "is the palladium of the Republic." The people of Prussia are as well instructed in rudimentary knowledge, as the people of New England, and yet the Prussians are wholly unfit for self-government. Indeed Prussia is almost the only nation in Europe that has produced no great spirit to stand up for civil and religious freedom. Even frivolous France, beastly Austria, and midnight Rome have, during the present age, all done better than Prussia, in raising up apostles for light and liberty.

This Republic of ours was not born of letters. The people had indeed received a true republican education—but it was education in field and forest, in toil and danger, when men depended on themselves for every thing, and on government for nothing. And after all the common school quackery, that has been practised in various States for the health of the nation—the health of the nation has suffered most, just when said quackery has flourished most! Massachusetts has been the great leader in State Education: but what patriot would prefer the Massachusetts of 1855, to the Massachusetts of 1776. It is not surprising that her material wealth has augmented very greatly; for what else had the people to do, but devote their wits to money-making, seeing that the State had assumed their parental responsibilities. And they seem likewise to have time to attend industriously to their neighbor's concerns, and to plot treason against the General Government. Who does not see that "enlightened" Massachusetts is the most dangerous member of the Union—with all her Horace Mann quackery. New York stands next in her zeal for State Education—but has it proved so lovely a thing there, that all should imitate her example! By the time she has finished her schemes for endowing Popish schools, shutting out the Bible as a "sectarian book," expurgating even the old primers of every liberal, Protestant idea and allusion, perhaps carrying out Mr. Seward's old plan of having the children of foreigners taught in separate schools, with teachers and text-books to suit their several languages and creeds, and forbidding prayer to be offered in any school—we shall then see that even her love of Southern cotton, will not prevent her from emulating her sister of the Granite State, in despising the constitution and laws of the country. The experience of our country on this subject, is only just commencing. Its difficulties and disadvantages will multiply perpetually. If the system ever obtains undisputed sway, it will be by flattering the natural indolence of parents, and by blinding their minds, and stupifying their consciences, as to what they owe to the moral and religious, as well as the intellectual natures of their children.

At another time, the same general principles will be applied to the subject of ecclesiastical education.

LETTER TO A KENTUCKY LAWYER.

MY DEAR SIR:—You express some surprise at the assertion, that the duty of immediately receiving and obeying the Gospel, is one so plain and definite in its nature, and enforced by arguments so obvious and convincing, that you, on an argument of equal force would expect to obtain the verdict of any intelligent jury in the world.

You complain on the contrary, that though disposed to be a Christian you find yourself encompassed by insuperable difficulties, in any purpose you form to become such. That in the first place, you have occasional, if not settled doubts, touching the whole question of religion as a practical reality; without having either the leisure or the ability to relieve your doubts by a thorough study of the evidences of Christianity. That in the second place, when putting aside all doubts of this sort, you come to the examination of the teachings of the Gospel, you find yourself embarrassed by the singular and apparently self-contradictory doctrines therein set forth, which embarrassments you have not the leisure to remove,—if study could remove them, by reading books of Divinity. Or that in the third place, if you have put aside again all these speculative questions of doctrine, and direct your attention singly to the practical duty specifically demanded of you—viz: “Believe,” you can form no clear apprehension of the “believing in Jesus Christ,” and the “being born again,” so much insisted upon, or, in the last place, that even when you feel impelled to make the effort to believe and obey, you find yourself placed by Providence in such circumstances,—so surrounded by the anxieties and cares of daily life, and the temptations of society—that your attention is constantly diverted, and your incipient interest in the whole subject destroyed.

Allow me now to express my gratification even at your uneasiness on this subject,—to re-affirm the opinion before expressed,—even though you seem to doubt its correctness; and to express my conviction further, that the difficulties which you state with such apparent force, are all of them, difficulties of your own creation, and therefore they do in no degree invalidate the force of what I have said of the plainness of the question of a man’s salvation.

I have not unfrequently been surprised, to find gentlemen of your profession,—skillful, one would suppose, above all other men, in the detection of fallacies—so easily imposed upon by their own fallacies, in the matter of personal religion. I can account for it only on the supposition that they seldom carry their reflections on the subject of personal religion far enough, and seldom think deeply, definitely, and intensely enough on the subject, to allow their minds an opportunity to get that clear and distinct view of the point, which they are accustomed to have of the subjects about which they ordinarily reason. If the juries whom you address, should treat the matters

which you bring before them, with the same sort of attention which you give to the question, which the Gospel calls upon you to decide personally, I doubt whether you would ever have any other report from them, than "unable to agree upon a verdict."

The fallacy underlying all the grounds of difficulty which you present, consists in the substitution of a series of false issues, in the place of the one true and single issue, which the Gospel makes with every man when presenting him with the offer of salvation. In the first place, it is not a question of appeal to external and remote evidences to substantiate the credibility of the offer, but simply an appeal to every man's own consciousness. The very terms of the offer imply this. It is of "water" to quench a "thirst," of which the soul of man is supposed to be conscious; it is of "bread," the "bread of life" to satisfy a hungering, which the soul of man is supposed to feel. It is in the nature of a remedy for the felt wants of the soul, and its one simple issue with every man is, "will you accept the remedy?"

The Gospel statement of the *credenda*, essential to salvation, is not a statement of puzzles and high mysteries of speculation—but simply of facts. "It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." It demands not high powers of intellect to comprehend a speculation, and appreciate its philosophic justness;—but "if thou believe *with thy heart* and confess with thy mouth that Jesus is the Christ, thou shalt be saved." Heaven is not a *future*, merely, of glory, in reward for accepting without analysis, or for skill in the analysis of puzzles. "He that believeth on the Son *hath* (now) everlasting life." The two elementary ideas of the Gospel, are a felt want in the soul, and a divine remedy in Christ for that want. And accordingly, the appeal of the Gospel is not to the powers of the discursive intellect, but to the undiscursive consciousness of the soul. By the very form and terms of the Gospel offer therefore,—all the issues raised in your statement of difficulties are at once set aside. The only question is—do you feel that a remedy is needful for a moral malady of which you are conscious, and are you willing to accept the remedy herein proposed—to wit: restoration to God's favor through the mediation of Jesus? But instead of directly and practically meeting this personal issue, you direct your mind to vague and general speculations, touching the testimony in favor of the credibility of the History of the Divine remedy for sin—or to equally vague and general speculations, touching certain principles of reasoning, and certain points of philosophy involved in the theory of such a remedy—or to caviling inquiries concerning God's providential control over you and your relations to this remedy. You will not understand me, here, as disparaging the importance of such inquiries as these, intrinsically, or as calling in question the propriety of your engaging in them. All I mean to say is, that these are not the issues involved in the great question of personal salvation, which the Gospel makes with you,—

and therefore your difficulties on these subjects are not *the* difficulties which hinder your personal salvation. Yet, is not just here the great fallacy which deceives you, and so many other intelligent men, who think you wish to be christians and cannot? Instead of a simple examination of the authoritative record to ascertain precisely, and definitely what is involved in being a christian, you draw upon your own fancy, and employ your thoughts upon an ideal Gospel. Hence, with some of you religion is a congeries of incredible and impossible truths, naturally contradictory to human reason; and the terms of salvation accordingly seem to you to be the offer of an eternal heaven, as a reward for superior credulity in believing what is hard to be believed! And to such, the aspect of the Gospel is of a sick-nurse, laboring with offered sweets as bribes to induce the swallowing of the revolting draught. With others of you religion becomes a congeries of divine puzzles, which man's soul must work out in order to attain eternal life. To these the aspect of the Gospel, is that of the monster Sphynx of the old Greek Tragedy, sitting by the way of life, and propounding to each passer-by the mysterious riddle, and demanding of him to solve it or die! Whilst on the contrary the true Gospel with infinite simplicity, is appealing to you, as a sinner in controversy with your Maker, and telling you of One who was made peace for us, and becomes his voice crying to you, "Look unto me and be ye saved—all the ends of the earth."

You will doubtless insist, however, that these other great questions are all involved in this question of religion—since you must know that this remedy is real and divinely appointed, as a condition precedent to your accepting it. True, the question of the credibility of the Gospel, and the reasonableness of the Gospel, are in the highest sense involved in the question of a personal faith in Christ; but they are not so involved, nor do they at all stand in such relation to the personal faith in Jesus Christ, as to render the complete investigation of them necessary as preliminary to any rational acceptance of the offer of the Gospel. They are no more so than a well grounded confidence in the adaptedness of water to quench the thirst, or of bread to satisfy the hunger may be supposed to imply first a careful investigation into the evidences from chemistry of their adaptedness to this end, as preliminary to a rational acceptance of the water and bread as a means of relieving one's physical wants. For the whole matter of religion as a personal thing, if we inquire into it in the most natural and direct order—is finished in all its aspects, without any such inquiries into the evidences of Christianity,—or any such determination of different points of Theology.

The inquiry concerning religion, arises naturally in the first instance out of phenomena, which no man who reflects at all, can fail to have observed in his own nature. Conscious of the possession of powers moral and intellectual, which have no adequate theatre for their development in the few days allotted him here on earth—he is compelled at least to *suspect*, if not to *infer* a continuance of his ex-

istence beyond the death of the body. Conscious again of a power to conceive and approve of a higher degree of moral character than he actually ever attains to in his actions, he is compelled to *suspect*, if not to *infer* the existence of a retribution in some form for his many delinquences. Now out of these two elements we have a strong suspicion of a hell for man—together apart from any question of the Gospel. And the question must press itself home upon every man who thinks—and with infinite force—what is the solution of this problem of my existence? Obviously, so far, the questions raised in your statement of difficulties, have as yet no place in the inquiry. Altogether anterior, logically, to the Gospel is this tremendous inquiry—and no matter what theory you adopt as the Gospel—this inquiry stands still unaffected. Now assuming this state of inquiry in the soul—this “thirst” as the Scripture calls it—the Gospel proposes a solution and a remedy for it. Declaring that Jesus the Son of God hath taken humanity upon him, hath volunteered to obey for man, and yet to suffer in place of man,—hath furthermore, in virtue of that atonement, provided a divine means for the restoration of the nature of man—and asks of man only to accept of him as an all-sufficient Saviour, appealing to you, it demands simply will you have salvation on these terms? Here again there is no place for the difficulties of which you speak—for it is simply an appeal to your own willingness to accept his offer,—but “you will not come to him that you may have eternal life.” See you not the perfect propriety and justice of the Gospel representation of unbelief—such being the character of the unbelief—as thereby the sin of all sins?

I have made this response to your suggestion of the difficulties that lie in the way of your being a christian—rather than go into any detailed examination of the difficulties themselves. For if the issue on this subject be as I have stated it, then all necessity for any reply to your points is obviated. It would be no difficult matter to show that your doubts concerning the reality of religion, are not doubts founded on rational grounds—which may be reached by reason and argument;—that your difficulties touching *the doctrines* of the Bible are, at least so far as concerns you, imaginary difficulties, since you hold to none of these doctrines with any force of conviction strong enough to produce any practical effect upon your mind;—that your want of ability to apprehend the terms of salvation is an inability of heart, for “the word is nigh thee even in thy mouth and in thy heart,”—that is, most plain and familiar, to you. All these points I might have made in detail. I have preferred, as a more brief and satisfactory method, to show simply that the real question, as a practical matter in your case, cannot involve any of the difficulties you complain of. And if I have presented the question fairly, I humbly submit whether it is not a question, as plain, as definite, and as capable of being decided at once, as any question you submit to a Jury.

I add no more at present— but having made these suggestions as to the true issue involved, ask for them your most earnest and prayerful attention.—FAREWELL.

PAPAL PHILOSOPHISM.—BALMES.

WE have presented our readers with various specimens of the Protean forms, which in the 19th century, Popery is wont to assume; in order to seduce all sorts of men, of all classes and of all sorts of opinions. We have shown how its advocates, with most shameless unscrupulousness have, in the highest theatres to which they can gain access, not feared to affirm or deny any thing that might be supposed to favor or to oppose the Papal interests. Nay, that with the most brazen impertinence one partizan of the Pope is openly proclaiming and publishing such and such statements as facts by authority—and such and such doctrines as the creed by authority of the Papal Church; while another advocate is perhaps at the very same time in a different place, and when there is a different end to gain,—proclaiming and publishing these very statements to be infamous lies—and these doctrines to be treason to the Papacy!

It occurs to us that it may not be without interest and advantage to our readers, to present them with specimens of another class of advocates of Romanism—in the writers, who may be taken as the current popular book writers of the higher class among them—by way of letting them into some acquaintance with the ideas which Popery is busy in circulating among the educated young men of the country. We begin with some of the philosophical writers, par excellence, whose praise is in all the Romish booksellers' circulars. Among these Balmes' "Protestantism and Catholicity" is now in the ascendant in certain latitudes. Its pretensions to philosophy are very lofty, and it seems to have been intended as a response to Mr. Guizot's History of Civilization—and to show the superior influence and advantage of Romanism in the civilization of modern Europe. He is a Spaniard by birth, and we may add, strongly a Spaniard in spirit and in *logic*. His work, however, has many of the elements which dazzle minds of a certain class. There is an air of magnificent Spanish grandeur of style, of late fashionable among the transcendentalists of Europe—a sweeping torrent of generalization, which piles up all sorts of historical driftwood, into all sorts of shapes—from which much in the style and manner of Fluellen, reasoning from Alexander of Macedon, to Henry of Monmouth he draws his conclusions. In such a field, unhampered by any restraints of actual facts, as by his mental training untroubled by any restraints from laws or limits of logic, a Priest playing the philosopher, might be expected to perform some remarkable feats. Whilst at the same time the air of grave learning, and the easy flow of his Spanish style has many a fascination for ambitious young tyros in philosophy just out of school, and not less for that class of tyros who never were trained in school, but who fancy that Philosophy and Theology come to them by nature.

We select here by way of specimen, once for all, an instance of this lofty generalization, with the accompanying array of facts for the purpose of illustrating the style and method of this Priest Philosopher. It is from Chapter IV, entitled "Protestantism and the Mind," page 45.

"Catholicism says to man, "thy intellect is weak, thou hast need of a guide in many things." Protestantism says to him, "Thou art surrounded by light, walk as thou wilt; thou canst not have a better guide than thyself." Which of the two religions is most in accordance with the lessons of the highest philosophy?

It is not therefore surprising that the *greatest minds among Protestants* have all felt a certain tendency towards Catholicism, and never have seen the wisdom of subjecting the human mind, in some things, to the decision of an infallible authority." &c., &c.

Such is the general assertion in the text of the Philosopher. This general assertion he proceeds to illustrate in detail in a note on this page, at the close of the volume as follows:—Note 7, p. 45.)

"I have said that the most distinguished Protestants have felt the void which is felt in all the sects separated from the Catholic Church. I am about to give proofs of this assertion, which *perhaps some persons may consider hazardous.* (!)

Luther writing to Zwinglius says: "If the world lasts, it will be necessary on account of the different interpretations which are now given to the Scriptures, to receive the decrees of Councils, and take refuge in them, in order to preserve the unity of the faith."

"Let us hear Calvin: "God has placed the seat of his worship in the centre of the earth, and has placed there only one Pontiff whom all may regard, the better to preserve unity."

"Cultus sui sedem in medio terrae collocavit, illi *unum* Antisticem praefecit, quem omnes respicerent, quo melius in unitate continerentur."—(Calv. Inst. 6, § 11.)

So in like manner he quotes at length Beza, Melancthon, Grotius, Puffendorf and Leibnitz—all to the effect of making the admission, that the Church must have a Pope—an infallible head. Now we are rather surprised, that even a Spanish Priest—a liar by the combined influence of race and education, should not himself have considered it hazardous to perpetrate such a manifold lie as this. And more surprised that American Papists should presume upon the ignorance of reading men of any class enough to give it currency. There is no need of going into any detailed exposure of those quotations—we take that from Calvin simply by way of specimen. We have taken some pains to hunt up the place from which this quotation is forged, for the place is incorrectly cited—and present it to our readers in full, that they may admire this specimen of Spanish imprudence.

"Let the question, therefore, be stated thus: Whether it be necessary to the true system of what they call the hierarchy or government of the Church, that one see should have the pre-eminence above all the rest in dignity and power, so as to be the head of the whole body. Now, we subject the Church to very unreasonable laws, if we impose this necessity upon it without the word of God. Therefore, if our adversaries wish to gain their cause, it is necessary for them, in the first place, to show that this economy was instituted by Christ. * * * *Because the Jews were surrounded on all sides with idolaters, God, in order to prevent their being distracted by a variety of religions, FIXED THE SEAT OF HIS WORSHIP IN THE CENTRE OF THE COUNTRY, AND THERE HE SET OVER THEM ONE PRINCIPAL PRIEST, TO WHOM THEY WERE ALL TO BE SUBJECT, FOR THE BETTER PRESERVATION OF UNITY AMONG THEM.*"

"Hic igitur sit questionis status, Utrum ad veram hierarchiae (ut vocant) seu ecclesiastici ordinis rationem necesse sit sedem unam inter alias et dignitate et potestate eminere, ut sit totius corporis caput. Nos vero nimis iniquis legibus subjicimus eccle-

siam, si hanc ei necessitatem sine verbo Dei injicimus. Ergo si volunt evincere adversarii quod postulant, ostendere eos primum oportet oeconomiam hanc a Christo esse institutam. * * * * Quia undique ab idololatriis septi erant Judaei, ne religionum varietate distraherentur, cultus sui sedem IN MEDIO TERRAE SINU DEUS COLLOCAVIT : ILLIC UNUM ANTISTITEM PRAEFECIT, QUEM OMNES RESPICERENT, QUO MELIUS IN UNITATE CONTINERENTUR. Nunc ubi vera religio in totum orbem diffusa est, uni dari Orientis et Occidentis moderationem, quis non videat esse prorsus absurdum? Perinde enim est acsi quis contendat totum mundum a praefecto uno debere regi, quia ager unus non plures praefectos habeat.”—(Calv. Inst. Lib IV. c. 6, sec. 2.)

Here then is the latest devised Philosophic style of manufacturing authorities! Calvin’s very argument to show the preposterous absurdity of any central Head of the Church, by a twinge so merciless as none but a Spanish inquisitor would give it—simply expanding by a “free translation” the little land of Juda into the broad earth, and the High Priest of Israel into the Pope of Rome;—is thus turned into a Protestant admission of the necessity of a Pope to the Church!

With this remarkable instance of the candid philosophic fairness which modestly trembles at the *hazard* of telling the whole truth about the Reformers, our readers will be prepared to appreciate another specimen of the philosophic style of representing the character and opinions of the Reformers, found in immediate connection with the foregoing. After being informed that Luther, Calvin, and Beza, all believed in a Pope for the Church as absolutely essential, and ordained of God; they will be less surprised to learn, that Luther admitted himself to be an infidel hypocrite—who preached to others what he did not believe himself. We give the Philosopher’s learned note on this subject:—

“Some of the leaders of the Reformation have left suspicions that they taught with insincerity, that they did not themselves believe what they preached, and that they had no other object than to deceive their proselytes. As I am unwilling to have it imputed to me that I have made this accusation rashly, I will adduce some proofs in support of my assertion. Let us hear Luther himself. “Often,” he says, “do I think within myself that I scarcely know where I am, and whether I teach the truth or not. (Sæpe sic mecum cogito, propemodum nescio, quo loco sim, et utrum veritatem doceam, necne).” (Luther, *Col. Isleb. de Christo*.) And it is the same man who said: “It is certain that I have received my dogmas from heaven. I will not allow you to judge of my doctrine, neither you nor even the angels of heaven. (Certum est dogmata mea habere me de cælo. Non sinam vel vos vel ipsos angelos de cælo de mea doctrina judicare).” (Luther, *contra Reg. Ang.*) John Matthei, the author of many writings on the life of Luther, and who is not scanty in eulogies on the heresiarch, has preserved a very curious anecdote touching the convictions of Luther. It is this: “A preacher called John Musa related to me that he one day complained to Luther that he could not prevail on himself to believe what he taught to others: ‘Blessed be God (said Luther) that the same thing happens to others as to myself: I believed till now that THAT was a thing that happened only to me.’”—(Johann. Matthesius, *conc.* 12.)

The doctrines of infidelity were not long delayed; but would it be believed that they are found expressed in various parts of Luther’s own works? “It is likely,” says he speaking of the dead, “that, except a few, they all sleep deprived of feeling.” “I think that the dead are buried in so ineffable and wonderful a sleep, that they feel or see less than those who sleep an ordinary sleep.” “The souls of the dead enter neither into purgatory nor into hell.” “The human soul sleeps; all its senses buried.””

In order to complete this set of specimens of philosophic history by a priest, we feel constrained now to present the philosopher’s spec-

ulations touching the fanatical visions of the Reformers, in contrast with the true, orthodox visions of St. Theresa :

“ If any persons find difficulty in persuading themselves that illusion and fanaticism are, as it were, in their proper element among Protestants, behold the irresistible testimony of facts in aid of our assertion. This subject would furnish large volumes ; but I must be content with a rapid glance. I begin with Luther. Is it possible to carry raving further than to pretend to have been taught by the devil, to boast of it, and to found new doctrines on so powerful an authority ? Yet this was the raving of Luther himself, the founder of Protestantism, who has left us in his works the evidence of his interview with Satan.”

“ The phantom which appeared to Zwinglius, the founder of Protestantism in Switzerland, affords us another example of extravagance no less absurd. This heresiarch wished to deny the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist : he pretended that what exists under the consecrated species is only a sign. As the authority of the sacred text, which clearly expresses the contrary, embarrassed him, behold, suddenly, at the moment when he imagined that he was disputing with the secretary of the town, a white or black phantom, so he tells us himself, appeared to him, and showed him a means. This pleasant anecdote we have from Zwinglius himself.”

“ Who does not regret to see such a man as Melancthon also given up to the prejudices and manias of the most ridiculous superstition, stupidly credulous with respect to dreams, extraordinary phenomena, and astrological prognostics ? Read his letters, which are filled with such pitiful things.”

Now contrast these regrets of the Philosopher with the following :

“ After the desolate and horrible picture which I have given in the preceding note, perhaps the reader will be glad to let his eyes rest upon a spectacle as peaceful as it is beautiful. It is St. Theresa writing her own life out of pure obedience, and relating to us her visions with angelic candor and ineffable sweetness. ‘ The Lord (she says) willed that I should once have this vision : I saw near to me, on the left hand, an angel in a corporeal form ; this is what I do not usually see, except by a prodigy : although angels often present themselves to me without my seeing them, as I have said in the preceding vision. In this the Lord willed that I should see him in the following manner : he was not tall, but small and very beautiful, his face all in a flame, and he seemed to be one of the angels very high in the hierarchy, who apparently are all on fire. Without doubt, he was one of those called seraphim. These angels do not tell me their names ; but I clearly see that there is so great a difference among the angels, between some and others, that I do not know how to express it. I saw in his hands a long dart of gold, which appeared to me to have some fire at the end of the point. It seemed to me that the angel buried this dart from time to time in my heart, and made it penetrate to my bowels, and that when withdrawing it, he carried them away, leaving me all inflamed with a great love of God.’—(*Vie de Theresa*, c. xxix. no. 11.)”

“ It would be difficult to find any thing more beautiful, expressed in more lively colors, and with a more amiable simplicity. It will not be out of place to copy here two other passages of a different kind, which, while they enforce what we wish to show, may contribute to awaken the taste of our nation for a certain class of Spanish writers, who are every day falling into oblivion with us, while foreigners seek for them with eagerness, and publish handsome editions of them. ‘ I was once at office with all the rest ; my soul was suddenly fixed in attention, and it seemed to me to be entirely as a clear mirror, without reverse or side, neither high nor low, but shining every where. In the midst of it, Christ our Saviour presented himself to me, as I am accustomed to see Him. He appeared to me to be at once in all parts of my soul. I saw Him in a clear mirror, and this mirror also (I cannot say how) was entirely imprinted on our Lord himself, by a communication which I cannot describe—a communication full of love. I know that this vision has been of great advantage to me every time that I recollect it, principally when I have just received communion. I was given to understand that when a soul is in a state of mortal sin, this mirror is covered with great darkness, and is extremely obscure, so that our Lord cannot appear or be seen therein, although He is always present as giving being ; as to heretics, it is as if the mirror were broken, which is much worse than if it were obscured. There is a great difference between seeing this and telling it ; it is difficult to make such a thing understood. I repeat, that this has been very profitable to me, and also very afflicting, on account of the view of the various offences by which I have obscured my soul, and have been deprived of seeing my Lord.’—(*Vie*, c. xi. no. 4.)”

"In another place she explains a manner of seeing things in God; she represents the idea by an image so brilliant and sublime, that we appear to be reading Malebranche, when developing his famous system.

"We say that the Divinity is like a bright diamond, infinitely larger than the world; or rather like a mirror, as I have said of the soul in another vision; except here it is in a manner so sublime, that I know not how to exalt it sufficiently. All that we do is seen in this diamond, which contains all in itself; for there is nothing which is not comprised in so great a magnitude. It was alarming to me to see in so short a time so many things assembled in this bright diamond; and I am profoundly afflicted every time that I think things so shocking as my sins appeared to me in this most pure brightness."—(*Vie*, c. xi. no. 7.)"

It will be perceived, therefore, that according to the higher philosophy, a vision, a dream, miraculous in its nature, is not necessarily contrary to their philosophy. It must be an orthodox dream, and by one of the Saints, then it is worthy to be compared with the best philosophic dreams of Malebranche!

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY FOR JULY, 1855.

This is one of the most generally readable numbers of the Repertory for sometime past. The article on the "Zurich letters," on "Dr. Spencer's Sketches," and on the "Logic of Religion," all furnish pleasant and profitable reading for the dog days. The article on Presbyterian Liturgies has a squinting, which we do not fancy much, toward a Liturgical Presbyterianism for the upper classes. Whilst it insists, indeed, that the objections are valid against the use of all "unvarying forms authoritatively imposed;" yet it maintains "they do not bear against the preparation and optional use of a Book of Common Prayer." As we hope to give full consideration to this subject in the pages of the Critic before very long, we take leave merely to express our utter failure to appreciate the force of the reasons urged by the writer, for the preparation of such a book for optional use. All these arguments seem to us to prove indeed the importance of preparation for prayer by the minister himself; but not a preparation by others for him of his public prayers. It is true many ministers are poorly gifted in prayer. But it is equally true that as many more are as poorly gifted in preaching. If the poverty of gifts in the ministry be a reason in the one case for a Book of Common Prayer for their use, why is not the poverty of gifts in the other case, as good a reason for having a book of sermons or homilies prepar-

ed for their use? According to our view, the remedy for this evil would be worse than the disease in both cases alike. True, we have felt the lamentable evil of a feeble and lifeless—or inappropriate—or irreverent public prayer *extempore*. And we have not hesitated to admit the too common occurrence of such services in the Presbyterian Churches, even to Episcopalians who are apt to cant much on this subject; contrasting our mode of worship with the marvellous propriety of "our excellent Liturgy." But it is very manifest that there may be just as feeble and lifeless, inappropriate and irreverent public prayer with the book as without it. Nay, we have had our feelings of reverence and propriety of tender shocked in proportion by the *bad reading* of the prayers, than by the *bad extempore praying*. The drawing, whining, canting, affected and even conceited tone in which in a large number of cases, the Episcopal prayers are read, is fully as inconsistent with all notions of propriety in public prayer, as the extempore harangues so much inveighed against. But we shall not here go into the argument.

Of the general tenor of the Repertory's article on the General Assembly, it is needless to speak, after what has already been written in our pages on the same subject. We cannot forbear, however, to express our surprise at the Repertory's deliverance on the question "Who has the right to vote for Pastor?" on page 489. After

having quoted on the previous page the book which says:—"In the election of a Pastor, no person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the Church, or who does not contribute his just proportion to all necessary expenses," the writer thus summarily concludes the whole matter:—"We are glad to see the Assembly declining to answer questions which the Book has settled. If the motion to restrict the right of voting to communicants had prevailed, it would have effected a change in our standards and therefore been null and void!" Now we humbly submit, that the motion of Dr. Plumer referred to, was a motion with a view to settle by vote of Assembly, *what* the Book means in this case. According to the natural and obvious construction of the language, the meaning of the Book is not as Judge Fine held—"that there are two classes of persons entitled to vote for pastor;" but on the contrary, that one class of persons alone are entitled to vote, viz: *members of the Church who contribute their just proportion.* This is the plain construction of the words on the face of them—and if there be some hidden key to their interpretation which makes their meaning so infallibly the contrary of this, that all other meanings are manifestly null and void, the Repertory would have prevented a good deal of unnecessary discussion for the future, by furnishing in a single paragraph even that key. Nothing is more certain, than that even in face of this dogma of the Repertory, there will be in time to come, much earnest inquiry into this matter.

The summing up of the discussion on Boards, this year as last in the Repertory, somewhat to our surprise, is self-gratulatory in the highest degree, and prophetic of perpetual quiet on the whole subject hereafter. "All these objections (to the course of the Boards) as well as those founded on views of expediency, were so fully answered in the course of the discussion that it is unnecessary to dwell longer on the subject. *It may be assumed that this whole matter is set at rest.*" "The ablest men in the Church who have ever expressed their disapprobation of Boards have done their best in argument, and have utterly failed." (!) Truly this is consoling. But we must bear in mind that summing up the discussion on the very same subject last year, the Repertory in like complacent tone, prophesied:—"The sense of the house was so strongly evinced in favor of the Boards * * that we presume the controversy will not be renewed." How far that was from being a sure word of prophesy the events of the year past have made manifest! And we venture to suggest in regard to this renewal of the prophesy this year, that we shall be much surprised if the coming year does not

furnish equally conclusive demonstration, that among all the eminent gifts conferred upon Princeton, the gift of *prophesy* is not among the most prominent. Nothing can be more manifest, than that on this whole subject, the discussion is but fairly begun—the main issues hardly yet reached—the contest so far having been mainly whether we shall discuss at all. One party whilst earnest in their zeal for the great work of the Church, ready to unite heartily in the use of the agencies now at work, till they can be made more conformable to the word of God and the Constitution, yet still urging upon the attention of the Church the necessity of Reform in them. The other party, instead of meeting the true issue, are raising other issues and proclaiming their victories and their strength. No! It may not "be assumed the whole matter is set at rest." Great questions are not so put to rest in the Presbyterian Church.

—
 "A DISCOURSE DELIVERED BEFORE THE GRADUATING CLASS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF N. CAROLINA, June 4th, 1855. By Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.—Raleigh, 1855.

The subject of this Discourse is, "Christianity, the only religion for Man." Taking for his text the memorable words of Peter in John 6: 68, 69,—Dr. P. finds, in the interrogation, a confession of man's need of a divinely extracted religion, and, in the affirmation, the essential conditions which such a religion must fulfil. The main propositions of the sermon, therefore, are:—1. That man's religious nature constrains him to find repose in some form of faith and worship. 2. That the wants of this nature, well understood, are met only in Christianity, as taught in the Gospel. The first proposition, is argued from "the elements which enter into our own moral constitution,"—the conscience, the affections, &c.:—from the "tenacity with which religious ideas, once communicated, are retained by the mind," and from "the universal prevalence of religion and worship in so many diverse forms over the globe." Under this head, we notice the melancholy fact, that "the only apostates from all religion, the men who enter no sanctuaries, and bow before no altars, and who speak only the language of profaneness and blasphemy,"—are to be found in Christian lands.

The second leading proposition is proved—1. From the fact that Christianity is "the only religion which presents to man a personal God, clothed with all the attributes of a perfect Being, with clearly revealed personal relations to the creature." 2. It alone "reveals man's true character and future destiny." 3. That it "rests upon a historical basis: is a religion of

facts." 4. It is "pre-eminently a religion of law, and alone solves the problems which arise from the Holiness and Justice of Jehovah." 5. It alone "provides for the renovation of our nature, in its doctrine of the new birth." 6. It is "the only system of religion, to absolute certainty of whose truth it is possible to be brought."

The points are illustrated with the usual felicity and force of Dr. Palmer: and we trust that the young men, to whom the discourse was particularly addressed, will ponder them with seriousness and candor.

PROF. HITCHCOCK'S DEDICATORY SERMON. A Sermon delivered at the dedication of the new Chapel of Bowdoin College, Thursday, June 7, 1855. By Roswell D. Hitchcock, Collins Prof. of Natural and Revealed Religion.

This is a discourse founded upon Col. 2: 3. "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." It opens with an exposition of the spiritual constitution of man, according even to naturalism as *trinal*—viz: That by which we apprehend the beautiful—or Taste. That by which we apprehend the true—Intellect—and that by which we apprehend the Good—Moral Sense—which three faculties give rise to Art, Letters and Religion—all of which are shown to have their representation in such an evidence as the new College Chapel. The preacher next proceeds to exhibit in outline, according to the revealed religion, the fundamental truths presented in Christ—"in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." These truths lead to three departments of inquiry—God Nature—Man. And an outline of the fundamental truths of christianity, touching each of these three departments is rapidly selected.

We have read this discourse with extraordinary interest on several accounts. First, as the production of one of the companions of our youth and early manhood—in whom even then we recognized genius of the very highest order, as well as heart qualities to make him capable of the noblest friendship. Secondly, as the production of one just called to the high office of preparing ministers for the Church in the Seminary at New York. For though that school has no relation to us, or to our Church, to give a special claim on our attention—yet we must be allowed to feel an interest—and to express what we feel—in every matter that relates to forming the character of the rising Presbyterian Ministry of whatsoever ecclesiastical relation. And thirdly, this interest in the discourse, has arisen largely from its own intrinsic character as in its way, a beautiful master piece of thought—and especially as a fine

specimen of that somewhat rare phenomenon—*Orthodox Transcendentalism*.

We shall perhaps best convey to our readers an idea of its peculiarities, by allowing the preacher to speak for himself—so far as our limits will allow. We cite first from the introductory portion of the discourse.

"While thus we build and justify the College, we are enabled also to define its work. It must take the whole nature of man, and make the most of it. In deference to our sense of Beauty, it must honor Art. In deference to our hunger for Truth, it must honor Science. In deference to our apprehension of a Divine Presence, it must honor Religion. And neither of these by itself alone, but all in harmony. Exclusive addiction to either one of them breeds mischief. Art, unbalanced, becomes voluptuous; Learning, arrogant; and Religion, fanatical. While in a just blending of the three, there appears the fulness and symmetry of a perfect discipline."

"Such in part, are the sentiments which find expression in this edifice, within whose walls we are now assembled. The completion of it marks an epoch in the history of the College."

"In its Gallery of Paintings, it proclaims the legitimacy of Art; in its Library, the worth of knowledge; in this grave and lofty room, with its glowing windows and its starry roof, it proclaims the dignity of a rapt and reverent Communion with God. These, too, in their proper order; Prayer seeking palpable enforcement, in the very architecture of the building itself, as the central and the grandest thing. Thus we represent the trinal nature of man. Thus we represent its triple discipline. And thus, especially, do we emphasize religion as at once the crowning grace, and the crowning wisdom, of our culture."
—(Pp. 6, 7 and 8.)

In the following passage are presented some of the leading points of the discourse—and they serve as illustrations of the Author's method of treating them:

"But we do not stand here to-day on the ground of mere Naturalism. There is another and more commanding revelation of God, than the one he has made of himself in the soul of man. It is the Christian Revelation."

"What, then, is Christianity? Plainly, a remedial system; presupposing the ruin, and undertaking the recovery, of a fallen race. Like the Spirit of God, which once brooded over the waters, it finds a chaos, and would make a world. And its method is, not by lessons and examples, not by visions and theophanies, which must all be feeble and transient; but by a permanent, historical incarnation of God in Christ. Or, as the Scriptures have tersely expressed it for us, "God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Such is the Gospel.

"The departments of inquiry as students are three: God, Nature, Man. It is proposed, on the present occasion, to look at each of these, for a few moments, from the stand-point of the Christian Revelation.

I. Our doctrine of God. * * * It is not merely the intense holiness of God, flashing terror upon a guilty vision; it is not merely those awful scales of justice, whose beams hang and tremble amongst the stars; there is something unspeakably appalling in the thought of sheer Spirit pervading this immeasurable Universe, with a force that nothing can resist, or weaken, striking its steady pulses, age on age, from world to world; and yet a Person clothed with attributes as distinct and real as our own, with a heart to feel, and a mind to think, and a will to choose. Such is God; the God of reason

and of conscience: an infinite reality, overwhelming our astonished spirits."

"II. Our Doctrine of Nature. Here, all around us, is a material Universe apparently entirely antipodal to Spirit. Matter and Spirit seem, indeed, to stand in a sharp antagonism, dividing the Universe between them."

"Natural Theology in our day, with its Bridge-water Treatises, is very confident of its ability to reason out the Existence, Power, Wisdom, and Goodness of God from the works of Nature. But one of its positions, which it has to take, is a virtual confession of lameness in the argument. It is not in every instance, but only in "a vast plurality of instances," that the Divine Goodness is affirmed to be clearly visible. Some evils are admitted to exist. What shall be done with them? Paley says, they have only to be voted down. The voices of gladness, it is argued, are against the voices of wailing as a hundred to one. And so we settle the question with a pencil upon our slates."

"As to the disorders observed in Nature, Christianity looks down upon them with entire composure from a lofty height. The solution is simply this, that the world was left imperfect in anticipation of its moral history. It was pre-figured to its career of sin. The Drama required a fitting Theatre. Sin needed its shadows and echoes in an eclipsed and discordant economy."

But sin is not alone here. Redemption is wrestling mightily against it. The world, then, is not a prison but a school-room; not a graveyard, but a battle field. We are here for conflict, and for discipline. Christ is at once our Captain, and our Example. Voices from Heaven cheer us on. Angels of God whisper courage and patience. The evils and miseries appointed us, are only spurs and stimulants to virtue."

III. Our Doctrine of Man. First of all, the essential character of man has been a sore puzzle to mere Philosophy."

"Such is the Religion of Christ our Lord. A Positive Religion, attested abundantly by most conspicuous Providences, by Miracles and Prophecies; with an immense crowd of witnesses, out of all ages and nations, gathered, and gathering, to do it reverence. For Doctrine, it lays open to us the very bosom of our God; it explains the mysteries of Nature; it unfolds the character and destiny of man. And so it floods with heavenly light every problem of our Philosophy, every period of our majestic and endless career."—(Pp. 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23.)

If we may be indulged in a remark or two—not in the spirit of a cold, carping criticism, but of a cordial interest in the author of the sermon and his future career—we would say: 1. That whilst disposed to applaud this discourse as by a College Professor, delivered to college students, on an interesting public occasion, we earnestly hope that this style of discourse may not get currency among the students of the N. York Seminary, by reason of the brilliant success of the Professor elect in this method of preaching. We cannot conceive of any peculiarity in a professor more likely to be contagious among students, or more likely to do harm by becoming so. What is truly excellent in it, will rarely be attained by an imitation—whilst what is most objectionable in it, will surely be exaggerated, in every attempt at imitation. A far simpler gospel than this, is that which the Holy Spirit attends with power. And (2.) aside from the style of preaching, we gravely doubt the expediency of the style

of theologizing here exhibited. We attach indeed no supreme importance to the old methods of expression in theology—indeed we are disposed to admit, that the dialectics of the Scotch school of metaphysicians are too narrow in their measure for the full discussion of Calvinism in all its bearings. And perhaps many of the heresies that have troubled the Church in their last days, have their origin in the straitened and contracted dialectics of the men who have undertaken to expound the Calvinistic Theology, according to the Scotch Metaphysics. We are disposed, therefore, to accept some of the fundamental points of the modern transcendental dialectics, not only as true, but also as necessary to many of the higher discussions of our Theology. But at the same time we are jealous of the new methods, with a godly jealousy, and we apprehend most serious results to the "truth as it is in Jesus," from any general adoption of Professor Hitchcock's methods of expounding and illustrating the doctrines of grace. (3.) We are disposed to except very strongly to some of the incidental utterances of this discourse, as inconsistent altogether with the simplicity of the Gospel. We are not prepared, for instance, to join in the sentiment—"prayer seeking palpable enforcement in the architecture of the building itself"—whose "glowing windows and starry roof proclaim the dignity of a rapt and reverent communion with God." It is a sentiment which sounds strangely to us, as coming from the land of the stern Old Puritans—who, not because of their uncultivated rudeness, as canting Formalists will have it, but because of a profounder philosophy perceived that a mere worship of the imagination or the taste—a worship that art and architecture could inspire, is no true worship of a God who is a Spirit; who reasoned very justly, that if such aids—to devotion were needed—then instead of seeking inspiration from temples made with hands—instead of "glowing windows and starry roof" of man's device—it would be far more philosophical to have no house of worship at all—but wander forth to the true "starry roof" of God's great temple—and the "glowing windows" that circle that dome of immensity—and there let "prayer seek palpable enforcement" in the architecture, not of the building, but of great nature itself.

So again turning to graver matters—we are not at all ready to take it for granted as proved by "Fossil Geology," that death with all its attendant fears and sufferings, was here, ages before man—in any such sense as can affect the question of the relation of man's fall, to the question, why the "whole creation groaneth." But our straitened limits admonish us to forbear.

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE CHOICE OF A FIELD FOR MINISTERIAL LABOR: being the *Annual Address before the Society of Alumni of Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, May, 1855.* By Rev. Wm. T. Richardson, of Waynesborough, Va. Printed by the Society.

The leading purpose of this address is, to present "some considerations which should influence a Minister in the choice of a field of labor:"—and the author aims especially to show that "the preference should be given to the waste rather than to the cultivated field;" that it is "a higher and nobler exercise of ministerial office to plant new churches, and to build up feeble ones, than it is to preside over and serve such as are already well established."

Among the considerations adduced to show that destitute fields ought to be preferred, is this one; "that it would open a wide door of usefulness for many who now seem to have nothing to do, or are waiting to be called." We are sorry that we cannot transfer to our pages, all that is said upon this point. We regard the strictures of the author as eminently judicious and timely: and we honor him the more, because it required some courage to make them. There is no rage so fierce as that of mediocrity. We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting the following passages:

"If we would take a correct view of destitute fields, not only would many enter them who are now idle, but those who labor in them would be more successful. It is too common for those who go to such fields to look upon their situation as a temporary one. They do not feel permanently settled, but rather as if they were only serving a kind of apprenticeship; and so are all the time on the look out for what they call a wider field of usefulness; which being rightly interpreted, often means, a *more comfortable position*. The consequence is, they do not half cultivate the field while in it; as a tenant by the year will never improve like one who has settled for life. They who go then to destitute places, should go with the resolution to accomplish the work of God there as far as he shall enable them. Why should the work of laying the foundations, and building up be considered as fit only for the young and inexperienced, or for such as can find nothing else to do? This work of planting and building was once called apostolical and evangelical. It was the noblest work to which the servants of Christ could aspire. Is there not danger that we shall underrate it, or that we shall too readily shrink from the difficulties of it? Who are sent to the waste fields? Who are expected to endure the hardships and surmount the difficulties of establishing the Gospel in new places? Do we find the tried and veteran

Soldiers of the Cross coming forward to claim the peril and the honor as theirs!

Against the desire of having any pre-eminence in the church except the pre-eminence of the most abundant and most disinterested labors, Christ carefully warned his disciples. In honor, christians should prefer each other; but in labor each should strive to excel. But if it be true that the posts of greatest difficulty be posts of greatest honor, there is reason to fear that this christian grace of giving the preference to others is carried quite too far.

When Chalmers had won a fame such as few men ever attained—after he had held the highest and richest places in the gift of his church—after he had been the great leader of the Free Church Movement—in the Sabbath of his life—at an age when most men retire from active pursuits—he performed the noblest of all his labors as a missionary in West Port, the most destitute and depraved of all the precincts of Edinburg. Nor do we hesitate to say that Chalmers, preaching in the *Tan loft* of West Port, to an assembly of ragged outcasts, was greater than Chalmers preaching in the Tron Church, to which the wealth and fashion of Scotland crowded—greater too than Chalmers in the Chair of Theology."

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST REVIEW AND ECCLECTIC, June and July, '55. *J. R. Graves, and J. M. Pendleton, Editors, Nashville.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION MAGAZINE, a *Southern Monthly Periodical, containing contributions by Southern Clergymen and others of known talents and piety*—ANTI-SECTARIAN—*Wm. Potter, Editor and Proprietor, Richmond, Va.*

These are two new monthlies,—both Southern. The first named seems to be a very spirited and earnest journal, for the exposition and defence of the gospel according to the views of the Baptists, and whilst we wholly dissent from those views, in so far as they are peculiar, we are pleased with the energy and life with which they press the Gospel as they understand it.

The other Magazine signalizes itself by the somewhat ostentatious parade of "Anti-Sectarian" upon its title page, and in conformity with the usual appendages of that idea, a remarkable *thinness* of ideas. For it contains in all just sixteen pages of matter,—and that of the most pointless kind. To each of these Magazines the subscription price is two dollars per annum; whilst one contains sixty-four pages, and the other sixteen. We fear the cause of Anti-Sectarianism will suffer sadly at the South, if left to combat with these Sectarial Baptists alone, at such odds of pages—16 to 64—and at certainly an odds of 1 to 100 in the way of ideas.

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 9.

SEPTEMBER, 1855.

Vol. 1.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1855.

CONTINUED FROM AUGUST NO.

THE BOARDS OF THE CHURCH.

After all that has been said in this periodical, it is not necessary for us in a general article like this, to enter upon the discussion of those great questions which lie at the bottom of the whole action of the Church through Boards. For any thing of that sort we refer our readers to the previous numbers of the Critic. Moreover, the General Assembly had the advantage of having in its bosom, probably the ablest man in the Church; and no competent judge, we presume, has any other opinion than that Dr. Thornwell's speeches on this whole subject, were incomparably superior, in all respects, to any thing else in the entire discussions in the body on all subjects. Even if those remarkable efforts should be considered as having failed, in any degree, in their immediate design, they at least had the extremely happy effect of recalling to the Assembly the conviction that it had great men and great objects; and of making men see the immense difference between empty, superficial, and incoherent haranguing, and that noble simplicity and force, which so justly characterize the best debates of that venerable court. This is the greater praise—because the most of those who took *occasional* part in the debates of the last Assembly, did so in a spirit and manner, eminently right; and because there were cases of another sort, that stood in eminent need of correction, by example.

The Church can have no other object in the use of any Board, than to do, in the most effectual manner, the work committed to her by the Lord. But the Reports of all the Boards to the late General Assembly, show that not so much as one half of the congregations in our body, gave any thing at all, or manifested the least interest at all, during the preceding year, in either of them. Yet this is the practical result, after many years of effort, after many years of boasting that the machinery was perfect, after the most lordly hectoring over every one who ventured to suggest that the machinery was faulty. Here is the *practical* state of the affair. Now the question is, is it satisfactory; and if not, can it be improved? The answer

of one part of the Church is, that the machinery is without fault, and shall not be changed; but rather, more of it, of the same sort, shall be added. The answer of the other part of the Church is, that the machinery is extremely imperfect, and that it not only, can easily be greatly improved, but that the fundamental principles of our religious system require that it should be. In the last Assembly, Dr. Plumer and Dr. Boardman were the most conspicuous representatives of the former opinion, representing a condition of the Church in which one-half look idly on, doing nothing for any Board: and Dr. Thornwell was the most conspicuous representative of the latter opinion, demanding such practical improvements as both experience and reason prove, would easily enable and powerfully induce the whole Church to take part in every great enterprise. Of course, in a Church accustomed to think and really desirous of serving God, there can be ultimately, but one issue to such a controversy at this. Various circumstances may obstruct for a time, the grand conclusion. But it is impossible to imagine, that in the end, the people of God will not secure for themselves the opportunity to promote the cause of Christ, in some manner that will be effectual; and that the more they cast about for the means of doing this, the more they will rejoice to find that God himself has provided the means in the divine model of the Church itself.

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

This organization keeping itself perfectly clear of every thing but its own glorious work, and sticking to it with a noble energy and zeal, goes on to advance in strength, and to enlarge its operations from year to year, as fast and as far as the means put at its disposal will permit. It is by all odds the most successful of all our general and organized operations—and that in the most difficult field, by far. It is by all odds too, in its whole spirit, as well as its working, the nearest approach we have to what such an organization should be. That the Presbyterian Church in this country, should do even as much as it has done for the cause of Foreign Missions, under the whole circumstances of the case, seems to us a living proof of its own immense vitality. And we have no sort of doubt, that if that great cause were once put on such a footing, that the whole power of conviction could operate freely, through the whole form of the Church,—without any doubtful contrivances to obstruct it, and with the moral force of the body fairly and systematically applied,—we should immediately see results which our distrust of God and of the efficacy of his own forms, so deplorably hinder at present. There is one fact worthy of special attention. This Board has used no paid agency to collect money during the past year: and yet the voluntary ordinary contributions to it are not only far larger than those to any of the other Boards,—(indeed we believe about as large as all three united,) but larger than in any preceding year; though the last year was one of wide-spread pecuniary embarrassment in the country. God's Church has done this, through its own regular action. The same party in our Church so fierce now when even a finger is pointed at any defect in any Board, was, not long ago, equally fierce if any one presumed to intimate a word against a regular system of paid agencies for collecting the ordinary incomes of all these Boards; and scoffed at the notion that such agencies cost far more than they come to. Behold the first perfect demonstration! Cannot men believe in the existence of the power of God? Have they no convictions as to the piety of God's people? Have

they no faith in the efficacy of the means and forms created by Christ? Do they suppose there is neither sense nor reality in that part of the most ancient creed of God's people, which professes to believe in the Holy Catholic Church? They ought to be more moderate in their unmannerly sarcasms, lest men should be tempted to intimate, that in fact, they know themselves better than others do, and that their principles are but the reflection of a state of faith, which being capable of very little, easily believes that the Church of Christ is capable of as little.

THE BOARD OF DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

There is not in the world a more important work, than that committed to this Board: for there is no work of evangelization on earth, more important than the spread of the Presbyterian Church on this continent. Moreover, the work entrusted to this Board is peculiarly complex—and therefore peculiarly difficult to be reduced to a few simple laws. It is entrusted with the support of our weak congregations, and the aid of our poor and illy-paid ministers who are engaged in their regular calling. A distinct work, and one of immense importance; for the Church ought not to allow the very feeblest of its congregations to perish, nor the humblest of its ministers to suffer, in this land of plenty. Besides this, it is entrusted with the glorious work of evangelization; and that in two very distinct departments. First, within the limits of the Old Church organizations; secondly, in the new and immense regions rapidly filling up. Both of these departments of evangelization are of vital importance to the Church and to the country. Now either one of these three great classes of labor, well performed, would produce incalculable fruits; and either one of them completely executed, would fully engross, and justly immortalize any one man: for all three of them, are immense in extent, and boundless in their issues. Fully impressed with these truths,—while we have always felt the great need of caution and forbearance in meddling with the practical control of this Board, and forcing changes which were resisted by those having the responsible control of it; we have, at the same time felt it to be our duty to point out what we conceived to be its theoretical defects, and its practical mistakes; leaving to others, and especially to its immediate managers, the responsibility, which seemed to belong to them rather than to us, of actually making reforms. In the mean time, we have never had a doubt, that it was the duty of us all, to co-operate with the Board, while it was the organ of the Church; and do it uprightly and zealously, in such manner as was permitted to us: and this we have always done. Dr. Plumer was pleased to say in the Assembly, “that he loathed this constant irritation of our public officers:” that “as for this constant, underhand, stealthy, stabbing of them, his soul loathed it;” &c., &c. We suppose he alluded to *somebody*; and if he did, as he failed to make it apparent who it was he meant, his soul-loathing, was so far evangelical, that it could not avoid being directed against what he was then doing himself, in the “underhand, stealthy, stabbing” of *somebody*. As for *us*,—this periodical, and the conductors of it, and the contributors to it, though we had the honor of being denounced, on more than one occasion, by more than one distinguished member of the late Assembly, we cannot allow ourselves to believe so poorly of Dr. Plumer's understanding or love of truth, as to suppose he could have had any allusion to such a course of conduct as that we have stated above, on our part. What we have done, may, for any thing we know, have irri-

tated "*public officers*,"—men are often unreasonable in their irritations. *Somebody* seems to have irritated Dr. Plumer exceedingly, and to have gotten an "underhand, stealthy" stab for his pains. But, this at least is certain, that we never fail to tell who it is we strike—whenever we are so unfortunate as to be obliged to "stab,"—even if the wounded man should be unconscious of our feeble blow. The harm we wish the Board of Missions,—the "*public officers*,"—and all the agents of the Church is, that they could do a hundred fold more good, than they do: the *conviction* we have, being that the very nature of the work attempted to be done by the Board of Missions, in all its parts, is precisely such, that no Board organized as it is, ever can do it completely as it ought to be done, and might be done otherwise; and that the whole of it is of that description which requires a more perfect control, and a more direct action on the part of the Church than exists at present. Still, for whatever good is done, we are abundantly thankful to God, and glad to bestow commendation on whomever He honors by allowing them to do it, and grateful for liberty to have ever so humble a share in it ourselves.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

We count ourselves amongst those who believe that one of the most important portions of the business of the Church of God, in her distinctive capacity, is to provide for an ample supply and a continual succession of able and faithful Ministers of the Gospel. We are also of the number of those, who firmly believe that it is the ordinary course of the providence of God to raise up from amongst the poor of his people, a large portion of his faithful Ministers; and that it is the duty of the Church to provide liberally for the support of all thus chosen of God, in every part of their progress into the ministry. These two principles result in such an action of the Church, as that whose supervision is now committed to the Board of Education. Our grief is, that this is not its exclusive, as it was its original work. In the present state of public opinion and religion in this country, we are decidedly of the opinion, that there is no call for the Church to interfere with the State in the way of a general attempt to superintend secular education in any of its departments,—much less in all of them; least of all to denounce and set about obstructing popular education, because the whole round of doctrines taught in her standards, are not taught in the secular schools. All this, and much like it, we have attempted, according to what God's service seemed to require of us, to show; and deeply regretting much that the Board has done on the subject, have never had a doubt that every departure from its main work was a waste of its strength, an interference with what did not properly belong to it, an ill-judged and hopeless pursuit of objects, utterly unattainable, and never committed to the Church by Christ. There is no opinion more deeply fixed in the minds of the American people, than that it is their duty and their interest to provide for general education, through the State and not through the Church: an opinion, in our judgment, perfectly just and indescribably important. We have, therefore, deeply regretted and steadily opposed every attempt to occupy a different ground by the Board of Education, and by the General Assembly under its lead; and correspondingly rejoice at every indication of what we consider the appearance of wiser counsels in the Board or in the Assembly. In this view we think something has been gained by the action of the last Assembly, which, in one of its set resolutions in relation to this Board.

leans over—rather slyly we admit, towards “Schools, Academies or Colleges, under private, corporate, or State management;” but openly avows the duty of God’s people, to reform instead of forsaking the public system of education; and designates the Bible, and not our Confession of Faith, nor yet teachers appointed by our Church courts, as the great moral instructor for public schools, which we ought to demand, and with which we ought to be satisfied. To all which we cordially agree. Every personal consideration induces us to rejoice in the prosperity of this important Board, and would tempt us to wink at its mistakes; while every view we have of the duty and prosperity of the Church of Christ leads us to appreciate its value higher than we fear is universal in the Church. It is, therefore, only from a deep conviction of the truth and importance of the matter that we venture to say, that in our own judgment, a more distinct line of demarcation than exists, needs to be drawn between those beneficiaries of the Board who are in the stages of their training any where preliminary to the actual study of theology, and those actually studying theology. It is one thing to take a youth under our care and support, in order to be educated; it is quite another thing to take a man under trials for Licensure. The step from one state to another is most important—and should be most distinctly marked, and most solemnly made. We add one more suggestion. We are convinced that the original form of proceeding, on the original principles of the Board, were wiser and safer, when the beneficiaries were considered as under the care of the Board merely, and not of the Presbyteries at all, up to the moment of commencing the actual study of Theology, and putting themselves actually upon trials and under care of Presbytery for Licensure. It is not a very great matter to educate a youth for the ministry, and then find ourselves mistaken; but it is a very solemn matter to pass a man to Licensure and find ourselves deceived. To give money to educate a youth, is a widely different thing from determining, as a court and in the name of Christ, that he is a proper person to take on trials for the Gospel ministry. The confounding of such things is a theoretical error as well as a great practical evil. The *charity* is the charity of the whole Church: therefore let the Board look after its administration, and let the Presbytery not meddle with it, or its objects, till they come before it, according to our standards, as students of Theology in the proper sense of the words. The idea that a greater degree of regularity and a fuller ecclesiastical control are obtained by making the Presbytery intervene from the earliest moment, is a mere delusion. For the Board has no lawful existence, except as a power exerted by the Assembly; and the Presbytery has no lawful power to take a child under its care, to be educated—much less to say when it does so, that it takes him on trials, as a beneficiary, for the Gospel ministry. Could it take a child who was not under the Board, and did not need pecuniary aid? Could it take a *man* even, except, in its conscience, it took the man on trials for the ministry, and not on trials to get an education? We are aware that the present Secretary, (Dr. Van Rensalaer,) did not make this change in the principles and action of the Board. But great experience satisfies us that the making of it, was a serious error and evil: and we would earnestly beseech him to seek its redress.

THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

We are too much restricted for space, to venture upon the discussion of a number of things connected with this Board, its objects, and its manage-

ment, which need to be far more thoroughly and freely considered than has yet been done publicly. In the meantime, as the matter lies directly before us, we cannot pretermit it entirely. The most obvious remark about its business affairs is, that a Book concern with an income of nearly \$90,000 a year, and an immense reading community like the Presbyterian people of this country, its steady and deeply interested patrons, must be very badly managed, or must make a very large sum of money every year, and must have the very best opportunity to increase its business and its means, rapidly from year to year. It must make, or it must lose, or squander, or give away,—we should suppose, on the basis of its present operations thirty or forty thousand dollars a year. Its net *earnings*, we mean, ought, under such circumstances, to amount to some such sum. Whether they do or not, we have no means of knowing. What amount this Board has received, in all, from the Church, we do not know though we know it to be very large: what has been done with all its earnings, and all the donations to it, in the last fifteen years, or thereabouts, we do not know; though, doubtless, it has a large amount invested in its stock in trade. This Board, is precisely the reverse of all the others in this important respect, that none of the others can, by possibility, earn any money, while this cannot avoid earning a great deal, except by gross mismanagement. We could never, therefore, understand the propriety of this Board's asking annual collections from the churches, like all the others; but can very easily understand why the results of those collections should be comparatively so meagre. The religious literature of the English language is the richest religious literature in the world; and the Church which erected this Board, has, what purports to be, a thoroughly educated ministry. In the two great departments, therefore, of creating valuable and lasting additions to this literature, from the labors of our own ministers and members, and of reproducing the immense stores of standard religious literature from other Boards and other languages, this Board, in its great resources of every sort, had advantages which no publishing house in the world possessed. How has it availed itself of these immense advantages? What is the sum of its efforts in both of these great and leading departments of its work? As we before intimated, we have not space to discuss these questions in this place: but we invoke the attention both of the Board and of the Church very earnestly to them. Take an example. There is probably no want of the whole Church more deeply or universally felt, than a complete commentary on the whole Bible, produced in the sense of the Westminster Standards; and a clear and faithful exposition of our Confession of Faith and Form of Government, systematically written, but for popular use. In the absence of these two works,—what endless evils are encouraged, if not promoted by our own indifference, and the activity of all sorts of heretics? Both of these subjects were urged upon the attention of this Board, at the very commencement of its career, by those who had the official right to do so, but whose advocacy of any thing, was never any recommendation of it, in the judgment of certain "Fathers and Brethren"—whose position, unfortunately gave force to their prejudices. We are anxious to know, what progress has been made, during these fifteen years, in this American Presbyterian Commentary on the whole Bible, under the care of this Board of Publication. We are also curious to know what progress has been made upon this contemplated Book of Popular Institutes, upon those noble standards, out of veneration for which, this very Board really had its own

birth; for it was created and endowed, as a monument of gratitude to God, and love to these Westminster Standards, at the period of the joint occurrence of the second centenary of the Westminster Assembly, and the final deliverance of our own Church. Are they both almost ready for the press? Is one word of either of them written? Is there so much as even a purpose, or desire, in the Board, to produce either of them? Is it even known or remembered, that such wild schemes were ever urged on the Board? Oh! what a blessed thing it is to have the affairs of a church so discreetly managed, that nothing difficult shall be encouraged; nothing that approaches to grandeur of conception be tolerated; nothing that exceeds "red tape," rise above the surface,—if there is an ordinary possibility of preventing it! And, then, if any one remonstrates against this eternal glorification of mediocrity, what a blessing to have some ecclesiastical hero ready with a font of type—wherewith to beat out his brains as a standing and intolerable affront to "red tape!"—If the Presbyterian Church ever had an operation, that ought to have had at its head, men of extraordinary gifts and powers and attainments, this was the one. If ever there was an opening for a work of supreme value, if rightly done, this Board had it, fifteen years ago. Nor is it too late yet. The grand necessity of our Church is, that real superiority shall come to the top—and when, by the wonderful and unusual grace of God it gets there, that it should be protected, vindicated and sustained, in its glorious efforts. What interest, under the sun, has the Church, in making an endless series of apotheoses of official mediocrity? Is a leading spirit a sin? Is great capacity a crime? Can great deeds be done, by means of "office hours," "red tape," and "routine?" But this is none of our business—they will say—as we have neither salary, position, office, nor expectations connected with it. So let it all pass with the rest.

We make no attempt to record the history and exact position of any of the great schemes of the Church. Other sources of information furnish such things abundantly. We can do no more than call attention to leading facts and principles, and of these, only such as are keys to unlock many other things. Looked at in the aggregate, these four schemes cover an immense area; and their existence and operations reveal immense powers and purposes in the Church. That we would make the work more effectual, that we would ground it on deeper principles, that we would give it wider scope, that we would extricate it more thoroughly from all carnal hindrances, and lodge it more profoundly in the very soul and life and form of the Church,—is all abundantly true. That we would do, or connive at, any thing else, is abundantly false; and the pretence thereof is the poor refuge of those, who like him whose office at God's altar was to bear away the dung of the sacrifice, would consider their chief mission in the Church ended, if the plague spots on which they live were cleansed.

CHURCH EXTENSION.

There are, in the Presbyterian Church about eight hundred more churches than ministers. But the actual disparity is probably greater than the apparent, since the number of ministers who have more than one church, is hardly so great, as the number that have no church at all. And this ratio goes on steadily, the ministers not gaining at all upon the churches; and the aspect of things indicating that a rate of relative increase, so long

and so firmly established, will continue while the country shall continue essentially in its present condition. To all this add the fact that this growth of churches is, and has always been spontaneous, and in a manner unavoidable; while the utmost efforts have been used, as a part of the long settled policy of the Church, to increase the number of ministers. In one word, the Church produces new churches, spontaneously, so to speak, in an immensely greater ratio, than she can have any hope of supplying them with the stated means of grace.

Now we are very far from saying that the erection of new churches, and that to a great extent, even under these extraordinary circumstances, is not desirable: though it would be unspeakably more so, if the congregations when vacant, as many of them must be permanently, had grace enough to meet stately every Sabbath day for religious service; and if the Presbyteries would set about the accomplishment of that fearfully neglected duty, with some due sense of its importance. But what we do say is that the state of the facts, of the Church, and of the country, does not appear to call for extraordinary efforts on the part of the Church, for the erection of new meeting houses. And we add that the whole effect of the movement, if successful, will be to rob multitudes of congregations of their ministers, and to desolate multitudes of old churches, for the benefit of new ones. Besides this, again supposing the movement to be successful, immense sums of money will be expended, how wisely the future will show, in doing *immediately*, what with a little wise patience, would have been perhaps better done, so far as we could do it, by the people, in the localities immediately interested.

The General Assembly thought differently; and under a clamor, gave way, as we predicted it would; and created a *Church Extension Committee*, located at St. Louis. We refer the reader to former numbers of this Periodical for our reasons, in detail, against the wisdom of this scheme; simply remarking that all we have seen and heard since we published them, has failed to convince us that we were in error; and that, neither then or now, had we any other motive in uttering our convictions, but the strong desire to promote the real and lasting good of the whole Church. No doubt if the Lord would miraculously, or otherwise, raise up for us five or six hundred additional ministers *this year*, the case would be materially different.

Nothing could be more obvious, than that the General Assembly had no common, or very clear practical views on the whole subject. Nor was the slightest allusion made, so far as we know, in the protracted and desultory debates upon it, to the actual state of the Church, as we have briefly stated it; nor to the probable working of the scheme; nor to its effects upon the Church at large. Some were in favor of a fifth Board; nay were extremely anxious, if they got no more, to call the Committee—a Board. All such attempts failed, in every form, though repeated eagerly and in various ways. The Assembly was positive that it would not create another Board—nor call this Committee a Board.—Some men were in favor of keeping this Committee in immediate connection with the Board of Domestic Missions, even if the Committee were located at a distance from the principal seat of the Board. But the Assembly was positive, that the Committee should have no connection whatever, with that Board; being satisfied apparently with what that Board had already done on this subject.

Some were in favor of removing the Board of Missions to the West, and continuing it in the charge of the work of Church Erection as a necessary part of the great work of evangelization. But this also, was decisively rejected; whether because it was opposed to removing that Board, or opposed to continuing this subject under its care, or for both reasons—we cannot say. And, to pass by minor differences, some were opposed to the Assembly's taking the control of the subject at all; preferring to leave it, where it has always stood until lately, as a local interest, to local control, whether of the people—the churches—the Presbyteries or the Synods.—The majority of the Assembly were for an independent Committee, located at St. Louis, composed of twelve ministers and an equal number of Ruling Elders, elected by the Assembly, one-third every year. Efforts to make the Committee much larger were made by the strenuous Board party: the numbers 99, 85, 80, 65, &c., &c., being successively proposed and rejected—down to 24 which carried. These are the facts, as nearly as we understand them. Whether the actual creation is, after all, *really* a Board, or *substantially* a Board, or *partly* a Board, or no Board at all—were considered to be very serious questions indeed—by a number of persons. Who succeeded and who were defeated in this great battle—seemed also to be a very uncertain matter, to many learned and exceedingly wise men. We shall not venture to offer even so much as a conjecture on any of these high questions at this moment. Something was undoubtedly created, and located at St. Louis—with members scattered far and wide;—all of them, never to meet, unless by accident, but at *one* place and time. The strong probability is, that the hopes of its warm advocates will be disappointed; that the particular cause intended to be promoted will derive but small advantage from it; and that after a few years of trial of it, it will be seen that the great interest committed to it, is not of that description of cases, best managed in any such way as this.

The discussion itself was one of the most curious and protracted, ever held in the Assembly. Some of the speeches were remarkably able; some of them, such as we commonly have in that venerable body, sensible, proper and earnest; but some of them were also, about every thing, nearly, except the pending subject—and in form as singular as in substance. All subjects, personal and public—from anonymous articles in the publications of the day, and private opinions of absent gentlemen—up through dictionaries and natural history, dead doctors and living ones, to the widest range of parties, church politics, and glory in general—were handled with an unction and emphasis truly remarkable, upon, about, and by reason of the matter of Church Extension. Out of this mass of literature, rhetoric, logic, and philosophy—there are two points which we consider rather demanding a slight notice at our hands,—the more especially as they involve very grave matters, according to the judgment of two of the leading members of the Assembly, who are also amongst the most conspicuous ministers of our Church.

Dr. Plumer, who was *the* Board man of the Assembly, was pleased to say, that "The ground that the Assembly has no right to appoint Boards, is precisely the same taken by the New School men in the Assembly of 1836, at Pittsburgh." With much more of the same drift. The ground taken by the New School men at the Assembly of 1836 was that the Assembly had no power or right to conduct Foreign Missions—and therefore

no power or right to make the contract it had made with the Western Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions: and therefore, that New School Assembly refused to ratify that contract, and refused to allow the Assembly to enter, at all, upon the work of Foreign Missions. The ground of those who do not approve of the principles upon which our Boards are organized, is precisely the opposite of that occupied by that New School Assembly of 1836—to wit, it is the ground that the Assembly not only has the power, but is bound to exercise it directly, instead of by means of Boards. We shall not dispute with Dr. Plumer, as to the *secret* principles and purposes of the New School men in 1836, because at that time few persons who afterwards acted with the Old School party, had better means and opportunities than he must have enjoyed, to know what those worthies really meant. We shall not offer any remark upon the spirit which prompts Dr. Plumer to class the opinions of men who were, as he knows, *always* Old School men, with the worst conduct of the worst era of the New School party in our Church. We shall not even hold Dr. Plumer too strictly amenable to repeat truly the most important facts in the recent history of our Church—facts of which he ought however to have personal knowledge. But it does seem to us, that an eminent divine who is a professional teacher of Theology, in an important school of the Church, ought to respect the fundamental distinctions of logic sufficiently to observe, that it is not *precisely* the same thing to say that the Assembly has *no* power, as it is to say that the Assembly *alone* has power. For really it is rather hard of belief that Dr. Thornwell in the Assembly of 1855, and Dr. Peters in the Assembly of 1836, occupied “*precisely* the same ground,” on the fundamental principles of church government!

The other point, or possibly we should say a modified, and if possible, more offensive aspect of the idea of Dr. Plumer, was brought forward by Dr. Boardman. “A new theory of the Church has been virtually propounded in several of our judicatories and some of our periodicals. * * * * * If it be true that ecclesiastical Boards are in contravention of our Church polity, even though they were adopted in the time of our great conflict, the Church could not have been justified in resorting to them. To those gentlemen who now resist ecclesiastical Boards, he would say, you had no right to rally under that banner for the mere purpose of defeating another party.” To obtain a fair impression of the sense of these and similar statements, it must be remembered that they form a portion of Dr. Boardman’s reply to Dr. Thornwell’s argument against the proposition to make a *Fifth Board* for Church Extension, coming up on a distinct motion to re-commit a report recommending a *Committee*, with instructions to report a *Board*. It is undeniable also, that the utterances of Dr. Boardman as reported and printed, come very far short of those delivered by him, both in the extent and the severity of his accusations, as some considered them against the moral honesty of a large portion of the Old School party, but as he would have it, only against their logical consistency. And again, what is reduced in the printing, to the mere dictum that “some of our periodicals” “have virtually propounded a new theory of the church,” was in the delivery, as other portions also of his speech were understood to be, an abusive attack upon this periodical, if not upon one of its conductors. But taking the printed matter as we find it, and giving Dr. Boardman the benefit of the friendly suppressions of the reporter of his discourse, there is that in what he says and insinuates, which is far from being either proper or accurate, and which,

as true Old School men, it is our duty to correct. The position of Dr. Boardman, during the early part of his ministerial life, did not place him in circumstances very favorable to his obtaining an intimate knowledge of the principles of that portion of the Old School party which he now assails; and captious people might say that they did place him in circumstances which ought to prevent him from making hasty charges, whether morally or logically, or even hypothetically, that gentlemen had acted under our banner, merely to give them certain advantages, either against or for a different one. In point of fact, it is not historically true, that the Old School party ever did rally to "our great conflict," as Dr. Boardman, curiously enough, calls it, under the banner of Ecclesiastical Boards;—nor is it true that the Old School party, much less the portion of it now assailed by Dr. Boardman, has changed its banner, or its opinions on the subject of Boards. On the contrary it is true, that the Old School party made its rally, fought its battle and won it—and that without any aid from any of its present chief revilers,—upon the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and upon the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government. And these unquestionable facts, not only lie in the memories of men, but are exhibited in acts which will live, and in records which posterity will not permit to be forgotten. *The Act and Testimony*, whose author Dr. Thornwell saw fit to pronounce out of the reach of the attacks of Dr. Boardman made in this very speech of his, was the first utterance of the Old School party, as a body,—and was assuredly the most effective banner displayed. In it, there is not so much as an allusion to our Boards, that we can find. The *Testimony and Memorial* of the Convention of the Orthodox, which was laid before the Assembly of 1837, and was the actual basis, as is well known, of all the Reform acts of that great Assembly, was drawn up by the author of the *Act and Testimony*; and through nine closely printed pages now before us, treating of *Doctrine, Church Order, Discipline*, and the *Method of Reform*—that is, containing every stripe and every star, in the banner of the Orthodox, we do not find the name of either of our Boards, or the subject of Boards alluded to, except to denounce the action of the voluntary societies in our church; but we find the clearest assertion of the divine right of our form of church government, and its perfect sufficiency to do all the work required of the church by God. And to put to rest, the fairness and historical accuracy of Dr. Boardman's statements, criticisms and insinuations, we subjoin an extract from an article of ten closely printed pages found in the *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine* for August 1839, and written by the author of the *Act and Testimony*, expressly upon the subject of "*Ecclesiastical Control in Benevolent Operations.*" The article concludes thus: "6. We have already spoken of a spirit of servile imitation of the voluntary Boards. What else could have ever seduced our church into the idea of having Boards at all;—or so long and so fixedly bound her to them? They are to us a cumbersome and a needless machinery; rendered originally necessary by the impotency of the principle of independency; but entirely out of place in a Presbyterian system. They are not the church; they are not a committee of the church, except in a most illegitimate use of the term. Their only proper use is to conceal the real effect of their operation: which is, *first*, to divest the church of its proper control over the particular subject, in the guise of a real delegation of power; and *secondly*, to vest this divested power in a few central Boards at the seat of operations, under the guise of

sharing it with some hundred persons scattered over the land, and physically incapable of taking any material part in it; and who may be fortunate to escape censure, as intrusive, if they sometimes attempt it. These Boards are an excrescence upon Presbyterianism—to which they have no affinities, and in relation to the true action of which, they are useless or hindrances. Formerly the Assembly appointed standing committees, to this work. This is the proper mode. Let a committee of moderate size be appointed on each important subject: let it be really a committee, and really responsible: let it be a *separate* committee for each interest; and let them, if necessary, be distributed. Then *the church* will really do its work; and the work will really be done on ecclesiastical principles. Then we shall no longer be at sea; but safely in port—as a working, scriptural, Presbyterian organization.” (*Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine*, p. 378, August, 1839.) Really it would seem as if the Assembly of 1855, had taken from the foregoing article written nearly sixteen years before—the programme of the leading features of its plan for the new organization: a standing committee—appointed by the Assembly—located apart from other operations—charged with the particular work—directly responsible to the Assembly—and of moderate size! Here is the *new* theory of the church—so shocking to Dr. Boardman, voted in all its parts, by the Assembly under his eyes! The only serious point of disagreement, is one outside of the whole question of church principles, namely the wisdom of any *general* control at all, of the particular cause. We need hardly say that the want of accurate discrimination and of a true and fair statement of the facts of the case, are the smallest part of Dr. Boardman’s offence. The grosser part—the charge that a portion of the Old School party acted for a *purpose* under a banner which they were not loyal to, we have no remark to make about, just now, except that it reveals rather the loftiest pretensions for our Boards that have come to our knowledge. That *they* saved the church—that any body saved it in *their* name and on *their* principles—that not to recognize *their* banner is a revolt against the principles of the orthodox and a disloyalty to the cause which triumphed in 1839: these certainly, are new pretensions—and all the more remarkable, considering who made them—and how the Assembly of 1855, treated them, by their votes. All candid and enlightened men clearly understand that the case lies thus, as one of great principles;—the orthodox contend for ecclesiastical action: they admit that our present Boards are an immense improvement upon voluntary Boards: but they deny that in their practical operation or in the radical principles of their organization, they either adequately perform the duty of the church or adequately exhibit her nature: on both accounts they demand a greater infusion of ecclesiastical action, into the whole matter. Every tendency in that direction, is of course, a gain, in their opinion. The finality they desire, is that *the church* will do her work, and cease to content herself with *contriving* to have it done. This, in Dr. Plumer’s view, appears to be identical with some of the radical principles of New Schoolism. In Dr. Boardman’s view, it seems to be a terrible offence against something that occurred formerly. In the view of the Assembly of 1855, it seems to be rather respectable; and that body accordingly applied to an important case in hand, the most of its fundamental principles. If the accusers of the orthodox are satisfied—we see no particular reason why they should repine. It seems very singular to us—that the principal accusations which we see and hear against any body

in our Church, are nearly always against the unsoundness of some Act and Testimony man: and what is equally singular, this furor for soundness, is nearly always exhibited by some one who was not an Act and Testimony man; not unfrequently indeed by some one of the original opponents of that 'banner!'

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.

There is no illustration offered by the current of events in the Presbyterian Church since its deliverance from the New School party, more clearly indicative of the tendencies of the orthodox in one direction and of the moderates in another, than that furnished by the discussion and final result of the question of systematic agencies and systematic benevolence. The same conception of the church which exhibited it as incapable of doing any thing in the actual working out of any of its great plans of good, exhibited it also as destitute of any sufficient means of obtaining the funds necessary to carry on its benevolent designs. It was the accepted notion before 1831 that as soon as any thing was to be done, there must be a Board to do it; and as soon as there was a Board, then must be agents for that Board; and these agents must not only pervade the whole church, but they must create State societies, and county societies, and congregational societies—Synodical societies, Presbyterian societies, and Church societies; until the idea that the church itself, of itself, could do any thing, or ought to attempt to do any thing directly, was rapidly passing away. The utter absurdity of this idea of the church as an organized power upon earth, is sufficiently obvious now; and the preposterous notion that the Presbyterian Church could endure, as a finality, such a state of things without thorough disorganization and ignominy, is palpably clear at present. But this was so far otherwise in other days, that one of the very slowest principles to make way in the general christian mind of that day, was the principle that the church itself was the very power, its own divine organization the very form, its own immediate object the very business, which every plan of doing good, and every organized means of doing it in the name of the Lord Jesus, supremely exacted—supremely fitted. In the first stages of the progress of the church back again to the great foundations from which she had so fearfully swung off—it satisfied the attainment which the general christian mind had then made, to bring the power and action of the church, over all these Boards and agencies. And it was, no doubt, a great point gained, both as matter of principle and matter of practice, to interpose the power of the church so far as to give her a real, though it was an inadequate control, to bestow on her a real though an insufficient part in the great operations of benevolence—by means of the substitution of Ecclesiastical Boards and their agencies, for voluntary Boards and their agencies. It was, we repeat, a real point gained, a step firmly taken in the right direction. And it is striking to note, how all parties had the unfailling instinct of this fact. How all the orthodox went in a body for the change; how all the New School went against it; how the moderates got upon the crack between, as far as they possibly could; some of them dividing their loyalty and their contributions between the voluntary operations and the ecclesiastical operations,—some of them adhering to a part of each kind, and some of them trying to serve all of both. We presume we should be accounted harsh and of a bad spirit, if we were to illustrate these cases by great names, which we could do very easily; and perhaps it would not be hard to show, that up almost to the present moment, some of those who

profess to be most shocked at our principles, have continued to maintain the closest intimacy with voluntary Boards and agencies, which have hardly as yet fully abandoned their systematic endeavors to supplant our own, in our own churches.

The contest however is about ended whether as one of principle or of practical effort; and the strict orthodox view has gained the same decisive triumph in this, as it has done in every other case, for nearly twenty-five years, in which it has been calmly, earnestly and persistently held up before the mind of the church. The great principles of the case have been worked out to a systematic solution: and the General Assembly of 1854 reduced them to order and enacted them—strange to say, with almost entire, if not with absolute unanimity, as a system. It may have been accidental that Dr. Thornwell was appointed chairman of the Committee on Systematic Benevolence in the General Assembly of 1855; and as such reported the able paper, once more setting forth the great result reached; which was once more unanimously ratified by the church, through its highest tribunal. But it was a most fitting thing, that the man who, of all those on the floor of that Assembly, most conspicuously represented, and has always represented, the principles which find their exposition in such great acts of the church—should have been selected as the chairman of that very committee, and been required to make that very report.

The Church of Christ, is perfect in all its parts, for all the ends to which God has ordained it. Amongst the rest, it is perfect in the method by which means are to be raised to enable it to carry forward its great designs. This method, in its full extent, constitutes an elemental part of her very nature and form. Charity, in the form of almsgiving—using that term in its very widest sense—is a part of the instituted worship of the church: just as really so, as the sacraments of the New Covenant are: though like them, not necessarily to occur on every occasion of public worship. A church that will not *give* to promote the cause of Christ, is as thoroughly heretical, as a church that will not celebrate the Lord's Supper: the former exhibits as complete evidence of denying Christ, as the latter. *Give*, we mean, as a part of its actual *worship* of God;—give in faith and as a religious act, commemorating Christ and our own devotion and obedience to Him. Moreover, it is as much the duty of the ministers of the Word to explain and to enforce this part of christian duty, as any other part; as much the duty of all the church courts, to see that sound doctrine is delivered and godly living exhibited, on this as on any other part of the christian life. Still further, it is as much the duty of the church to guide and direct and make effectual, this living charity of the people of God, as it is her duty to perform the same great office concerning any other part of the efforts of God's people, to upbuild the cause of Christ. And finally, the very form of the church, furnishes throughout—from the Deacon, to the General Assembly, a perfect method, whereby, whatever God's people are willing to do can be the most effectually done; and whereby they can be the most effectually taught, encouraged and persuaded as to what they should be willing—yea, eager to do.

All this is involved in the deliverances of the Assemblies of 1854 and 1855 on the subject of Systematic Benevolence. It is all involved in the very idea of the church, in its concrete form, as held by the orthodox amongst us. It is the practical side of their whole theory—that *new* theory we hear of—as applied to this particular matter. As a method, for its

end, it is perfect; nay, it is divine. It exhibits the church as steadily and spontaneously *doing*, all that her ability will allow, all that her piety will suggest, all that her opportunities will permit. It provides in the very form of the church, a method absolutely complete, whereby the utmost power the church has, may infallibly be put forth: and it provides, in the very nature of the church, that the worthiest objects shall be presented for the exercise of this charity, and that the most effectual instruction shall be imparted concerning our own duty. What more do we need? Alas! very much more. We need that a plan so complete—should be completely executed. We need that the church herself, instead of setting up, or countenancing any sort of hindrances to the free action of God's people; should, herself, steadily go before them—*doing her appropriate part*, as she calls upon them, to do theirs. We need that the church courts, and all the office bearers of the church, and especially the ministers of the Gospel, should teach, and guide, and encourage the people in this blessed way. We need that those amongst the people in whom is the fear and love of God, should set examples of true christian liberality to those around them. In one word, it is not an army of agents that we want—any more than it is a corps of Boards: what we want is, the simple, stated, faithful doing of our duty—each in his own place; and more of the spirit of God enabling and inclining us all thereunto. We need to know more thoroughly, that the piety of the church—her faith in Christ and her love for Him—is the power by which all her triumphs are to be won: and knowing this, frankly and trustfully to cast upon her, the complete responsibility—of obeying or disobeying her Divine Master. We have tried every thing—but this. Let us arise now, and return to our Father's house!

[To be concluded in the next number.]

THE CHAMBER OF IMAGERY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

ONE of the most striking features, in the aspect of affairs in this country, at present, is the pervading curiosity of our people in reference to the doctrines of the Church of Rome; and the jealousy, almost universal, in regard to her designs and movements. The sagacious instincts of liberty,—coupled with God's blessing upon the faithful and frequent warnings of some eminent patriots, endowed with a larger share of forecast than the mass of their generation,—have detected dangers ahead, and the whole nation has been aroused and put in a posture of vigilance and defence. The social and political tendencies of Romanism—its ferocious opposition to civil and religious freedom, *in principle*, always and every where: *in practice*, whenever and wherever it has not been restrained by policy or power—its audacious interference with the law of marriage, as ordained of God, and as lying at the very foundation of all earth-

ly and temporal relations—it's universal and shameless disregard of personal and public morality—it's implacable hostility to the best and highest interests of man, for the life that now is :—all these aspects of this proud empire have been, of late years, so amply exposed, that thousands of Americans are now awake and watchful, who, not long ago, were sleeping in the profoundest security, and crying, in their dreams, "peace! peace!"

But these are not the only, or even the most important aspects of this "mystery of iniquity." We ought to know it, not only as a *tyranny* or as an *immorality*—but, also and mainly, as a *heresy*: a heresy, fundamental and fatal: fundamental in its denial and corruption of the Gospel; fatal, to the eternal happiness of mankind. All the dreadful names of infamy, which may be justly heaped upon Rome, are names of honor compared with that of ANTI-CHRIST:—ANTI, in both senses of the preposition; *against*, and *in the place of*: *against—because in the place of, CHRIST*. It is the mystery of iniquity, because it sets itself against, and in the stead of,—the mystery of godliness, "God manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* And unless we take this view of it, and learn to hate it in this view, there is no security against our falling, as a people, under the same dominion which has crushed the life and energy out of nearly all the nations of Christendom, and shut still faster and more hopelessly against them, those gates of Heaven which its keys were *never* able to open.

It is never to be forgotten, that Popery is a judicial infliction upon mankind on account of their unbelief. The advent of the Man of Sin is thus described by the pen of inspiration:—"Whose coming is after the working 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 believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." So long, therefore, as men refuse "to receive the love of the truth," they are in danger of falling under this blighting curse of a righteous Judge.

For when we in our viciousness grow hard,
Oh misery on't, the wise Gods seal our eyes,
In our own filth drop our clear judgments, make us
Adore our errors, laugh at us, while we strut
To our confusion.

No man is safe, who is ignorant of the righteousness of God. The

* The connection of the passage here quoted, with the graphic description, in the beginning of the next chapter, of the Apostasy—is worthy of note: and, particularly, as Bp. Mede observes, the dislocation of the clause, "received up into glory," in order to bring it unto closer juxtaposition with the "doctrines of dæmons," subsequently mentioned—1. Tim. 3: 16, &c. If we consider the relations of our Saviour's ascension to His work, we may see at once, how the leading doctrines of Rome involve an utter denial of that glorious truth.

necessity of believing something, which is the fundamental and indestructible condition of intellectual activity, may, at any time, drive a man who has trifled with the majesty of truth, and the principles of evidence, into a communion which professes infallibly to decide all religious questions, and to relieve from all doubt, in regard to a subject upon which all serious doubt must be agony. We are not at all surprised, that men of the very first order of mind, and of the highest attainments in all the walks of merely human thought, should throw themselves into the arms of Rome. When Cicero wrote his Treatise on Pagan Theology, history informed him of but three speculative atheists. Since the light of Christianity has dawned upon the world, they may be counted by hundreds. In heathendom, every man has a religion and observes some form of worship. In Christendom, there are tens of thousands who have none. Infidelity and superstition, all forms of unbelief, of disbelief and of misbelief, grow from the same root, the carnal mind which is enmity against God: they are the unclean birds of night which haunt the darkened shrine, the fallen columns and ruined walls of the human soul, which was created to be the temple of holiness and truth. "This is the condemnation,"—said He who knew what was in man,—"that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved."

The darkness of Popery has special charms for that class of unbelievers, who, from the force of education, or the natural effects of disappointment and misfortune, have been led to reflect upon their moral condition, and to listen to the voice of conscience. They long for a darkness, in which the colors of truth and falsehood, of right and wrong, shall alike be lost: in which they may get rid, at once and forever, of the intolerable misery of thought and the harassing sense of responsibility: in which they may float smoothly along upon the current of impulse, appetite and passion, with a comfortable persuasion that it can convey them to nothing worse than an ocean of purgatorial fire. "That is an affair of the priest," said the Belgic Count, stained with a brother's blood, when urged to prepare for death. He had surrendered his private judgment, and consequently, his responsibility. Alas! for the wretchedness of poor human nature, seeking to escape its doom by a voluntary surrender of all that made it the image and glory of God, and degrading itself to the level of the brutes that perish! This is the intellectual death which thousands have found, which thousands more have sought, but have not found, though they have dug for it, as for hid treasures.

That which invests Popery with this tremendous power to entrap and destroy, to blind and kill men, to buy and sell and make merchandize of their souls, is suggested in the title of this article. It is the chamber of imagery in the very temple of the Lord. It professes to hold the great principles of the Gospel, but really denies them

and tramples them under foot. Its real doctrines are the images of the true: its worship, a counterfeit of the true worship of God. It becomes all things to all men in the largest sense: to the heathen as heathen, to the Christian as Christian, if by any means it may destroy some. The gilded crosses upon their temples reflect the earliest rays of the morning, and the last rays of the setting sun linger upon them; but the meaning of the symbol is, "Christ crucified afresh, and put to open shame," within the gloomy walls below. It professes to represent, by its external unity, the one, only true church and body of Christ, out of whose pale there is no salvation: it is really the unity of a vast and complicated machine, in which immortal men are mercilessly ground to powder. It professes to be the pillar and ground of the truth: it is really the strongest prop and bulwark of Satan's kingdom on earth. It professes to be the church founded upon the rock: it is really the gates of hell.

It has been often observed that the majority of men look only at the outward signs of things. "The outward signs of a dull man and a wise man, are the same, and so are the outward signs of a frivolous man and a witty man." And, in like manner, the outward signs of false religion may be the same as the outward signs of the true. The image and superscription of the spurious coin, are accurately copied from the true. The misery is, that, in the matter of religion, men will not go to the trouble of weighing the coin in the scales of eternal truth: they are satisfied with the beauty of the stamp, and, as they find very little use for religion in the trade and business of life, the mistake is seldom discovered until they and their fancied wealth are together condemned and rejected in another world. The case is even stronger than this. As it is by the outward signs they regulate their judgment, the more ostentatiously the signs are paraded by any form of religion, the fairer chance it has of being accepted as the true. Crosses, surplices, gowns, altars and what not, pass for religion, while the modest graces of the spirit, faith, love, temperance, mercy and the rest, having no pomp and circumstance to recommend them, are overlooked and despised. It ought to make a man blush for his race, that bold, impudent and constant assertion of extraordinary and exclusive pretensions is, to so great an extent, successful in securing a passive acquiescence in such pretensions. We may remember, however, that the Pharisees, with their long robes, long faces and long prayers, boasting that they were the temple and the only temple of the Lord, were pronounced by Him who read their hearts, to be a generation of vipers that could not escape the damnation of hell. And yet they were adored by the multitude, who are ever ready to sell the truth and never ready to buy it.

It is one of the most universal characteristics of mankind to cling tenaciously to the forms and representatives of whatever has been once valued, loved, honored or revered. How long and with how much jealousy, did the ancient Romans cling to the forms and signs of their free republic, after the substance was gone, and they were

groaning under a despotism well nigh absolute! What passionate kisses are imprinted upon the marble features of the lifeless body, which once shined a spirit, pure and noble, the object of affection and respect! So is it with religion. When the experience of the power of the truth of God has been lost; when men have ceased to *taste* and *see* that the Lord is good; when there is no more pungent and radical conviction of their needs as subject to guilt and misery, and, consequently, no more conviction of the necessity and priceless value of a Saviour's atoning blood, and sanctifying Spirit; when the perception of the true glory of christian worship, simple, manly and spiritual, consisting in fellowship with God and the divinely-ordained expression of that fellowship,—has been destroyed, or in a great degree impaired; when, in a word, nothing but the corpse of religion remains, the most is made of that corpse. It is bedecked and beautified, it lies in state, it is visited and gazed upon, with emotions approaching to idolatry. Such a corpse of christianity is the Church of Rome.—Let us look at it in a few particulars.

I. It is a cardinal truth of christianity, that Jesus Christ, in His person and grace, is to be proposed and represented to men, as the principal object of their faith and love.*

'The Saviour being, as to His divine nature, invisible to us, and as to His human nature, gone beyond the reach of mortal vision, must be represented to our minds in some way, or He can never be the object of our faith and love. This representation is made in the Gospel and in the Sacraments, by which He is "before our eyes evidently set forth, crucified amongst us." "We all, with unveiled face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord." We have four different portraits, so to speak, drawn by those who lived in familiar intercourse with Him, who listened every day to the gracious words which issued from His mouth, who witnessed His wonderful works of beneficence and power, and saw the tears which demonstrated that the Man was tenderly alive to all the impressions of human woe. He is presented to us in a great variety of lights and attitudes, to render our conception of Him as round and full, as our limited capacities will allow; and all this under the inspiration of God. At the same time, we have no minute description of His bodily form or features; in order, as it might seem, to rebuke beforehand the presumptuous folly or misguided affection, which should lead the church to attempt to reproduce them upon canvas, or in marble, wood or metal. The perception of Jesus, is a spiritual perception by faith. Faith goes to Him in distress, leans upon Him for support, communes with Him in joy, fights for Him against the world, the flesh and the devil, and looks for that blessed hope and

* See Dr. Owen's Sermon on the "Chamber of Imagery," preached at the Morning Exercise at Cripplegate, 1682, in answer to the question, "How is the practical love of truth the best preservative against Popery?"—Works, vol. 16, p. 52. Russell's London edition 1826. Many of the thoughts which follow, were suggested by this Sermon.

His glorious appearing, when, its office shall cease amid the splendors of the vision beatific. Now we see, as by a glass, darkly: and even these dim reflections of the beauty of our King, cannot be perceived by us, till He, by His Spirit, opens and purges our eyes. Nothing is more natural, then,—when the conviction exists that Christ ought to be habitually present to the mind, and yet the spiritual illumination, by which alone He can be perceived, is denied,—to resort to images and pictures, to fasts and festivals which commemorate the events and vicissitudes of His mortal life. And this the Church of Rome has done. But the Christ of their temples and domestic shrines, is no more the Christ of the Scriptures, than Aaron's golden calf was the God who brought the Israelites out of Egypt; and is no more suited to instruct the besotted people who use the image, as to the true nature of His person and His office, than the more ancient instrument of idolatry was suited to convey adequate conceptions of that majestic Being who was thundering out of the thick darkness of the Mount. In both cases, there is an attempt to worship God by a violation of one of the very plainest of His commandments. The ancient idolaters, however, made no attempt, so far as we know, to expunge the obnoxious precept.

It is, however, as an object of worship less than as an instrument of instruction, that we now refer to the use of the image in the Church of Rome. It is *their* way of setting forth the great truth touching the prominence which is due to the person and grace of Christ in the experience of the believer. The manner in which Paul would begin a missionary work may be seen in Rom. 10: 6, 8. The method of Popery may be seen in any history of its missions. The results respectively of the two methods, in exalting national character in knowledge and civilization, are so obvious that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err concerning them. The results of the two methods, in the improvement of the individual, in Scriptural knowledge and genuine piety, are still more startling and scarcely need to be referred to.

II. Again, "it is a prevalent notion of truth, that the worship of God ought to be beautiful and glorious."

We cannot reflect upon the majesty of our Maker at all, without feeling that the worship which becomes such creatures as we are, and which is acceptable to Him, must not be mean or low, except so far as these qualities must belong to the creature in comparison with the Creator. This is the dictate even of the light of nature. When we come to examine the Scriptures, we find that this instinct, so far from being disallowed, is sanctioned and confirmed. The worship of the Mosaic Institute, the gorgeous furniture of the tabernacle, the splendid temple which succeeded it, the brilliant vestments of the priests, the costly incense which ascended in a fragrant cloud from the golden censer, the inner sanctuary, where was the throne of God attended by the cherubim, concealed by a vail which the High Priest alone was allowed to put aside, and he only once in the whole year,

—all this was designed to impress the ancient people of God with a sense of His awful majesty, and with a conviction of the glory of His worship. But it was only the alphabet, the primary elements, as Paul calls it, of the truth. The scheme of redemption, in its great features, was so different from any thing ever conceived by the human understanding, so difficult to be received by it, that a new language was necessary, symbols addressed to the senses and the imagination, and kept continually before them, to give the new ideas and anomalous relations, a permanent lodgment in the current of human thought. Under the Gospel all the forms are changed: the worship of God is still glorious, nay, far more glorious than before, but the outward signs of the glory have been removed. Compare 2 Cor, 3, with the Epistle to the Hebrews throughout. Jesus Christ is the Spirit of the old letter; the Temple, the Ark, the Mercy-seat, the Altar, the Priest, the complement of the whole imposing ritual in all its parts and details. There is no more use, no propriety in such forms and appliances of worship, as were tolerated under the Law, in the infancy and childhood of the Church. There is no priest on earth in the literal sense; all are priests, high-priests who have boldness to enter, every day and every hour, into the holiest of all, through their union with Jesus, the only real Priest, *de jure* or *de facto*, in the universe. There is no sacrifice, in the literal sense, on earth; all the services and worship of believers are spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, who offered Himself *once for all*, and by that one offering, perfected for ever them that are sanctified. There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin. There is and can be no temple on earth in the literal sense: every believer is the temple of the Holy Ghost, and there are no dead temples now, no consecrated stone, brick, or wood: our houses of worship are “meeting-houses,” no more, no less. The true and only Temple, in the sense of that which makes God conversable with man and man’s worship acceptable to God, is the human nature of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

We need not say that, in the Church of Rome, there is nothing but the old Jewish image of the true glory of divine worship. A temple, a succession of mortal priests, a daily sacrifice, incense and intercession, a ritual imposing to the senses and the imagination, but no access to the mercy-seat of God. “Through Him,”—that is the Son,—“we have access by one Spirit to the Father;” this is the description of true worship, the fellowship enjoyed by all who

* It will be obvious from these statements, that there are many things done and tolerated in our own church, especially in the large cities, whose tendency is towards Popery. The pedigree seems to be. 1. Semi-Presbyterianism. 2. Semi-Episcopacy (Low Churchism.) 3. Episcopacy (High Churchism.) 4. Popery. The forms of worship must correspond, in the long run, with the doctrinal character of the religions: innovations in worship lead to corruption in doctrine. Innovations have been made in the worship of the Presbyterian Church in this country, which would have been resisted by a thoroughly instructed people, (say the Scotch) even at the peril of an open rupture. Such may be the result even here: for Christian liberty, as at present interpreted, is the high road to Jewish bondage.

have been admitted to the glorious liberty of the sons of God. But where are the vestiges of it, in the great Apostasy? Is God a Father there, or a vindictive Judge, ever ready to launch His thunder-bolts against the wretched victims of remorse and terror? Is not the mediation of the Son entirely annihilated? What means the sacrifice of the mass, but a denial of the reality and efficacy of the sacrifice of Jesus? The erection of a daily "remembrancer of sin," which can never make the worshipper perfect as pertaining to the conscience, and therefore, keeps him in the iron bondage of a sense of guilt? And where is the intercession of the Son? Is it not thrust aside by their "doctrines of daemons," their teachings concerning angels and the glorified spirits of the saints, accommodated from Pagan mythology and Rabbinical tradition? And what room is there in this accursed system, for the agency of the Spirit? The Priesthood, which is the Church, has thrust itself between the worshipper and the Holy Ghost, as well as between the worshipper and the Son. It is a mere mechanical process of salvation, by sacramental means: the personality of the Spirit is practically denied; the sovereign will of the blasphemous usurper of divine prerogatives called a priest, implied in the "intention," is the only personal element in the business. The miserable wretch, who is taught to believe that he is eating his god, will have this advantage over the priest who makes the god for him, that his damnation will not be quite so deep.

We have no space for more specific illustration. We advise our younger brethren to study this system more and more as *Anti-Christ*. The most subtle and ingenious perversions of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, made by the cunning of him who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning, constitute the essence, the organic life of Popery; and give rise to all those appalling manifestations of its nature, in the history of individuals, families and nations. Clearly and strikingly will it be seen, by such an investigation, that no man can hate it as it deserves to be hated, unless he loves the doctrines of grace: that the infamy which covers the system as a grinding despotism in the life that now is, is honor and glory compared with the infamy which belongs to it as a cruel and devilish device to crush all the hopes of fallen and agonized humanity for the life that is to come. It is amazing to observe with what remorseless activity and vigilance it meets the sinner at every turn, offering the image for the reality, the shadow for the substance, stones for bread and a scorpion for an egg. It is Hobbism in this world, a vast Leviathan whose will is law, whose frown is death: but it is also Semi-Pelagianism, which is worse, sealing men up in everlasting darkness and despair.

We are not to be deterred from doing our duty, by the cry which we shall doubtless hear from foolish men, that in exposing and denouncing Popery, we are dabbling in politics. If the insatiable ambition of Priests and Prelates, and their equally insatiable avarice, have alarmed the jealousy of those who love their country, who are to

blame for it? While as American citizens, we claim the right to think and speak freely on all subjects connected with our national prosperity, we swear by no party. Doubtless there are many who declaim upon the stump and elsewhere, against Rome, who do not and cannot hate it, because they have not been converted to God. There are not a few, who justify the sarcasm of Mr. Wise; who raise their hands with holy horror at the audacious wickedness which shuts the Bible against man, and yet never disturb the repose of their own Bibles covered with cobwebs and dust. But if men hold the truth in unrighteousness, they must answer for themselves. The duty of the church is plain. It is to set forth the mystery of godliness, and in contrast with it and explanation of it, the mystery of iniquity.* "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained."

THE LATEST THEODICY. THE NATURE OF EVIL, CONSIDERED IN A LETTER TO REV. EDWARD BEECHER, D. D. AUTHOR OF "THE CONFLICT OF AGES," BY HENRY JAMES. (Appleton & Co., 1855.)

THIS enormous letter, filling a volume of three hundred and forty pages, opens with the following address to Dr. Beecher, which, considering the source from which it comes, we regard as by far the cruellest of all the visitations, which its own intrinsic folly has called down upon the head of that *Lusus Theologiae*, "the Conflict of Ages."

"Dear Sir:—The unfeigned sympathy with which your recent work, entitled "The Conflict of Ages," has impressed me for your intellectual struggles, must be my apology for thus addressing you. . . . Your attitude is very broadly representative. Your theologic experience reflects that of numberless thousands, though it is at the same time true, that only one here and there is seen lifting his hands to heaven, and loudly imploring deliverance, while the vast majority lock the sullen pain in their own bosoms, and dying, make no sign. . . . Nothing, I think, would be easier to show, than that the entire infirmity of your book, viewed as a Theodicy, attributes itself to the specific intellectual disqualification, operated by the old theology, *against whose stony udders, my own infantile gums, equally with yours, have been long and solicitously*

*See 1 Timothy 3: 16 4: 1, 6, and the Second Encyclical Letter of St. Peter, c. 2, throughout.

pressed, only to be withdrawn again, like your own, lacerated and bleeding, not merely makes it impossible to apprehend aright and moral problem, but also when fairly interpreted, flatly denies the possibility of morality, and turns its existence into an illusion.

You appear to think, that the answer to this question is purely historical. . . . But the difficulty as it appears to me, does not imply any lack of historical knowledge. It implies only an infirmity of our reason, or our *powers of intellectual digestion*, which are sometimes inadequate to resolve the facts of knowledge, and leave us meanwhile to *suffer the horrors of spiritual water-brash and acidity* (!!) We have cited somewhat fully, lest our readers suspect us of caricature;—the Italics are ours.

We confess to a little curiosity to know something of the personality of the author of this work. And we have caught ourselves while engaged in reading, wandering off into all manner of curious speculations concerning him. Our prevailing idea on the whole, is, that he must belong to that growing class of doctors who deal in quack remedies, both for the spiritual and physical maladies of men. The singular metaphors already quoted give just ground for such a suspicion. And similar metaphors further on in the book, all go to confirm it. Thus we have this very witty saying in ridicule of the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to his people,—“they are never benefitted by it, seeing that their own actual righteousness is necessary, *like castor oil after calomel to give it efficacy.*” (p. 206.) So again, denouncing the recent Romish dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary—whom with all the coarse irreverence and indecency of a genuine quack, he pronounces to have been a “*woman, in all probability, as to her natural characteristics, one of the basest of her kind*”—he goes on to inform us that the recent decree of Rome in regard to Mary “is the ne plus ultra of falsity in that branch of our ecclesiasticism, and *snaps the thin umbilical connexion* which still bound it to the long-suffering *maternal heavens*” (!!) Thus “his speech bewrayeth him” as a quack, and to our notion, the whole style of the logic and argument points to the peculiar phase of the quackery, as being of the Homœopathic order. In the first place his fundamental theory of theology—the Swedenborgian—disregarding the actual, tangible, physical and moral man, as the subject of his investigations and remedies,—is directed to an ideal, fanciful, spiritual man, whose only existence is in the dreams of a ranting insanity. In the second place, the theoretic remedy for the ills of the spiritual man, like Hahneman's, is in itself so ludicrously absurd, as to have caused men to be equally divided in opinion, just as they have been concerning Machiavelli, whether the originator of the theory were in earnest, or only playing off his *dry fun* on the credulity of mankind, either in cynical contempt of their stupidity, or perhaps with the benevolent purpose of making men “laugh and be fat.” In the third place, while the theory itself is little more than a harmless, crazy folly, whether originating in joke or in earnest, and its logical

agencies so infinitesimal as to be harmless, yet the practitioner under it, far from being content to abide by his theory, is not very sparing either of his poison pills, or of his abuse of all established science and common sense. In the fourth place, his demands of our confidence in his remedy, are all based upon his own assurances and certifications of its potency and triumphs.

Thus, we have a history, through seven pages of the volume,—marvelously akin to some of the certificates of wonderful cures, performed after the old practice had given the patient up—of a discussion between the author and a “professor of philosophy” on the “power of contrary choice,” with green and black tea for the diagram in which the professor, after the discourse had extended beyond midnight, was compelled to admit himself “perplexed for the time,” and to ask for a postponement of the question to a future night; but which he not only never dared to resume, but in meeting his antagonist thereafter, “discovered a blank unconsciousness of any unfinished business between them.” All of which we think likely is true, indeed it is the only matter wearing the natural air of veracity which we find in the book. According to the report of this “high argument” in the book itself, we doubt whether any “professor of philosophy” in the land would voluntarily subject himself a second time to such an infliction, sustained by nothing stronger than green or black tea. One such midnight discussion we should suppose, would drive any ordinary professor of philosophy into “blank unconsciousness.” While we admire “pluck,” we think there are reasonable limits within which it should show itself.

But—not to enumerate farther,—in the last place, the lofty contempt with which the logic of this book looks down upon any demand for proof and evidence, beyond the dicta of himself and Swedenborg, we think finishes the question, as to the professional calling of the author. Thus he informs us that “Swedenborg, the wisest of the moderns, never attempted to *captive your assent* to his statement by *argument* (!) As a more wonderful Humboldt indeed, he carries you into regions before untrodden of mortal feet; but he no more essays to *reason* you into a belief of the *audita et visa* he encounters there, than Humboldt attempts to convince you argumentatively of the tropical *fauna* and *flora*, whose existence he witnessed in South America. Reasoning is manifestly out of place in either case. *It is always the resort of those who do not possess the truth,*” &c. Now, we venture in passing, to suggest one slight discrepancy in this analogy between Swedenborg’s travels through the world of angels and spirits, and Humboldt’s travels in South America. Humboldt’s descriptions, being of things on terra firma, not only are capable of being conceived of, but within reach of proof and verification or contradiction, if called in question—we have in this fact, in connexion with the traveller’s character, a guarantee for his veracity. Swedenborg on the other hand, travelled like Gulliver and Munchausen, only in the regions which have no “local habitation;” and as he not only puts himself beyond the reach of all possible means of

attestation or denial, but tells us things marvellous beyond measure—the more proper rhetorical epithet for him, by far, would be “the great Munchausen.”

Laying aside however all theoretic investigation, as to the nature of this new phenomenon of authorship, we must be content to take his own account of himself, from such hints on that subject as his marvellous modesty has allowed him to scatter here and there through his book. In the preface, at the outset, he informs us:—“From the very dawn of my intellectual life, I have been exercised in studious efforts after a philosophic solution of the problem of human responsibility; but philosophy gave me no help. My concern was to discover how evil in the creature could consist with the Creator’s perfection. . . . The key to the enigma I found only in the theology of Swedenborg.” What has given more special interest to us however, in this inquiry, is finding the author speaking of “good old Dr. Miller, and our professors at Princeton,” and exhibiting some familiarity with the discussions on the Old and New Theology in the church twenty years ago. Which circumstance furnishes, we think, a solution of what is otherwise an inexplicable phenomenon—namely, how it is possible for a man, who *passes* for a sane man, (so we infer from the fact, that Appleton & Co. publish his book,) could be guilty of the folly and wickedness, which are the marked characteristics of this work. It is the solemn and most significant saying of the inspired Apostle—“because they received not the love of the truth; for this cause God sent them strong delusion to *believe a lie*.” Those who will not believe when they ought, on sufficient evidence, He gives over to this peculiar punishment;—not to become utterly incredulous, unable to believe anything, but the very contrary,—to the utter and stupid credulity which believes when it ought not,—even “believes a lie.” The special penalty annexed to sinful incredulity, is *excessive credulity*. And our own age perhaps as remarkably as any that preceded it, is illustrating and verifying this inspired enunciation of a most remarkable law of the human mind. It will not fail to strike any thoughtful observer of men in our times, that the grand recruiting ground of the most preposterous caricatures of the religion of the gospel,—those schemes which most pre-eminently set reason, common sense and human consciousness at defiance—as Popery, Mormonism, Spiritualism, Swedenborgianism, &c.,—is precisely within the circle of those who have enjoyed peculiar advantages for attaining to the true knowledge of God, and have become God-rejecting apostates. Mr. James, who talks so familiarly of old and new theology, of Princeton and Dr. Miller, is an exaggeration however, even of his class. Through the entire length of his pretended inquiry into the nature of evil, there runs one continual scurrilous diatribe, against what he is pleased to term the “reigning ecclesiasticism,” and the “old theology,” but really against all the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel. And yet so far as we have had patience to examine, not a single statement that he makes concerning the current theology of any school,

has even the semblance of truth. Utterly incapable, apparently of anything else, than as the Apostle says, "believing a lie," when the point in hand is the orthodox views of faith, he is alike incapable of anything else, in writing of those views, than *telling* a lie. And the only apology that the largest charity can make for the man is, that he "tells" what he "believes," and so far the lie is not wilful. He caricatures and exaggerates even the dogmas of Romanism. This we take it for granted, no man would feel any temptation to do, whose mind is not incurably diseased, either from original infirmity, or superinduced in the manner indicated by the Apostle. And yet, with the utmost self-complacency we are called upon to receive,—as a complete solution of the great problem of evil, certain statements of facts concerning God's secret doings in the spiritual universe, in their nature, contradictory of all our conceptions of God;—and that on the unsupported testimony of a man, who has shown himself incapable of stating the truth touching the most common and the most notorious facts, relating to the visible world around us, and the men in it!

We say nothing of Mr. James' philosophy, as exhibited incidentally in the discussion of his "high argument." Our readers will excuse us, we doubt not, after the following specimen:

"My first proposition is, that man is dependant upon the rigid oppugnancy, in his experience, of pleasure and pain, or plenty and want *for his development out of vegetable and animal conditions.*
 This is the peculiarity of the vegetable subject, that it is *born for pleasure alone*, to sport in the breeze and revel in the sun, and that it perishes consequently under the least blast of adversity. See the gigantic oak for example, whose summer foliage is able to embower an army, and whose years are counted by centuries; let but the first breath of autumn blow upon it, and those vivid leaves grow pale *with fright (!)* and hasten to deposit their multitudinous glories in the dust. . . . And this, simply because the vegetable life is one of pleasure alone, and perishes therefore by the slightest oppugnancy of pain!"

And yet this is the production of a mind, that once was taught by "Good old Dr. Miller and our Professors at Princeton!" We may add, as scarcely less surprising, this rant, with much more, far less harmless, against the current, religious ideas, and feelings of the country is brought out in the best style of Appleton & Co., and honored with all the agencies for circulation, which belong to an established and respectable publishing house!

We have said nothing as yet of the main subject, or what the author sets forth as the main subject of the book, its merit as a Theodicy. Our readers, by this time, will feel disposed to excuse us from this part of our task. And yet while intrinsically unworthy any one's attention, it may not be altogether useless to exhibit in a single paragraph, its main points in comparison with the Theodicy of Dr. Beecher, and that of Professor Bledsoe. If it answer no other end, it may illustrate very forcibly, how when a subject is in

its nature, beyond the reach of human faculties, the discussion of it brings men of good sense and men of nonsense upon the same level.

The problem which the Theodicy-makers undertake to solve is, how evil can exist in the world without disparagement either to the omnipotence or the benevolence of God. Says Professor Bledsoe, "There is no difficulty in the problem whatever. God is absolved from all responsibility, for evil which flows from the free will of man. He could not create an intrinsically holy being; for a created holiness is a contradiction in terms. The will of man is not, like the understanding and emotions necessitated, but is absolutely free, spontaneous, exempt from the law of cause and effect, which obtains in nature. God cannot touch or control the will, and of course is not responsible for the evil which is an incident of its freedom."

Says Dr. Beecher, "God *must* create the creature holy, or violate the eternal principles of right. But evil arises out of a *temporary limitation of the Divine power in the earlier stages* of his system, (i. e. before Adam,) in consequence of the necessary liability of finite minds to unbelief and distrust of God. . . . If he will act with finite minds in an infinite plan, he must act, at least in the earlier generations, with a liability of being misunderstood."

Says Mr. James. "All the trouble comes from the hypothesis of an absolute creation,—that at a certain time in the history of earth, at a certain place on its bosom, the Almighty called Adam into being. Whereas, it is a strict corollary of God's absolute perfection, that he cannot create anything but forms, organs, subjects, receptacles of life. Moral and physical evil are necessary incidents of man's finite constitution; are in themselves, only constituent facts of finite consciousness; are therefore nothing derogatory to God or man. It is only spiritual evil that needs to be accounted for. And that arises simply from man's mistaking the spiritual life of God that is in him, for his own life, and that he has life *in se*—an independent self-hood. This is the origin of all the evils that desolate humanity. Here lies the great *mother fallacy at whose exuberant paps cling and feed* all the minor fallacies of the universe. The sentiment of independent self-hood."

Such are the three solutions of the problem, stated in the language of their own authors. We do by no means affirm of them, that they are all equally ridiculous in their form and style of statement. We dare affirm however, that there is little choice between them; as satisfactory answers to the inquiry to which they profess to be a response. If their several authors would permit a suggestion from so humble a quarter, we venture to submit whether,—if their soaring ambition will be satisfied with nothing short of a grapple with, puzzles hitherto insoluble,—they had not better turn their energies to the mastery of the problem of "perpetual motion." There they may gratify their peculiar passion, without the necessity of continually doing violence to the deepest convictions and holiest emotions of the religious portion of their fellow men.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR 1855.

THE report of the Board of Education for the present year is before us. No one would dream from the perusal of it, that the views of the Board of Education had excited any earnest or conscientious uneasiness in the Church. It comes forth with its customary display of partial truth, confused thought, and common place remark, hot in its zeal, emphatic in the enunciation of some unquestionable truths, and particularly discreet in its avoidance of all points of opposition. Now we submit in all candor whether this is the way in which the issues raised with the Board ought to be encountered? The doctrines of their reports and the acts of their policy have been gravely impeached. They have been arraigned before the church as carrying the claims of ecclesiastical power far beyond the bound of a legitimate authority. The utmost candor and fair dealing have been displayed towards them: their motives have been honored; their feelings consulted, and every expedient has been adopted to save their personal consideration, while impeaching their policy, yet not once have the official papers of the Board condescended to notice that their views had been questioned. They seemed to be resolved to rest upon other powers than argument for their success, and to combat the opposition with the weapons of dignity and silence.

We shall not pursue the Board through the masses of ill-digested matter with which they afflicted the Assembly, and with which the Assembly has afflicted the church. There are only one or two points to which we shall call attention at present, preliminary to a more active canvass of the modern heresies on this subject, concerning which we have accumulated a quantity of miraculous disquisition, with which we propose hereafter to astonish and console the reader.

The Board after wading through a large proportion of their report, at length touch the vital question in the theory, by a very brief appeal to the alleged historical concession of the issue, and then very sentimentally refer the inquirer to their past papers on the subject. They say in phrase remarkable for its gingerly tenderness:*

“The question now arises whether the church *ought to assist* in founding institutions of this religious character, if the wants of her household require it? The question is not, whether the Church has the exclusive authority to take part in public education, nor whether it is bound under all circumstances to exercise that authority. But it is simply, whether in the absence of the required institutions to carry forward the education of her youth, the Church may not through her judicatories, see that Christian Institutions are established in sufficient numbers to meet her wants. This question has been settled historically again and again, with the utmost unanimity. The Reformers were all of one way of thinking. In Geneva, France, Holland and Scotland the Church established institutions

* Report, p. 34.

of learning, and kept their control within her own judicatories. The question is therefore historically settled, if there is any value in precedent."

Upon this paragraph we have several remarks to submit. In the first place, we would inquire, why the Church is degraded in the first sentence into a mere *assistant* in the construction of these institutions? Assist whom? This remark seems to place her in the position of a mere subordinate to some *principal* agency, whose rights are implied, but not expressed? Why is the Church placed in such a position if the doctrines formerly advocated by the Board are true—that the Church is empowered to act directly on the subject, in the exercise of her *own powers*, expressed or implied? Why is she now placed in this subtle deprecatory phrase in the position of *a mere assistant*, to some implied agency endued with prime powers in the case! Is it because the Board dread the outspoken claim of original and official power, and fear to maintain it? Surely if the Church is possessed of any power at all, it is her own: she is not the servant of any other agency: even where she possesses a conjunct or common power, that which she possesses at all, she holds as her own and not as a delegate of another seat of authority. Why then this sweet and subtle evasion of the claim of legitimate *official* power, direct or implied, set forth in the opening of the paragraph before us?

But again: it is said the question at issue simply is, "whether in the absence of the required institutions to carry forward the education of her youth, the Church may not through her judicatories, see that Christian institutions are established in sufficient numbers to meet *her wants*." What is the meaning of these last words, *her wants*? Whose wants? The wants of the Church in her organic capacity, things necessary to carry out her business, as the propagator of the Gospel? We are not aware that any one has disputed such a claim. Not one within our knowledge has ever disputed the right of the Church to educate her candidates for the ministry, and consequently to provide schools for that purpose. No one has questioned the right of the Church to erect a school, or establish a farm, or to practice physic among the heathen, or elsewhere, where such a procedure stood in the relation of an immediate and direct incident to its own work, and was necessary to it. Certainly the Church has the right to supply *her wants*. But the question at issue with the Board is not whether the Church, has the right to supply her own wants in the matter of schools, *but the wants of society*. It is whether she may take under her control the general interests of education, and supply *the necessities of society* in this great demand. But perhaps the Board mean to put another construction on the term *Church*, and consider it the representative of Christian people, simply as such, without any specific relation to their organic character as an ecclesiastical body. Then the *wants of the Church* are the demands of pious parents for the means of education, and as nobody ever questioned the right of Christian parents to supply the educational wants of their families, the question of ecclesiastical education is settled.

Settled with a vengeance! If this be a correct employment of the term Church, then any Christian parents or members of the Church who may unite to form a school, will form an *ecclesiastical* institution. If a number of individual members of the Church form a Temperance Society, it is an *ecclesiastical* organization. There is really no difference between the American Tract Society and the Board of Publication; both are equally *ecclesiastical*; and the great conflict of 1837 about voluntaryism and ecclesiastical action, was a contest for a distinction without a difference—a second edition of the Gulliverian fight about the big and little end of an egg. It plays a very unmerciful specimen of destruction also, with the Board's own laborious distinctions between Oglethorpe and Hampden Sidney, Lafayette and Princeton. The Church must have enough institutions to supply *her wants*! That is in one sense, the Church as an organic body, must have enough to supply her organic wants. Very well: nobody objects to this. But the Church—that is Christian people must have schools to educate their children. Very well again: nobody quarrels with this sort of ecclesiastical action. But thirdly, the Church—that is the organic body, must have enough institutions to supply *her wants*—that is the wants of the Christian people considered simply as such. This conclusion limps dreadfully from the premises, and we are sorry to be compelled to characterize it as a very ill favored specimen of a logical cripple. In the name of reason why do not the Board define what they mean by *the Church* in connection with this subject, and stick to it? Why will they use the term one minute in one sense, and in another sense the minute after, and then jumble up both meanings together in one sentence, so that either can be used in case of necessity, and no one can ever tell exactly which of the two conveys the mind of the writer? If they mean to claim the control of education as a general interest of society, as one of the granted or implied powers of the *government* of the Church, let them say so, and stand up to it squarely through the fight. If they mean to claim it for Christian people as such, let them say so and the contest is over: for we shall not debate the propriety of the courts of the Church controlling what is admitted to be the affair of men in an unofficial capacity. But if they mean that the control of education, as a permanent interest of civil life, is under the control of the individual and official members of the Church as a mass, yet in their organic capacity, and in the exercise of their official powers, let them come out distinctly and say so, and we shall give them employment hereafter in explaining what part of the official business of either the officer or private member of the ecclesiastical organization brings under its control this vast interest of society. At all events, let the Board clear up the foundations, locality, limits and nature of their claims, so that there may be no doubt about the question. We despise this bush fight, in and out and around and about the many meaning word, *Church*. It is unquestionable the Board mean the control of education by the government of the Church; but it is necessary for the definite information of the masses

of the people, for them to say so in direct terms, and then proceed to derive the source of this *governmental* power.

The attentive reader of these remarks will have already discerned the distinction which lies at the foundation of the doctrines of the Board, and in part at least, refutes the argument drawn from the testimony of history on this subject, cited by the report before us. The Church may create a school under such circumstances, that such an institution is really incidental to its own legitimate business and necessary to it. This principle makes ecclesiastical action in the erection of schools limited absolutely in its nature: it cannot proceed beyond what is honestly and truly ecclesiastical necessity. But the claim of the Board is that the Church can control the interests of education as a general and permanent interest of social life: it is absolutely as *unlimited* in its range as the demand in society for the means of education, and the capacity of the Church to fill it. It is a claim of power radically different in every element essential to either from the limited and purely circumstantial power which we have just defined. Now the Board have something else to do in determining on the real nature of the testimony of the Church in its history, than merely to cite the fact that they have erected schools: it must be also shown that the alleged action was not in the legitimate subordination to purely ecclesiastical ends, but was the result of a direct claim to control education as a general interest of society. The Old Hanover Presbytery created a school at Hampden Sidney: this may have been altogether proper. There were no schools then in which candidates for the ministry could receive their education, and it was a legitimate exercise of power in the Court to erect it. But this admission by no means involves that the Presbyteries of Virginia may now do the same thing, because the condition of things in the community is wholly altered. There are now colleges in which candidates can be trained, and the Church would have no right to create a similar school, even for the education of her ministry—a legitimate object of ecclesiastical action. Still less would the example of the Old Hanover Presbytery warrant the creation of a whole system of schools, avowedly designed to embody a claim to control, *not merely the official training of candidates for the ministry, but education as a general interest of society.* The idea that the past action of ecclesiastical courts *necessarily* warrants the present claims and doctrines of the Assembly and the Board is utterly unfounded. The claim is radically different from the example cited to sustain it. We might therefore admit in detail the historical examples on which the Board seem to rest as their last dike in the argument, and yet impeach their conclusions. We might do this on a distinct ground if we pleased: the loose notions which have controlled the policy of the Genevan and Scottish Churches in relation to Church and State, might well warrant us in demurring to their example in the matter of education, even admitting as we do, to an extent, that the Board is entitled to plead their action. But we dismiss this for the present, and proceed to the last point in the

document before us, to which we design to allude. The Board tell us :

“ Our Church has never advanced the theory—much less adopted it—that secular teaching alone, unconnected with the religious, is a work she may discharge under her own supervision. Such a labor under such circumstances, she neither seeks nor practices. Her theory is, that she has a right to teach religion to her youth in every stage of their education ; and as the development of the mind goes on with that of the heart and conscience, the two being naturally united, her officers may lawfully educate the mental as well as the moral powers. The chief end in these efforts, is the salvation of the soul. Religious instruction is the main and permanent object ; the other instruction being incidental to, and inseparable from the former.” *

This is one of those hopelessly confused masses of bad thinking, which have done more to render the reports of the Board of Education the vehicles of error than the extraordinary labor, the commendable zeal, and the occasional ability with which they have been composed, will ever be able to counter-balance. The Church, we are informed, has never pretended to teach secular learning alone : that would be wicked ; she has only claimed to teach it in connection with a course of instruction in religion, and as she has the right to teach religion to her youth, she has therefore a right to teach them secular learning along with it. A marvellous sequitur verily !

Let us put a similar case. Suppose the Church wants to get the control of *professional* education in her hands. It will not do to claim it *directly* : this would be too obviously inadmissible. But she claims to teach religion to her youth all through their training ; and as religion ought to be mixed with the whole course of education, she can in this indirect manner slide her hands upon the reins, and triumphantly do what, in its naked form, it is admitted she had no right to do. In the case of ordinary education, the Board admit she has no right to teach secular learning alone : but she must control education : how is she to manage it ? Why she claims to teach religion : religion must be taught in the educational curriculum, and therefore her right to teach this part of it gives the right to teach the other. To disentangle this confusion more completely : what is it the Board are aiming to accomplish ? It is to inaugurate a complete system of education. Now it would seem that the end involved the means. Secular learning is a part of the means to this end : religious knowledge is another. Now they say the Church cannot teach secular learning alone ; but that the right to teach the secular learning is *conditioned wholly* on the right to teach the religious department of the course. This is about as reasonable as to say that a schoolmaster has no right to teach grammar directly ; but he has the right to teach arithmetic ; and *therefore* has the right to teach grammar. It is obvious that the right to teach both is involved in the right to teach

* Report, 1855, p. 35.

at all ; and it is utterly absurd to condition the right to teach one, on the right to teach the other. Now if the Church has the right to *educate at all*, she has assuredly the right to use the means to accomplish it : she has *the same direct right* to teach the secular part of the curriculum as she has to teach any part of it. If she has the right to enter the educational field at all, she has the right to teach secular learning alone, apart from all religious knowledge. Should she do this from an imperfect judgment of the necessity of religion to the completeness of the curriculum, the true charge against her would be, *not that she was doing what she had no right to do* : for we are arguing on the supposition of her right to educate : *but that her educational plans were grossly defective in leaving out the element of religion.* Her right to educate, involves the right to teach all parts of the course *directly* ; and is not impeached by defective conceptions of the means to do it, and to deny, as the Board seem to do, her right to teach secular learning as such, is *to concede the whole issue*, since to deny the right to use necessary means to an end, is a denial of the end itself. In short this confused vindication of its doctrines indicates most painfully that the Board are even their whole grand scheme on grounds *not distinctly ascertained resting to themselves!* To tell us in further vindication of their theory, that "religious instruction is the main and prominent object," in what is commonly understood by a course of liberal education, is a strange confusion of fundamental conceptions of the purposes of such a course. Religious knowledge is assuredly more important than any other ; but it does not follow that it ought to assume the most prominent position in every course of instruction. Religious knowledge is certainly more important than an acquaintance with the carpenter's trade ; but if a master carpenter should make religion more prominent in his instructions to his apprentices, than a knowledge of the craft, we presume no one would call him a wise trainer of boys in the mysteries of building, although he might give them more important information than a knowledge of that art. It is absolutely distressing to see the Boards reduced to such shifts of logic as these. To sustain an unwarrantable extension of the jurisdiction of the Church, they commit themselves to positions which confound the fundamental purposes of education, and to others in which all logical propriety is engulfed in the abysses of absurdity.

We had intended to have remarked on the singular indirection in which the report before us renews the endeavor to obtain some support from the relation of infants to the Church, for their theories of ecclesiastical jurisdiction ; but we must defer it for the present. If nothing else indicated the growing necessity of the definite settlement of the nature and limits of that important relation, the hopeless confusion of several paragraphs in this report, would of itself, be decisive. We shall return to this subject at some period in the future.

SACRED ARCHITECTURE AND SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

THE purpose of David, so soon as quietly settled in his cedar palace at Jerusalem, to build a palace for Jehovah, the actual sovereign of Israel, whose magnificence should ever remind the people of His presence as their real sovereign, was not disapproved of by Jehovah. Nay, it was not only commended, but the expression of the pious purpose was made the occasion of a special promise, that the throne should be hereditary in his family, and of a new revelation, through Nathan the Prophet, in advance of all preceding revelations in its distinctness, touching the coming Messiah,—namely: that He should come in the royal line of David, and be the founder of a community, His everlasting rule over which, should be typified by the Dynasty of which David was the head.

And yet the era of the complete execution of this purpose of David by his son—in the building of that magnificent temple, whose fame filled the world, and the complete establishment in connection with it, of the most gorgeous and imposing rites of worship—whilst in some aspects of it the golden era of Israel—was marked not only by the subversion of that constitutional liberty, which was the peculiar glory of the political institutions of Moses, but also for a remarkable corruption of the faith of God's covenant people. The very King who in his early manhood, with such piety and zeal, engaged in the execution of David's purpose—perhaps the very head which devised, and the the very hands which executed the magnificent palace and altars of Jehovah, in more advanced life, were engaged in devising and executing, as if in derision of their own former piety, altars on every hill that surrounded the temple, for the insane and beastly rites of Chemosh and Moloch, which the puritanic horror of their fathers had well named "the *abominations* of Moab and Ammon." Thus the magnificent temple, which the earnest and loving faith of David projected, and the consecrated genius of the youthful Solomon executed, stood forth to the old age of the same generation which witnessed and marvelled at its rising glory, no longer a testimony to the love that burned in the hearts that reared it, but rather as a magnificent sepulchral monument in memory of the early death of the faith that had once reigned in the heart of Israel.

This fact, very significant in itself, has additional significance, when contemplated as testifying, that God permitted even the pious design of "the man after God's own heart," and the work which He had himself given permission to be done in his name, thus, in its outworking and results, to conform to a general law which all history points out as governing every such attempt of men under the impulse of their religious nature, to honor the God whom they worship, by costly and gorgeous external display of their devotion. For it seems to be an almost invariable law of all forms of religion—Pagan and Christian alike—that the era distinguished by the gorgeousness and splendor of their erections for purposes of worship,

whether of false gods or of the true God, is the era which marks the decay of the power of their faith over their hearts and lives.

Thus the Parthenon at Athens rose in all its beauty just at the period when the superstitious worship, which it was designed to promote and to honor, had already lost its hold upon the minds of the people, and its power to nerve them to deeds of wild and savage heroism. The temple of Diana at Ephesus, that world's wonder for its magnitude and costliness—was reared by the united genius of Chersiphon and Praxiteles, and wealth of all Asia Minor during the very hundred years in which the superstition which it represented was slowly dying out, and with it dying the liberty of the people. The magnificent temple of Jupiter in Rome, dated its foundation in the age of Augustus—and represented a theoretic faith, which had no longer any other than a purely imaginary existence—and a practical life whose horrors the Apostle so graphically depicts in the 1st Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. And the same general law will be found to continue in its manifestations in the history of the Christian Religion. The Basilica, the first St. Peter's at Rome, the St. Sophia at Constantinople, stood forth as so many sepulchral monuments reared under Constantine to the memory of the burning love, and all-conquering faith of the Apostolic Church. The modern St. Peter's at Rome, singularly enough again, had its finishing touches from the hand of Raphael at the opening of the sixteenth century, which marked the utter and final Apostasy of Rome, shamelessly announced by herself to the world in the decrees of Trent. And though a more partial instance, yet not less remarkable as illustrating the general law,—the ambitious St. Paul's in London, engaged all the powers of Sir Christopher Wren, during that most shameful and shameless period in all the history of the Anglican Church, when the restored Stuarts celebrated their triumph with Bacchanalian revels over the grave of English liberty, and sycophantic Bishops crawled at their feet and cried amen! to all their curses upon God's faithful children.

These illustrations might be multiplied indefinitely. They are all to the one point that architectural splendor in the temple outwardly, is the mark of decay of faith inwardly. And that therefore the splendid temple is reared in fact to be monumental of an age of faith passed away; they have their explanation in that singular paradox in the soul of fallen man, that while from the original constitution of his moral nature, he is impelled to worship God in some manner, yet from the alienation of his heart from God, he seeks ever some form and mode of worship, which shall satisfy the instinctive fears of his soul, without requiring him to worship God, who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth. And, therefore, just in proportion as he fails in heart earnestness, and is conscious of his deficiency of real faith and reverence as a worshipper, he seeks to substitute for the spiritual worship of the heart an external worship of the imagination or of the passions. No one who has diligently considered the proneness of human nature to this error, will wonder any longer, that in that very comprehensive sum-

mary of duties to God, the first table of the law, so large a space as one-half should be occupied with the requirement that not only shall men worship the one living God alone, but they shall worship the one living God only in the exact way which He himself has pointed out in his word. And that throughout that word, there should be line upon line—to enforce a simple, pure, spiritual worship. It was their deeper insight into these truths of human nature, and of the Divine Word, and not their savage, coarse ferocity, and their ignorant bigotry as dilettanti poets, novelists and historians would have the world believe,—that fired the zeal of our Puritan and Covenanting forefathers in their architectural and ceremonial iconoclasm. Their deeper experience and diligent study of the subtle treacheries of the carnal heart, led them to see only more clearly than others, that all these pleas for an appeal to the imagination in worship—all this aiding the soul with wings to soar in its devotions, and the association of all that is grand in architecture, and all that is lovely in taste with worship, in order to draw men, is one of the grand delusions of the devil. That so far from drawing men to the specific duty which God enjoins—namely, spiritual communion of the soul with God, it puts a veil between the soul and God; keeps out of the view of the soul the idea of God, as “glorious in holiness, fearful in praises,” yet at the same time satisfies the uneasiness of the soul which impels to some sort of worship, with a form that ministers to the pleasures of imagination, and to the pride of the worshipper.

Understanding fully this propensity of human nature, they regarded with no special admiration, or even approbation an ostentatious display of costly devotion. To them this was but the indication of the utter decay of all spiritual affections, and the consequent zeal to build and garnish temples, which should be the sepulchral monuments of a faith of the heart already passed away, rather than the erection of true spiritual temples of the Holy Ghost in the souls of men.

Even though the carnality of the formalistic philosophic wits, and historians who have denounced and ridiculed the Puritans, incapacitated them for comprehending the motives and views of that sturdy race of men; it is somewhat strange that it never occurred to them that at least in so far as relates to the philosophy of worship, those Puritans, so ignorant, coarse, and fanatical in their esteem, displayed a far profounder philosophy, than the ablest of their revilers. In the first place, even granting that true worship were nothing more than the effort of the soul to rise to the contemplation of the natural attributes of God, as gathered from His works, it is not easy to perceive how the contemplation of the *works of man*—architecture, sculpture, music, should be the chosen means of such worship. But if it is the real aim of true worship to bring the soul into communion with a moral God, whose law speaks to the conscience, it is still more difficult to understand how the plain place of worship, the simple and devout prayer, and praise, and meditation upon the truth, with nothing to distract the attention, is not a more appropriate

means than all the appliances of architecture and sculpture. Whatever importance we may please to assign to the cultivation of the imagination and the taste in devotion, still it is not easy to see how splendid architecture and gorgeous ritual of man's device, are the most appropriate method of approach into the presence of the Almighty. If imposing architecture in the church is supposed to rouse the soul to devotion, then so far from going on the Sabbath to contemplate the tinsel grandeur of man's device in some ostentatious Cathedral, let us turn away our feet from the temple made with hands, and rather spend the hallowed hours in wandering through the great temple that God has reared. If imagination is to be captivated with scenes of imposing grandeur, bursting upon the eye—then we turn our back upon the sham grandeur of men's altar shows, and go forth to witness the simple, but awful grandeur of mountains raising their heads to heaven, or the ever rolling waves of the ocean, or the thunder cloud gathering its blackness, or the lightning writing "Jehovah" across the veiled heavens. If music rolling through "long drawn aisle and fretted vault," and the mysterious shadows of the "dim religious light," be a means of raising the soul spiritually to God;—then away with all half way devices, and cunning counterfeits! We will go forth in the early night-fall, and gaze upon the heavens as their "hosts" begin to kindle their camp fires; and listen to the whisper of the evening breeze, symbol of the Holy Spirit that whispers to the soul, and the many voiced lullaby, wherewith maternal Nature soothes to sleep her myriad children; to the deep bass of ocean, or of the rising tempest, compared with which as soul elevators, your blowing bellows and screaming pipes, are but a soul mocking *Charivari!*

No! with a profounder philosophy, Puritanism decrees, let the very simplicity of the place of worship, be our confession of its inadequacy to lead the soul up to God; and let no ambitious architecture, nor garish decoration of ceremonial, draw away to the work of man, the soul desiring to draw near to God. The thought that "surely God is in this place," is in itself too all absorbing, to admit of any incidental impressions taking root in the soul.

Such is the Philosophy of the old Covenanter and Puritan theory. It is not more profound than true. But better than all philosophy in the matter they learned from the oracles of God, the vanity of all attempts to substitute for the spiritual worship of a deep religious faith, a mere external show of reverence for God, in costly architecture and gorgeous ritual. All of which their children will understand fully, if it shall turn out that the reigning taste for magnificent houses of worship, be but the rearing of monuments in memory of a faith once living and earnest, but now passed away.

THE VICTORY OF FAITH.—BY JULIUS CHARLES HARE.
Lond. 1847.

ARCHDEACON HARE,—as we noted in a former number of this Journal,—is said to have belonged to the Broad Party in the Church of England. What the distinguishing doctrines of this party are, it is not easy to determine, since, as the name implies, it is very broad. It is broad enough to embrace a genteel and Christian infidelity, on the one hand, and a simple, child-like, spiritual faith, on the other : a presumptuous rationalism which explains away the essence of the scheme of salvation, and a reverent humility which delights to sit at the feet of Jesus and listen to the words of eternal life. A party formed upon such a liberal principle, is perfectly natural in the English Establishment, whose formularies were never intended to be standards of faith or tests of orthodoxy, but rather articles of peace and covenants to differ. A church which can embrace at once Swift and Cecil, Sterne and John Newton, need not have convulsions, because Denison Maurice and Chenevix Trench are both within its pale. One party might say to another, and one portion of a party might say to another portion of the same party,—“Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed.” The unity of *the* Church,—as an old Edinburgh Reviewer says,—is the unity of chaos. There was but one chaos ; but in that one, there was infinite confusion.

While we heartily despise the absurd pretensions to unity of this branch of the Christian Church, and laugh to scorn its supercilious depreciation of other branches, which exhibit at least as good evidence of the indwelling of the Spirit of faith, humility and love ; we still rejoice in every thing they do for the real advancement of Christ's cause on earth, and cheerfully acknowledge our obligations of gratitude to their men of faith and learning, who have helped us to clearer and wider views of that precious truth, which adorns, elevates, comforts and sanctifies the soul. We endeavor always to “prove all things,” and we are glad that, even among those who smite us and hand us over to the uncovenanted mercies of God, there is some “good” to which we may “hold fast.” We pity their mint, anise and cummin, and, if they will not throw them into our faces, pass them by ; we admire and try to imitate their judgment, mercy and faith. It is on this account, that we expressed our gratification with Archdeacon Hare's “Mission of the Comforter,” in the Critic for May ; and now proceed to notice his “Victory of Faith.”

A noble theme ! but sadly neglected and still more sadly abused. “Faith, as a principle of life and action, in any sense at all approaching to that which it bears in the New Testament,”—says our Author,—“is scarcely heard of without the pale of Christianity. Even within that pale, if we listen to the language of men, when they are speaking of the springs and motives of their own conduct, or that of others, or if we look into the speculative treatises which profess to examine into those springs and motives, though we shall find many

good qualities ascribed to man, and many evil qualities, it is rare to meet with any mention of Faith, except in certain peculiar limited senses." This was probably written more than fifteen years ago, and was truer then than now. We have little reason to complain now that men do not *talk* about faith. The Oxford Apostles have instructed us that without faith we can do nothing; that we must "believe before we examine, and maintain before we have proved:" not in the sense of the sound maxim of philosophy, "*Ut intelligas, crede,*" which points to the fundamental faiths of the human reason as the conditions of all thought, but in the sense of a capacious credulity, which can swallow enormous mountains of primitive and mediæval absurdities, and among the rest, the doctrine of apostolical succession and the related doctrine that the Roman, Greek and Anglican Churches,—the first two anathematizing each other, and both anathematizing the third, while this third dares not anathematize either,—together constitute the true and only church of Christ on earth. This faith has all its holy sensibilities shocked at every attempt to demonstrate, that the above named mysteries are no more mysteries than the proposition that two and two are *not* equal to four, or that the whole is *not* greater than any one of its parts: that logically, they are contradictions, and morally, mysteries of iniquity. The Infidel Apostles, also, talk a great deal about faith, the "higher faith," as they delight to call it, in contrast with the lower faith of Christians. And well is it so called. The faith of the Christian removes mountains, but they are mere mole-hills, compared with the mountains which the faith of the Infidel is required to remove. The Christian accepts one mystery, incomprehensible and unapproachable, "dark with excess of light," which clears up all others: the Infidel accepts a million, "dark, dark, irrecoverably dark."

True faith, however, that which "overcomes the world," is not sufficiently talked about or considered. It is the burden of the New Testament: it is the burden of the Old. "The just shall live by faith." This is the great purpose of these Sermons, to show that faith is the great principle of human life, in all its departments, in the affairs of this world, as well as in reference to that which is to come. In the following passage the reasons are forcibly stated why we are not so much impressed with the importance and prominence of faith in reading the Old Testament, as in reading the New:

"In the Old Testament, it is true, this great evangelical doctrine of the power of Faith is not often stated in the same broad, naked, abstract manner. Even there however we read the declaration of the prophet Habakkuk, to which St. Paul refers more than once, *that the just shall live by faith*; words which have often upheld the soul of the believer, when it might otherwise have failed and sunk under the crushing weight of the world. And if we look beyond the letter, and search into the principles which pervade and animate the Old Testament, it becomes plain that they are the very same, which are merely brought forward more definitely and explicitly in the New; and that the whole history, as is set forth in that great chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is a record of

the warfare waged by Faith, of its victories, its triumphs, and its conquests. Indeed this accords with the main character of the Old Testament; where we see those very truths exhibited visibly and livingly, in type and symbol, in action and endurance, which were afterward to be proclaimed under the New Dispensation in their eternal aboriginal universality. Nor is this process different from that which has prevailed in the other provinces of human thought. Everywhere the thing exists, and is taken up among the objects and elements of action, long before the thought comes forward into distinct consciousness. The sun did not lie slumbering beneath the horizon, until man had made out the laws which were to regulate his course. States had sprung up, and spread far and wide, and had grown into empires, and had armed themselves with power and with knowledge, before any one dreamt of speculating upon the principles of government and of social union. For it is only the word of God, giving utterance to the law, that precedes the work; and it is through the work that the knowledge of the law comes to the mind of man, and by the work that it is awakened there. The word of God goes before; and no sooner has it issued from the Eternal Mind, than the work starts forth in the fulness of reality: the thought and word of man follow after, and are often centuries, or even millenaries behind."

The following passage is also well worthy of consideration on the part of all who are in the habit of taking one-sided views of the character of God, and are ready to receive all the Gospel, except that which constitutes its essence and its peculiar glory:

"Moreover, since the Gospel has been set up on high over the heads of the nations, and has been acknowledged, outwardly at least, to be the one great and only pure source of wisdom and truth, the very language of men, and all the manifold currents of thought and opinion, have been so shaped and modified by it,—so much reflected light has been shed abroad by it, even upon those who have not been dwelling immediately under its rays,—so much has been effected by its holy precepts toward correcting and ennobling the notions and views, so much by its sacramental influences in the way of purifying and elevating the feelings and affections of mankind,—that whoever sits down nowadays in a Christian country to read the Bible, comes to it with a mind prepared to receive and assent to a number of its truths, as matters of unquestioned certainty and general notoriety, without being aware that they too are a portion of the boundless riches which Christ has poured out over the earth. Thus it comes to pass, that even those who turn away in selfcomplacent blindness from the more peculiar and essential doctrines of the Gospel, are still mostly ready to admit the excellence of its Morality, and the beauty of its Charity: and they are willing to receive these into their own code of life; though not till they have enfeebled and deadened them both, by cutting them off from that root of divine Faith, out of which alone can they grow in perennial vigour and bloom. Indeed, when a person is very forward in extolling either the Morality or the Charity of the Gospel,—when he is apt to single out the parable of the good Samaritan, and such texts as express the duty so beautifully enforced by it or such as *God is Love*, for the main and only prominent objects of his admiration,—it will often be found, if we are led to look closely into his opinions, that his Christianity,—supposing him to make profession of it,—has been stunted and enervated, as it has been so

generally in the last hundred years, into a sort of *sentimental theophiltrophy*. For although the Christian will continually bless God, from the inmost depths of his heart and soul, for that gracious revelation of Himself, yet the remembrance of the manner in which that revelation was made, of the Cross from which it was manifested to the world,—and the consciousness thereby awakened and kindled of his own unworthiness, and of the miserable return he has made for the privilege of being thus allowed to look into the innermost mystery of heaven,—will strike him with awe, will make him shrink from taking those sacred words in vain, from uttering them with unhallowed lips. If the angels themselves veil their eyes in the presence of God, how can we do otherwise than cast ours down in speechless shame, at the thought of the ineffable glory of the Mercy and Grace, the Holiness and Righteousness, through which they must pass, before they can behold the central throne of Love; and which are themselves only particular manifestations of God's Love in His dealings with His creatures! Hence we shall rather exclaim with the Psalmist (cxxx. 4), *For there is mercy with Thee; therefore shalt Thou be feared*; more especially when we bethink ourselves what deceitful notions men are sure to form of God's Love, in measuring it by their own deceitful standard, stripping it of its Holiness and of its Justice, without which it could have no substantial reality, and degrading it into little better than infinite goodnature and imperturbable indifference, which they may insult and mock as long as they please. They who look in the first instance at what they call God's Love, will take the second commandment without the first, which alone can sustain and give life to it. For God, they say, in His self-sufficing omnipotence, holding the reins of all the worlds in His hands, and evermore turning the wheels of life and death, cannot need or care for the love of His creatures; and they know not how it elevates and hallows the heart, to have a Being of infinite perfection to devote to it. They will take the Morality of the Gospel, without its Righteousness, and without the principle of that Righteousness; apart from which principle Morality can no more preserve an equable path, than a planet could revolve in its orbit without the centripetal attraction. For in nothing else is the wisdom of the Gospel, and its thorough knowledge of that which is in the heart of man, of his readiness to fall into every snare, and to be beguiled by every delusion, more apparent than in this,—that, in singling out the primary power, through the exercise of which mankind were to become partakers of the glory ordained for them, it did not, like the Law, enjoin Holiness and Purity, or any moral observance, as the ground of justification: nor did it choose out Love as that ground; precious and inestimable as it declares Love to be, exquisite as are the colours with which it portrays Love's surpassing excellence and beauty. The Gospel did not make Holiness the ground of justification: it did not make love the ground of justification: but it shewed its wisdom, and its knowledge of man's weakness and of his wants, in this more especially, that it made faith the ground of justification."

We have been particularly interested in the views presented in Sermon IV., on "the power of faith in man's natural life." There is room for improvement in the phraseology,—many of the forms of expression being liable to misinterpretation. But we think the views, in the main, are sound, and we would gladly quote the whole discourse. We find space only for the following extracts. The first

will give an idea of the general scope of the discussion : the others, illustrations of it, in the business of education.

“When we read the Bible, we are taught that *the just live by Faith*. But when we think about our condition in this world, about our manifold ties and dealings with each other, we seldom call to mind that, as members of a state, as members of a family, as neighbours living in social intercourse and mutual interdependence,—nay, that as men, as beings framed with thoughts and wishes which pierce beyond the outward shell of the objects set before us by the senses, which dive and soar beyond the little drop of time wherein we are immerst,—as creatures who do not feed, like the beasts of the field, and the birds of the air, and the fishes of the sea, on what the earth and waters cast up, but who have to prepare and provide our food long beforehand,—we do not call to mind that, as beings who “look before and after,” who look above and within, as beings who think and read and know and love, as beings who dwell in houses and eat bread, it is only through Faith that we can do all these things,—it is only through Faith that we can live at all. Everything that we do from any motive whatsoever, beyond the blind impulses of the senses, and the brutish lusts of the moment,—everything that we do in any way for the sake of others, or with a view to the future, though it be no further than the morrow, must needs be in some measure an act of Faith. It could not be done, unless there were a living principle within us, whereby the invisible world is enabled to struggle and heave against the superincumbent weight of the visible, and for moments at least to shake it off and overpower it; unless there were a secret sympathy between our spirits and the spiritual essences of all things that live and move and are, by the strength of which they burst through the partywalls between them, and meet. Thus our whole lives,—thus the life of every being who lives any higher life than that of the beasts of the field,—of every being who projects his thoughts, consciously, and by the act of his own will, beyond the present moment,—is made up, whether we are aware of it or no, of numberless ever-recurring petty acts of Faith. This, which in one respect is the infirmity, in another is the chief dignity, and, so long as the invisible things are better than the visible, the noblest privilege of our nature, that, as the great Apostle says, *we walk by Faith, not by sight*.”

We conclude by expressing our sorrow that the Author closed his labors on earth, before he had time to prepare and publish the promised “notes” to these Sermons. From the well-furnished mind, we were entitled to expect rare treasures.

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

QUESTIONS OF THE SOUL. By J. T. Hecker. Appleton & Co., 1855. (From J. S. Waters.)

This is a volume of what may fitly be termed Jesuitical Parlor Transcendentalism, designed to aid the labors of such Romanists as are wont to "creep into men's houses and lead captive silly women"—of either sex,—"laden with sins" far more than with sense.

The title of the book no doubt, has reference to the title of Mr. Francis William Newman's book,—*"The Soul—Its Aspirations,"* &c.—and is intended to suggest that at this oracle such aspiring souls shall find true answer to their queries. A corresponding tone is kept up throughout the volume, of poetic, sentimental philosophy;—that style of muddy and shallow profundity, so delightful to a certain class of ambitious feminine metaphysicians; since it permits them to venture safely, though they see no bottom, into the romantic struggle with the harmless dangers of the profound depths, which the imagination very readily creates, in any water with no visible bottom.

Setting out with the utterance of a deep conviction that "the age is out of joint" and that "the question—Has man a Destiny—and what is it? agitates the souls of all men," the author through some eight chapters and eighty odd pages, proceeds to show that all the Poets—Goethe, Byron, Tennyson, Milne Emerson and the host of conferees; all the Philosophers alike, from Pythagoras down to Cousin; all the Socialists and Economists at "Brook Farm," "Fruitlands," in Massachusetts and elsewhere—all the High Church Episcopal Holy Brotherhoods of Bishop Ives' Diocese and elsewhere—all alike have failed either to sing, say, or work out the solution of the vexed question "Has man a Destiny and what is it?"—By some peculiar logical process of his own, he works out for us, and presents to us the very original discovery, first, that man has a destiny, and next, that destiny is to know, love and enjoy God. It is an unwelcome task to tear away the toil-worn laurels of genius, but in all honesty, we feel bound to hint to Mr. Hecker that to our personal knowledge a similar discovery had been distinctly enunciated some time since. At least as far back as the days of our childhood—and that dates back to the very era of the Satanic School of Poets and Novelists, who carried on the war against destiny—we distinctly remember to have seen enunciated, even in print, in a small volume called the "*Shorter Catechism*"—and the very

first proposition in the volume at that—the declaration, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever." Nor, if we recollect aright, was the proposition even then claimed as either original or novel—but the book referred to a still older volume, dating nearly as far back as the era of those ancient philosophers who struggled so manfully, as Mr. Hecker tells us, with this question of man's destiny—as having asserted that "none of us liveth to himself"—and as having exhorted "whether ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

We are far from meaning hereby to charge Mr. Hecker with having plagiarized his discovery from the little volume wherein we saw his proposition enunciated so long since. We have not the least idea that he ever saw the book. For, if reared in the Romish Church from childhood, it would be a forbidden book. If on the other hand he had by apostacy from early faith gone into the Church of Rome, that fact of itself would make it manifest that he had never seen, or at least never studied and understood that wonderful little volume. Nor do we suppose that Mr. Hecker ever read his discovery in the older and more authoritative Book, to which the Catechism attributes the origin of its idea of man's destiny. For not only is that also a forbidden book, but he declares in this very volume—"Nor can we admit that a Book written in a dead language by his disciples, containing at best but a small part of what he said and did, is the fountain source of God's eternal and everlasting Truth. To send man back eighteen centuries, or tell him to read a book, however good, when he feels the need of the love of the Infinite God in his heart, is downright mockery."—(p. 110.)

At this point, we are as much struck with the wide divergence between Mr. Hecker and the little volume referred to, as we were before struck with the coincidence between them. That volume having first asserted man's destiny as to "glorify and enjoy God," proceeds further to declare that God hath not only appointed man such destiny, but hath also given him a rule—even "the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him." Mr. Hecker on the contrary, declaring such a rule to be "downright mockery," avers that "if the Christian religion has no such authority (as the living Church) to teach and show the soul its final aim, then we cast aside its creeds its dogmas and its

formulas. They are but worthless fictions of men's brains."

Having examined Protestantism and found it utterly wanting in the necessary means for meeting the "wants of the soul," Mr. Hecker proceeds to point out how exactly all the requisitions of a soul, are philosophically satisfied in the Church of Rome. "First the soul needs authority to command it and authority to teach. This Rome offers." Then, "the Church must attract childhood and youth—this Rome does"—(by raree shows innumerable.) "The church must offer friends and guides to souls:—for to recommend prayer and reading the Bible is to proclaim our insufficiency and incapacity. Rome offers her priests, the friends and *confidants*, to whom the soul may unbosom itself." (This surely is the smoothest name for confession we have yet met with.) "The church must possess the power of pardoning the sinner and reconciling him to God." (!!) "The Church must feed the soul with divine food. This the Church does," (by feeding the *body* with the flesh of Christ.) "The Church must assist the soul in its last struggle with death, and must not lose her hold after death, but stretch forth her maternal arms to aid and protect it beyond the grave" (!!) Such are specimens of this philosophic response to the "Questions of the Soul." We cite them by way of acquainting our readers with Parlor Popery. We do not wonder that the author in conclusion mourns, that "This Church, strange as it may seem, is concealed from the minds of the American people, by ignorance, misrepresentation and calumny, as effectually as if it were once more buried in the Catacombs"—and muses over the momentous question, "Whether the Catholic Church will succeed in Christianizing the American people as she has Christianized all European Nations?"

If the Papal European Nations are the model to which we are to be Christianized, we doubt not every Christian and Patriot will cry—"God forbid! Keep the Church of Rome still hid in the Catacombs."

THE GOLDEN REED; Or the True Measure of a True Church. Appleton & Co., 1355. (From J. S. Waters.)

This volume is the production of a writer "who several years ago dreamed of such a Church (Swedenborgian) while quietly pursuing his theological studies in one of our New England Universities." Surely the "quiet" must have been intense, and the dullness remarkable for even the most incorrigible Theological hair-splitter of all the New England Universities,—that a man should be found "dreaming" to this day, after a greater lapse of years perhaps,

than from Rip Van Winkle's sleeping to his waking. Certain it is, that this book shows not even yet any symptoms of waking in its author. And the declaration with which he sets out in his preface we think, finishes the question concerning his rationality, viz: that in preparing this "Easy way to Swedenborgianism," the labor has consisted, "in selecting, classifying and arranging the extracts (from Swedenborg) which have been gathered by a careful reading of more than ten thousand pages!"

Indeed we refer to the book partly by way of announcing this remarkable occurrence, that in the middle of the nineteenth century, a man "has carefully read more than ten thousand pages," of such matter as is contained in this book—the "Golden Reed"—nay rather, out of which this is the distilled essence. "In the diligence and labor thus bestowed, if for nothing else, the author feels that he is fairly entitled to the thanks of the public." So far as "the public" is confined to those who wish to have some idea of what Swedenborg discoursed about through ten thousand pages, the author is entitled to the thanks of such for this modest compilation of three hundred pages. We have no doubt it is an infinite improvement on the original and that "Barrett's Swedenborg" is a far better edition than Swedenborg's. But so far as concerns the great public, out side this dozen perhaps, we fear Mr. Barrett will find the public not very grateful. They will stare at the man that read the "more than ten thousand pages," out of which this book came, just as they would upon one of those singular monsters in the shape of humanity, that base their title to public regard, on having eaten on a wager a hundred weight of sour-kroust, or swilled a barrel of Lager Bier. But we have no idea that beyond that the public's grateful thanks will ever recompense the author's labors.

All that will be needful to satisfy the curiosity of our readers and save them the trouble of reading even these three hundred pages, much less the ten thousand pages of Swedenborg, will be the citation of the following leading propositions:

"1. As at the time of the coming of Christ, the Jewish Church was consummated, so just ninety-nine years ago (1757) the Christian Church was consummated—the day of Judgment took place in the spiritual world—and a new era and new Church, the New Jerusalem, began."

"2. Emanuel Swedenborg is the Divinely appointed instrument in unfolding and revealing the spiritual sense of the Scriptures. Only what the Lord teaches through this his servant is the teaching of the New Church. The humblest indi-

vidual may appeal from the teachings of societies, conventions and clergy, and refuse his assent, if they are not in accordance with the Divinely Authorized teaching of Swedenborg."

"3. Of all the Gentiles, the Africans are most beloved in heaven. It was told Swedenborg from heaven, that the doctrines of the New Jerusalem Church, are orally dictated by angels to the inhabitants of Central Africa."

"4. The Mahomedan heaven is outside the Christian heaven, and is divided into two heavens, the lower and the higher."

"5. True doctrine does not save. Salvation is possible for whatsoever heresy. There is a heaven for Mahomedans and Pagans. Such are, as infants, educated by angels. Swedenborg saw many such spirits, and heard them speak very sanely from the precepts of the decalogue."

But we weary our readers with this insane folly. These propositions selected at random, from the lucubrations of this student who commenced his dream "in one of the New England Universities," may give some idea of the sort of stuff issuing from the American Press and passed off as religion. Add, to an indefinite series of such propositions, the usual preface of overflowing brotherly love, and detestation of all bigotry, followed by the most absurdly blasphemous caricatures and Billingsgate abuse of all other religion than this New Revelation, and one has the staple of this Golden Reed and its co-laborers in the work of spiritual illumination.

NOTES OF A THEOLOGICAL STUDENT. *By James Mason Hoppin.* Appleton & Co., 1854. (From J. S. Waters.)

We know nothing of Mr. Hoppin, nor of the circumstances which led to the writing of this book. With a modesty very remarkable in a young author who has written such a volume, he has refrained from any account of himself or of his production, beyond the simple fact that these are "notes of a Theological Student," who after spending some time in quiet study in Germany, visited Greece and the Holy Land.

Perhaps we feel an undue and un-critical partiality for Mr. Hoppin, from the circumstance of his having so delightfully relieved the tedium of a sick-day at home. Seldom have we met with a book so admirably adapting itself to the moods of one's day dreams when a little too sick for severe mental effort, and yet not sick enough to suspend the operation of thinking. He carries one along so gracefully, and yet with such continual skipping about from scene to scene—each successive scene in such utter contrast to all that precede it—that the very waywardness of a sick

man's dreams is humored, and any sense of weariness is out of the question. Now it is the view which an intelligent and refined scholar takes of the interior life of a great German University. Next the musings of one deeply imbued with the spirit of the reformation, as he stands upon the very spot, whereon Luther's great deeds were enacted. Then again drawings of the grounds which the modern German Poets have made classic. And forthwith pictures of scenes in classic Greece, which seem to recall all one's early fancies concerning the land of Homer and Demosthenes. And then again descriptions and meditations which recall in all their freshness, the wonderful themes of the Gospel.

It must not be inferred, however, from this view of the book that it is merely, or even chiefly a book of travels. So far from it, these "notes" are rather a series of short essays upon various topics suggested by the several localities visited. Regarded as such, though the work of a "Theological Student," they exhibit a maturity of thought, a ripeness of scholarship and breadth of view, which would do no discredit to a Doctor of Divinity. With an intelligent admiration for what is really superior in German learning and the German mind, there is none of that affectation of admiration for foreign learning, that recognizes no superiority in any thing American. With all the enthusiasm that characterizes the true classical scholar, there mingles a warm and simple-hearted spirit of devotion and of no less enthusiastic love for the spiritual beauties of the pure word of God. Mr. Hoppin displays a style of thinking and of mental cultivation very much to our mind; one that we should rejoice greatly to see becoming prevalent among our Theological Students. A highly cultivated classic taste, combined with great power of generalization; a manly independence of thought, with an humble and most devout reverence for the oracles of God. We cannot but rejoice in the hope that many such Theological Students, are making their way to the ministry in the Church.

The highest ambition of Mr. Hoppin and his friends ought to be fully gratified, if he shall acquire any thing like the skill and ability as a preacher of the everlasting Gospel to the people, which, judging from this book, he already possesses as a thinker and writer. We append a single paragraph and that not above the average, at once to illustrate and to justify our criticism:

"But Biblical science alone, the habit of approaching the Bible purely for critical study—this we believe to be the injurious thing. The sad phenomenon which an age has sometimes presented, of men spending long lives and unbounded energies upon a

venerable book in the dead languages, which garners up into itself the antique world, while they smiled at its authority to bind their conscience, rule their faith, and judge them at last—here we conceive is the deep evil. That sharpened spirit, which, as some one has said, is “continually coursing up and down the Bible” and never arrives at a restful faith,—that study of the Bible with a pre-determined theory, which draws out the Divine Spirit from it, as a chemical substance will search out and expel the subtlest gas from a liquid substance,—that chilly criticism, which is as the night-frost to the tender and spiritual vitality of the Word of Life, so that until lately, in the very land of criticism and learning, when a man rose up there, with the warm life of Christ in his heart, like Augustus Neander, he seemed to stand amid those philosophers like that lone Antarctic volcano which burns amid regions of snow,—such a study of the Bible to the individual soul at least, appears to be worse than its neglect; for when we reflect that even in so corrupt a translation as the old Latin Vulgate, all the great truths of life and salvation are preserved, then may we know that this consuming of strength upon the “letter that killeth,” will not produce a religious reformation in an individual or a nation, and did not produce the Reformations of Luther, Zwingle and Wicklife.”

MODERN LIGHT LITERATURE—THEOLOGY.

It is not, perhaps, an altogether insignificant fact, that the earliest inventions in the arts were due to the skill of the accursed posterity of Cain. The curse of painful toil which fell upon the whole human race, in consequence of the apostasy of the first man, operated with special intensity upon that branch of it which was so unfortunate as to spring from the loins of the first Deist, the first Murderer and the first Persecutor; and special efforts were therefore made to mitigate it. Cain was the first to build a city, and his descendants Jabal, Jubal and Tubal-Cain gave each an impulse of lasting importance to the onward progress of an earthly civilization. The fact, we say, is significant. It may teach us *first*, not to estimate too highly a civilization, of which such things are the principal elements or instruments: *secondly*, that we are not to expect the knowledge of religion to keep pace with the advancement of science; and, therefore, *thirdly*, that it does not follow that the nineteenth century is ahead of all others in religion, because it is undoubtedly in advance of all others in natural science and in the arts, whose improvement depends upon the accumulation of facts, upon induction, observation and experiment. It is true of re-

ligion, as it is even of those branches of merely human inquiry whose results are reached by *reflection*, in the strict philosophical and technical acceptance of the term, that its progress has been by no means proportioned to that of the departments above-mentioned. Is there a man living in this age, who, without the lights reflected from the Bible, could give the world such discussions as those of Plato or Aristotle? Is there any such orator as Demosthenes? any such poet as Homer? Is there any man who has penetrated as deeply into the abyss of human consciousness, as Adam had at the close of a life extending nearly through a millennium, and that too, after having passed from the condition of a perfect man to the sad one of a fallen sinner? Is it not easy to imagine, that the thoughts, wide and deep, which Milton makes him express, fell far short, in depth and compass, of the thoughts which really filled his great soul, as he looked forth, in the garden of Eden, upon a glorious creation in its virgin purity as it came from the hands of God, or inwardly upon himself, the resplendent image of his Maker? Can the minute philosophers of the present day have the impudence to compare themselves, in true and high philosophy, with Noah when he left the ark, at the age of six hundred years? Yet there are men of reputed learning, and acknowledged cleverness, who attribute to the patriarch of the flood, reflections, of which even Ham, when a graceless youngster, would have been ashamed. The truth probably is, that Cain's posterity had engrossed all the objective tendencies of the times; the subjective had full scope in the minds of the worshippers of the true God, with whom the modern striplings of three score years and ten make so free.

These remarks were suggested by an article under the caption placed at the head of this notice, in the July number of Blackwood, containing a very caustic review of Maurice's Doctrine of Sacrifice. As we had occasion, some time ago, to call the attention of our readers, to a very silly article on theatrical amusements in the same Journal, it is with the greater pleasure, that we refer to this. We add the following extracts as a specimen of the Author, and as containing some just strictures upon the spirit of modern infidelity, especially as exhibited in the church:—

“So we have placed ourselves in the noble position of “inquiring after truth.” Our philosophers are the most impartial, the most candid investigators in the world: no old-fashioned faith stands in their way; they are above the prejudices of education, above the weakness of personal interest or anxiety. They are martyrs to the noble thirst which possesses them; they must

follow Truth, sublime conductress! wherever she leads them; and though now and then it is a will-o'-the-wisp dance enough, their lofty purpose sustains them through all. And whether it be the sublime eclecticism which selects a bit out of Paganism and a bit out of Christianity, and complacently pronounces its verdict on all the creeds, as the Creator did upon the world He made—or that sad, conscientious, much-suffering infidelity, which weeps over its own vain efforts to believe, and deplores its undeceivableness—or the improved divinity, clad in new graces, which makes something handsome out of the Bible and that Gospel which hitherto have only given a rude idea to the world,—we surely cannot refuse to be struck with the beautiful aspect of this open unbiassed judgment, this mind which begins its investigations with no prior tendency—this candid impartial intellect, which sits apart, overlooking “creeds and systems,” and judging of them like a god.

“But, after all, it is a remarkable thing to find this nineteenth century, with all its boasts of itself and its own progress, so completely at sea about the most important matters of human thought. Have we drifted so far away from the everlasting standards that it is a Restoration of Belief, and nothing less, for which the world of to-day is waiting?—have we lost hold of the old clue so entirely that we can do nothing but grope about the darkling labyrinth, and feel our way by touch and sense? Is the ancient system of faith, which, pressing on through crowds of foes, has kept itself intact for eighteen hundred years, proved so imperfect at last that our skilled artificers have to take it to pieces, and cobble it to suit “the requirements of the times?” A strange result of all our learnings and philosophies! yet not so strange a consequence of our universal smattering, our universal self-applause, our wide-spread persuasion, that of all the ages of the world none has ever been so well qualified to sit in judgment on everything human and divine as this age of steam and electricity, this nineteenth century, this culminating point of human wisdom, from the eminence of which we can supervise and condescend to the beggarly elements of the past.

“But infidelity, however fashionable, and sceptics, however amiable, are not our immediate subject. They are what they are, distinct and acknowledged; but we find a more curious field for inquiry among those members and leaders of the Church who, not content to relinquish their faith, and confident in the wonderful elasticity of that wide and all-embracing *cordon* which surrounds the English Establishment, have entered upon the dangerous experiment of accommodating and reconciling the gospel to the theories of their neighbors who have passed the rubicon. These divines are no

longer contented with justifying the ways of God to man: they bring Himself, a most august defendant, to the bar. They say, with more or less plainness, “We will believe in you, if we find you come up to our standard, and realise our idea of what God should be;” and with a real and true desire that the glorious Examinant before them should vindicate His own character according to their view of it, they set about, with His own materials, to build a system of—we cannot say salvation, but of Divine help and benevolence. Let us give all just credit to these teachers; they strive at their work anxiously; they do it, we believe, devoutly; they only begin with a different idea in their minds from that which revelation declares to have been in the mind of God.”

LE CURE MANGUE; *Or Social and Religious Customs in France.* By Eugene De Courcillon. Harper & Brothers, 1855. (From Jas. S. Waters.)

This purports to be an attempt by “one born and reared in the provinces, to give a faithful representation of the modes of life and thought, and the social and religious customs of the great body of the French people.” And while “so far as form is concerned it is a work of fiction, yet the work is essentially true—the characters all drawn from actual life and the scenes portrayed are a faithful reproduction of what I myself have known and observed.”

We doubt not that the pictures of every day French Popery in this book may be relied upon as faithful. Indeed they correspond in many important points with the imported French Popery which may be found in many French Settlements in our country. We have not been favorably impressed, however, with a portion of the spirit that pervades the book. There is too much of the air and manner of a Barrack room or a fore-castle yarn, by some clever truant whose restive spirit, unable to endure the restraints of school or college law has taken to the army or to sea. The pictures of rural superstition and ignorance in France are very fairly drawn, we doubt not, but we would have preferred to have them without the leering jester at religious things uniformly showing himself in the back ground. We would commend these and similar pictures, however, especially to those Papal romancing Philosophers, who are wont to discourse so floridly of the high civilization, and the happy peasantry which are, according to their account, found so universally where the Roman Catholic religion has supreme sway in a nation. And more particularly to the attention of such American writers as Dr. Brownson, whose patriotism is so often mortified, at the comparison of the corruption and vice of New England as compared with Papal countries in Europe.

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 10.

OCTOBER, 1855.

Vol. 1.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1855.

CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER NO.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH OTHER CHURCHES.

The General Assembly, upon mature consideration "*discontinued, for the present,*"—"the interchange of Delegates with the General Association of Connecticut." Two grave reasons are assigned for this act; namely, that the Connecticut General Association of 1854, had formally attacked the character of the General Assembly, in a manner that could not be overlooked; and that there was such reason, as the Assembly could not pass over, to believe that the Association was unfaithful, if not unsound, touching the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Religion—the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation and Atonement being specified. It can hardly be doubted that either reason was abundantly sufficient to justify the act performed: for it is hard to imagine what obligation could rest on the Assembly to continue an interchange of Delegates, with a body of persons, who are officially both uncivil and false in their speech; or who are either unsound or unfaithful as regards the first principles of the doctrine of Christ. If the Assembly had acted with an equal degree of spirit and consistency twenty-five years earlier, it would have been all the better.

The Assembly of 1854, refused to appoint a Delegate to the General Synod of the German Reformed Church. The action of the Assembly of 1855, on the subject was to the following effect. The proper committee, after considering the subject, reported reasons why it had declined to nominate any Delegate; and this part of the Report was stricken out by order of the Assembly. Afterwards the committee, nominated Delegates; and their Report was put on the docket. At a subsequent session, the nomination was taken into consideration; and then laid on the table. The very last act of the Assembly, before the order for its dissolution, was a refusal to reconsider the vote laying the nomination on the table. No reasons are recorded, for any of these acts. The general result was, that the Assem-

bly, after having the matter under consideration four different times—refused to endorse certain reasons why Delegates should not be appointed; but refused, still more decidedly, to appoint any Delegates. The position taken by the Assembly of 1855, is essentially the same, we suppose, as that taken by the Assembly of 1854; and probably it represents, very fairly, the general state of feeling in the church upon the subject: a feeling of anxiety and dissatisfaction, rather than of clear and settled conviction that fidelity to God's truth requires our church to withdraw completely, its confidence in the orthodoxy of the German Reformed church.

Undoubtedly there is reason, which we do not hesitate to avow, why our church should be more reluctant to break up intercourse with a *Presbyterian* denomination, than with any other: and, moreover, there is reason why this reluctance should be increased, in the case of a denomination, whose official acts towards us have been courteous,—while others who are probably no sounder, have been habitually, and we think unbearably offensive: and still farther, whose endeavors to extend itself, neither are, nor can be, materially in conflict with us,—while others, still tolerated by us, habitually and boastfully seek to embarrass and obstruct nearly every effort we make. We have felt, therefore, in the actual posture of affairs, a very great reluctance to see matters carried any further than the keeping of a good conscience required, in the direction of weakening our relations with the German Reformed Church, or doing any more than we were obliged to do, that might be disagreeable to that ancient Presbyterian communion. Still, we are constrained to say, that there is much reason to distrust the condition of things in that body—and still more to feel great anxiety at the obvious favor with which the elements of a Gospel which is not the Gospel of God are received and diffused from the chief places of influence amongst them, and appear to be accepted by the denomination, as such. This we take to be a fair statement of the condition of opinion and sentiment in our church, upon this subject; and we think it fully explains all the actions of the Assemblies of 1854 and 1855, with regard to it. It will depend entirely upon the choice of the German Reformed church, what course the Presbyterian Church will take hereafter. We endorse the essential orthodoxy of the standards of that venerable Church, and we greatly desire to be allowed to love her, to trust her, and to advance her interests. But we cannot shut our eyes to the painful evidences, that while we believe her standards, it is extremely doubtful whether she believes them herself. If she obliges us to elect between the truth in her standards, and the heresy in her bosom—we shall not, of course, hesitate to make the election which becomes us. And she ought to see that such a course on our part, can be prompted only by love to what she ought to love also; and cannot be avoided, if she sees fit to drive us to the alternative, without compliances, and tricks, and chicanery on our part,—which are, blessed be God, no part of the character or purpose of our Church. In one word, if the German Reformed Church is what she professes to be, there is our right hand—frankly and truly. If she is not—not. Whether she is, or not, is no longer capable of being determined, certainly, except by herself. Our Church will await that determination in such a posture, as will express our real state of mind,—one of anxiety and apprehension—earnestly desiring to be satisfied. This is the undoubted meaning of the Assemblies of 1854 and 1855—and of our Church.

The course of the Congregational Churches of the North has been very remarkable; and their conduct towards the Presbyterian Church has long been such as ought not to have been submitted to. It is perfectly certain that all the troubles which have been brought on us during the present century, have been surreptitiously introduced from our confiding trust in Congregationalism—and have been carefully fomented for the benefit of Congregationalism. If the Presbyterian Church had been true to herself, she might have won New England with less effort than she had to use to keep New England from winning her. And now, to every reflecting man, it is no more obvious than it was twenty-five years ago, that the most direct, effectual and christian course for us to take, is to make, at last, a determined effort to carry the simple Gospel, once more into the region over which Congregationalism has run its course. Congregationalism has been continually declining in spirituality and orthodoxy for fifty years and more; and continually increasing in arrogance, and a wild and restless activity which pants for every thing that is *not* good and true and settled. The folly of the Presbyterian Church has been to accept this licentious activity, as a proof of Christian zeal—and to tolerate this utter confusion, disorder, and pretension, as evidences of progress. It is impossible to say how little sense is consistent with restless energy; how much folly and wickedness may possibly consist with a little grace; how diseased a man or a church may be, and yet have a certain vigor, a good appetite, and the digestive power of an ostrich. Nor is there any need to spend our days in making experiments to determine such questions. Proof enough, surely, is long ago accumulated, that in many respects the distinctive mission of Congregationalism is a most disastrous failure; and that in the middle of the nineteenth century, every true christian, scholar, statesman, patriot, and thinker, must if he is honest, and not afraid, frankly admit, that Yankee religion, learning, literature, education, politicks, and all—are not what they pretend they are—not what this great nation—and greater world ought to put up with. If the Presbyterian Church has made full proof of any thing—she has made full proof of all this—and so we thought and said—long years ago. In the intervening years, the principle of Presbyterianism, and the principle of Congregationalism, have had a double conflict, over the nation. One conflict, face to face: Old School Presbyterianism with Congregationalism. The other conflict *sub rosa*, full of love and honey: New School Presbyterianism with Congregationalism. In our case, wherever we have done our duty, the result has been, as it always must be: we have steadily and uniformly gained ground, precisely in proportion as we have put forward the sound, honest, simple, thorough nature of our principles. And there is not, probably, a solitary point in this broad land, nor a solitary subject in the wide range over which the combat has been waged; where the characteristic difference of the two principles has been developed to the advantage of Congregationalism. Between New School Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, where the conflict has been more fierce, because less honest—the results also have been more mixed because the antagonism was more equal. No considerable man doubted in 1837, what the end of all the boundless mutual love of those confederates for our ruin, must be; and we could, to day, write a faithful history and what has happened since, and what further must come, from the deliberate utterances of that day. Congregationalism must, in the long run, be intolerable in its spirit and aims, as well as in its princi-

ple, even to honest and robust New School Presbyterianism. We are very far from saying, that a system of Church order, merely because it is Congregational, must necessarily be, in the concrete, what American Congregationalism has been, and is: very far from saying that even American Congregationalism has no good element, and contains no sound men. But what we do say is, that taking American Congregationalism as it is, it is thoroughly antagonistic to Old School Presbyterianism, as it is—in too many and too important particulars for either party not to have a profound instinct, even if it has not a clear vision, of that most important fact. And what we say further is, that Old School Presbyterianism has no mission more distinct than to save this nation from the inundation of Congregationalism, and the type which that inundation would put upon it. After an unprecedented exhibition of patience under indignities, and long suffering attempts to believe that the minimum of orthodoxy should conceal the maximum of incivility, the Presbyterian Church seems to have come to some such convictions as those we have now uttered—and to have set out to act on them. And our trust is that having put her hand to the plow, she will not look back in the furrow. It is the merest mockery to say that we have any more reason to endure affronts, put up with abuse, and lend our countenance in any way, to the heresies of the Congregational body, than we have to do so with regard to Baptists, Methodists, or Episcopalians. And our deliberate conviction is that the simple Gospel of God is, as a general fact preached with more simplicity and far greater earnestness and unction, by the great body of the Methodist, Regular Baptist, and Low Church Episcopalian divines, than by the great body of American Congregationalists: while all three of these bodies are incomparably freer than they from that monstrous and inherent tendency to fanaticism, out of which such a prolific brood of monsters has been bred. After one has deducted Garrison and his followers, Joe Smith and his followers, Ballou and his followers, Finney and his followers, Channing and his followers, &c. &c., the portion left would hardly be the one-half of the real Yankee population of the country, to be still farther reduced by deductions for errors, barely endurable through that charity which endureth all things. And this is the grand peculiar sum of the influence of that system which the Presbyterian Church is expected to endorse and imitate?

SLAVERY, AND THE ANTI-SLAVERY HARANGUES OF CONGREGATIONAL DELEGATES.

When the movement in the Baptist Churches of the West, which resulted in the Campbellite secession, was in its first stage, two very warm disciples intruded into the pulpit of an aged Baptist minister, and occupied the attention of the people, alternately, the greater part of a Sabbath day. The old minister, nothing daunted, sat it out calmly;—and when the two disciples had fully delivered themselves, he dismissed his people with a few words to this effect: “Brethren, I have served you in the ministry a great many years, and have had a great many proofs that you are among the cleverest people in the world. But I never had such a proof of it before. For you have listened patiently and attentively all day long to two of the meanest preachers in the State, talking all manner of nonsense, not one word of which you believed, or they had any right to utter from my pul-

pit." Really it seems to us, that any one who had the fortune to hear the anti-slavery harangues read to the Assembly by some of the Congregational Delegates at Nashville, and to see the tranquility with which two hundred and fifty members of the body—to say nothing of a large audience of Southern people besides—listened to their untimely trash, and the perfect politeness with which the whole thing was passed by; must have felt, in his heart, at least so far like our old Baptist friend, that he was amongst a people worthy of the greatest admiration. A few calm words from the Moderator, to the effect that the Presbyterian Church had uttered her mind, fully, clearly and often, upon the whole matter of Slavery, and was not likely to depart from her ancient and perpetual faith on that subject—finished the matter for that time. We say for *that time*; because, of course, it will be renewed again, when these Delegates report their mighty deeds to those who sent them; and repeated again upon the next General Assembly; and so on, without end, just so long as the spirit of Abolitionism continues to supplant the spirit of the Gospel, at the North; and just so far as the Assembly shall consider it to comport with its duty to allow of such proceedings. The only effect of such proceedings, at present, is to excite the vanity and self-conceit of the Congregationalists—and to excite in like manner, the pity and contempt of the Presbyterians. Surely it were better for both parties, to put an end to such impertinence; and if this cannot be done otherwise, to put an end to privileges which are abused in this manner.

There never was, probably, on earth, so large a body of Christian people, scattered over so wide an area, and occupying such diversified conditions, which agreed more nearly with each other upon the great principles of any disputed question of duty, than the members of the Presbyterian Church in the United States do on the subject of slavery. And certainly no large body of persons ever had more complete opportunity to understand any question of the sort, nor did any ever more carefully and thoroughly make up, pronounce and adhere to their decision thereon. On the other hand, no instance can be found in which a numerous party of respectable persons, has ever made up an opinion with less care, or persisted in it with more obstinate folly, or manifested greater ignorance and impudence with regard to it, than the Congregationalists of the North have done, in their judgment and conduct touching this whole agitation about slavery. What is the use of any further rebukes from them? What is to be gained by any further endurance of such rebukes on our part? Our entire views of the whole case are diametrically opposed to each other. They denounce us as hypocrites: we are satisfied they are fanatics. The thing grows more offensive, with less hope of benefit, every day. Let it come to an end.

The Presbyterian Church has never wavered in her opinion on this subject. She does not believe that the mere fact of slave holding ought to be made a term of Christian communion: she does not believe that slave holding is, of itself, a sin: she does not believe that it is any part of her direct mission on earth to abolish slave holding as a sin, by means of discipline, or by means of preaching against it. On the other hand she does not believe that the institution of slavery as it exists in this country is one which she has any warrant to defend, as good in itself: nor does she believe that it is any part of her duty either to extend or to perpetuate it on earth. She does believe that the forcible reduction of freemen into bondage is a

sin : She does believe that she has immense duties to perform, both to masters and slaves, which result out of slavery : and she does believe that, according to the grace given to her, she is more and more zealous in the discharge of them all—and that the fanaticism of the Congregationalists of the North is one of the very greatest obstacles in the way of a more effectual performance of them by her. As to the private opinions of her members, or any body else, on any part of this vast subject, she no more thinks of interfering with them, than of interfering with their private opinions upon any other subject concerning which she has no divine warrant to address herself to the faith of men—no divine message to enforce. If any one, instead of talking nonsense, and being insolent, will show her a sufficient warrant from the Word of God to preach a crusade against slavery, she will certainly preach it, if it were to cost her the martyrdom of half her ministers. But until they do that, she is as certain not to preach any such crusade, as she is not to abandon the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation and the Atonement, for unfaithfulness to which, she has been obliged to break off official intercourse with the Congregationalists of Connecticut.

In a paper of this sort, we do not feel it to be proper to enter into a question of this sort, further than to state and illustrate general principles. We therefore content ourselves with saying, in addition to what is stated above, that it is perfectly clear to us that if slavery is to continue in this country, the view taken of it by the Presbyterian Church, is of all others, the one which is most beneficial to the slave, as an immortal being: and that if it should ever be abolished, it will be found that the conduct and principles of the Presbyterian Church, afford at once the most rational inducement and the most effectual means of arriving at such a result, in a manner the most beneficial to all concerned. No higher evidence of human wisdom can be given than this: no higher evidence of human folly, than to denounce that which is capable of mitigating all evils while they endure, and of making their end fortunate, when they terminate. If any aggravation were needed to make the conduct of these abolitionists utterly indefensible, it would be found in the double fact, that they know perfectly well that the Presbyterian Church is wholly unable to do what they abuse her for not doing—unable, we mean, even if she desired ever so ardently to do it; and that the deliberate judgment of the Presbyterian Church is, that even if the main thing the Congregationalists profess to desire could be done, it ought not to be done in the horrible manner they demand. For slavery has a *civil* status which the *civil* power, ordained of God, is alone competent to deal with; and which it would require the whole authority, the whole resources, and the whole force of that civil power to revolutionize in any effectual manner,—much less in the tremendous manner demanded by the abolitionists. And that particular tremendous manner of revolution is not only seen to be utterly absurd, but inevitably fatal. For the instant and indiscriminate setting free of the third part of the population of fifteen commonwealths, which third part are not only a degraded race, but a different race—must they say be followed by the immediate and permanent bestowal upon these three and a half millions of emancipated black slaves, of all the rights of citizens, and all the privileges of equals. It is nothing to the enlightened christians of New England, that two thousand millions of dollars are to be surrendered at their bidding :

it is nothing that this is to be followed by the utter disorganization of Society, throughout fifteen free, christian, fair and noble commonwealths: it is nothing that the white race in all these States, is to make these sacrifices for the purpose of hurling itself from an exalted condition of civilization, down to a depth of social degradation and imbecility which they contemplate with horror and disgust: all this is just nothing—for the real thing is, that the Presbyterian Church must undertake to do all this herself, and that forthwith, in order to escape the ill opinion of the Congregationalists of the North!—the ill opinion of those very Congregationalists, whose mission in their own land exhibits nothing more decisively than their own steady decline from the lofty standard of their own ancestors; unless it be their utter incapacity to comprehend the causes and the extent of that declension. We solemnly believe that a case of equal folly and recklessness, persisted in with equal insolence, has no parallel amongst Protestant denominations. And we have not a particle of doubt that if the Presbyterian Church could be persuaded to embark in the extremely wise, christian, and inviting course so affectionately urged upon her by her disinterested and loving Congregational brethren, from year to year; she might confidently rely on their generous and ready assistance, to the whole extent of finding herself promptly supplanted at every principal point throughout the entire slave States, by Congregational efforts to ruin her for doing exactly what Congregationalism itself had urged her to do!

There are various respects in which great harm is done, by allowing this state of things to continue. We risk, and that without the present prospect of any good compensating that risk, the confidence of sensible and wise men, by persisting in such a manner of intercourse with such people, as not only gives them the opportunity, but affords them a pretence of duty, for acting in the manner we have been commenting on. These delegates are sent to us, expressly to do, and are commanded and pledged to do, what they do. We all know this: and yet connive at it. How can we expect to escape,—why should we escape just suspicion, for connivance at what we could so easily prevent? Moreover, all we attempt to do with regard to slavery in any of its great and difficult relations, is liable to the suspicion of being done under the instigation of these taunts—just so long as we allow of their periodical occurrence. From whence a double evil arises, in that what we attempt is not so cordially seconded by society, and in that we are liable to attempt less under the influence of such offensive and absurd rebukes. To which add the great evil, that we expose ourselves to the temptation of contemplating the poor slave and his pitiable case, in connection with his pretended and reckless advocate from the North, and risk the hardening of our hearts against him, under the indignities and injuries of those who profess to plead his cause. No fact is better known than this uniform evil tendency in the South, of all these miserable follies from the North: nor is any thing more natural. And finally, we risk the serious change of our own opinions on the subject of slavery itself, by the temptation of confounding it with the fearful schemes pressed on us for its abolition. If we could be satisfied that the mode of dealing with slavery pointed out by the abolitionists, was the wisest mode that could be imagined with a view to its destruction in any one of the Slave States, much less in all of them; we should certainly be forced to the conclusion, that no attempt whatever should be made, to abolish it any where or

at any time: just as if we were sure that Popery was the only view that could be presented of the revealed method of saving men's souls, we should be perfectly satisfied that no mode at all had been revealed. Say what you please of Slavery—abolitionism is worse; say what you like of midnight—it is better than to have your eyes torn out. The re-action upon ourselves is, from the very constitution of our natures, liable to make us overlook the evils of slavery; and from contemplating with disgust or contempt, the remedies which fanaticism suggests, we easily slide into a condition in which we are prone to overlook the necessity of seeking any remedy at all.

We are perfectly aware to what ferocious denunciation we expose ourselves by what we have now said. But what of that? The country is in peril. Society is wildly and universally agitated. Many of the Churches are torn in pieces. In the midst of this scene of confusion and danger, the Presbyterian Church, covering the whole nation—thinly, indeed, but yet with a real power—is calm, united, and in thorough repose on the fundamental principles which must at last, be accepted as the only basis upon which these fierce agitations can be composed, and the country return to peace and reason. So far from abandoning her ancient doctrine and firm position, what is required of her is that she should make herself felt for good in every proper way. Ranking amongst her sons, thoroughly approving her principles, and deeply alive to all that concerns her purity, her usefulness, and her progress, we have willingly availed ourselves of the present opportunity to utter from her bosom a note, at once of good cheer to all who love her venerable name, and of defiance to all her slanderers. It is scarcely worth while to say, that it is the *general* and not the *personal* aspect of the particular case which gives occasion to these remarks, which alone could entitle that case to any special notice. We have nothing whatever to say concerning the individual delegates who felt obliged to speak as they did to the Assembly of 1855, except that they spoke as delegates, and spoke as they who sent them expected and desired. All the rest is designed to have the widest possible application—and the most intense.

PROGRESS, CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH.

Somewhat more than a century and a half ago, the Presbyterian Church had only such an existence on this Continent, as could be exhibited by scattered families, or small and imperfectly organized congregations—the whole number of both being very inconsiderable. At present she has 2261 ordained ministers, besides nearly seven hundred licentiates and candidates for the ministry; nearly 100,000 families, and probably 250,000 members; 30 Synods, 148 Presbyteries and 3079 Churches, with not less than 12,000 Ruling Elders. This immense progress has been made by the simple power of the Gospel left to itself—the spontaneous movement of the Christian life of God's people, without any aid from the civil power—nay, against its positive opposition in large portions of the country, during the greater part of her existence. Comparing the condition of the Church now, with her condition a century and a half ago, and her means of progress then and now; who can calculate the work she will have done, and the advance she will have made at the end of another century and a half, if she continues faithful to the Lord? It is in no spirit of vain-glorying that such state-

ments are made. But it is only as we open our minds to the realities of the past and the probabilities of the future, that we can keep them steadily fixed upon the true work set before us, and the true means of accomplishing it. Let us not dare to limit the mighty God; but rather let us strive to elevate our plans, our hopes and our efforts, to the greatness which his past blessings indicate, and his gracious promises encourage us to expect. The tendency of our hearts is to be satisfied with that which does not satisfy our master. Let us beware of this, and every one go before another in the wise and earnest zeal to make our future progress answerable to the greatness of our blessings and our opportunities.

Eighteen years ago the Presbyterian Church extricated herself at an immense sacrifice of members and apparent influence and strength, from a condition in which her farther progress as an orthodox and evangelical Church was no longer possible. No one in her bosom doubts that God's blessing has followed her richly, ever since. It would, however, have been unreasonable to imagine that the work then accomplished could be a perfect work; and one of the most obvious processes of all the subsequent career of the Church, has been the gradual working out of the remnants of evils which had sunk so deeply and spread so widely. No practical difficulty could be greater than to determine with precision what was indispensable to be thoroughly removed, and what might be more wisely left to be absorbed by a restored healthful action, or thrown off from the renewed system by its own vitality. And no praise can be greater, than to say that they who were called of God to decide and to act for so great interests in a matter so difficult, made no serious mistake on either hand. No evil was cut off, that we are able to say after so great subsequent experience, could have been safely left, and no evil was left which ought to have been suddenly cut off. Still the Church as she stood after the great excision of 1837 and the great schism of 1838—had much to learn and much to unlearn; much to do and much to undo; before she could be said to have completely recovered from the effects of her great declension from sound doctrine and order. It is this she has been doing up to the present moment. They must be careless or incompetent observers who do not see that her progress, though always resisted and sometimes in peril, has been real and great in the right direction.

At the present moment we are not aware of any considerable difference of opinion in the Presbyterian Church upon any fundamental doctrine of evangelical religion, or any cardinal point of christian duty. The age is thoroughly agitated: but we are at rest, on all those grand truths—all those great obligations—which belong to the vital part of a sound Presbyterianism. There remains amongst us, undoubtedly, questions to be settled; questions of great interest and importance. But they are chiefly questions which relate rather to the form of the Church, than to the vital parts of religion. Upon these questions—the most pressing of which as they relate to the form and action of the Church have received more or less notice in preceding portions of this paper,—there is a general and increasing tendency against the views of the old moderate and re-actionary parties, and in favor of those of the thoroughly orthodox and Presbyterian party in the Church. The opinions of the Church on the general subject of Church government have been totally revolutionized within twenty-five years: and it is now nearly as rare to hear one of our ministers deny that

the form of the Church is of divine authority, as it then was to hear any of them express the opposite opinion. It still remains to remove from the mind of the Church the remnants of that heresy, and to shape all the practical efforts of the Church in the grand mission committed to her by God, after the true and effective principles of a sound Presbyterianism. And this last triumph of that glorious system of truth, in the spirit of which that party was organized, by means of which God delivered the Church in 1837, proceeds with a firm—though it may be a delayed step. It is to be deplored that good and enlightened men should still cling to the remnants of Congregationalism on the one hand, and Prelacy on the other, which as yet have not been thoroughly purged out of our noble system; and not less so, that any should manifest a temper so fierce and proscriptive against those who, after so long a delay, urge the final application of the true principles of our system to our great benevolent enterprises, and our whole administrative system. In the mean time the end is certain—and not far off. The practical necessities of the Church oblige her from year to year to advance along a career in which all reaction becomes more difficult at every step; and the abounding success of every new application of the heaven-approved principles of her system, force her to go onward to perfection. The cavils of a shallow philosophy, only afford the opportunity of stating more and more clearly the grand principles of that form of the Church, whose logical cohesion is as perfect as its divine warrant is complete; and the coarse intolerance sometimes manifested against those who urge the completion of the work—is even so far of use, as it shows that intolerance itself may be calmly and safely tolerated, when its force bears no proportion to its pretensions.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

There remain in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church three types of opinion upon such of these things as there is any difference amongst us concerning. They occasionally appear with some distinctness; though we cannot avoid the belief that they are all drawing more nearly towards each other—and the points on which they are clearly distinguished are gradually diminishing, as the Church advances on her high career, in the line of the immense force imparted to her in 1830-'40. All three of these types appeared very obviously in the Assembly of 1855; and the most of what was peculiar in that Assembly, might perhaps be traced to this three-fold division of the body—and the various fluctuations of concert and antagonism of these three-fold elements. There is that type of thorough Presbyterianism which rallied the earliest and most resolutely for the deliverance of the Church, and which came in the progress of the conflict to be called derisively, the "Act and Testimony party:" the party against which Princeton set itself with such desperate hostility twenty years ago, and which after an interval of some years of more forbearing counsels, it appears inclined to distinguish again with peculiar opposition, under the name of "High Church Presbyterianism." Of this type Dr. Thornwell, and we might perhaps add Dr. Krebs, and many other distinguished members of the Assembly of 1855, might be taken as specimens more or less complete. Next to this was that type of a Presbyterianism, which was not ready in 1831: was not ready in 1834: was *getting ready* in 1836: and being fully resolved in 1837, participated in all the struggles and tri-

umphs of that eventful year—and in all that followed. Without the adhesion of this party, the Church could not have been sound as early as 1837. In those days it delighted to call itself the “Virginia School,” and to avouch, (we always thought with doubtful propriety,) the late Dr. Alexander as its head. Dr. Plumer, to whom we might add other leading members of the Assembly, (whose views of the true policy of the Church we consider far sounder than those of Dr. Plumer,) might be taken as exponents of this type. Then, after both of the others, was that type of Presbyterianism—which was able barely to tolerate the Acts of the Assembly of 1837, after they were passed; which, driven to make election by the events of 1837 and ’38, preferred the Old School, and stood for the Church on the basis of the acts of 1837 and ’38, and which has contended so sharply ever since, for all that was left in the Church at that era, and against any particle of further progress in the way of reform. Dr. Boardman must be considered the leading exponent of this party in the Assembly of 1855. In old times, it delighted to be called the “Princeton Party,” and still, we believe, glories in that name. The Church was saved without the co-operation of this party; nay, even against its strenuous opposition to most of the leading measures adopted to save it. But, after it was saved, this party seems to have supposed that it was extremely clear, that the Church being saved in a manner very distasteful to it, could not get along without its supervision, and ought not to take any new step which it did not approve: in short, that the Church having acted without its consent on that great occasion, ought to be satisfied with this act of disrespect, and forbear to incur any danger of the sort again.

It has appeared during all the interval from 1838 to 1855, that these three types, as we have before observed, have been gradually wearing into the one great type of the “High Church Presbyterian,” if our brethren insist on that name for us—under that universal law which obliges the final development to correspond with the primeval force. Weighing the sum of the Acts of the Assembly of 1855, we incline to the opinion that very few Assemblies during the past twenty years have established this fact more conclusively than this one. For ourselves, we have no sort of difficulty in accepting, with sincere cordiality, the second and third of these three types, as honored Presbyterian brethren, with whom we cordially agree in most essential things; albeit we are ourselves called by them ultra of the first type. Nor have we the least objection to concede to those of the second and third types as much excess of place, honor and control as is at all compatible with the true progress of the Church; leaving to them, as heretofore, a great over-share of all their hearts may desire—and prompt, ourselves, as heretofore, to wink as far as possible at the differences which separate us, and hold up their hands in all their attempts to do any thing which we can approve or aid, and keep a good conscience. Meantime, however, we must be tolerated in watching steadily their own progress towards a more thorough “High Church Presbyterianism;” aiding, now and then, their steps if they halt a little; and crying out, even lustily, to them when we see them taking a route, which we know will carry them back to the place they set out from, and to which we are rather obstinately bent on not returning with them. It were well, however, if they could be content with somewhat less.

We must admit, in fine, that the Assembly of 1855, did a few things which we would gladly have had otherwise: some of which we sincerely trust will never be repeated. Take this: "On motion of Dr. Plumer, the thanks of the General Assembly were voted to its officers for their promptness, faithfulness, and courtesy, by which the business of the House has been greatly facilitated,"* (*minutes*, p. 303.) We believe that, in the sixty-seven General Assemblies of our Church, only one, that of 1849 at St. Louis, besides that of 1855, at Nashville, ever passed such a resolution. One of a similar kind was attempted to be passed in the Assembly of 1850, at Cincinnati; but decided opposition was made to it, and the Moderator, Dr. Leland, set his face against it: and it was not pressed to a vote. It is probable that nine men out of ten who allowed this resolution to pass in 1855, and a similar one in 1849, felt that the thing was improper: but, dreading to appear captious or personal, let it pass in silence. It is the duty of the public press to take cognizance of such cases; and not doubting the monstrous evil of thus converting the courts of God's kingdom into instruments of vanity and worldliness, we protest against the thing in the most decided manner. What would be thought of some gentleman's rising in a Church after sermon, and in the face of the minister, offering a vote of thanks by the people "for his learned, godly, and eloquent sermon, by which they were greatly fructified?" What would be thought of the Supreme Court of the United States, if the Associate Justices, were to enter up a public vote of thanks to the Chief Justice, upon his delivering an opinion, thanking him "for his clear, able, and most profound opinion, by which their knowledge was greatly increased, and their hearts delighted?" It may be said some legislative, political, popular and even literary and scientific if not religious bodies, do this habitually. Well, let them. They all understand it to mean nothing. They all do sundry other things which the General Assembly never will think of doing, while it retains any proper sense of its own character and duty. It is unnecessary, however, to discuss matters of this sort. A sense of propriety, a perception of what is suitable and becoming—is like good breeding—a thing that every one must determine for himself, according to the state of his own inner man. For ourselves, we utterly condemn this proceeding, and sincerely hope it may never be repeated. The orthodox are sometimes, of late, twitted from high places, with borrowing from New School Presbyterians, certain principles of church government, and certain points of church action; of which some-

* Dr. Plumer's other complimentary resolution of thanks, to "the Secretaries and other Executive officers of the Board," is not only obnoxious to these censures in higher degree, but also to additional censure, as an infliction upon the good taste, good sense, and delicacy of feeling of the most eminently worthy of the officers for whose benefit it was intended. However plausible the plea for such a resolution, in the case of officers recently appointed, and as yet in a measure officially unknown as the Secretary of the Board of Publication or even the "Worthy and modest Secretary of the Board of Missions" as Dr. P. was pleased to style him—what possible propriety, or what call, for such a resolution, in behalf of officers so long and so eminently known, as the Secretaries of the Board of Education and Foreign Missions. "Paul was thankful for small favors," argued Dr. P.; therefore the Assembly should express thanks, &c.—To say nothing of the ambiguous compliment, in classifying the services of such men among the "small favors" to the Church; we doubt if even Paul himself, in just the position of Walter Lowrie, for instance, would have been thankful for so small a favor as Dr. P.'s resolution.

thing has been said in a former part of this paper. Here is a point of christian decorum, which we earnestly trust may be restored forthwith to whomsoever it belongs to, with the amplest apology for having taken it, and the fullest remuneration for any damage it may have sustained by awkward handling while in the possession of our people.

We have had a specific object in preparing this paper, namely: to estimate and to point out the general drift of the Church; to indicate, as far as the matters reviewed offered the means, the good and the evil tendencies, with the causes of both: to bring those acts of the Assembly and those proceedings which took place in it, which seemed to us most appropriate for such an object, to the test of those great truths and that great progress, which especially appertain to the history of the Church during the last quarter of a century. Whatever else has been said has had for its chief object to make more obvious and just, the presentation indicated above. Where we could properly avoid the use of individual names, we have done so; not designing to laud any one, not wishing to wound or injure any one, but not content to shrink from any proper thing, either way, which was required by the duty we set out to perform. We have not presumed to write history: but the results and the seeds of history we have endeavored to handle: and if what we have said is true and just, it will be more important hereafter than at present. We have seen enough to feel that it is of no particular consequence what any particular ordinary Assembly may be or do; but that it is of very great importance to comprehend what bearing the general life of the Church has towards those great truths and acts, and upon that great development and progress to which all her glory and blessedness are intimately related.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW ON THE
(N. S.) GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1855.

THE observations in our first number on the "GREAT General Assembly of 1854," have apparently not been lost upon the historiographer of that body in the *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*. It may be that we are making the mistake of the fly on the wheel, in the old fable; but certain it is that his history of the Assembly of 1855 is far less pretentious in tone, less "volcanic" in style, and less "agonistic" in its specially eloquent passages, than that of last year. So much have we been gratified in reading the article on the Assembly, in the September number of the *Quarterly*, that we are disposed to forgive and forget the angry, hard names which our criticism brought down upon us—even the terrible nickname "*Second chop Breckinridge of the excinders*," and all. Nay, so much have we been mollified in reading his remarks on the doings of the Assembly, especially on the Board question, that we are not indisposed to forgive, even though we cannot forget, his cruel insinuation, of our having "adopted their (N. S.) suggestions."

The improved style and manner of the history however, is very far from being the chief thing which gives this article its interest. The "*res gesta*" of the Assembly which it gives us an account of, are in themselves, of unusual moment, and that chiefly, because of their indication of a most remarkable re-action in that part of the Church towards higher and clearer views of the nature and mission of Presbyterianism. To the more prominent of these acts only, and the comments of the *Review* upon them, we propose to call attention at present.

Quite a prominent place is given in the history to the measures for carrying out the purpose indicated by the Assembly of 1854, to become legally denominationalized. We took occasion in our former article, to call special attention to the very singular expedient employed to get around the legal obstacles which Judge Gibson's decision had thrown in the way of their claim, to be the true Presbyterian Church. It appears now that the expedient proposed last year, has been fully carried out; and the "Trustees of the Presbyterian House," by provision in the charter, have been constituted practically Trustees of the General Assembly, competent to hold funds and property for any purpose of the body whatever. But what gives peculiar interest to this arrangement, is not so much the intrinsic importance of the thing in itself, as the application to be made of it, in the way of covering up the weak point in the claim of this succession from the old Charter of 1799. The reasoning of this Reviewer on the point, is so remarkable a specimen of legal argumentation, that we cannot forbear presenting it to our readers.

"It will be seen:

1. THAT THE STATE OF OHIO, by her Court, has declared that the trustees, professors

and members of the executive committee of Lane Seminary are in connection with "the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," they being in connection with our Church.

2. That THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, by her lower and higher Courts, has placed in the hands of trustees belonging to our Church, the lands deeded for a theological seminary by Dr. Blackburn, a minister of our Church before the division, thus deciding, that by the founding of a seminary in connection with our Church, the intention of the donor is *bona fide* carried out.

3. That THE STATE OF NEW YORK, through her Legislature and Executive, has recognized the right of our Church to use the chartered name, "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

4. THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, by her Legislature and Executive, has taken the following action: In the year 1799, this State granted the original Act of Incorporation, by which the Presbyterian Church took the title, through her highest judicatory, of "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." But this same State, in a charter granted unanimously by both Houses of the Legislature, and immediately approved by the Governor, on the 21st of April, 1855, has designated the highest judicatory of our Church by this identical title, "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." In this charter, as will be observed, is a provision authorizing the Trustees to manage all property whatever committed to them, and to execute any trust whatever confided to them by the General Assembly. Any further litigation as to legal rights, or the succession of the Church, of course becomes useless, &c.

"Thus our equal right to the succession, and our rights under the original charter of 1799, have been guaranteed by the Legislative, Executive and Judicial authorities of Pennsylvania. It appears abundantly, therefore, from the action of these four great States, that the claims set up so freely by the other branch of the Church, to be the exclusive successors of our Church in law, are not only, considering the utterly disputable character of the Excising Acts, in very bad taste, they seeking, as no honest men ought to do, to take advantage of their own wrong, but that they are utterly baseless and even ridiculous."

If the Reviewer had been content with stating his case, without this appended fling at the "bad taste," and the "utterly baseless and ridiculous claims so freely set up by the other branch of the church," we could have afforded to pass on without disturbing his measureless content with their line of succession. As it is, we have a word to say of this very self-complacent legal argument. In the first place, we do not understand how the Legislature of Pennsylvania—much less the Legislatures of New York, Ohio and Illinois have the power to review and set aside the Judicial decisions of the Supreme Court through Judge Gibson. In the next place, we cannot attach quite so much logical importance to the fact, that a legislature "designated" a certain corporation "by the very indential title" of some other corporation. Legislatures are very accommodating in the matter of changing names and giving names. We doubt not that on our application, if a citizen of Pennsylvania, we could have an act passed "unanimous by both Houses of the Legislature, and immediately approved by the Governor," changing our name to Albert Barnes; but we gravely doubt whether that would entitle us to a share in the profits of the "Notes," and authorise us to inform that gentleman, on his demurring that "any further litigation as to legal rights of course becomes useless." We remember having been consulted once by a grave legislator in reference to the question, whether when the Legislature by mistake divorced the wrong couple, and restored to the woman her maiden name, the parties could be held to be man and wife without being married over again? It appeared

that during the passage of what in those days, and in that State, was called an *omnibus* divorce bill—that is, a bill originally proposing to divorce A. & B., but amended by successive motions to insert also, B. & C., then C. & D. and D. & E. on to the end of the alphabet, this old Senator, in the hurry, and embarrassment of forcing in an amendment for the benefit of one of his constituents, had named the wrong parties, and in consequence, one of the most loving and happy old couples in his district, in reading the papers one morning found to their amazement and grief, that by “act of both Houses of the Legislature, and immediately approved by the Governor,” they were no longer one—and the name that the poor old lady had gloried in for thirty years, was to be laid aside! As a matter of course the Senator speedily found himself overwhelmed with indignant and sorrowful reproaches, and his chances for re-election hopeless, unless the evil could be repaired. But how could this be done? Even though the act could be repaired by the Legislature—could a new act of the Legislature marry them again? It is needless that we report the legal opinion delivered by us in the case. We cite the instance merely to illustrate the troubles which must grow out of a recognition of the doctrine of the Reviewer, that an act of “both houses immediately approved by the Governor, designating by the identical title,” has a legal potency to overrule a decision of the Supreme Court, and make “all further litigation useless,” while we fully agree in the conclusion that “all further litigation is useless.” We have been of that opinion—and we suppose every sane man who understood the facts, had been of that opinion ever since Judge Gibson’s decision in the case, seventeen years ago—nor has the recent act of the Pennsylvania Legislature affected in any way our opinion.

The eagerness of our New School neighbors to snatch thus at even the shadow of the name and succession—especially their willingness to share it in common with the Old School Church, is not a little surprising, considering all that they have done and said concerning the Old School in years past. One would think that if they themselves believed half the bad things they have said of us,—so far from seeking to assume our name, they would, as members of a disgraced family and name sometimes do, rather apply to the Legislature to get a *change of name*, and thereby relieve themselves of the disgrace which they affect to think belongs to the Presbyterian name. Do they insist upon being part and parcel of a church of Excinders, Revolutionists, church stealers, &c.? Strange they do not seek rather by public Legislative enactment, to put themselves utterly apart from such a body. We may add, moreover, that the affected chuckle of the Reviewer over the “identical title” in the recent act, wears to us after all that occurred connected with that enactment, too much of the air of boasting over a successful deception by low cunning. Does he mean that his readers should understand, that all the ado about the title of the corporation, had with the Board

of Publication, was merely for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of Mr. Happersett and the Board, that they might not detect the tremendous danger to them concealed in the "identical title," applied in the Bill itself to the New School body at large?

But we hasten on to far more important matters. The action of the Assembly on two subjects especially, is of marked significance. We allude 1st, to the debate and action on Church Election, embracing the Board question, and 2nd, the spirit manifested toward New England and the Congregationalists. The action of the Assembly of 1854 in the direction of "ecclesiasticism," as opposed to "co-operativeism," in the benevolent efforts of the church, seems to have been fully endorsed by the Assembly of 1855 without another syllable of opposition to what *had* been done; and then further steps taken, after some debate, in the same general direction. Indeed, if we may take the Presbyterian Quarterly Review as a fair exponent of the views of the body, the rapidity and extent of the revolution in favor of ecclesiasticism is truly surprising. The organization of the Standing Committee on Education, which last year gave rise to the greatest discussion of that Great Assembly, seems to have been completed and amended this year without a syllable of opposition. Not a word further is said in the History, of the "co-ordinate agencies" of the New York Central and the Philadelphia Education Societies. But we quote the following resolution which was adopted in connection with the report on Education as a sort of supplement to the resolution of last year to which we called special attention, calling upon the voluntary education societies to report to the Assembly's Board or committee, what they were doing in the Presbyterian Church:

"Resolved, That the Trustees of those colleges within our bounds, which originated in the action of any of the Synods connected with this Assembly, and the colleges which now report to said Synods, be requested to make a report annually before the 15th of April to the Education Committee, to be incorporated in their report to the Assembly."

"This," adds the historian, "*is a resolution of great importance.*" So we would judge. But we would ground its importance on still other reasons than that which he assigns, to wit: "No church can exist without its own colleges—and where are ours?" (The italics are his own.) We need not however enlarge upon the tendencies indicated by this resolution here. Its significance, as pointing to a scheme of ecclesiastical control in education, which may well make the Old School men stare, is at once obvious.

The additional step toward ecclesiasticism in the Assembly of 1855, was the organization of still another Board or "Standing Committee of Church Extension." This, our historian informs us, was "the most exciting topic of the Assembly." It became the exciting topic, however, precisely for the same reason that the same

subject became the exciting topic in the Assembly at Nashville, namely, that this subject was selected as a test question on the whole subject of ecclesiastical machinery. We cite by way of illustrating the views and spirit of the body—a few specimens of the debates.

“Mr. SNEED (Iowa) opposed the part of the report which disclaimed the establishment of an ecclesiastical board. That was the very thing he wanted. The greatest blunder we ever committed, as a denomination, was our quarrel with the “Old School,” on the subject of voluntary societies. It was the practice of pilots on the river when they ran their boats into a “pocket,” to put on steam and “back water.” Our Church has been driven into a “pocket,” and we must “back out” before we can “go ahead.”

“Rev. J. JEWELL, (Northern Pennsylvania,) moved to strike out the phrase “that it is not their intention thus to establish an ecclesiastical board.” He said that there was no use in concealing the real purpose of this movement. He did not like to be Janus-faced, nor to see the Assembly deny that it was establishing an ecclesiastical board, when it was doing so in reality.

“Mr. WALLACE said there is a vital distinction between a committee and a board, and if he were not unwilling to take up the time of the Assembly, he would endeavor to explain that difference. At present, he would merely throw out this idea for the consideration of brethren. So far from their being the same thing, when a committee is appointed we actually relinquish the very distinctive idea of a board, for a board is that which comes between the Assembly and the executive committee. *On our plan, the Assembly is the Board.*

“Dr. BULLARD would resist “to the bitter end” all projects for the establishment of ecclesiastical boards. He felt obliged for the important distinction hinted at between a committee and a board, which he hoped would be developed. No denomination was ever in a better condition to frame a wise and efficient system of operations. We have the experience of both societies and boards to guide us.

“Voluntary societies tend, from the very nature of the case, to concentration of power. It is so in reality; there is not one of the voluntary societies that is subject to any efficient control. I know what I say; I have been connected as an officer with more than one of them.

“Boards are only voluntary societies with an ecclesiastical stamp upon them. Our brethren of the other branch of the Church, seeing the undeniable evils of voluntary societies, swung over to the opposite extreme, and exemplified the truth of the old adage, that extremes meet. We have not been contending for a shadow in opposing ecclesiastical boards, nor are we satisfied with a name when we prefer committees. There is a principle as important as the safety of the Church involved in this controversy; and if we are wise, we shall now, while the matter is manageable, avoid the obvious evils of both these systems. Let us learn and act upon the broad distinction between a committee and a board; let us never place ourselves at the mercy of a set of men who will rule us while we imagine ourselves free.

“Mr. SNEED expressed his deep satisfaction with the light which this discussion was throwing upon matters which had greatly agitated him. The distinction between a committee and a board was one entirely new to him, and one with which he was greatly delighted. It struck him at once as affording a way out of all our difficulties.”

We have of course no adequate space for the History of the war between New Schoolism and Congregationalism, which since the Assembly, has grown out of these proceedings. From the account of it in the Presbyterian Quarterly Review, it seems to have been a sort of ecclesiastical counterpart of the war now waging on the other side the Atlantic. We give a specimen or two :

“Let us look at the language in which the Holy Alliance of Independents and Ex-scinders, think it decent to give us their understanding of this matter. “The Independent” has devoted column after column to this subject, and for its spirit we might select almost at random. We give only a sentence or two, not wishing, as a matter of taste, to remain long in such company. . . .

“Let our readers restrain themselves until they hear the Puritan Recorder. . . .

“Now the reader will please peruse the following from the magnanimous “Presbyterian,” a newspaper published in Philadelphia, and which is characterized by a high-minded and noble-hearted disregard of sect; a large and affectionate charity towards

“New School men;” a cherubic disposition always to put the most favorable construction upon every thing “New School men” do, and a seraphic tendency always to call attention to every thing excellent in them. . . .

“Here it is—the “Independent,” the “Puritan Recorder,” and the “Presbyterian” have given their *pronunciamento*. They are in our judgment, *perfectly fit company for each other. It is an inevitable law of nature that “like seeks its like.”*”

Now we are free to say, that while we cautiously stand aloof from the conflict, our sympathies are entirely with the New School men, in so far as this contest is concerned. Aside from the similarity, according to the estimate of certain eminent members of the Assembly at Nashville, between the New School views of ecclesiastical agencies, and what these eminent gentlemen are pleased to regard as the “*high church*” views of the same subject in this journal,—we have a natural sympathy with the weak against the strong, and “the sinned against,” rather than the sinning. Whatever may be the right or wrong, of the several points in controversy, one thing is certain, that the New School men have been the losing party, in the long run, of this partnership between them and Congregationalists. Indeed in every branch of the partnership business they have been the losers. We observe that not only in the case of the Home Missionary Society, but in the matter of the American Board of Foreign Missions, they report most disastrous results of the connection. In the debate on the “Standing Committee of Foreign Missions” it comes out, that they have been contributing their funds for twenty years to a Board at Boston, whose management is not only in the hands of another denomination, but who practically *refuse to allow their Presbyterian missionaries to be organized into Presbyteries*; so that as the result of the whole matter, the history of Foreign Missions in the New School church, is thus summed up by Mr Wright, of Chicago, in his speech in the Assembly.

“It is understood that the Presbyterian Church has contributed about two millions of dollars to the treasury of the American Board, and yet not a solitary Presbyterian Church has been organized by its missionaries.”

With such a result before us, we cannot help feeling a sympathy with the party so used. And on the other hand we cannot but feel a deep interest in the efforts of men, who discovering, however late, the egregious folly of their past conduct, are seeking to repair the evil, with a zeal and energy that shrinks from no mortifying admission of past errors on their own part, and of the truth being with those whom they opposed in time past. It gives us no particular uneasiness to be told that the New School Assembly are adopting the same ecclesiastical views which we have advocated. If the New School men have at length felt the degradation of the bondage of Egypt—enough to make them willing to give up the “flesh pots of Egypt, even though the sooty traces of the flesh pots” are yet upon their faces and their dress, we are not ashamed to see them following in our way. We are glad to hear even their stammering efforts to speak the language of Canaan, even though we occasion-

ally can hardly refrain from a smile at their mingling therewith the brogue of Ashdod. We would have been better pleased if their views, like ours, had resulted from a clear perception beforehand of great principles, which must have such and such an out-working, rather than from a sad perception of results after seventeen years of the trial; and after finding, by experiment, that bad principles had worked out nothing but disaster and ruin. But still, "better late than never." The practical result of this breaking off from congregationalism must necessarily be to Presbyterianize the New School. Practically they are setting out in 1855, where the Act and Testimony party set out in 1835. Shall they ever overtake them?

The Author of the article on the Assembly of 1855, seems to have taken a particular fancy to the saying, "the historian is the prophet with his face turned backward." We know of no more remarkable illustration of the saying—and at the same time of the difference between true Old School-ism, which in its control of church affairs would look to nothing but principle—the eternal principles of God's Truth as a guide—and New Schoolism with its guidance by expediency—the expediencies of the hour,—than is furnished in his own article—in the paragraph on Boards (p. 311.) We are the more ready to quote this paragraph as it will be the best answer we can make to the charge, that we in our views of Boards have "adopted New School suggestions." After informing his readers that the Assembly at Nashville, in case of the vote on the Church Extension Committee at St. Louis, "*actually* by a vote of 134 to 57, *came precisely upon OUR PLAN of a committee instead of a Board* ; he proceeds to discuss the difference between Boards and Committees. In order now fully to illustrate the case of "the prophet with his face turned backwards," and the true prophet with his face turned everywise man's face ought to be—*before* him, we place side by side here the vaticinations of the Prophet in the Baltimore Literary and Evangelical Magazine in 1839 looking "*forwards*," and the prophet in the Presbyterian Quarterly Review in 1855, with his face "*backwards*."

Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine for August 1839, p. 378.

"We have already spoken of a spirit of servile imitation of the voluntary Boards. . . . They are not the church, they are not a committee of the church, except in a most illegitimate use of the term. Their only proper use is . . . secondly, to vest this power in a few central hands at the seat of operations, under the guise of sharing it with some hundred persons scattered over the land, and physically incapable of taking any material part in it. . . . These Boards are an excrescence upon Presbyterianism—to which they have no affinities, and in relation to the true action of which they are useless or hindrances. Formerly the As-

Presbyterian Quarterly in September, 1855, p. 311.

"For any number of men to say and to repeat it never so often, that there is no difference between a committee and a Board does not alter the fact; men may choose not to see, but the fact remains. . . . We choose a hundred men to do our work, and call them a Board, or any other name we choose. *The same result happens as in the voluntary associations.* The hundred men do not meet except in theory, *but eight or ten men do meet and hold up the shield of the Board between them and the Assembly, that is between them and the will of the people.* Now we say, take away that screen and let in the day-light. *Let the Assembly, the people's representa-*

sembly appointed Standing Committees to this work. This is the proper mode. Let a committee of moderate size be appointed on each subject; let it be really a committee, then the *Church* will really do its work, and the work will be done on ecclesiastical principles."

tives be the Board. Let them appoint the working efficiency, the executive committee and the secretaries too, if it is thought best. . . . Choose, say fifteen men to work, not to set others to work and let the Assembly supervise their action, &c."

We care not to raise the issue with the Quarterly Reviewer, as to who "*adopted*," and who first originated "the suggestions." If the New School men shall go on courageously in the work of getting back to the right ground—we shall feel too much rejoiced at the result to sue them for an invasion of our patent. We cite these remarkable coincidences between the prophet of 1839 and the prophet of 1855, for the purpose of suggesting to certain parties of both schools, that what very wise men have sometimes been pleased to brand as "the *whimsies*" of a mere ultra-ism, may often become very sober and grave maxims in the historic pages of those who formerly denounced them. And, moreover, in the choice of her leaders and guides, the church by the selection of prophets who keep their faces turned "*forwards*" rather than "*backwards*," may keep herself from many an awkward tumble over rocks and rough places, which will not only impede seriously her onward progress, but expose her sons to much mortification. In the nineteenth century, and in this great country, the church must not move *crab-fashion*.

THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THE POOR.

WHEN John the Baptist sent his disciples to Jesus with the question, "Art thou He that should come or do we look for another?" the answer was, "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." These were the credentials by which the divine mission of Jesus of Nazareth was authenticated; these the evidences upon which the trembling faith of the prisoner's messengers might confidently lean for support, and the wounded spirit of the prisoner himself,—if peradventure it had been too much shaken by the sudden and disastrous termination of his public ministry,—rest itself in peace. In order to comprehend the full import of this remarkable statement of our Lord, it will be necessary to remember, that His miraculous works were designed not merely to authenticate His mission, but also to reveal its nature; they were "*signs*" not only of a special divine interposition, but of a divine interposition for a beneficent purpose; striking and over-

whelming proofs, that there was something more than mortal in that power whose results were exhibited to the eye, something more than mortal in those accents which fell upon the ear, but a power wielded by infinite compassion, and accents uttered from out the depths of a love which would spare no sacrifice, however costly, to gratify its measureless yearnings over the victims of sin and the children of woe. How different the wonders which inaugurated the ministration of the law, of condemnation and death, from those which introduced the ministration of righteousness, grace and peace! Moses the Servant, commanding the reverence of the people, in circumstances of terror; Jesus the Son, attracting the love of mankind, by voices and deeds of mercy! It had been easy for Him to establish His claims, so far as mere evidence of divine authority was needed, by smiting men with blindness, lameness and leprosy, or the stroke of death, as was done by messengers of God under the dispensation of law; but He chose rather to proclaim the spirit and nature of His mission, in the very acts by which he demonstrated its divinity, in giving sight to the blind, soundness to the lame, health to the leper, ears to the deaf, and life to the dead. When two of His disciples, Sons of Thunder, in their indignant but ill-considered zeal in His behalf, desired to invoke the fire of heaven upon His enemies, in imitation of the stern representatives of the Law, He uttered that memorable rebuke, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

Another circumstance, noticed by Lord Bacon (*Med. Sac.* 2.) in connection with the last, as characteristic of our Saviour's miracles, is the fact that they were all "consummate about man's body, as His doctrine respected the soul of man. The body of man needeth these things; sustenance, defence from outward wrongs, and medicine; it was He that drew multitude of fishes into the nets, that He might give unto men more liberal provision: He turned water, a less worthy nourishment of man's body into wine, a more worthy, that glads the heart of man: He sentenced the fig-tree to wither for not doing that duty whereunto it was ordained, which is to bear fruit for man's food: He rebuked the winds that threatened destruction to the sea-faring men. No miracle of His is to be found to have been of judgment or revenge, but all of goodness and mercy, and respecting man's body; for as touching riches He did not vouchsafe to do any miracle, save one only, that tribute might be given to Cæsar." Here again the wonderful works of the Gospel are in strong contrast with the wonderful works of the Law; in their sphere as well as in their spirit: the one being mainly in the outward frame of nature, "signs from heaven;" the other in the bodies and outward estate of men.

To apply these principles; let it be observed, that the preaching of the gospel to the poor is mentioned along with the miracles of our Lord, as constituting part of the evidences of His Messiahship. It was certainly not a miracle in the same sense as opening the eyes

of the blind, and giving life to the dead ; yet it resembled a miracle, in being a striking departure from the established customs of mankind, and especially from the customs of those teachers who were in the highest esteem among the Jews. The practice of the Pharisees was to teach the common people, as Gideon "taught" the men of Succoth, with thorns and briars, with rites and ceremonies very grievous to be borne; holding, perhaps, like their modern successors, that ignorance is the mother of devotion, that is, devotion to priests and ecclesiastical masters. The feeling of their hearts was, "This people, which knoweth not the law, are cursed," fit only to be squeezed, crushed, plucked and puled. But these common people heard Jesus gladly: the voice of tenderness sounded strangely in their ears, sympathy with their sorrows evoked the better feelings of their nature, and they were led captive in chains of affectionate respect by Him whom the Pharisees despised. No wonder that it had the effect of persuading them that there was something extraordinary and celestial in the Person and Mission of the lovely Nazarene. It had never before been so seen in Israel: the records of history, immemorial tradition afforded no parallel. Great men had condescended to receive the admiration and applause of the undistinguished multitude; they were willing to use them as means and instruments in the acquisition of wealth or power; but they knew nothing and cared nothing for their sorrows, their temptations, their ceaseless struggles, their miserable lives and unlamented deaths. Good men there had been, who had not refused some words of consolation and encouragement. But here was one, whose very vocation it was to proclaim glad tidings to the poor, the poor in health, in estate, in the furniture of the mind, in that righteousness which hides the nakedness of the soul, adorns it and makes it beautiful to God, in that peace and joy and hope, without which life is a weariness, and death but the entrance into a wider and deeper sphere of degradation and despair. Was it strange that they should ask. "Is not this the Christ?" How glorious the contrast with those who boasted that they were the peculiar people of the Lord!

Now as Christ was, so are His people in this world. They have been organized into a visible church on earth, for the very purpose of proclaiming glad tidings to the poor; to instruct, to encourage, to comfort all who need instruction, comfort and encouragement; the doing of this work is their testimonial to the world that they are Christ's, and just in proportion as they do this great thing, faithfully, earnestly and constantly, do they show themselves to be His. The Church's whole work is comprehended in this, and all her furniture and armour given her of God to make and maintain her conquests, have reference to this end. The poor she has always with her, and will have till the coming of the Lord: the poor within her own pale, the immense masses of the poor all around her in the world that lies in wickedness, bankrupt in knowledge, righteousness and liberty, under the curse of God. This is the grand object of

her Home Missions, her Foreign Missions, of all her schemes of benevolence. Hereby shall the world believe that she is sent of God.

Thus far the term "poor" has been considered in its large sense, as including those who are destitute of that which constitutes the true riches of human nature, as well as the poor in worldly goods. But it is evident that, whether we consider our Saviour's statement as evidence merely, or as revealing the nature of His mission, it must have special reference to the "poor of this world," the poor with respect to this world. The evidence of miracles was *sensible* evidence: it was addressed to the senses; and the evidence afforded by the preaching of the Gospel to the poor, it should seem, must have been of the same sort: a visible preaching to the visible poor. If, on the other hand, we consider this statement as an illustration of the spirit and nature of our Lord's ministry, the same conclusion is reached. His disposition and ability to heal the diseases and infirmities of the soul, were indicated by His disposition and ability to heal the diseases and infirmities of the body. Some of these infirmities affected the whole body, others only certain parts and organs: sometimes sensation was destroyed, sometimes the power of motion: here there was a case of partial, there a case of total paralysis. But all these affections of the body, whether general or specific, adumbrated the morbid conditions of man's immortal part; and the power to cure the one, was proof of power to cure the other. The connection between the two is sometimes beautifully brought out, as, for example, in the healing of the paralytic who was let down through the roof. "Whether is easier to *say*, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to *say*, Arise, and walk?" It was doubtless easy for any man to *say* either; but to do either was impossible to all. It was easy for the Saviour to say both, and do both; for with Him, it is only to "speak and it is done, to command and it standeth fast." But the grand difference was, that the doing of the one was visible to men, the doing of the other, not. He adds, therefore, "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy) Arise, &c." The seen became witness for the reality of the unseen. It should seem, then, that the harmony of the statement required, that the poverty referred to should be literal poverty as to the outward estate, as the blindness and lameness were real affections of the body. If it should be said, that, in this case, congruity required that the Lord should have made these poor rich in this world's goods, as He gave bodily vision to the blind, the answer will be found in the very able paper read by Dr. Chalmers before the Royal Institute of France, on 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."

This view of the passage has been the more earnestly insisted upon, because it is alleged in defence of splendid churches from which the poor are practically excluded, that our Saviour refers here, as Isaiah did in the prediction concerning Him from which the

phrase is borrowed, to the spiritually poor; and that, as the rich are often among the poorest in this respect, the condition is fulfilled in preaching, even exclusively, to them. But in addition to what has been said, let it be remembered that the majority of Christ's people are poor in this world, that they are poor in the sense of being subject to affliction and temptation, that they are in pressing need of the glad tidings to console and animate them, and that *these* poor are excluded from such churches. They live in lanes and alleys, and cannot be allowed to confess their sins with those who live in avenues.

The preaching of the Gospel to the poor of this world, we are therefore warranted in asserting, is at once an evidence of its divine origin and a glorious illustration of its nature and design. It is a remedy for sin, and all the evils which have followed in its train, personal, social, temporal and eternal evils. It is a grand scheme of restoration, provided for man by the Eternal God, illustrated in its tendencies, by the effects of the Saviour's personal ministry on earth, and by the ministry of the church, so far as she has apprehended aright her true mission and faithfully labored to perform it; destined to be fully and gloriously illustrated, when its divine Author shall return to earth, and the tabernacle of God shall dwell with men, and He shall be their God, and they shall be His people, and there shall be no more pain, nor sickness, nor sorrow, and He shall wipe away all tears from their eyes. A consummation which the whole creation has long groaned for, which modern philosophy has endeavored to achieve in vain, which has fired the imaginations of poets and nerved the arms of philanthropists, but a consummation which has been reserved to grace the triumph of the Man of Sorrows, the Second Adam, the Lord from Heaven. The true posture of the Church, if she would be a witness and an earnest of this restoration, her highest duty is manifest from this view of the subject. "As the larger portion of mankind will ever be found in the classes of neglected and restricted education, to despair of the poor and of the many, is virtually to despair of the well-being of the race." So did not Jesus Christ. "Unlike all others who despised the people, despaired of them, He addresses himself to the poor and the ignorant. It is the mass of the nation He hopes first to reach. But what are His arts of persuasion with the people? Does He hold out the lure of wealth, or earthly honors, or pleasure? Is He slipping the leash of law and order from the passions of the multitude, and cheering them on to the prey that is before them in the possessions of the wealthy? He honestly assures His auditory that they must expect to lose all in following Him, that His poorest followers must become yet poorer, and that His disciples are doomed men, bearing their own crosses on the way to death. He writes no books. He forms no plots. He meddles not with political strife; nor interferes with religious sects, but to denounce them all, and to turn their combined enmity on His single and unsheltered head. And the weapon by which He

is to foil all His enemies, and to subdue the world to the obedience of the faith, is,—hear it, O heavens, and be astonished, O earth;—the foolishness of preaching—the plain tale of man to his fellow-men concerning God and His Christ. By the preaching of the word, and especially to the poor, Christ is come to change the face of society. Jesus Christ was, indeed, the discoverer of these two great truths, that all reformations must begin with the lower classes, and that preaching is the grand instrument of changing the opinions of a nation. The latter had indeed been used in the older dispensation, but its applicability to such a scheme as that of the world's conversion, had never been suspected. Yet how well established are both now become. The man, who in endeavoring to heat a mass of water, should build his fire above the fluid, would in physics be but as absurdly employed, as the man who in morals looks to the highest points of a corrupt society as the first to be reformed. As in the heated liquid, the lower stratum when warmed passes upward, and gives place to another still cold, which in its turn is penetrated with heat, and then displaced by the descending of yet another; so in the moral world, the only efficient reforms are the reforms that begin at the lower portion of society, and work upward. It was so in the first preaching of the Gospel. It was so in the English Reformation. It was so in the religious influence that followed the labors of Wesley and Whitefield. And Jesus Christ first discovered and first applied this great but simple principle, that to the poor the Gospel should be preached.”*

To the poor the Gospel is to be *preached*. We do not underrate the importance of the press as an instrument in the diffusion of the words of eternal life; we rejoice in those winged messengers which fly through the length and breadth of our country, and silently alight in the abodes of the ignorant and degraded; but the spirit of the living creature is in the winged words, spoken with all the accompaniments of manner, and the adaptation to the state of persons addressed, which are necessary to make them effectual. “A word spoken upon its wheels (Prov. 25: 11, in the margin) is like apples of gold in pictures of silver;” the spirit of the living creature is in the wheels. A tract has but one voice to utter, and if that utterance happens to be unsuited to the case of the person who reads, there is no help for it. “As vinegar upon nitre, so is he that singeth songs to a heavy heart.” Whether the reader be a conscience-smitten, penitent sinner, who is thirsting for peace and consolation, or a hardened reprobate, or a cavilling sophist, or a sincere inquirer after truth, the tract

* Williams' *Miscellanies*, p. 229. The Author in a note, quotes the following extract from the correspondence of Voltaire with D'Alembert, to show how the “Father of the Faithful” (Infidels) regarded the masses. Would that the infidels of the present day would let the “rabble” alone! “Let us bless this happy revolution, that has within the last fifteen or twenty years taken place in the minds of all respectable people (*tous les honnêtes gens.*) It has outrun my hopes. *As to the rabble, I meddle not with them; the rabble they will always remain. I am at pains to cultivate my garden, but yet it will have its toads; they should not however prevent my nightingales from singing.*”

or book knows not. The living minister can change his voice, and in the name of God, proclaim the thunders of the law, or whisper the sweet promises of the Gospel, as the nature of the case may require. The tract has no power to demand or to entreat the attention; it may lie long or lie forever upon the shelf. Not so the word conveyed by the living preacher. And then there are thousands of the poor who cannot read; and the tract is a dumb messenger to them. The living minister is the cheapest of all instrumentalities; he is many books in one, can travel farther and last longer than any book or tract. In short, the *preaching* of the Gospel, the rightly dividing of the word of truth, giving to each his portion in due season, this is the ordinance of God for the salvation of men; it has the birth-right and is entitled to the blessing; it was before writing, before printing in the order of time; it is before them now in point of power and efficiency. With all the ceaseless working of the press, and the millions of pages it showers upon the world, the necessity is importunate as ever, for prayer to the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth more laborers into His harvest.

Among the poor that have a special claim upon our regard, are those who crowd our cities. It was in the towns and cities of the Holy Land, that our Saviour chiefly exercised His ministry. Towns and cities were, for centuries, the strongholds of Christianity, as the term *pagan* bears witness. They are the great centres of influence, the hearts whose pulsations are felt to the very extremities of the social body, the foci in which all human activities of mind and body burn most fiercely, where the highest virtue and the deepest vice are alike to be found; the great fountains of good, the prolific sources of all monstrous, all prodigious things, abominable, unutterable. Who can fail to perceive, that they are the great missionary fields? That the obligation resting upon the church to take possession of them, is immense and superlative? The encouragement to do so, is also great. When men are congregated in great numbers, the same amount of labor will tell more widely and powerfully, than when expended upon a scattered rural population; and if the blessing of God should accompany these labours, and genuine conversions take place, the same intense activity which pervades all things else, and which produces such a rapid development of character in all departments of human life, will be felt also in the church, and in the development of Christian character.

Finally, this subject appeals to us as lovers of our country and its free institutions. The best method in which we can "widen the area of freedom," is that of widening the area of religion, of the fear of God, among that vast multitude which constitutes the basis of the State. To extend our institutions without extending the knowledge and character upon which they rest, is to commit the folly of building wider than the foundation. The great dangers which beset us, are superstition and infidelity; a superstition in intimate alliance with political tyranny; are infidelity, in intimate alliance with political

is of t' centiousness. An intelligent and cordial reverence of the Word of God, and intelligent and ardent love of regulated liberty, a liberty regulated by law, a law free enough to allow the amplest scope for the development of all that is good and true and noble and exalted in our nature, strong and stringent enough to restrain and hinder all that is bad and false and low,—these will enable us to steer clear of Sylla and Charybdis. But it is among the poor that the elements of mischief are chiefly to be found. It is low down beneath the surface of the earth, those fierce fires are kindled, which finally flame out at the summit of the volcano, and spread their desolations over the surrounding plains, sleeping in the sunshine and unconscious of their danger. The reign of terror was the outbreak of what had been long smothered in the secret clubs of Paris. And what nests of sedition, revolution and anarchy may now exist among us, who knoweth? The Gospel of the Prince of Righteousness and Peace, is a remedy for all.

HISTORICAL FACTS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE ORIGIN OF THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, BALTIMORE.

The facts relating to the connection of one of the conductors of this paper with the "Associate Reformed Congregation" of Baltimore, (formerly the charge of Dr. Duncan) and the formation of the Central Presbyterian Church, which grew out of that connection—having not only been extensively misapprehended in this city, but also most egregiously misrepresented in one or more public prints,—we have thought it advisable, at once to present the true state of the case, and at the same time to give permanency to papers which may have historic value in future, by publishing the documents relating to the matter without any other comment, than simply such statement by way of explanation as is absolutely necessary to a proper understanding of the papers.

In January, 1852, the Session, through one of the Elders, addressed to Rev. S. Robinson a request to visit the Congregation, accompanied with an explanation of the position of the Congregation. The invitation was promptly declined by him on the ground of his unwillingness to take charge of a congregation in such position. In May following, while visiting Dr. Plumer, on his way to the General Assembly at Charleston, at the invitation of the Session, he supplied their pulpit two Sabbaths. After reaching Charleston, he received the following letter and invitation to become "stated supply" of the Congregation.

(Duplicate.)

BALTIMORE, May 22nd, 1852.

Rev. Stuart Robinson, Charleston, S. C.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:—We have the pleasure to enclose you copies of a series of Resolutions which were passed at an unusually large meeting of the Associate Reformed Church of Baltimore, held in the Church on Wednesday evening last; by reference to which you will be informed that it is the unanimous and hearty desire of the people of that church that you should assume in the manner and under the terms of the accompanying resolutions, the pastoral charge thereof, as "Stated Supply," being a relation, we understand, you may hold towards them without interfering with the connexion which you desire to retain with the Presbyterian Church.

The duty of making the invitation you will see devolves upon the Session of the Church. The matter was laid before that body yesterday, and they have appointed the undersigned to prepare and forward to you such invitation. In pursuance of this duty, we do hereby earnestly and affectionately invite and desire you to take the spiritual charge of the Associate Reformed Congregation of Baltimore; and we promise you in behalf of the Session, and people of the Church, all proper support and encouragement in the discharge of your duties.

The Congregation, desiring that you may be free from worldly care, have provided for your maintenance a salary of three thousand dollars per annum, which will be paid to you in such manner as may be agreeable.

We avail ourselves of the occasion to assure you that these proceedings have been adopted by our people with entire unanimity, and that there exists, not only among them, but also among a large portion of this community, an earnest hope that you will not decline the "call." We need scarcely say that individually we look with great interest for a favorable response, and in that event shall welcome you not only as one who will be eminently useful as a minister of our Lord Jesus Christ, but as a friend, who has become already endeared to us.

COPY.

Whereas, this Congregation has under consideration the expediency of inviting to take the pastoral charge thereof, the Rev. Stuart Robinson, who is at this time a minister of the Presbyterian Church, and differing with them in some of their views of doctrine and practice, and it is desirable and proper that a clear and full understanding shall exist with both parties as to the positions they shall occupy, and the course they shall pursue, respectively, as Pastor and people, should such relation be formed, therefore, with the view to express the sentiments in relation thereto, on the part of this Congregation,—

Be it Resolved, That the relation that shall exist between the Pastor and this people will be considered as a "Stated Supply," as understood in the Presbyterian Church; with the understanding, however, that all the duties belonging to the Pastoral office shall virtually be discharged by him, and in accordance therewith he shall, by courtesy, preside, in ordinary cases, in meetings of the Session.

Resolved, That it is entirely acceptable to this Congregation that the relations of Mr. Robinson to the Presbyterian Church may continue the same as they now exist, before his connexion with us—it being also understood that this Congregation will continue independent, and disconnected from any other ecclesiastical organization, as at present: *the question, however, as to the future course of the Congregation may be considered an open one, and the Pastor will be at liberty to express his opinions and views, on the subject, on suitable occasions, if he should be so disposed, and such course shall not be considered by us as unfair, or in violation of any confidence reposed in him.*

Resolved, That the Rev. Mr. Robinson shall be considered free and untrammelled in preaching God's Word, and in administering the ordinances of the Gospel, according to his own convictions of truth and duty; and at liberty to adopt and carry out such plans for the religious education of the young people—for the edification of the Church—for the promoting Christ's cause by the spread of the Gospel, as he may deem advisable in the circumstances of the Congregation; the people being at the same

time at liberty to sustain, or not, as they may think proper, his peculiar views and measures, on these or any other subjects; and the decision as to time and propriety, or expediency, of public collections in the Congregation to be left at all times to the proper officers of the Church.

Resolved, That this meeting, being well satisfied of the ministerial qualifications of the Revd. Stuart Robinson of Kentucky—believing that his ministrations in the Gospel will be profitable to our spiritual interests—and trusting in his good sense, candor, and piety—does hereby request the Session of this Church to invite him to take the spiritual charge thereof in the Lord, as “Stated Supply,” as that relation is understood in the Presbyterian Church, with the understanding that all pastoral functions will be discharged by him.

Resolved, That the salary of the Pastor be fixed at the rate of three thousand dollars per annum.

True Copy from the Minutes of the Meeting.

Test, ROBERT H. LOWRY, Secretary.

Having signified his acceptance of this invitation, Mr. R. obtained a release from his pastoral charge in Kentucky, and a letter of dismission to the Presbytery of Baltimore, and entered upon his duties as Stated Supply of the “Associate Reformed Congregation” early in September, 1852. After laboring there some six months, in March 1853, he delivered a discourse to the people on the duty of the Church to labor for her own expansion as taught in the parables of Jesus Christ. After presenting the general subject, the discourse concluded with the following observations touching the position of the congregation. We are enabled to give them just as they were delivered; for with a view to avoid any misunderstanding, this portion of the discourse was written down, and was delivered from the manuscript:

But let us not rest satisfied with an application merely to the Church at large. Is this picture of Christ's kingdom realized here?—*in this Church?* If not, why? Does any one dispute the correctness of the drawing from the Parables? If so, then I pray you,—go home and examine them—study them—and compare them with Christ's other teachings to the same effect. I do not ask you to examine merely as an opinion; but as of personal and practical duty. But if not realized, why? Partly—chiefly—because of our unfaithfulness as individuals;—will you allow me in candor and faithfulness to say—partly from our very position as a Church.

It was your own proposition in your call to me—that I should not only be untrammelled to preach, &c., but that I should be free to discuss with you your position as a Church. You will bear me witness that neither publicly nor privately have I availed myself of that right since I have been among you. I came among you in great doubt and perplexity, without seeing my way clear any further than the single point—to go—and like him of Old going out from “Ur of the Chaldees”—I literally knew not whither I went, at least so far as concerned my purpose or policy. I have thought the question of your ecclesiastical relation a question of form merely, about which I have had no zeal whatever, if it hampered me not in preaching the Gospel and working in the vineyard for the spread of the Word. As incidental difficulties of form and order arose, I have discussed them candidly and kindly with your representatives—the Elders and Trustees;—and met in a spirit of kindness and candor they have been easily arranged. So far as your Church order is concerned I find it essentially the same as that under which I have been brought up—I minister here and rule here to the letter, as I have always done while a pastor of one of our own Churches. I find that in many cases you differ from my views—but that I have ever been accustomed to. It is so in all Churches—especially Presbyterian Churches, where people are taught to think for themselves and to speak what they think. I am under every conceivable obligation to your warm hearted kindness—which I also have been always accustomed to;—and which in your case has been so marked as to have in a greater degree than I supposed possible, made me even among strangers, feel some compensation for the sundering of old ties of long growth.

Now that I see difficulties beginning to perplex our relations, I feel it to be the best testimonial of my worthiness of your kindness and confidence, to state them frankly and freely to you.

The views presented from these parables of the duty of Church expansion, and Church effort for the spread of truth, are with me no mere theories, but practical points of duty—which I hold myself and every other christian responsible in their measure to carry out. I have no right to expect the Divine blessing to attend my labors in the Church—so long as I and my Church are unfaithful in the discharge of plain duty.

I have been urging these duties upon you—in connection with the development of these parables from time to time;—and many of you have already engaged in an effort to realize them. We have recognised our obligation to have the Gospel given to the poor around us,—first by the effort to establish a School among them. Of course the obligation felt to go that far, will lead further. In order to give efficiency to our efforts, a mission for the instruction of destitute parts of the city must necessarily grow out of any real and permanent carrying out the principles of Christ's parables. In short, it is a plain proposition to me, that a large Church—in a rapidly growing city, is under obligation to exert itself and do its full share in the work of evangelizing not only by colonizing other Churches—but laboring “in the streets and lanes of the city.”

Out of the applications of these general views have grown the perplexities of which I have spoken. They have occurred to me only recently, and have only grown upon me as I have, in my usual way, talked of them freely to some of the officers of the Church.

In order to present the subject more clearly—allow me to take the case of our present Mission School Enterprise,—as an illustration of what must constantly occur—for this is but one of a dozen forms of the difficulty.

We have succeeded in a Sabbath School—and a field opens, for much good. A benevolent gentleman proposes to provide the ground if we will build. I have already in response to that offer called upon you, from the pulpit, to contribute the funds.—Even at the time of making that call, the difficulties of which I speak had not distinctly occurred to me;—nor until I thought of this as the beginning of a system of operations in Missions. The very success of the School implies the establishing of a Church—the people cannot come here for the ministrations of the Gospel—the Church is already full large for proper pastoral care; besides this there are various other obstacles to such a course. Hence the question naturally arises—as in fact it has risen in the minds of many who have thought of aiding the work—under what protection shall the funds be, and with what declared purpose? Under whose care shall the mission be and the Church be founded? Now there are three propositions which obviously exhaust this subject:—

1. Either it shall follow the Church and faith of the Pastor who has urged on the work—under trustees' holding for his Church,—
2. Or it shall follow the Church, by their trustees, who have contributed to it—or a Board of Trustees holding for them,—
3. Or it shall follow neither—but stand simply as a separate enterprise under the guidance and control of those who may from time to time take an interest in it.

In regard to the first—as things now stand, I shall of course, not urge you to contribute funds to a mission—with a purpose on my part hereafter to turn over the results of your work to my Church. I am zealous for Presbyterianism,—but have none of the sort of zeal that seeks to steal a Church mission—or entrap any one into my connection. We are not authorised to entrap people in from the highways and hedges—but to compel them, by strong argument and urgent entreaty. I do not recognise, nor does my Church, the morality of that sort of ecclesiastical chicanery, that proselytism in some latitudes seems to justify. And I make the stand I do just here for the very reason, that in the delicacy of my position I might give color, in some shape or degree, to the insinuation, which ecclesiastical moralists, of a certain school, naturally enough make, touching others,—since they recognise the principle themselves as all fair—that I perverted funds from the purpose of the donors—that under guise of zeal for the poor, I got your funds into my sect.

2. Shall the Mission Church be under Trustees held for this Congregation? Here rises a very grave question—the great question:—Are we ready to establish a sect? For such this idea implies. The Churches so planted gradually must grow up either as parishes of this, as metropolitan, its pastor the Bishop—or form a Presbytery—or its practical equivalent, an Association. This suits neither me—nor you—Not me;—for I have neither the right nor the wish to head a schism in the Church.—Not only am I *Ex Animo* a Presbyterian, but,—what is called “*Jure Divino*.” That is, I believe that Christ and His Apostles have laid down a form of government, and this is that form. But were I not—I have no desire to head a sect. Toward every one of the 2060 ministers of my Church I feel the kindest and strongest attachment. To a

large number of them personally—to all of them officially—I am under the highest obligations. Uniformly have they treated me more kindly and esteemed me far more highly than I deserved.

Even if I felt any dissatisfaction with my Church connection, I should long hesitate—before I cut myself off from a relation that enables me speak to all parts of the world—press my opinions and get for them a hearing through such a Church—to stand alone even in the centre of a clique.

Neither does it suit you to become formally and permanently a sect. It is a much graver matter than most people think,—very grave if Christ have established a Church. I believe in sects—but not in sects without an idea and a reason. Just as politically—“When in the course of human events,” &c., so in religion. If there is reason—some great truth to be developed or maintained—I believe it may be just as important there should be Methodists, as Presbyterians. But you will find some one great idea of the Gospel peculiarly represented in each. You however have now no such great idea—though your fathers may have thought they had such an one as to justify withdrawal and holding off as one Church; but not to become a sect. They believed they had a mission—to show that when, as they thought, mere power and influence undertook to crush a man for not conforming to their requirements—his people should stand up and say *he shall not be crushed*. They have executed that mission, and they did all they aimed at. I do not see that you now stand off on any great idea. Still I have been content to waive that question—even though I might think it a mere notion of yours. But while I do that, you perceive it is obviously a new and different question, when it comes to propagate notionalism. This I cannot, in conscience, aid you in doing.

3. Shall the Mission effort be left under such Board as may choose to look after it? This I cannot assent to. I cannot ask Christian people to give funds, with no guarantee against perversion. It is a remarkable fact—that the bone and sinew of nearly all the heresy and infidelity now in the Christian world, is religious funds perverted from their original purpose. I want no body to contribute money to a purpose, where there is a likelihood their funds will be perverted, and used against the very truth they are intended to promote; and to hire men to sow tares—funds which may be used to pervert your own children. This is a grave and solemn question.

Such are some of the difficulties of the subject. Shall we avoid them by doing nothing?—Neither does this suit either me or you. If my view of the duty of the Church is correct—we are bound to see that so far as we can do it—the poor have the Gospel preached and the Church extend. If when I preach, my preaching does not tend to cause the Gospel to be sent to the highways and hedges—I must go to the highways and hedges myself—So the servants in the parable, “when they all began to make excuse.” Wo! is me if I preach not the Gospel—and as Christ preached it. To be quietly shut up to preach within one set of four walls,—to those who not only “begin every man to make excuse”—but for a life time repeat the excuse;—to become a salaried performer for the Sunday entertainment of an unfaithful and duty refusing people—however it might be the necessity of some worn out servant of God—is certainly not the duty of a minister in the prime and vigor of health, while the cry is coming from streets and lanes—“Come help us.” It will not suit you—if you value the spiritual interests of your friends and kindred. It is a very clear principle of the divine economy, that duty neglected by the Church shall leave the Church without power from on high. Duty neglected obscures truth—and truth dishonored, power from on high withdraws.

Such are some of the perplexities which I find surrounding me. I state these perplexities to you just as they have arisen in my own mind. My desire is that you may look at the various bearings of this matter—candidly—closely—prayerfully. There are solemn and important interests involved in this matter. You that have families and that know the importance of fixed and settled Church relations—need not be reminded that these questions affect very widely your children. It is too grave a matter to allow mere impulses of prejudice—pride—or passion to control its decision. It will give me very little trouble, so far as concerns myself, to hear my motives impugned. I have discharged a solemn duty to you and to myself by expressing fully my convictions. I shall make no hasty move, nor do I desire any present change in my relations toward you. I speak thus early of tendencies which I see clearly, in order to enable you to provide in time for them. I shall feel that I owe it to your kindness to render you every aid in carrying out your purposes, whatever they may be. All I desire is that you may do what is most for God’s glory—and that I may be free to aid in expanding the Church.

On the following Sabbath a notice was sent to be read from the pulpit, announcing a meeting of the Congregation to be held the ensuing week, (March 23d, at 8 o'clock, P. M.) After reading the notice Mr. R. remarked: "Though I am not officially informed, yet unofficially I have been made acquainted with the purpose of this meeting of the Congregation. That purpose being to consider the matter brought to your notice in my discourse of last Sabbath, in the form of a proposition to settle me fully as pastor, I feel unwilling that any of you in the decision of so important a matter should be embarrassed in giving your votes by *seeming* to vote against me—and to send me away. Without thereby intending at once to cease my labors among you, if you desire me still to act as your Supply, I resign the position to which you called me in May last, that you may be as free to act in the matter, as though that call had not been given."

In accordance with this public announcement to the Congregation, the following letter of resignation was also addressed to the Session of the Church:

COPY.

BALTIMORE, March 19th, 1853.

To the Session of The Associate Reformed Congregation, Baltimore.

By a nearly unanimous vote of the Congregation which you represent, in May last I was invited to take charge of the Congregation as "Stated Supply," discharging virtually the duties of Pastor. In that invitation it was set forth as the understanding of all concerned that while neither I nor the Congregation changed any ecclesiastical relations by this arrangement, "the question as to the future course of the Congregation may be considered an open one, and the Pastor will be at liberty to express his opinions and views on the subject on suitable occasions, if he should be so disposed; and such course shall not be considered by us as unfair, or in violation of any confidence reposed in him."

So long as the position of the Church was not found seriously to embarrass my labors for the cause of Christ, I have not felt it worth while either publicly or privately to trouble the people with it.

But now that after laboring among you during the more active half of a year, the Congregation has been collected together, and the time has come in my opinion for some aggressive movement to spread and extend our influence, I begin to feel myself embarrassed in almost every aspect of my work as a minister.

On last Sabbath I felt called upon to set forth to the people the difficulties of the isolated position of the Congregation, as they bear upon the great question of extending the means of religious instruction to the poor around us in this growing city. I selected this one instance merely by way of illustrating the subject. In many other points of view I see a tendency to other difficulties still more embarrassing to me as a minister standing in so peculiar a relation to a congregation not in connection with any religious denomination. If for instance, I look forward to colonizing from our already very large and powerful Church, to make room for gathering in more, nearly all the difficulties pointed out last Sabbath touching the Mission School, with additional difficulties peculiar to this, at once present themselves. Our people having no connection or affinity with other Presbyterian Churches, cannot unite their force with some other, as is usual, and aid and assist in building and establishing another Church.

Hence the only hope of successful colonizing would be the withdrawal of an amount of strength from our Church alone sufficient to sustain a new Church enterprise—and that probably only under the Pastor himself. Or whether or not under the Pastor—either the old Congregation or the new, is exposed to a renewal of all the trouble of past times in procuring a Pastor. And should I feel called upon to lead off a colony, I should lay myself liable to the charge of deserting the body that remained, leaving them weakened, to increased trouble in securing the settlement of a Pastor—and thereby give color of justice to the complaints that would naturally arise.

Not however to go into detail of the various aspects in which these prospective difficulties present themselves—I may say in short, that the more I have been led to consider the subject, and discuss it with one or two of your body—the more the difficulties in prospect increase upon me—and the more fully satisfied have I become that candor and justice to the Congregation require of me to say at once, that I do not think it possible, that under the present relation as “Stated Supply” to a Congregation out of connection with the Church of which I am a minister, either I or you can fully discharge our obligation to Jesus Christ the Head of the Church. If the Congregation could feel at liberty to put itself in connection with the Baltimore Presbytery, so as to be in a position to call me and have me installed the permanent Pastor of it, I should so far as at present advised, be strongly disposed to settle permanently among them. As this connection with Presbytery involves practically little more control of Presbytery over you than it already has in its control of me—while the want of such connection operates practically so much embarrassment in our relations:—as this connection does not affect in any degree the right of private judgment of the members of the Congregation—nor restrain them in the expression of their opinion in favor of independency; nor so far as I can see involve any question of Church property—I do not feel that they make any great sacrifice beyond that made in calling me a year ago. If however, they think otherwise, let us part in kindness and peace. For my part I shall carry with me the warmest regard for you all and leave my best wishes for God’s blessing upon you. I cannot but avail myself of this opportunity to express to you and through you to the people, my high sense of their abounding kindness to me, since I came among them a stranger. It is not from any sense of the least injury or unkindness from any one of all your large number—nor in accordance with, but altogether in violence to my own personal feelings and comfort—simply from a strong and clear conviction of duty, that I take the step I now propose.

Therefore with a view to relieve the people of all embarrassment—free to act and decide without even an apparent unkindness to me, in seeming to vote for my removal, should they vote against my being called as permanent Pastor, with the condition implied in that call—I hereby resign the position to which you called me in May last, placing you, so far as any relation to me is concerned, as you were before that call was given. In order however to avoid as far as possible any immediate inconvenience to the Congregation from want of a Supply for the pulpit, I shall hold myself in readiness to serve the people at the request of the Session, as a Supply for so many Sabbaths as may be deemed necessary by them, and compatible with my own private affairs.

Yours truly,

Signed, S. ROBINSON.

To R. H. LOWRY, Esq., *Secretary of Session.*

At the meeting held on the 23d March, Mr. A. K. Mantz offered the following resolutions, which were rejected, and a vote to accept the resignation adopted by a vote of 60 to 41.

Whereas, this Congregation desires to have the Revd. Stuart Robinson settled among them as their Pastor permanently; and whereas in his view such relation cannot be formed with the Congregation, while it retains its present position; and whereas the members of the Congregation are willing, reserving to themselves the right of private judgment touching points of doctrine and Church government, in which they may differ from the Presbyterian Church; to place the Congregation under the care of the Baltimore Presbytery, with a view to calling Mr. Robinson as their Pastor—therefore be it

Resolved, That the Session of the Church be and they are hereby instructed, to request the Baltimore Presbytery, if in view of the foregoing statements they are willing to receive this Congregation into their connection.

Resolved, That a call be made out and signed by the Elders of the Church in the usual form, to the Rev. Stuart Robinson to become the Pastor of this Church.

In accordance with these proceedings the Session made the following reply to Mr. R.’s letter of resignation :

BALTIMORE, March 28th, 1853.

Revd. Stuart Robinson, *Baltimore.*

REVD. AND DEAR SIR:—I have been directed to inform you that your communication

of the 19th inst. addressed to the Session of the Associate Reformed Congregation, resigning your office of "Stated Supply" to the Church, and stating your reasons for so doing, was received, and laid before a meeting of the Congregation held on the evening of the 23d inst. It having been first decided that the Congregation would maintain its present independent position, your resignation was accepted.

I am also directed by the Session to express to you the deep regret and sorrow that is felt by them, and by the Congregation generally, that your connexion with them should have been thus terminated, and that any difference in views should have arisen to interrupt that harmony and love that appeared to exist, and to destroy the work of enlarged usefulness that was opening to both Pastor and people, in the cause of their Lord and Master. * * * * *

On the following Sabbath morning a notice was sent to Mr. R. to be read from the pulpit, announcing that Dr. Stockton would supply the pulpit on the following Sabbath.

A portion of the Congregation, embracing eighty-five communicants, remonstrating against Mr. R.'s leaving the city, proposed to withdraw and organize a New Presbyterian Church with Mr. R. as pastor, under the care of Baltimore Presbytery. Some \$27,000 was immediately subscribed towards the erection of a suitable edifice, and the new Church organized with eighty-five members, and Mr. Robinson installed as Pastor by the Presbytery of Baltimore at the ensuing Spring meeting in April.

The Congregation thus organized worshipped in the New Assembly Rooms until April, 1855, and then removed to their new edifice at the corner of Saratoga and Liberty Streets. The Church having meantime increased to 205 communicants.

[For The Critic.]

STATISTICS OF BAPTISM IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

SINCE the publication of the Minutes of the last General Assembly, a number of curious items have been gathered from the Statistical Tables, by persons skilled in such exercises, and have been sent the rounds of the papers for the edification of the church. It being one of the objects of this Periodical to call attention to existing facts and doings in the church, we have taken the trouble to look somewhat closely into the statistics of Baptism, especially of infants,—a sacrament, which, according to our excellent and churchly standards, "doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ,"—and we deem it of far more importance that the Church should know to what extent this holy ordinance is observed or neglected, than that she should know which are the largest Synods, or who have the largest churches.

In a church with a genius and constitution like our own, the Baptism or non-Baptism of the children of the Church, may be safely taken as an index of her internal vital state, at least in certain

very important respects. From the relation in which our Confession of Faith makes baptized children to stand to the Church and the covenant of grace, we are warranted in regarding Infant Baptism as the pulse by which to test the soundness of the Church, according to the laws of her own peculiar life. Just in proportion as Infant Baptism falls into disuse, is it a sign that *something* is wrong. It is an evidence that the Church is proving false to her organic constitution and life; is sliding away from her own standards; is loosing from her ancient moorings. Now, if this be true, the statistics of the Church for the present year, may well excite serious inquiry, if not alarm. From an examination of them, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that in certain portions, and those the oldest, and in some respects most important portions of the Presbyterian Church, infant baptism is sadly *undervalued* and *neglected*.

The method we shall take to set forth this matter, will be to give the proportional number of baptisms (of infants) during the year to the number of communicants reported in the several Synods; as also in some of the Presbyteries and churches. We prefer to take the Synods for our leading estimates, because of the more extended results which will thereby be secured, and the diminished liability of doing injustice in particular cases. We will give no fractions of numbers, but chose the round number *nearest* the actual proportion in each case.

The proportional number of infant baptisms in the entire church, for the present year, compared with the number of communicants reported, is as 1 to 20. For 1854 it is as 1 to 19: for 1853 the same; for 1852 as 1 to 20: for 1851 the same. Here is uniformity of result; which is a desirable discovery in view of the statements we have yet to make. What the actual proportion *should be* of baptisms during the year to the number of communicants, we have no extended means at hand of ascertaining; though we are disposed to think that the ratios here exhibited, are not *far* wrong. In the congregation to which the writer ministers, numbering two hundred communicants, in one of the oldest regions of Presbyterianism, where the law of progress drags heavily, the number of infants *born* and *baptized* during the space of four years, holds the average yearly proportion to the number of communicants of 1 to 17. In but a small portion of our congregations would the births be fewer, in the great majority they would be more numerous. And besides, in almost all congregations there are a number of baptisms during the year, which do not fall under this rule of reckoning. In the congregation above named, there have been twenty-five of this kind in the four years. So that although the ratios alone ascertained for the whole church, may not be alarmingly out of the way (allowing for omissions in reports) yet we think the proportion of baptisms to communicants, is undoubtedly less than it should be. But it is with the details which go to make up this average that we have specially to do, in the present article—and we hope the church will give attention. Our statements will reveal the fact that in those portions

of the Church where she is pursuing to advantage her law of *aggression*, and securing a large number of converts from the unbaptized world, (which naturally secures an increase in the baptism of children) there the number of infant baptisms is very large, and the above ratios thus secured ; whilst in the older portions of the Church (with some exceptions,) where the law of *growth* must be relied upon, mainly for the perpetuity of Presbyterianism, there the number of infant baptisms is fewest ; and the ordinance must be falling (unless some explanation can be given) into lamentable and perilous neglect. A statement of the ratio of baptisms to communicants in the several Synods will show this. In the Synod of Albany, it is as 1 to 36 : in the Synod of Buffalo, as 1 to 27 : Synod of N. York, 1 to 19 ; Synod of New Jersey, 1 to 25 ; Synod of Philadelphia, 1 to 20 ; Synod of Baltimore, 1 to 18 ; Synod of Pittsburg, 1 to 15 ; Synod of Alleghany, 1 to 12 ; Synod of Wheeling, 1 to 17 ; Synod of Ohio, 1 to 20 ; Synod of Cincinnati, 1, to 24 ; Synod of Indiana, 1 to 18 ; Synod of Northern Indiana, 1 to 16 ; Synod of Illinois, 1 to 14. ; Synods of Wisconsin, Iowa and Missouri together, 1 to 15 ; Synod of Kentucky, 1 to 27 ; Synod of Virginia, 1 to 31 ; Synod of North Carolina, 1 to 22 ; Synod of Nashville, 1 to 19 ; Synod of South Carolina, 1 to 24 ; Synod of Georgia, 1 to 22 ; Synod of Alabama, 1 to 20 ; Synod of Mississippi, 1 to 22 ; Synod of Memphis, 1 to 16 ; Synod of Arkansas, 1 to 9 ; Synod of Texas, 1 to 10 ; Synod of the Pacific, 1 to 20. Of course these estimates would be affected more or less by full and accurate reports from all the Presbyteries and all the churches. But we cannot allow defective reports to have much influence upon our present conclusions. Many vacant churches give no report of baptisms, but our observation teaches us that in vacant churches baptisms are very rare ; and if a pastor does not take sufficient interest in the matter to report his baptisms, it is very likely he has but few to report. And, besides, it is a curious fact that it is in those synods which have the most vacant churches, and the most blanks in the baptismal reports, that the ratio of baptisms is most encouraging. This tells with double force against the older Synods.

From the schedule which we have given, it will be seen that the five Synods, in which the ratio is most unfavorable, are those of *Albany, Buffalo, New Jersey, Kentucky* and *Virginia*. To ascertain whether or not the position of these five Synods in the scale for 1855, was a mere casuality, we have gone over those portions of the statistical tables, pertaining to these synods, for the four years preceding, and with the following results : Synod of Albany for 1854, ratio 1 to 31 ; for 1853, 1 to 31 ; for 1852, 1 to 33 ; for 1851, 1 to 38 ; Synod of Buffalo for 1854, ratio 1 to 30 ; for 1853, 1 to 25 ; for 1852, 1 to 23 ; for 1851, 1 to 38 ; Synod of New Jersey for 1854, ratio 1 to 25 ; for 1853, 1 to 23 ; for 1852, 1 to 24 ; for 1851, 1 to 22 ; Synod of Kentucky for 1854, ratio 1 to 28 ; for 1853, 1 to 30 ; for 1852, 1 to 23 ; for 1851, 1 to 28 ; Synod

of Virginia * for 1854 ratio, 1 to 26; for 1853, 1 to 29; for 1852, 1 to 26; for 1851, 1 to 21. Here we have sufficient uniformity of result to indicate that the place which these five Synods occupy in the scale for 1855 is not a pure fortuity. Now what is the explanation of the facts before us? Are these venerable Synods suffering under the curse, so much dreaded by Jewish mothers, that of unfruitfulness? The supposition is contradicted by the history of Presbyterianism. They are a prolific people.

The same thing which we have discovered in the case of certain Synods, we find to be still more surprisingly true in the case of certain Presbyteries, and particular churches. The Presbytery of Londonderry reports 1 baptism (infant) to 64 communicants: the Presbytery of Buffalo City the same; the Presbytery of Rochester City, 1 to 46; the Presbytery of Michigan, 1 to 77; the Presbytery of Columbus, 1 to 30. In the Presbytery of New Brunswick, there are three churches, which report thus: one reports 343 communicants and 3 baptisms; another reports 340 communicants and 2 baptisms, another reports 315 communicants and 2 baptisms; and there are several others in the same Presbytery not much better. In Philadelphia one church reports 303 communicants and 2 baptisms, another reports 320 communicants and 7 baptisms, another reports 287 communicants and 1 baptism. Such instances might be gathered by the score. Now why is this? Are these Presbyteries and churches unblessed Rachels in the midst of more fruitful Leahs? Are not their virgins given in marriage, and have they "mothers in Israel" only in the spiritual sense? If this be not so, we see not how to avoid the conclusion that throughout the entire extent of our church, there must be thousands of children of professing parents left to grow up without the seal of baptism, and consequently without a proper church training, and are thus, many of them, ultimately lost to the church. In the five Synods above named for the five years for which we have made our estimates, taking the ratio of births during a year as one to every seventeen communicants, there would be a surplus of 5133, over the number of baptisms reported, more than half as many as are reported.

Again—we ask how are we to account for these facts? What do they indicate? Out of what do they grow? Undoubtedly, we think, they are to be traced first to a culpable *negligence*, on the part of both pastors and people. But what lies at the bottom of this negligence? *Why* are pastors and people thus negligent respecting one of the sacraments of the Christian Church? Every effect has its cause, and this thing is not the work of chance. It springs, we are *afraid*, out of low views,—insufficient, inadequate, unchurchly views of the nature and importance of the ordinance itself. We can imagine no other cause. Parents would not neglect it so amazingly, and require such repeated promptings from faithful pastors,—pastors would not neglect to enforce the duty, if such were not the case. Its high, solemn import, and deep significance, such as it had for the minds of our fathers, as embodied in the Westminster Symbols,

* Exclusive of the Presbytery of Winchester.

and as exhibited in the former practice of the church, seems to be *dying out* of the minds of the church of their sons and daughters, and an unsound, un-*Presbyterian* laxity of opinion and feeling, respecting the ordinance, seems to be taking its place. Those pastors, who are themselves awake to the subject, feel this to be the case among their people. The Church, *in this respect*, does not reflect the teachings of her standards. Her old sacramental and churchly spirit is becoming diluted. In a church with a scriptural constitution this will always show itself first in the sacramental ordinances. And from this, if not checked, it will invade and undermine the whole frame work of the church. Nothing, we conceive, is more certain than that if *Presbyterianism* loses her sacramental and churchly spirit, she will fall a prey to latitudinarianism and rationalism in some of their forms. The canker-worm will eat out her vitals. The prevalent neglect of infant baptism in the Congregational Churches of New England, has long been a well known fact; and it is also well known how rapid have been the inroads of latitudinarianism and rationalism upon them.

The undervaluation of baptism, in our own churches, is also seen in the undue *postponement* of the sacrament after the birth of a child. Parents seem to think there is no occasion for putting themselves to the slightest inconvenience. They take plenty of time to deliberate. Any one who will use his faculties of observation, will soon learn that it is very common for children of one and two years to be brought for baptism: and sometimes two or three from the same family, at the same time. *

Indifference to infant baptism seems to indicate another thing, viz: a difference of estimate put upon the baptism of an infant and the baptism of an adult. Have we two kinds of baptism, one for infants and another for adults? Does the baptism in the case of an adult mean one thing, and in the case of an infant, another thing? Let this query be pondered.

Brethren in the ministry, are you faithful in this vitally important matter? We have examined this subject in deep earnestness and concern, and to you we commend it. Ponder the tendencies that are to make the future of our beloved church. Do you ever preach upon the subject of Baptism, except when the peace of your flocks is disturbed by some innovating Baptists? Or is it not important enough for our ordinary ministrations? And when you do preach upon it, are you *more careful to urge* upon your people the nature and significance of the ordinance as "a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins," (See Con. of Faith Cap. 28) than to warn them against superstition, by telling them that it is a *mere* sign? Let not the bugbear of Romanism or Episcopacy drive us into an equally fatal error on the opposite side.

* We have known many instances in which parents have asked the minister to "give their child a name,"—certainly a very weak form in which to put the request for baptism—and we have known a congregation to be taken by surprise when a child was baptized without a name.

[For the Critic.]

MISSION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—DR.
BRECKINRIDGE'S MISSIONARY SERMON.

A Discourse, published by the Board of Missions, and therefore generally circulated and read, can hardly be regarded as furnishing a subject for ordinary criticism or review. Still it may not be without interest to give expression to a few thoughts suggested by the reading, and to call more particular attention to what may strike us as worthy of note. Many things conspire to give an unusual interest to these utterances. The time, the circumstances, the occasion, and the character and position of its author, would command unusual attention—even if not deserved by the matter and manner of presentation—all of which must excite, in the reflecting mind, some intensely interesting thoughts upon this subject. It is not our object to attempt so much to follow out these, as to suggest such as arise of a more practical nature.

The zeal of the Church in the work of Missions may be regarded in this age as the surest index of the state of her piety. But it is important that this zeal should be according to knowledge, and that she should understand clearly whence her obligation arises; and it is the discussion of this point in this discourse that strikes us as peculiarly appropriate and forcible. It can be briefly summed up as follows:—All our duties, individually or collectively, have their origin in our immediate relation to Christ and to his Kingdom—and the peculiar duty of the Church and of each individual is determined by Christ's law only, and by the circumstances of our lot, the times in which we come to the Kingdom. But as there may be, and ordinarily is, more or less obscurity in relation to our peculiar duty, faith is essential to enable us to follow the Divine guidance, and perfect fidelity in our lot is the only ground upon which we have any right to expect either security or success, for the guidance and direction is of the Lord, who has in a remarkable manner raised up instruments in all ages for his work, who has brought us into his Kingdom for a purpose which if we fulfil, we obtain the crown, but if we omit, we shall be cut off.

This argument, closely and logically wrought out in this discourse, seems to us to exhaust the subject in its application to Christian duty, in any and every circumstance in which we can be placed. As our duty is varied infinitely by varying circumstances, it can be determined by no rule of expediency of human wisdom or of feeling, but by *Faith*, which will lead us to follow Christ, whether to do or to suffer, whether in prosperity or adversity; for as the preacher remarks, "It is only by faith that the Church of God can walk, even in light; only by faith that she can ever live in darkness."

We have not time to follow to any extent the application made by the preacher, nor is it necessary, as, if the principle be thoroughly admitted and felt, the application will follow. For to feel this

trust, this dependence, is the evidence of the deepest piety—to understand it fully is the most complete enlightenment of the Spirit; to attempt to act it out is the highest act of faith, and will be owned and blessed by the great Head of the Church.

We are the more struck with this argument, as it coincides in its results so nearly with the point made in a sermon before the Board of Foreign Missions, in New York, in May last—that being drawn entirely from the internal constitution and nature of the Church and Kingdom of Christ—while the reasoning before us is applied particularly to her external relations. But the point reached is the same, namely, that Faith alone will enable the Church to maintain her proper relation to her Head, or to discharge her relative duties to the world around her. And it is the more striking, that two discourses should have been delivered by the authors of the two alluded to—almost simultaneously arriving so conclusively at the same result by different lines of argument. We must refer those wishing to pursue this matter further, to the latter discourse as published by the Board of Foreign Missions.*

This view of duty applies with peculiar force to the work of Missions; and we must express our gratification at seeing it argued upon that ground. It is too low a view of that work, to present it as at all a debateable matter, whether the Church, or any member of it, shall engage in it or not. It even lessens the force in no small degree, to urge it mainly on the ground of the importance of the work, or the encouragements that may urge us to it. The first great question for the Church should and must be, "Is it the Lord's work?—Does He call us to it?" Then, whether great or small, whether pleasant or arduous, whether promising or unpromising, she is bound to go forward to the extent of her ability, as He may direct. It is of *Faith*, and not of sight. And in our humble opinion, on no other ground but that can the Church ever be brought up or held up to her whole duty in her present position. But acting on that principle she cannot fail, if she really be truly the Lord's Church.

It must be manifest to any thoughtful observer of the course of events in the Church for some time past, that all the discussions which have arisen relative to the nature of the agencies to be employed by the Church, and the method of their operation in carrying on the Missionary work in all its forms, have their chief significance and value from their bearing upon this great idea, viz: that the Church, in her modes of action, just as in her Faith and in her form of government, must conform closely to God's Word; that all the work she has to do addresses itself to the Faith of God's people; that so far as concerns the things which the Church purposes to do it may be said, "whatsoever is not of Faith is sin," for it will lead immediately to the sin of carnality in the Church, and grieving the Holy Spirit of God. As Dr. Breckinridge expresses it here, in the terse and precise manner so peculiar to him: "The Church must not only go where the rule goes, *but stop where it stops.*" If the

* A Discourse for the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, by Rev. Stuart Robinson.

questions which have been raised in our Church, and of late so freely canvassed, reach no farther than—as some suppose—to the comparative expediency or in expediency of different methods of operation, then we are free to admit, it is a useless agitation,—and therefore hurtful. If however, these questions reach, as we think it manifest they do reach, to these fundamental points, of whether the Church shall engage in any work beyond that which Christ hath given command to the Church, as Church, to do, and to do which we have in our age a country “come to the Kingdom ;” then it is a very grave question, one which must be agitated, or the Church is undone. Or if it be a question again, whether even in the choice of method and means for carrying on the work, the Church may in her wisdom devise means and agencies beyond those already ordained of God in his Word—then also it is a most grave question, and should be intensely agitated. Such agitations, however they may seem to obstruct and hinder the Church in her action, are struggles for the very life of the Church. The world was made to believe, that the agitation growing out of the denial of the right of the Church to ordain rites and ceremonies, was a useless agitation about trifles—yet even the class who revile all such strifes, as unworthy of religion, must now see that, in that struggle against the authority of the Church to ordain rites and ceremonies, was clearly involved the very life of the Church. Is it any more a usurpation of the prerogative of the Head of the Church to ordain rites and ceremonies, than to ordain agencies and methods of action? But we had no design here to enter upon the argument, but merely to fix attention upon the principles which are so powerfully and eloquently illustrated in this discourse, as underlying the whole question of the Missionary movement of the Church.

The application of this view to our own Church, in determining its mission and its work, is full of solemn and important thoughts. This is presented in the third and fourth general heads of this discourse, in regard to the present condition of the world, and of the cause of Christ in our own land. That our Church has an important—we may hope a most glorious mission—can hardly fail to strike any one who has pondered closely her history, or who will consider her present condition and prospects. For her to feel and to know this, and to feel and understand why it is so, and whence her strength must come, is to give some hope that she may have grace given her to stand faithfully in her place and fulfil her mission, even to the end. On this subject of the peculiar mission of our Church, Dr. Breckinridge has the following words, full of truth and meaning:

“ There is a mission and a lot common to the whole Church of God ; but there is, besides, a mission and a lot peculiar to every part of the redeemed host ; and amongst the rest a mission and a lot for our Presbyterian Church in the United States. Where the truth of God is most pressed and imperiled—there is her place. Where the battle rages most fiercely, there men look for her banner. Where the enemies of God thirst most ravenously for Christian blood, there let her be ready to offer her own freely for Christ’s sake. Thus has the mission of our fathers been, always. Thus is our mission to-day. Thus will be the mission of our true successors, to the end of time.”

As our limits are nearly reached, we will close our notice of this discourse by quoting somewhat fully from the closing appeal, which coming from this source, and as is intimated, spoken probably for the last time from that position, in view of all the circumstances, have peculiar force:

"I know this Church well. I have known it long. From my youth up I have sat under the shadow of her altars, where my fathers had worshipped for many generations; and for five and twenty years I have gone in and out in the presence of her great Assemblies. I have sat, from my childhood, at the feet of the great leaders amongst us; and have seen them, one by one, pass away—and others raised up by God to sit in their vacant seats. Things were not always as you see them now. I have seen this Church on the very brink of ruin. I now behold it in abounding prosperity. I have seen the hand of God deliver this Church, when the help of man had failed. And the same mighty hand conducts her still, along her glorious way. To-day a purer, more united, more powerful Church exists not on earth. All the efforts she ever made are as nothing beside the efforts she can make now; all the triumphs she ever won are but intimations of the triumphs she is now capable of winning."

"I speak to you in the name of the great dead, whose ashes, as yet, are hardly cold. I beseech you, in the name of the scattered remnant whom the inexorable stroke of death still respects. I charge you in the name of our covenanted God—our Saviour and yours. See that ye keep this great Church steadily on her great career. See that ye conduct her steps in the fear and power of God. See that ye transmit to those who will follow you, her name untarnished, her garments unstained, her faith unpolluted. I call yourselves to witness—I appeal to posterity to judge between us—I invoke our common Lord and Master to take note, that ye receive it a glorious and a blessed Church, in the midst of which Christ dwells—and that ye are bound to deliver it up in like estate, when your warfare is accomplished. It is not that I distrust you, that I speak thus: for I do not. It is because I know that great prosperity is full of great perils, and that the good of my country, the salvation of my race, and the glory of my Saviour, are deeply staked on the fidelity of this Church, and of you into whose hands her guidance is now come of God, for such a time as this."

We cannot close this brief notice without expressing a regret that the circulation of such publications is not more general. We are convinced that but a small portion of the active reflecting mind of the Church have the opportunity to procure them. We speak this from our own experience, as from the large issue of this and similar pamphlets, we had felt sure they would be put in reach of all, at any rate, in our Church, who might wish to procure them; but we have been forced in several such cases to procure them of some minister. We could wish to see such publications in the hands of every thinking and earnest man in our Church.

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

Brownson's Quarterly Review for October, 1855.

We receive this number too late for a thorough reading before our issue for October. We judge however from such specimens as we have read, that it is a number of very special interest. Our attention very naturally has been directed to the first of the six articles entitled "The Temporal Power of the Pope"—being a Review of Prof. McClintock's letters on Chandler's speech. After all that has been said of late on this subject, our readers will doubtless be gratified to be presented with the last utterances of the Great Oracle of the American Papacy, and especially his response to what has been said of his views as compared with Mr. Chandler's in Congress. We shall as far as our space will serve, permit him to speak for himself.

"Dr. M'Clintock proves in his *Nine Letters to Mr. Chandler* that it is idle to attempt to ward off the objections of non-Catholics to the Papal power on the ground assumed by that gentleman in his well-known speech, apparently the ground taken by the learned and excellent M. Gosselin; for it is a ground widely rejected by Catholics themselves. It cannot be asserted as Catholic doctrine, and no non-Catholic, for no Catholic, can be required to accept it as such. At best it is an opinion in the Church, not of the Church; and if Catholics may hold it, they may also reject it. When Mr. Chandler urges it as Catholic doctrine, he assumes authority which does not belong to him, decides a question which the Church has not decided; and it is sufficient for the non-Catholic to tell him, that no Catholic is bound to hold it, and they who follow Rome rather than Paris, as Paris was in the last century, do not hold it, but reject it as incipient Protestantism, tending in fact to political atheism. Whether we are Ultramontanists or not, till Ultramontanism so called is condemned we must, in our arguments with non-Catholics, if they insist on it, defend our Church as if it were true."

"Every Catholic controversialist knows that the question of infallibility is much embarrassed by the Gallican doctrine that the Papal definitions are reformable till accepted by the Church; but in our arguments with non-Catholics we are not at liberty to relieve ourselves by deny-

ing that doctrine, since it is tolerated and they who hold it may receive absolution. We must defend the infallibility of the Church even on the supposition of its truth, for if it were absolutely incompatible with that infallibility it would not be tolerated. So with regard to the so-called temporal power of the Pope. That power has been asserted on very high authority, defended by doctors of the greatest respectability and weight, and acted on time and again by the greatest and holiest Pontiffs that have ever sat in the chair of Peter," &c. * * *

"With the greatest respect for the good intentions of Mr. Chandler, we doubt, therefore, the wisdom and propriety of the ground he takes in his speech. He re-opens in it an internal controversy among the Catholics, for only a portion of the Catholic body, and they not those in best repute at Rome, will accept that ground; and it counts for nothing with non-Catholics, for they look upon it, not as a ground sanctioned by the Church, but simply as the opinion of those whose devotion to the Papacy is not very deep or ardent, and upon the whole as evasive and unsatisfactory. They do not believe Mr. Chandler's statement to be frank and straight-forward, and it creates in their minds a doubt of Catholic sincerity and candor. Every intelligent Protestant knows how the Gallican doctrine has always been regarded at Rome, when we put it forth as the ground of our defence, he suspects we do it not so much because we hold it as because we shrink from incurring the odium of the opposite opinion. He may be wrong in this, but as a matter of fact it is not unfrequently his conclusion," &c. * * *

"Dr. M'Clintock attempts, and we think successfully, to show that the doctrine defended by our Review on the temporal power of the Popes is prevailing theory among Catholics, and that the opinion defended by Mr. Chandler is not the proper Catholic doctrine on the subject. He has done this in an able and scholar-like manner. He cites largely from our pages, it is true, but he cites fairly, and he states our view correctly, which is more than we can say of some of our friends. He concedes that the power we claim for the Pope is not a civil or temporal power, but spiritual, and is a power over temporals only in the respect that they are spirituals. He shows that Mr. Chandler's authorities are not

to the purpose, for they simply disclaim what no Catholic does or ever has asserted. This is all true. We could ourselves say, with the exception of this hypothetical abuse of the Pope, all that Mr. Chandler and his authorities say, for neither he nor they disclaim the doctrine we assert; they only disclaim the doctrine which Gallicans accuse us of asserting. But with Dr. M'Clintock all this fairness, this apparent honesty, has a purpose. He thinks that to prove that Catholics do hold the doctrine we maintain is enough to condemn the Church forever in the estimation of the American people. He calls the doctrine "a fearful doctrine," and thinks that all he need do in order to render the Church odious is to convict her of holding it."—pp. 417, 420.

We have cited freely and at large on this topic—partly for the purpose of showing that the citations made from Dr. Brownson, by Prof. M'Clintock, and the positions attributed to Dr. Brownson and his school are fully accepted by that gentleman, notwithstanding the prodigious ado made in many quarters about "garbling." But while we were disposed at first to respect Dr. Brownson's courage and openness in thus accepting in all their fulness the issues made respecting the temporal power of the Pope, we confess to some suspicions of the demagogue at finding him afterward attempting to reduce his doctrine of the spiritual power within the harmless dimensions of the Puritan and old Covenanter doctrine of the freedom of the Church from human authority. Dr. B. seems to have become quite enamored with the old Scotch Covenanters—there seems to us something hopeful in finding him first quoting at Dr. M'Clintock the Shorter Catechism—and then discussing as follows:

"If there are any people in the Old World with whom the larger portion of our American Evangelicals more especially sympathize, they are the old Scotch Covenanters and the modern Free Kirk. The old Covenanters separated from their brethren on the very principle we assert, and the Free Kirk is a solemn protest of a large portion of the Scottish people against the Erastian heresy. In both, the solemn assertion is of the independence and supremacy of the spiritual order. The Free Kirk asserts with all its energy the competency of the state in spirituals, and the old Covenanters asserted with even more energy the obligation of the State to conform to the teaching and precepts of the Church. Who then will dare maintain that the assertion of the independence and supremacy of the spiritual order, and the subor-

dination of the temporal, is the assertion of an abominable doctrine in the estimation of the American people? Have the American people become a body of atheists, denying God as King of kings and Lord of lords, denying moral justice, and the supremacy of right? Has not Dr. M'Clintock in his insane hostility to the Catholic Church forgotten himself, and unwittingly branded as abominable the very principle he asserts, and must assert, in every sermon he preaches, or else shock all the moral convictions of his hearers?"—p. 426.

Unfortunately for Dr. B.'s sudden idea of placing himself side by side with the Free Kirk—there stands the Act of the Seventh provincial Council in Baltimore, in 1849, confiscating the ecclesiastical property of the sect to the people—and vesting it in the ecclesiasticism—the Bishops. And following up this Act—there stands the ever memorable effort of Archbishop Hughes, to have the ecclesiasticism in his own person incorporated by law of the State. And there is that memorable mission of the Pope's Nuncio, to adjudicate on a question of real estate in America. All in our humble opinion going to show, that the doctrine of the independence of the individual conscience before the State—and of religion, is a somewhat different matter from the supremacy of the Church as Church—an organized power. Of this however, we shall take some future opportunity to speak. We make room for a specimen of Dr. B.'s terrible retort on Mr. Chandler and the Gallicans, who claim to be preeminently the Republican Catholics. We commend this to the special attention of the political Papistic demagogues in all sections, as decidedly rich.

"The American people see clearly enough that, if we assert the Church as the divinely constituted representative of the spiritual order, and the Pope as its supreme visible head, the Sovereign Pontiff must, from the nature of the case, from the very fact that he represents the supreme order, be independent and supreme in relation to the temporal power. They do not in reality object to this, and if once convinced of the premises, they would by no means shrink from the conclusion. An old Catholic people, trained under monarchical despotism, and feeling the necessity of managing the susceptibilities of power, may gradually lapse into Gallicanism, for Gallicanism was born and brought up in the courts of despots, and essentially a courtier or a slave. But we are a new people, republican people, accustomed to treat our rulers as our servants, not as our masters. We are strangers both to the timidity

and to the servility of the Gallican, and do not fear to offend his Majesty, lest we compromise the civil *status* of the Church."—p. 433.

"When the Gallican becomes a republican he becomes an apostate and a Jacobin, as the European revolutions during the last seventy years amply suffice to show. A republican people can be Catholic only on Ultramontane principles for it is only those principles that comport with their national independence and love of liberty, or that can sustain true republicanism if once established."

"Now what is there under Gallicanism to keep power within its constitutional limits, and to resist it when it transcends them? In this respect it is no better than Protestantism, nor in fact so good as modern Protestantism; for modern Protestantism allows rebellion and revolution, at least it does so in Great Britain and the United States, but Gallicanism does not. It says: "Let every one be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but from God." Therefore, whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation. It thus binds the conscience, with the whole authority of the Church, to submission, and denies to her all authority to loose it when the power abuses, and by its tyranny and oppression forfeits its rights. Nor was conceived a doctrine more favorable to despots, or more hostile to civil and religious liberty, than that of the Four Articles of the assembly of the French Clergy in 1682."—p. 435.

Rev. Aaron L. Lindsley's Sermon, on The Days of Old.

We receive in the September number of the National Preacher, "a discourse occasioned by the death of Jeremiah Keeler, a soldier of the Revolution, delivered in the Presbyterian Church of South Salem, N. Y." We cannot forbear giving expression to the gratification we have felt in reading this sermon. Its peculiar excellencies in our view, are: 1st, Peculiar appropriateness to the time and occasion: 2nd, The skill displayed in the use made of the occasion for inculcating important truth, and 3d, The intrinsic elegance, force and impressiveness with which great truths are enforced. In presenting the life and character of Mr. Keeler, who was at the same time a soldier of the Revolution, and a soldier of the cross, Mr. Lindsley takes the opportunity to discuss the *religious interests* involved in the revolutionary contest. A few specimens from this discourse itself

will best illustrate the manner in which he executes his purpose.

"It would ill become this day or this place to consider principally the secular issues which were involved in the momentous struggle that followed. We shall find an appropriate theme in the *RELIGIOUS INTERESTS* which were at stake. The claims set up and the pretensions made by many who have since come in for a share of freedom's blessings, require that our countrymen should be reminded that the war for independence was not exclusively a contest for civil liberty. The dear-bought rights of conscience were remotely jeopardized, and more directly the principle of religious liberty. The belief is well-founded, that if the Colonies had been subdued, the Church Establishment of England would have been declared by law the established church of all the Colonies, as it had been already in many of them."

"But it was the Puritan spirit which reigned over all that mighty contest. It has been well said that God sifted the kingdoms for wheat wherewith to sow the virgin soil of America. And the same God suffered not the old monarchies to reap the precious harvest. The Puritan spirit was transplanted into the new world, and here found an ample field, a fertile soil, and a vigorous growth. The Spirit of the Lord was in it, and "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Its birth-place was Geneva. It was cradled in France, and rocked in the storm of persecution. It was nurtured among the rugged glens of Scotland. It grew to man's estate under the heavy hand of oppression in England. The dungeon could not confine it. The faggot and the sword could not destroy it. And from this baptism of blood it crossed the ocean, and trod the free shores of the new world with the activity of a strong man armed."

"Its foundation principle was, the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Its leading doctrine was, justification by faith in the atoning merits of Christ alone, resting on the covenant of an unchanging God. Its ministry was of equal authority, to be called of God and not of man, and to show by their doctrine and their deeds whether they were in the line of succession from the Apostles. Its ordinances were Scriptural, carefully excluding every ceremony which was not enjoined by the Word of God. It yielded nothing to mere human authority: it subjected everything to the divine command."

"The end of all government is to secure to every loyal citizen the peaceable enjoyment of his rights. But what are *human rights*? No written constitution—no statute law, can create them. They

can be declared and ratified by constitutions; they can be defined and guarded by enacted laws. But as they are man's gift, so they are no nation's gift. The Rights of Man are his inalienable privileges under the government of God. And the powers of human government "are ordained of God" for the purpose of securing those rights to every man."

"How can this great end be attained? Not by standing armies, not by frowning fortresses, not by a secret police. There are many moral considerations involved, and the only lasting and successful government must therefore, to a great extent, be moral. No man can invent his own rights—no State can create them: they are the gift of our Maker; and therefore we must learn of Him their nature and extent, and to Him we are in the highest sense responsible for the use of them. Hence, a knowledge of these rights, and of their limitations, is of vital moment in a free government, because where power does not overawe, self-restraint should govern."

The utterance of such truths as these from the pulpit is not untimely in this day. True, indeed, there is enough of a certain fashion of glorification of the Puritans—and even to spare. But there is not enough of clear exposition and analysis of the great principles out of which Puritanism grew; and therefore while many "garnish the sepulchres of the fathers," they set at utter contempt the very principles which made their fathers what they were.

CATHOLIC INTERESTS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By the Count de Mont Alibert, member of the French Academy. London, 1852.

Here is another specimen of the proselyting literature which the Papists are circulating among men of a certain class. It is a companion of the book of Balmez, exposed in the August No. of the "Critic." Truly, there is a marvellous versatility of talent displayed by Papal propagandists. The author appears to be a Gallican Ultramontanist: his book is a Catholic defence of constitutional government against the theory of absolutism, whether in the form of an autocracy, or a democracy. If we did not know that 'Catholicity' was only another name for a vast earthly empire, administered and sustained by the sanctions of religion and a future state,—if we were so ignorant of her symbols and her history, as to imagine that she was, merely or chiefly, a religious body,—we might, perhaps, be surprised to find a book on "Catholic Interests," turn out to be only a treatise on

the politics of Europe, and the chances the Roman Empire has to run, amid the schemes of monarchs and the disturbances created by the spirit of revolution, for the preservation and increase of its own power. Knowing, however, what Rome is, it appears perfectly natural.—There are many curious things in this book, of which we venture to present a specimen or two; premising that the author's political creed is, according to his own confession, only his upon a contingency; to wit, that the Pope shall not object to it: "Such is my political creed, and except an express order from the Pope comes, I intend to persevere in it." There is meaning in the following sentences:—"Liberty of conscience, that principle so long invoked by the enemies of religion, is every where now turning to its profit. It would doubtless be madness to proclaim it in countries in which it does not exist, or in which no one claims it. But in those where it does exist, in those where it has once been inscribed in the laws, let us be careful not to efface it, for it becomes therein the safeguard of faith, and the bulwark of the Church." The English whereof is, "Where Protestant freedom reigns, take advantage of it to push your cause: where Papal tyranny reigns, and liberty of conscience has no existence, it would be madness to proclaim such liberty, because it would be fatal to your cause." What a commentary upon this counsel is furnished by the contemporaneous history of "the Church" in Tuscany and in the United States of America! Again, here is a definition of "religious liberty,"—cited from Rendu, Bishop of Annecy,—which rests on a very doubtful contingency, if the Pope's sanction be necessary: "Religious liberty is composed of liberty of conscience, liberty of worship, and liberty of proselytism." Compare this with the expositions of his Grace of N. York, contained in his letter touching the Madiai, and in his letter to Gen. Cass. We seldom meet with Papal proselyting literature, without thinking of his Grace's estimate of our intelligence as a people (letter to Mr. Brooks): "the imbecile credulity of a public calling itself enlightened." We wonder if the Roman dignitaries,—magni, majores, maximi—ever meet each other without laughing over our "imbecile credulity."

A DEDICATION SERMON: preached at the Opening of the New Presbyterian Church in Chesterville, S. C. By Rev. John Douglass. January 21st, 1855.

A capital performance for the occasion. Mr. Douglass' old-fashioned Presbyterian notions would incur the risk of condemnation in some quarters, as being very far be-

hind the age; but are none the less agreeable to us for that. Indeed we should regard it as a very high compliment, to have it said of us, by some people, that we are nearly eighteen hundred years behind the age in our religion. The old "Purity Church," however, have never tasted, we imagine, the new wine, and do not know, by contrast, how much better the old really is. There is only one remark in the Sermon, to which we feel inclined to object, and we notice it merely on account of the flagrant abuse which is made of it. Among the people to whom the discourse was delivered, it was perfectly just; but it does not admit of universal application. The remark is, that "the house in which any people statelyly worship God, should correspond to their worldly circumstances and habitudes." It is evident that this is true, only when the "worldly habitudes" of the people are what they should be. They may spend more upon their private dwellings than is altogether consistent with the professed consecration of themselves and their wealth to the service of the Lord. Vanity and caste may have something to do with the erection of splendid meeting-houses: houses in which it is scarcely true, that "the rich and poor meet together." As to architecture as a means of grace, something has been recently said in this Periodical. We are delighted with Mr. Douglass' protest against the idea of a Temple on earth, since the ascension of our Lord.

A REVIEW OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON HUMAN ABILITY AND INABILITY.—*Hartford, 1855.*

This is an anonymous pamphlet, containing a very satisfactory statement of the points in controversy between Dr. Tyler on the one side, and Dr. Harvey and Mr. Case, on the other; together with some private history, which puts the first named Doctor in an unenviable light.—We have a mariner's land-mark in our Chesapeake Bay, whose name precisely expresses "natural ability" in Dr. Tyler's Theology. It is "Point-no-Point." He

insists that it is a mere matter of "words and names." But names are things.—Hobbes said that "words were the counters of wise men and the coin of fools;" but this will never help the matter, till the proportions of these two classes of mankind shall be reversed.

REMARKS ON THE PROVISION THAT SHOULD BE MADE FOR THE CHILDREN OF MISSIONARIES. *New York, 1855.*

An anonymous pamphlet on an intensely interesting subject. The tone of sentiment that pervades it, is, in the highest degree, honourable to the writer's heart; the suggestions are judicious, and bear the stamp of observation and experience. It is a subject of great difficulty and delicacy; one which deserves to be pondered with great care; one which the people of God will be eminently ready to consider, when their attention shall, in the proper way, be called to it; and one, in regard to which, a conscientious consideration and an enlightened effort would be attended, we have every reason to believe, with the special blessing of God.

THE ANTIDOTE OF CARE: *A Sermon preached in the Presbyterian Church in Columbia, S. C., July 29th, 1855.* By B. M. Palmer, D. D., Pastor.

WHY WILL YOU DIE? OR DIVINE SOLICITUDE FOR THE PERISHING: *Two Discourses on Luke xix, 41—xi, 13, delivered in the Second Presbyterian Church, Lancaster, Pa.* By Rev. A. Nevin, Pastor. *Philadelphia.*—Jos. M. Wilson.

All these sermons, it will be seen, are strictly Pastoral discourses. So far as appears, they were preached without any view to being printed. The first named was not written, till the request for publication was received. That sermons on such subjects have been printed, would seem to indicate, on the part of the congregations by whose request they were committed to the press, not only respect for their Pastors, but some earnest concern about their own spiritual prosperity.

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 11.

NOVEMBER, 1855.

Vol. 1.

POPULAR LECTURES AND LECTURERS.—NECESSITY
OF REFORMING BOTH.

THERE has grown up a system of operating upon the public mind, to which less attention has been paid than it merits, and of which the general effect is of more importance, and we may add, as yet more uncertain, than society seems to be aware of.

You may observe how the title "*Professor*," has been made to supplant many other titles less reputable than itself; but the effect of this, in various ways, may not have attracted your attention. So you may observe how the business of *public Lecturing*, as a means of distinction and livelihood to the "*Professor*" and others, has been extended and systematised; but it may not have occurred to you to estimate the effects which may be produced—especially the *evil* effects, by the abuse of such a system of controlling public opinion, and perverting the public conscience and taste.

We do not know that it is more unbecoming for a man to assume the title of "*Professor*"—than that of "*Major*" or "*Colonel*"—or any other that he has no sort of right to: but when he proceeds a step farther, and assumes the exercise of the functions which appertain to his title, and exercises these functions in a manner detrimental to society, and has, at his back, organised societies and widely circulated newspapers, conspiring to extend and deepen the injuries he inflicts—the matter assumes a different aspect. The *professional Lecturer*, who offers himself to hire and lives by the public and mercenary use of his small stores, for the amusement of the idle, may be commiserated; but when a *class* begins to be formed out of such persons, and they assume a distinct and eminent position, and

seek to exert an influence hostile to christianity, or even to sound learning and true taste ; it is all the more needful to have a care of them, if societies of respectable persons hire them to appear as their representatives, and if influential journals carefully exalt their claims upon society.

Let it be granted that any man has a right to call himself *Professor* or *Lecturer*. It is equally clear that any other man has an equal right to call him an upstart and a pretender. Let us admit that any man has the right to *take* the position he supposes himself entitled to. Obviously, any other man has an equal right to refuse any sort of recognition of his assumed position. Concede that any one has the right to offer himself for hire—by the job—for any honest work, from breaking stone on the turnpike up to Lecturing on Philosophy ; it cannot be questioned that any other man has an equal right to refuse to pay any part of his hire, or to be one of his employers.

But these are things which no man has a right to do ; and which no man has a right to stand by and see done, and hold his peace. No man has a right to degrade an honorable and useful calling ; still less has he a right to *assume* one, and then degrade it : least of all to assume it that he may degrade it. No man has a right to use channels through which society is accustomed to expect food, in order to give society poison : but he is bound, if he intends to offer to them any thing but food, to label his nostrums fairly and legibly beforehand. No man has the right—in the highest sense of the term—to attack *the truth* ; least of all the highest *truth* ; and the very climax of villainy is to attack religion in the name of Christ.

It is impossible not to see that the principle of association, which is capable of doing so much for society, by many methods, and amongst the rest by means of public lectures of a popular kind ; is not only capable of terrible abuse—but is actually terribly, and systematically abused—in many ways—and amongst the rest in the way of public lectures of a popular kind. We observe in, probably, the most extensively circulated journal in the world,—the *New York Tribune*, under date of October 23d, a list of *Forty-three* Lecturers—the elite, no doubt, of the vast class, in the judgment of that journal—the notice being editorial. In this list, are some highly respectable, and a few distinguished names. But its general character, considering the Lecturers as public instructors, whether in religion, knowledge or taste, may be fairly judged of by the fact, that after the Englishman *Thackeray*, the two American names at the head of it, are first *Ralph Waldo Emerson*, and secondly *Henry Ward Beecher*. Amongst those of whom fame knows very little—two additional Beechers follow : and amongst the chief of those of whom fame knows a good deal, are such names as *Horace Mann* the Unitarian, Dr. *J. B. Buchanan* the infidel philosopher, the Rev. *John Pierpont* the Unitarian : and to omit others, *Theodore Parker*, of Boston, whose name is not in the list, is spoken of with special emphasis, as about to take “a long tour Westward”—as a Lecturer. We have

said there were distinguished names on the list; and there are. That, for example, of "*The Rt. Rev. Alonzo Potter*," Bishop of the Episcopal Church in a part, or perhaps the whole of Pennsylvania—appears conspicuously; "*Elizabeth Oakes Smith and Lucy Stone Blackwell*"—going immediately before it: and "*The Rev. Antonette S. Brown*"—following immediately after it: a distinguished Prelate and three hardly less famous females, making the quarternion. We sympathise deeply with Bishop Potter. Of the forty-three names, fifteen appear to be Preachers: of which fifteen, one is a woman, two are Prelates of the Episcopal Church,—three are Beechers, two—perhaps more—were once Congregationalists—and the remaining seven are partly Unitarian, and partly wholly unknown, both name and sect, to us. Upon the fairest scrutiny we are not able to detect the smallest symptom of an Old School Presbyterian on the list: which, considering the relations of that powerful denomination to the grand interests of public morality, learning, and the progress of society in this country; is one of the clearest proofs that could be given of the posture, drift and design, of the whole "*Lecture Business*," as at present organized and prosecuted.

The *Tribune* states that "the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher had been hired to give twelve Lectures, independent of all societies, in Western cities, for \$125 per night," and that "the speculator in brains had fixed his price for Cleveland at fifty cents per ticket, which is complained of—not without reason." We observe in a Cincinnati paper of a few days later date, that Mr. Beecher had commenced his course in that city—with signal manifestations of public contempt; the people would not even go to hear him—which he well deserved, in the judgment of that press, for his mercenary conduct. The *Tribune* says of Mr. Emerson, that he is to "lecture in ten cities on or near the Mississippi:" at what exact price, and whether hired by societies, or some individual "speculator in brains," is not stated—nor, as far as we can see, is it all material. We happened to be in the city of Indianapolis, Indiana, about Christmas of last year, when the school teachers of that State held a Convention to consider the interests of Public Education. *Horace Mann* was to deliver one of a series of Lectures before that Convention; and public notice was given to an immense assembly of people, at the close of a lecture by another person, that after Mr. Mann had delivered his Lecture for the Teachers Convention, he would, on a different night deliver another lecture on his own account—free to all who would pay twenty-five cents—as we recollect the sum. Now the idea of Mr. Beecher, the Pastor of a respectable Christian Church, fully able to support him and his family—hiring himself out, at so much a night, to a speculator: or Mr. Emerson, who professes to follow Literature as his love, hiring himself out, in "ten cities," at so much a city, or a Lecture, or a course: or Mr. Mann, who had been a member of the Congress of the U. S.—and Superintendent of Public Instruction in Massachusetts—and was then President

the great "People's College" in Ohio, showing himself off, at twenty-five cents per capita, at a place to which he had come by invitation of the Teachers of a whole State to promote the great interest of Popular Education: we must say is unspeakably contrary to our notion, of what is reputable and becoming—and comes perfectly up to our notion of what is supremely mercenary. That Marshall of the "Grand Empire," who, when rebuked by a companion in misery for taking to the trade of a barber, defended himself by saying he did it, "for the pleasure of the thing—and the sixpence," may have had more reason on his side, than Mr. Beecher, Mr. Emerson, and Mr. Mann; and certainly there was nothing more incongruous in his case, than in each of theirs. If the worst comes to the worst, a man may starve with dignity: but he cannot feast with dignity, upon wages earned by the degradation of a noble calling; and when he incurs the degradation without any higher temptation than those low motives which are incompatible with all higher culture—he becomes contemptible. However insignificant the example of these persons might be—considered only as three persons; their conduct becomes important when it is considered the conduct of choice leaders of thought, and chief enlighteners of the age: the conduct which the age itself will put on, as soon as they and their co-workers rectify it perfectly. It is part of the case, therefore, for us to know and to consider calmly, that at the bottom of the grand thought, effort, heart, soul, of this great disinterested movement, in its present phase—lies far down,—not "the pleasure" only, but the "sixpence" also.

We have said that on the list several times alluded to, there were several women; ladies, we doubt not, though they are not so called. And it is well known, that the same influence which is turning the "Lecture Business" to ends already indicated, is in concert with that, if it be not identical with it—which is turning woman from being wife, and mother, and sister, and daughter, into being haranguer in popular assemblies, and brawler in mixed multitudes. We have reached, already, the two apparent conclusions of this attempt to change the sphere which Christianity and an exalted civilization assign to woman. We may study one result at Deseret, amongst the Mormons: we may contemplate the other, at the "Free Love League," in the city of New York. It is impossible to change the smallest portion of a vast and complicated machine, so that the portion changed be an essential part of it,—without materially effecting the nature and power of the structure. And the same law pervades the universe. How then can it be possible, for moral regenerators to remove out of the structure of human society, its most vital part, without utterly destroying the grand and peculiar aspect, which society has at last assumed under the long continued power of God's Gospel? Any man who has a heart, or any brains, need only ask himself about his mother, his sisters, his wife, his daughters,—to revolt at once, at every suggestion that would convert them into

men. But even that, if it were possible, would be better than to convert them into beings—who are not and cannot be men, and who are no longer women in the sense, either of true refinement, of high civilization, or of the religion of Christ. If society has any one interest which is supremely great, it is the interest it has to place woman, and keep her precisely in the sphere to which God has assigned her: God, we mean,—not of Mr. Emerson, nor of Mr. Mann,—we will not insult them by saying not the God of the Mormon, and of Free Love; but the God of the Bible—the God of true Christianity: the God who forbids women to become public teachers of mankind—who has placed them in subjection to their own husbands—who has made their own families their special charge—and who inculcates modesty as a virtue inseparable from every other which adorns their nature.

But we do not hesitate to assert, that even if there were no objection to be urged to the sordid manner, in which these things are made insupportable to pure minds; and none to the detestable revolution in the whole relations of woman to society, which is accepted as part of the scheme; there are objections of the highest character to the Lecturers themselves, taken in the mass, into whose hands the instruction and the amusement of the public has fallen. As a body—they are not fit for what they undertake to do. Not fit in point of moral training: not fit in point of literary culture; not fit in point of scientific knowledge; not fit in point of oratorical gifts. It is turned into a vast scheme to unsettle the opinions of society on all subjects; and all that does not tend in that direction, is so much added, like sugar and gum arabic, to disguise the nostrum. No doubt there are individual exceptions, to whom it would be the grossest injustice to apply any one of these statements. But the statements are not only true, but are short of the truth, as to the great mass of hired, professional, peripatetic Lecturers, now before the public. And the public has the very highest interest,—as it also has the most complete and simple remedy—either to reform or to abolish the whole business, with the least delay, and without the least remorse. Let “speculators in brains,” and all “societies,” provide suitable Lecturers; or let the public keep “the sixpence”—and leave “the pleasure of the thing,” to those who have trifled with us long enough.

Popular instruction, and even public amusement, by means of courses of Lectures, are undoubtedly of far too much importance to be allowed to fall under settled bad management, or to be wholly given up. The first step, perhaps, towards placing the whole matter properly before the public mind, is to call attention distinctly to the present abuses of it. But in attempting to do this, we are unwilling to close this article without the strongest expression of our opinion that good and enlightened men owe it to society to combine, every where, for the purpose of using, as it should be used, this powerful engine for the progress of mankind. They ought never to have al-

owed its control to slip out of their hands. They ought, at once, to recover that control. They ought to do this, because that is the surest way of preventing an immensity of evil—while, at the same time, it is a certain method of doing a vast amount of good. Indeed, if it had not been for our strong desire to utter what is contained in this closing paragraph, we should not, probably, have written this paper at all.

TRUSTEES OF CHURCH PROPERTY—THEIR FUNCTIONS AND RELATIONS TO THE DEACONS OF THE CHURCH.

In previous numbers of this journal, attention has been called to evils now existing, and dangers to be apprehended in the future, from the undue extent to which—especially in our large cities—the control of all pecuniary affairs of the Congregation indiscriminately is often assigned to the Trusteeship, an office unknown among the constitutional offices of the Church, but created by the law of the State, for the care and protection of what the Maryland Incorporation Act properly terms “the estate, interest and inheritance of the Congregation.” We entirely accord with what has been said in Nos. 2 and 4 of the Critic, touching the inexpediency and the utter inconsistency of such an arrangement. The manifest tendency of the usage, is to hamper the free action, if not to enslave the Church, and bring about consequences similar in kind, if not equal in degree, to those which necessitated the exodus of the Free Church of Scotland. For practically it must lead to the exercise of a patronage right from without the Church, as objectionable in every point of view, as any right ever claimed by a Scotch Patron.

On the other hand, we as fully accord with the writer in No. 4 of the Critic, that the proposal to remedy this evil, by asking of the State to incorporate as Trustees of Church property, Deacons only, or other ecclesiastical persons, involves the still greater evil of admitting the right of the State to recognize an ecclesiasticism, as such, and to endow it with rights of property and corporate franchises. As we conceive of the matter, a recognition by the State of any ecclesiastical persons, as such, is contrary to that fundamental law of our American polity—a law not less the safeguard of the Church, than of the State itself—that the State, *as State*, knows nothing of the Church, *as Church*. According to the American theory, the State knows nothing of Church affairs and Church members, as such. It knows only people as people. It can confer corporate

privileges only upon people as people. It protects Church property simply as property belonging to people as people. In any litigation concerning such property, the courts of law contemplate the parties litigant, simply as citizens or denizens of the State; and therefore, though questions of ecclesiastical doctrine or order may arise before the Courts, they arise only incidentally, and in the way of evidence, going to establish the intent and meaning of contracts and obligations between the parties, as people of the State. Precisely here arises the grand objection to the recent calls made upon the State by the Papal Hierarchy, for an act conferring corporate privileges upon the Archbishops or Bishops of the diocese. The objection lies not, as many seem to suppose, to the incorporation of a Board consisting of a single man; for to that the objection is not very serious. It would by no means obviate the difficulty, should Archbishop Hughes propose the incorporation of all the Priests in his diocese, instead of himself. The objection lies simply and chiefly to the incorporation, by law of the State, of an *ecclesiasticism*, whether in the person of one man, or of an hundred. It would be equally forcible as against the incorporation of a Presbytery, Synod, Conference, or Convention; nay, even to the incorporation of the body of private Christians composing the Church, as a Church. For in either case, such incorporation would involve a principle contrary to our fundamental law of separation between Church and State. All the jealousy of the Church, either affected or really felt, by mere politicians, who clamor so loudly of Church and State, falls far short of the jealousy which every truly enlightened Christian man feels for Christ's great fundamental law, "My kingdom is not of this world." All history shows, that the Church has far greater reason to fear the encroachment of the State, than the State to fear the encroachment of the Church. The chief disasters are to the Church; and the danger of "Church and State" is by no means so imminent at any time, as the danger of *State and Church*. It is not, as the demagogues would have it, that the innocent and credulous politicians have been imposed upon by the shrewd and cunning priests—but that ambitious politicians, whenever the Church became important to their success, have imposed upon the ministers of religion, and used them for their own ambitious ends. And so of every degree and form of connection between the Church of God and worldly influence and power. No matter how great the present apparent benefit to the Church, it shall in the end bring trouble and disaster.

We are very far from thinking moreover, that the evils complained of arise from the choice of men as Trustees, who are not Church members. Nor do we suppose that it would be any material alleviation of these evils, to provide that none but Church members shall be eligible to the Trusteeship. We are unable to perceive the inconsistency, sometimes so much enlarged upon, of selecting men as Trustees of the Church property, who are not pious men. For the power which created the office having had no reference to any such

qualification in those who fill it—the purpose for which the office is created, not being one requiring any other qualification, than such as is requisite to the proper holding in trust of any property; and the parties represented by the Trustees not being the Church, as such, but the people who have procured the property for *the use of* the Church—we cannot see the necessity of qualifications for an office, which neither the power creating it, nor the purposes of its creation, nor the status of those represented in it, contemplates as necessary.

The true source of the difficulties referred to, is doubtless to be found in a usage which has grown out of a neglect of the office of Deacon, in the Church—of thrusting upon Trustees certain duties, which the State law that created the office, never contemplated the discharge of by the Trustees, on the one hand, and which on the other hand, the law of Christ's Kingdom has committed to altogether a different sort of officers. And it will be found, on careful inquiry into most of the cases complained of, that the evils arise not so much from any usurpation of power by Trustees, in spite of the Church, as from the neglect of the Church itself to obey fully Christ's ordinance, in the appointment of officers, and in duly regarding the offices of his Kingdom, and the consequent thrusting upon Trustees of duties which belong not to their office. In this, as in every other case where the Church departs from the law of Christ, however plausible the reasons for the departure, and how wise soever the seeming present expediency, trouble never fails to come from it. While it is very important that the Congregation, as people who build the house of worship, should be represented to the law of the land, and their rights of property be duly protected, it is no less, but rather far more important, that the Congregation considered as a Church of Jesus Christ, should have also their representatives to the law of His Kingdom, and protection for the funds which in obedience to His ordinance, their piety may dedicate to His service. As there is a very clear distinction between the body of people, as such, who combine together to preserve and hold a certain property for *the use of* a Presbyterian Church, and the organized body of Church members—the ecclesiasticism for whose use the property has been procured and held; so there is a like clear distinction between the duties of the Trustees, who represent merely the combination of people who procure and hold the property, and the Deacons who represent the Church, as Church, in the temporalities which necessarily grow out of the life and action of the Church; nay, which necessarily arise from the very ordinances of Christ's house, fully and properly administered. For it is not to be overlooked, that Christ has arranged even the ordinances of His worship, so as to provide revenues for the purposes of His Kingdom; and it is essential to the highest welfare of His Church, to observe fully all His ordinances. Now, not less distinct is the limit which separates between the duties proper to the Trustee, and those proper to the Deacon. As the Trustee represents to the law of the State simply a collection of

people, who have combined to procure and hold a property for the use of a certain ecclesiastical body, so the duties of his office are properly limited to the legal protection of the property, and the whatever may be needful to prevent its perversion to any use, other than that generally to which it was originally devoted. On the other hand, as the Deacons represent the temporal affairs of the ecclesiasticism, which has received from the people, the property to be used for the purposes intended, so the duties of the Deacons extend generally to whatsoever concerns the temporalities of the ecclesiastical body having the use of the property, in carrying on its work as a Church. Every thing therefore that may involve the question of right use of the property as held for the use of the Church, belongs to the Trustees. Every thing on the other hand which relates to the temporal affairs of the Church, having the use of the property in carrying out the great work of the Church as a spiritual body, appertains to the office of the Deacon. What ordinances shall be observed in the Church—what modes of worship—how often to be used—by what method the ordinances shall be provided and sustained among the people—are matters either determined beforehand by the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, or are to be determined by the constituted authorities under that Constitution—not by Trustees created by the law of the State.

The confusion of ideas so common on this subject, doubtless arises from the prevalent practice of raising the means of paying for Church property, not by voluntary free gifts of the people, but by a sale of the pews, and of providing for the current expenses of the Church, by an assessment on the pews, rather than by the voluntary offerings of the people. When the building is paid for by free offerings, and handed over to the Trustees to be held for the Church, and the revenues raised by voluntary contribution, then the distinctive functions of Deacons and Trustees are very manifest. The Trustees in that case are vested with the title to the property, and protect it from perversion. The Deacons then manage all other temporal concerns of the Congregation. But the case is not so plain on the other scheme. Holding as they do, the estate from which the revenue springs, some sort of control of the revenues would seem belong properly to the Trustees. But if this arrangement for supporting Gospel ordinances, were regarded as it ought to be, as somewhat anomalous in our system, and if moreover the Deacons' office were appreciated as it ought to be, there would be a special arrangement made in every such case, to suit the exigency. The Church—the ecclesiastical body for whose use the property has been provided, now finds the property transferred to its use, under certain restrictions, which it is a sacred duty to respect in every point. But care should be taken at the same time, to stipulate in the beginning, that whilst all these restrictions shall be observed in fact, the form and mode of their observance shall not be such as to hamper the Church in the full development of her spiritual organization, or in the entire freedom of her action in observing all the divinely ap-

pointed ordinances. By arrangement with the Trustees, instead of allowing the control of the secular affairs of the Church to follow the control of the property from which the revenues are raised, the practical management of these revenues should be transferred, like the property itself, to the Church, through her proper representatives, subject only to the restriction, of an appropriation of them according to the original purposes for which they were levied on the property. In this way alone can the Congregation be made competent to contract fully through the Presbytery, for the support of the ordinances among them, according to the requirements of our Constitution. Under the arrangement which gives over the entire control of all the secular affairs to the Trustees, we seem to justify the absurd notion, that the Trustees are the party contracting with the pastor, and that the contract of the Congregation, through the Presbytery, is a mere form for the sake of appearances. Nor is it strange that under such an arrangement, we should find a constant tendency toward a practical independency in many of our large Congregations. Nor is it wonderful that in some cases the Trustees should even claim a direction in the matter of the "collection for pious uses"—a claim which, according to the teaching of Scripture and our book, is tantamount to claiming a direction of the order of worship. For if it is competent for mere Trustees to direct what collections shall be raised at public worship, and for what uses, it is equally competent to direct what prayers shall be made, or how much reading of the Word, or what singing of praise.

But as already intimated, the real blameworthiness in this whole matter, lies not at all with the Trustees, but with the Church. The difficulties which have arisen from the confusion of powers, have not been generally from a desire of Trustees to usurp power over the Church, but rather from the negligence of the Church, in ignoring practically her own officers, and thrusting upon Trustees the discharge of duties not properly belonging to them. It is a fact not to be disguised, that after all that has been said and done of late years toward a more perfect organization of the Church, the Deaconship is yet but very partially restored to its rightful place as a part of the organization. At the time of the Reformation, the Churches every where being entangled in State alliances, or suffering from the oppression of the State, no fair opportunity was afforded of practically exemplifying the completely organized Church. Nothing can be more manifest, than that the ideal of the Deaconship, which they deduced from Scripture, was not then fully exemplified, nor has it yet been. It was natural enough for those trained up in Churches connected with the State, to transfer some of the imperfections of that condition to the Churches which they planted here. And accordingly the traces of these imperfections may yet be found among us. Perhaps none of them are more plainly marked, than those which relate to the Deacon's office. In justification of these remarks, we need only quote in conclusion, a few testimonies in relation to the theoretic views of the office of Deacon, and the proper

management of Church temporalities, which prevailed two hundred years ago, and simply ask our readers to contrast them with the practical illustrations of them which now prevail in too many of our Churches. Hetherington gives the following account of the discussion, and the decision upon this point in the Westminster Assembly:—

“The office of Deacon next engaged their attention. The institution of this office was not denied, but several were of opinion that it was of a temporary nature. This view was entertained by few except the Erastians; and when the Assembly decided that the office of Deacon was of a permanent nature, Lightfoot alone voted in the negative, though both Coleman and Selden had spoken against it. The opposition to the permanence of this office, *seems to have arisen chiefly from the fact, that there existed in England a civil poor law, instituted in the reign of Elizabeth; which led some to oppose the Deaconship as unnecessary, others as interfering with a civil arrangement.* It was well suggested by Mr. Vines, “that the provision of civil officers made by the civil State for the poor, should rather slip into the office of a Deacon, than the reverse, because the latter bears the badge of the Lord.”

With this discussion terminated the year 1643, in which the business of the Assembly had been chiefly of a preliminary character. It had however been solemnly decided, that Christ is so completely the Head of the Church, that all its offices are essentially in Him, and from Him they are all primarily and authoritatively derived; that of these offices some are extraordinary, and have ceased;—those namely, of Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists; that Pastors, and Deacons or Teachers, are essentially the same, and form the highest order of divinely appointed officers in the Church; that Ruling Elders are also of Divine appointment, and are distinct from Pastors; and that Deacons are likewise of Divine and permanent institution, though not entitled to preach or to rule, but to take charge of charitable and pecuniary concerns.”—(Hist. of West. Ass. pp. 143, 144.)

A not less remarkable testimony is that of John Owen, of the same era—who, though an Independent, and the great light of those who confound the office of Ruling Elder and Deacon, thus speaks of the nature and functions of the office in “The True Nature of a Gospel Church”—Chap. 9:

“The office of Deacon is an office of service, which gives not any authority or power in the rule of the Church; but being an office, it gives authority with respect unto the special work of it, under a general notion of authority; that is, a right to attend unto it in a peculiar manner, and to perform the things that belong thereunto. But this right is confined unto the particular Church whereunto they belong. Of the members of that Church they are to make their collections, and unto the members of that Church are they to administer. Extraordinary collections, from or for other Churches, are to be made and disposed of by the Elders.—(Acts xi, 30.)

Whereas, the reason of the institution of this office was, in general, to free the Pastors of the Churches who labor in word and doctrine, from avocations by outward things, such as wherein the Church is concerned, *it belongs unto the Deacons not only to take care of and provide for the poor, but to manage all other affairs of the Church of the same kind; such as providing for the place of the Church Assemblies, of the elements for the Sacraments; of collecting, keeping and disposing of, the stock of the Church, for the maintenance of its officers and incidences, especially in time of trouble or persecution.* Hereon are they obliged to attend the Elders on all occasions, to perform the duty of the Church towards them, and receive directions from them. This was the constant practice of the Church in the primitive times, until the avarice and ambition of the Superior Clergy enclosed all alms and donations unto themselves—the beginning and progress whereof is excellently described and traced, by Paulus Sarpus, in his treatise of matters beneficiary.”

Near one hundred years anterior to the Westminster Assembly, the same view of the Deaconship was not only promulgated, but carried out in the organization of the Church. The Book of Policy, or

First Book of Discipline, constructed by John Knox himself, and sanctioned by the General Assembly of 1561, in delineating the form and order of the Protestant Church of Scotland, sets forth the ordinary and permanent affairs of the Church as of four kinds: 1.—The Minister or Pastor to preach and administer Sacraments. 2.—The Doctor or Teacher, to expound Scripture, and refute error. 3.—The Ruling Elder, who assisted the Minister in exercising ecclesiastical discipline and government. 4.—The Deacon, who had the *special oversight of the revenues of the Church, and the poor.* (See McCrie's Life of Knox, p. 211.) Accordingly in 1560, when there was but one place of worship in Edinburg, and Knox the Pastor, we find the number of Elders twelve, and the Deacons sixteen.

We may quote also, as showing the entire agreement of all the Reformers in their interpretation of Scripture on this point, Calvin's view of the office, as administered in the Apostolic and early Churches:—

“Nor was the situation of Deacons at that time at all different from what it had been under the Apostles. For they received the daily contributions of believers, and the annual revenues of the Church, to apply them to their proper uses, that is, to distribute part to the ministers, and part for the support of the poor; subject however, to the authority of the Bishop, to whom they rendered an account of their ministration every year.—(Calv. Inst. B. 4, Chap. 4, sect. 5.)

It is needless however, to multiply the citations of opinion upon this subject. If the teaching of the New Testament concerning the contribution for pious uses, as one of the ordinances of Divine worship—as really so, as prayer and praise—be accepted in its fulness, as it is in the standards of our Church, there can no longer be any question that the office of Deacon is absolutely essential to the complete organization of the Church. And it is chiefly because this part of worship has been too little regarded, that the office which grows necessarily out of its exercise, has been allowed to fall into disuse. In such a state of things, nothing is more natural than the devising of human expedients to supplement the deficiencies of the Church's organization. Then nothing can be more inevitable, than that such use of human expedients should bring the Church into trouble.

From what has been said, we derive these conclusions:—

1.—The normal order in the Church is, that the ordinances of the Gospel should be supported among the people by their voluntary offerings.

2.—The office of the Deacon is the Divinely appointed agency for the management of these offerings, and all the business connected therewith.

3.—The office of Trustee in the Congregation, is simply a human expedient for the protection of such estate as the people incidentally may provide for the uses of the Church, in order to its better accommodation.

4.—That though for reasons of expediency in any case, it may be the will of the people to give their offerings for the

support of the Gospel among them, the form, of a price paid for certain pew rights, and of assessment on the pews, yet this should ever be regarded as the abnormal order, and an expedient to serve a purpose in a given case. While every care should be taken to respect the rights of property, and the obligations of the Trustees holding authority under law of the State, yet special care should be taken to have such arrangement made, as to leave the Church untrammelled and free in her action through her own appointed officers, Divinely ordained.

5.—The true remedy for the growing evils from the usage which now obtains in many of our Churches, will be found in a restoration of the Deacon's office in its full exercise, and in such arrangement of the duties of the Trustees and the Deacons respectively, as shall confine those of the former strictly within the limits of the purposes for which the law of the State creates the office, and extend those of the latter to all the purposes for which the office was instituted by Christ.

We have read with peculiar satisfaction, since the foregoing writing, the proceedings of the late meeting of the Synod of Pittsburg, on the matter of the Deaconship in our Churches, and the memorial to the next General Assembly on that subject. We earnestly hope, that all who feel an interest in seeing our Church *perfectly* organized, and in the use of all the agencies which Christ has appointed for the administration of His Kingdom, will see to it, that this appeal to the Assembly shall not be without effect. We venture the opinion however, that in order to gain the object sought by the Synod of Pittsburg—to wit, a due regard to the matter of “the existence, efficiency, and power of the office of Deacons”—some questions as to the functions of Trustees, and the extent of their duties, must first be settled. If, in the central and influential Churches, the Trustees are made a substitute for Christ's officers, the Deacons, it will be in vain to labor for the general restoration of the Deacons to their proper place and dignity.

(For The Critic.)

**LETTER OF A VIRGINIA PASTOR TO AN INQUIRER
CONCERNING THE PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAP-
TISM.**

My Dear Sir:—

It is a matter of sincere regret to me, that I am so little competent to solve the difficulties which environ the subject of Infant Baptism to your understanding. That these difficulties are suscep-

tible of a full and satisfactory solution, is to my judgment unquestionable, by one who has devoted more talent to the investigation of the question, and for a longer time than I have. It is certain that the nature of the question is such, that if false, it must be very obviously false; and consequently, a man possessed of the mingled spirit of humility and independence, which is the spirit of the philosopher, will be very apt to infer at the outset, that beneath the obvious difficulty that invests the relation of a child to the Church of God, there lies an explanation, and a power of argument in support of it, that will amply justify the well nigh universal assent of all parts of the Church, and in all ages of the world, to that validity of the relation. Certainly the presumption for the truth of Infant Baptism, from this well nigh universal assent of the Church of Christ, is so powerful, as to make an honest inquirer search deep, and review repeatedly, the logical outline of his opposition to the practice, before he settles upon the conclusion which he will take with him through life, and to the bar of account. While I do claim this much, from this fact of universal assent, I claim no more. I do not wish you to surrender the independent exercise of your own judgment, for the judgment of others. But I do wish you to allow the judgment of others to enter into the materials of your own, and to be allowed just the weight to which your own impartial apprehension may suppose it to be entitled. This is all that I claim for the practice of the Church, and its judgment upon this question. As for my own personal views, I claim nothing for them, except that you will accept them as sincerely intended to assist you in reaching what appears to me a very important conclusion, and that you will use them to assist your decision, if they are found at all adapted to attain that end. As your pastor, and as your friend, it is my duty to do my best to guide you into what seems to me to be the truth, and you may rely upon it, that it will be no hardship to me to give any labor to the subject which may be necessary to assist you.

I wish I had a statement of your difficulties, drawn up by yourself: it would be easier to reach the exact point on which each one of them is found to hinge. I will endeavor to condense them myself from my recollection of the conversation we had on the subject, last week. If I make any material mistake, please ascribe it to the defect of my memory. Without pretending to observe any order in the statement, I will first jot down the items as they occur to my recollection.

1.—The Church of Christ is a spiritual corporation, based upon a spiritual qualification, designed for spiritual ends, governed by spiritual laws, and requiring spiritual qualifications in its members.

2.—The Abrahamic Covenant did not create *ecclesiastical* relations, as distinguished from a civil institute on one side, and from a covenant of grace for personal salvation on the other.

3.—Admitting this to be true—admitting that children were born into this ecclesiastical state during the Old Dispensation, yet the pos-

itive requisition of a spiritual qualification by Christ, operates as a positive bar against the old law of admission under the New dispensation.

4.—That *servants* were also admitted into the relations created by the Abrahamic Covenant, whatever was the nature of their relations as civil or ecclesiastical, and if the same law is in operation now, they are still equally entitled to its benefit.

5.—That Baptism, as a sign and seal of spiritual purification, and a pledge of spiritual blessings generally, cannot be properly applied to those who do not possess the spiritual purification typified by the ordinance, and the spiritual qualification to which the promise of the spiritual blessings is annexed.

In order to clear the question, let us create a hypothetical analogy, which may serve to throw light upon the various points raised in the issue before us. Let us suppose a dozen men to form the resolution, that they would form themselves into a voluntary association for the worship of God, for the attainment of various spiritual ends, and for the unlimited subordination of all that they have and are, to the Divine will. Suppose they dedicate themselves to His service, declare themselves *His* people, by their own voluntary act ratifying and re-enacting their natural obligations, and adopt some visible act, rite or symbol, to express their submission, and to impose formally the obligation which they have assumed. It is obvious that these men may arrange the internal constitution of their institute as they please. They may say, only we ourselves shall order it—or they may consecrate their children also with themselves, put the mark or symbol upon them, and lay them under the obligation to be the peculiar and God-fearing people which it was the end of the organization to secure. They may say whether any others besides themselves shall enter the institute, and if so, on what terms. They have a right to require a personal qualification in such persons, in order to entry, and *there is no inconsistency in requiring such a person to enter with a qualification, and his children to enter without it*. Nay more, in framing the internal organization of the institute, they may, if they please, establish two classes of citizens, or if they please, a succession of classes, each entitled to peculiar privileges, and each requiring a qualification of personal character, or otherwise, in order to the enjoyment of these privileges—consequently there is no inconsistency in conceiving of one member of the institute entitled to *one* privilege, and not to another—in requiring him to have *one* qualification, in order to *one* privilege, and *another* qualification, in order to *another* privilege. This is not all. We may conceive such an institute to exist for a while *without* this succession of classes, with privileges and qualifications annexed, and *afterwards* introduced; and the *succeeding* introduction of a new arrangement may not alter the *old*, but be merely a modifying or re-modifying addition to it. It is obvious that the organization of such an institute being purely a matter of convention, subject, as all matters of convention must be, to the general dictates of prudence

and propriety, still being in its own nature a matter of convention—a thing admitting of the comparison of expedients, it must be susceptible of any variety of modification in its arrangement, similar to those we have just pointed out. Our analogy is now sufficiently formed to guide us in our investigation of the Church of God.

It is obvious, that such institute as I have just described, being *possible* to be formed among men, it may be as properly *ordered by God to be formed*, as it might be by the voluntary association of men themselves. The form of the organization is one thing, and the principle impelling to it is another. God may order it, or man may volunteer it; but the form of the institute may be what either God may please to direct, supposing Him to be the author of it, or what man might please to frame, supposing him to originate the scheme. There seems to be lingering in the minds of many individuals, an impression that God *could* not frame such an association of men, such a Kingdom for Himself—that he is *bound* to require absolutely and in all cases, a *spiritual qualification* in the members of His Kingdom, lest they should be hypocrites. *But this is to beg the question as between Paedo and Anti-Paedo Baptists.* Recur to our hypothetical analogy, and certainly there is no such intrinsic absurdity or immorality in the idea of a dozen men devoting themselves and their families to the spiritual service of God—the adults to a fervent and actual spirituality of obedience, and the children to it prospectively. There is certainly no *intrinsic immorality* in a parent thus devoting his children to the service of God, binding them over to it by a specific obligation, and putting a visible symbol of it upon them. The children are not made hypocrites by it. They may ratify the act of the parent when they reach years of sufficient maturity, or not, just as they please: they may reject or confirm their dedication to God; but this does not show at all that they were hypocrites themselves, by reason of their dedication, or that their parents sinned or transcended their lawful right, to dedicate all that they had, children and all, to the service of God. We have seen that such an organization may be formed, by men, acting in their voluntary capacity, without involving any consequences adverse to the integrity of any parties, to the covenant; and if men may lawfully act for this purpose, God may surely order them to act, if he should please to do so. It is obvious, that God may order such an arrangement, if it is agreeable to His will. Let us apply the analogy and see the results:

1.—The spirituality of the Church, opposed to Infant Baptism. We have seen that such an institute as we have endeavored to describe, may be formed for *spiritual purposes*. To set apart a people bearing a visible and organic character, *as devoted to God*, and subject, by voluntary agreement, to His will—to secure obedience to His commands—to maintain His worship, and to seek the great and precious results of His grace, in life and death. In short, to obtain spiritual blessings, by obedience to spiritual laws, in the use of religious means, was *the end which we supposed to be sought by the fra-*

mers of the institute to which we have referred. The end is one thing, and the means of obtaining it is another. Now in what way does the *spirituality of the end* in view, seem to be incompatible with the consecration of children to the attainment of it? Here is an association for a specific purpose. This purpose is spiritual. But to obtain an ultimate end, purely *spiritual*—that is, the glory of God, and the ransom of the soul, there are various material or sensible means to be used. A voluntary organization is formed—men devote themselves first, and their children after them, to this work, and all is complete. If any organization at all is proper, for seeking the great end of eternal life; if there is any reason why men should organize at all, as a people peculiarly consecrated and set apart from the world, as servants of God, it is obvious that such an organization may be arranged according to such dictates of wisdom, as may seem best adapted to secure the end. If a voluntary association are pleased to form themselves into an organization for the purpose, and to leave their children out of it, leaving them in the same position with the masses of rebels around them, there is certainly no intrinsic absurdity in their doing it. But if it seems best to such parents to consecrate their children, as well as themselves, to bind them, as well as their own souls, to the service of God, to enter into covenant with Him, binding all they have over to Him forever, they can equally do so. If it seems, too, *intrinsically more probable*, that God will bless children thus bound over to His service, than if left standing alone, undistinguished from the mass of sinners—if, in other words, it is more likely that the spiritual end of the organization will be accomplished, by training a seed in the organization itself, instructing them in all knowledge pertaining to it, and enforcing upon their consciences the solemn and *special* obligation imposed upon them by their dedication to God—then the question is settled as to which of these two modes of organizing a Kingdom for God is the best. In a word, the *spirituality of the end* in view, is *not at all incompatible with the formation of such an institute or organization as we have supposed, in order to attain it*. Men may devote themselves and their children for *spiritual* purposes, as well as for other purposes. There is no earthly reason why myself and a company of my neighbors, may not devote ourselves and our families forever to the service of God, bind ourselves and our children to it, organize for the purpose, adopt a symbol of the allegiance we swear, and adopt a series of means, instructing prayers, praises and ordinances, for the attainment of the end. *The spirituality of the end or purpose we may have in view, is not at all incompatible with this organized way of attaining it*. If this be true—if the spirituality of the end, and the religious nature of the instrumental agencies employed to effect it, are not at war with such an organization, it follows, that *the spiritual ends of the Church are not incompatible with Infant Baptism*: children may be bound over to the attainment of *these ends*, without any necessary nullification of the *ends* themselves, or any intrinsic absurdity in the act of consecrating and binding them over for this purpose.

There is some little confusion of ideas in the popular use of the term *spiritual*, as applied to the *Kingdom of Christ*. There is *one* Kingdom of Christ, which exists only in the minds and hearts of His elect. This Kingdom, of course, cannot be positively defined by men: it appears in the fluctuating testimony of the lives and character of His followers, sometimes more, sometimes less visible, and that only in part. But He has another Kingdom, distinct from this, based on a visible principle—an organization of men, under ecclesiastical relations to Him. It is indispensable, that the distinction between these two Kingdoms should be clearly maintained; and although they touch in some parts—although the covenant of grace with Christ, on which stands the Kingdom of grace in the hearts of the elect, and the covenant of the Church with Abraham, on which rests the visible Kingdom of Christ, do bear certain important relations to each other, yet they are essentially distinct, and must be considered to be so, or it is vain to expect clear ideas on the subject before us.

If then, by the Kingdom of Christ being *spiritual*, you mean his *invisible* Kingdom, we agree to it; but the admission neither advances nor retards; it does not affect at all the question of Infant Baptism. But the *visible* Kingdom of Christ is also *spiritual*. What is the meaning of this? Does it mean an institute based on one uniform and invisible spiritual condition—a qualification of character, as the invariable condition of membership? *To assert this, is to beg the very question in dispute*. Certainly a spiritual organization might be founded on this principle, of an invariable requisition of a qualification of character in all its members. But the question is, whether this is the *only* principle on which such an institute could be founded: whether this principle might not be partly incorporated into the law of such a body, and only in part: whether the *spiritual* character of the organization might not be equally predicable of a body, from the *spiritual ends* of the organization, from its *religious means* to attain them, from its *moral and spiritual sanctions* for the maintenance of its laws, *as well as from an actual qualification of character* in its members. It is perfectly clear, that the *purposes* of the organization are just as legitimate a principle for discriminating the character of the body, as spiritual or otherwise, as the character of its members. The spiritual character of the Church of God, as a visible institute, is not then *conditioned absolutely* on the spiritual qualifications of its members, and is therefore entirely compatible with a class of citizens bound over to spiritual ends, by the law of their citizenship, yet not necessarily possessed of a spiritual qualification of character in order to membership, in the class of citizens to which they belong. In other terms, the spiritual character of the Church, is no necessary bar to the membership and baptism of infants.

2.—On the second question, as to the nature of the relations formed between God on the one part, and Abraham with his seed on the other, it is clear that they are *ecclesiastical* relations, as dis-

tinguished from a civil institute, on the one side, and a covenant of grace for personal salvation, on the other. The covenant of grace for the salvation of the soul; is made with Christ alone, and in His mediatorial capacity. The civil status of the Jewish people was the merely incidental result of their numerical increase. Long before a solitary national or political feature had been developed among them, the covenant on which the whole of their peculiar relation to God depended, had been fully developed in its visible form. Its obligations had been assumed; its rules had been observed; and its symbols of visible order had been displayed. The natural increase of the members of this ecclesiastical organization, developed, insensibly, the demand for a national or political system; but even in the highest days of the Jewish monarchy, the political capacity of the people was wholly subordinate to their ecclesiastical character. For an illustration of this, I beg leave to refer you to Mason's Essay on the Church.* It seems to me to be utterly inexplicable, that no trace of ecclesiastical relations can be found by Baptists, in all the long and splendid history of the Jewish Church. There were regular grades of ecclesiastical officers; there were forms and ceremonies, sacrifices, and oblations of religious worship. There were temples and synagogues devoted to the regular worship of God. There were laws upon laws, regulating the whole ritual of the service, from the most important definition of official functions, to the most minute specifications of dress and demeanor. Yet in all this, no trace of a Church can be found! How would a man go about to prove that there was a Church in our days, independent of any direct assertion of the fact, in written records? Surely he would appeal to the organizations of individuals on a religious principle—to the regular offices discharged in these organizations—to the prayers, hymns, and religious services of the people. This would surely be sufficient. If no trace of a Church can be found among the Jews, none can be found, since the time of Christ. The New Testament writers repeatedly allude to the existing organization of the Church. Allusion is made to *the Church in the wilderness*. Paul argues explicitly, that the Gentiles should be grafted into that from which the Jews were cast out. What was this but the Church of God? Promises were repeatedly made to the Jewish Church of Zion which are unsusceptible of fulfilment, except on the supposition, first, that there was a Jewish Church, and second, that it is *identical* with the Church of Christ, under the New Dispensation. Follow back the Jewish church through the successive ages of its existence, and we find it enlarged by Moses, embellished by Solomon; but still tracing back beyond them, through patriarch and prophet, until we find it organized in the family of Abraham, long before a solitary *national* characteristic had arisen to disturb the purely ecclesiastical character of the organization. But through all the modifications through which it may have passed, it still remained essentially and unalterably the same, down to the coming of Christ. Infants were included in

*Mason's Essay on the Church, pp. 27, 46.

their ecclesiastical relations, and when Christ came, he not only found a Church in existence, but he found infants universally regarded as its members. He came to raise the tabernacle of David, to set up its fallen walls, not to build an entirely new structure. He found a Church, and infant membership universally and practically recognized. *This fact is indispensably necessary to the understanding of the true bearings of the commission he afterwards gave to his disciples, on the baptism of Infants*; and we are now ready to investigate the objection, based on the requisition of a spiritual qualification.

3.—This is the third objection: admitting that children were born into this ecclesiastical state during the Old Dispensation, yet the positive demand of a personal qualification, operates as a positive bar against the old law of admission under the New Dispensation.

Let us recur to our analogy. We have seen that the original framers of a voluntary institute for the worship of God, might consistently require a *personal qualification* from a third party, desiring to come into the organization, with his children, and not from the children themselves—the parent entering one class of citizens, the children another. Suppose such an organization to exist—suppose it should be required of a party seeking entrance, that he give credible evidence of personal piety; suppose that this requisition should be proclaimed abroad, and that *it should be appealed to prove that children were no parties to the compact*, because a qualification was required, with which they could not be conceived as endowed. What would be thought of the argument? How would it be answered? Why, assuredly it would be answered by reference to the organization *as it existed*. Such a reference would show that children were included, and that the requisition of a qualification in an adult, in order to his entry, did not, and could not imply the contrary. Now interpret the requisition of a qualification of character, in the Apostolic commission, by the facts of the case, as they existed at the time. The Church was in existence; children were in it, with their parents; and a qualification of character is required of all who may wish to take position with them. Let it now be answered, whether interpreting the commission in the light of the facts, the requisition of a qualification *necessarily infer* that children were no longer to occupy the position they had done for many centuries before. To us it seems clear, that the commission bears single reference to adults, in its demand of a qualification of character, and does by no means carry with it the inference of necessary incompatibility with Infant Baptism. If this be so, then the commission of the Apostles does not operate as a bar to the membership of Infants.

(To be continued.)

THE LATE MEETING OF THE SYNOD OF BALTIMORE.

The second meeting of this body occurred at Chambersburg, Pa. on Thursday evening, the 25th of October. The opening sermon was preached by Mr. White, the Moderator of last year. From the passage in I. Corinthians, 9 : 16—"For though I preach the Gospel, I have nothing to glory of; yea, woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel;"—the preacher proceeded with singular clearness and force to illustrate the points: 1st.—What the Apostle preached—"the Gospel." 2.—*Why* he preached it—the "necessity laid upon" him. 3.—*How* he preached it—with humility, having nothing "to glory of."

The attendance at the meeting was quite full, especially from the Presbyteries of Winchester, Eastern Shore, and Carlisle. This remark, however, applies to the attendance of ministers, for with the exception of Carlisle Presbytery, the number of Ruling Elders was very small. Dr. Foote, of Winchester Presbytery, was chosen Moderator by acclamation, and Winchester, Virginia, was selected as the place for the next meeting, by a similar vote. The usual routine business was transacted. Three cases of appeal or complaint were heard and issued—two from Baltimore, and one from Carlisle Presbytery. The unexpected amount of business to be transacted, as the meeting occurred so late in the week, caused a little hurry and confusion, from the press of business during the closing session of Saturday evening. With this slight exception, not a single instance occurred during the entire session, of the least disorder, or any thing to mar the dignity and harmony of the proceedings.

Each day, during the meeting, Synod twice took recess for public worship. The preaching was eminently characterized by its simplicity, force and directness. Very obviously, in every case, it was just such preaching as the members were accustomed to do at home, and not specially prepared for the occasion, which in our judgment added greatly to its effectiveness. On the Sabbath, the pulpits of the town, we believe without exception, were supplied by the members of Synod. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated with Mr. Clark's people, and a Synodical Prayer Meeting held in the afternoon. We have seldom heard a more general expression of the highest gratification, and of spiritual profit, than in connection with all these services, and especially at the communion season.

Our purpose in this notice, however, is not to report the proceedings of this meeting, but rather to give expression to some thoughts which have been suggested by it, in relation to our Synodical meetings.

In the first place, so far as relates to the practical working of this new organization, composed as it is, of elements from the three dif-

ferent commonwealths of Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia, the experiment of two meetings has more than realized the anticipations of its most sanguine friends. The Synod of Baltimore bids fair to become a standing testimony to the truth, that sectional, civil and political separation, by no means involves the necessity of ecclesiastical separation also among Presbyterians. We were particularly impressed with this thought, during the very first proceedings of the recent Synod. On the morning of Friday, while waiting for the preparation of business by the several committees, a free conversation was held on the subject of the destitutions and the Missionary Territory within our bounds, with a view to some better concerted action of the Presbyteries in providing for the supply of fields lying along their common boundaries. The region which formed the chief subject of the conversation, was the mountainous country lying along the common boundary of Carlisle and Winchester Presbyteries. Dr. Foote, the Moderator, detailed, as none so well as he was able to detail, the position and wants of the vast Missionary field around him, in the mountains of Virginia. He took occasion to show how the people, now calling for Missionary labor in this portion of Winchester Presbytery, were the grand-children of those Scotch Irish, who originally went forth from Carlisle Presbytery, with the tide of emigration that set in for a time through the Cumberland Valley, to the Valley of Virginia, and the mountains of Virginia. His appeal was most effective. A prominent Elder from Carlisle Presbytery, in response, and giving utterance evidently, to the general feeling of his Presbytery, proposed that Winchester Presbytery should, as soon as practicable, get one or more missionaries into that field, and call, if needful, upon the Churches of Carlisle Presbytery, to aid in their support. This, indeed, was the spirit of the meeting. Winchester and Carlisle Presbyteries seemed to recognize with equal surprise, and pleasure, an ancient family relationship; and the good people of Chambersburg, in the spirit of the Synod, extended their hospitalities to the Virginia Presbytery, not merely as to ecclesiastical visitors, but rather in the fashion of a household, equally surprised and gratified by a visit from some long absent branch of the family, returning to the old household. Nothing was said—nothing done, indicating a special effort to be on good terms. It is only when there is lurking suspicion of having cause for disagreement, that such effort is made. There was manifestly a pleasurable consciousness of an essential family unity, in a common Scotch Irish Presbyterian ancestry. And though the representatives of different sections, and apparently separated by political, civil, and social prejudices and boundaries,—which “being men of like passions with other men,” they partake the influence of in their measure,—yet overriding all diversities and prejudices, is the control of a consciousness of a family bond, through the blood of a common ancestry—and that, too, martyr blood, in testimony of a common faith. Yea, and higher than all, a family union through the blood of Jesus, the common Sa-

viour, shed for the remission of sins, and "to purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

Another matter was not less forcibly suggested by this meeting, and especially by the religious services connected with it. This was the important incidental uses to which our Synodical meetings may be turned. The Synod, as a part simply of our system of ecclesiastical courts, is doubtless the least essential. It has been suggested heretofore in this journal, and elsewhere, that the very growth of our Church will necessitate, in the course of a few years, the reduction of both the representation and the business of our General Assembly; and that the most obvious method of getting at such a reduction, is the plan of representation in the Assembly by Synods, rather than by Presbyteries, as at present. In that case, the Synod will assume a much more important place in our system. As things now are, however, the Synod, in addition to its importance as an ecclesiastical court, may be made to have immense importance, as a religious conference of the ministers and elders of a large district of country. The conviction of the need of some such meeting, manifests itself not unfrequently in many sections of the Church, in the effort to form ministerial associations, for conference and mutual improvement. The annual meeting of the Synod affords such opportunity on a wide scale, for conference, if we choose to avail ourselves of it. The very fact of the Synod not being necessarily compelled to do much business, renders it the more suitable for such incidental uses, whilst the fact that there is important business to be done, ensures attendance. Nothing could be better adapted to preserve the unity and harmony of feeling, and therefore to give the greatest possible strength to the body of Ministers and Elders, in any portion of the Church; nothing more adapted to keep alive an *esprit du corps*, among the body of officers themselves; nothing better to keep alive the consciousness of the strength of our system, and the power of our Church, for the encouragement of the feeble and more scattered portions of it: and nothing could tend more to the edification and spiritual growth of the office bearers of the Church, than such an opportunity of worshipping together, once a year—preaching to each other, and hearing each other preach—extending acquaintance, and mingling sociably with the people, in the various portions of the field, under the supervision of the Synod. No reflecting man who attended the meeting at Chambersburg, could fail to be impressed with the desirableness of such a meeting, if it were for nothing else than to allow ministers to learn how varied the "diversities of gifts," and how various may be the manner and method of preaching the same Gospel with power and efficiency;—that would have been of itself sufficient compensation for the time spent there.

The chief objection to such a meeting of Synod, arises from the necessity of leaving the Churches unsupplied on the Sabbath of the Synodical meeting. In regard to this, it may be said, first, that to

a large extent, the difficulty is rather theoretical than real. Most of those who attend the Synod—especially if the number be no greater than has heretofore been usually in attendance—can obtain supplies for the Sabbath, either from among those who would not attend Synod, or from ministers of other Churches. In the second place, even if some inconvenience should arise to the several congregations, the inconvenience itself—the break in the ordinary Sabbath services,—might not be without its incidental benefits to the people. If it be desirable that the people should be trained to estimate highly the importance of our ecclesiastical system, in the outworking of all its parts, that end cannot be accomplished without an occasional sacrifice for the sake of the system. If nothing occur from year's end to year's end, to remind them even of the existence of such a thing as a Synod, and of their relation to it, they will not be likely to esteem it very important. That which costs men nothing, is ever lightly esteemed. And, moreover, there is ever a tendency in our Congregations—especially in our large Congregations in large cities, to segregate themselves, and become so entirely absorbed in their own concerns, as to overlook entirely their relations to brethren of other Congregations, and lose the consciousness of any relation to others, than perhaps their relations to the feeble Congregations sustained by their benevolence. There is apt to creep in among such the spirit of a practical independency. Their own Congregational affairs—their own minister—their own wants, gradually contract their views within the limits of the one Congregation, and that becomes to them the Church for which they live and labor. Their pastor, in their view, belongs to them, in a sense that practically excludes the idea that he belongs to the Church of Christ at large; and that he has, as a minister, any other relations, except as the pastor of that people. This is a very serious error, and tends directly to destroy the peculiar efficiency of our system. Instead of ministering to such a feeling, it is very important to withstand it earnestly; and perhaps by no one thing could it be more effectively corrected, than by a call every year, to give up the minister a week, and send up the Elder with him, that they may spend the time in conference with the brethren of all the Churches in the Synod, concerning the common interests of the Church. Too much importance cannot be given in these days—or interest attached to this matter of the essential unity of the Church, as *one Church*—the unity, not of mere aggregation of units, but the unity rather, of fractional parts, making up one unit. The whole tendency of the undue segregation of our large city Churches, is in the direction of Independency, rather than of Presbyterianism. And the leaven of Independency having been the fruitful source of most of our troubles as a Church, for fifty years past, it is surely the part of wisdom to guard ourselves on that side.

One thing in connection with this meeting deserves special notice—and that we look upon as the only defect we found in it. The

Ruling Elders seem to have acted on the supposition that their presence is not important at Synodical meetings. One reason assigned for the comparatively thin attendance of the ministers from Baltimore Presbytery, was the late period in the week at which Synod met, which would oblige them to be absent from their charges on the Sabbath. But yet the attendance of ministers from that Presbytery was three-fold greater than of Ruling Elders. No material interest of the Church could have suffered from *their* absence on the Sabbath. This practical form of the heresy that subverts the true position of the Eldership in the Church, we consider far worse than the theoretic form of it, which would make them merely *lay* representatives, sent as assistants to represent the people in Church courts, in some regard, wherein the ministers are not representatives of the people. When shall we see the beautiful theory of our ecclesiastical system realized, in the actual working of the Church? Of what avail to “*contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints,*” on the subject of the order and rule of Christ’s house, if we are content merely to contend for an abstract principle, while we continually contradict the theory by our practice? Let the Synod of Baltimore look to this matter, and let our Ruling Elders see to it, that they fail not to magnify their office. If they themselves, by their practice, constantly sanction the error, that their presence in the Courts is unimportant—or that their presence is somehow less important, and less obligatory, than that of the ministers, how are the wrong tendencies of the people to undervalue their office, to be corrected?

FORMALISM, PURITANISM, AND RATIONALISM—THE • THREE RELIGIONS, AS DEVELOPED FROM THEIR GERMINAL PRINCIPLE.

Whilst a shallow Latitudinarianism is still too current, which insists on receiving as Christianity, any thing which may choose to assume the Christian name, and which denounces any who refuse implicit obedience to the dicta of its despotic liberality—it is encouraging to observe, that the spirit of inquiry, as to the difference between a spurious and a genuine Christianity, is spreading among the more thoughtful class of men outside the Church; and to hear so often the inquiry,—“What is the difference in principle between genuine Protestantism, and its opposites, on either extreme?” We have thought it worth while to offer a few suggestions in re-

sponse to this inquiry, by way of indicating a method of response, which may at once most fully and concisely cover the whole ground of the inquiry.

We select the terms *Formalism*, *Puritanism*, and *Rationalism*, to designate generally, three different conceptions of religion. And this for the reason, that it is our purpose to discuss the principles involved in the inquiry, rather than any specific form in which they may have become embodied in any religious sect. As exponents, however, of the things indicated by these terms, we would cite *Po-pery* in any of its forms, as an illustration of the first; a pure *Presbyterianism*, of the second; and a candid and consistent *Unitarianism*, of the third.

Amid all the diversities of names and sects, among those who claim to be Christian, the most casual observer will not have failed to perceive, that whilst some of these diversities are but various forms of that which is essentially the same thing, others of them are radical, and affect the very substance of religion itself. He finds not only lines of distinction between them, but an impassible gulf fixed, as that between hell and heaven. The one party regarding itself as under the leading of God's truth, and therefore in the way of obtaining His Divine favor, but looking upon the other as given over to strong delusion, to believe a lie.

If the inquirer now proceed in the natural order of ideas, to inquire into the historical facts relating to this phenomenon, he finds floating upon the surface, certain popular accounts of the matter, which, however correct as mere statements of facts, as far as they go, are yet entirely unsatisfactory, as accounting for the existence of this wide separation. "Where was your Church before Luther, and the Augsburg Confession, of 1525?" asks the one party with a sneer. "Where was your Church before Pius IV, and the Tridentine Creed of 1564?" retort the other parties.—"Our Church and Creed are, on your own basis, at least forty years the senior of yours." Or in another aspect of the rival claims to be the Church—"Your religion is a mere negative—a protest against the Truth of the Holy Catholic Faith—How shall a man's soul be saved, by mere negation of belief?"—says the one party. To which, as before, is the ready retort: "What is your Creed, but a negation of the great positive truths of salvation, as set forth by the fathers of the Reformation; nay, what are all your acts of Trent, from which your Creed is distilled, but a series of protests against the truths of salvation, and impious damning of all who hold them?"

It is obvious, that whatever good purpose these statements of the question may serve, in embodying in some concrete form, the great principles involved to the popular mind, they are an unsatisfactory answer to the question: "Wherein consists the difference in principle between the three great sections into which the nominal Christian world is divided? In regard to the origin of the difference, the inquirer will find a substantial agreement between the more can-

did and philosophical of the partizans on all sides. That such is the fact, we cite here the answer of the most consistent advocate of the system of Formalism—concerning the origin and causes of Puritanism—and, by parity of reasoning, of Rationalism.

“*Luther found he did not create, but introduced his Protestantism.* Protestantism, if analyzed, may be reduced to four elements. [Mark this especially—as it will have an obvious bearing on the subsequent part of our discussion.]—Protestantism, if analyzed, may be reduced to four elements: 1.—The rejection of the Papacy. 2.—The rejection of the Christian Priesthood, or Sacerdotal Order. 3.—The denial of all *dogmatic Theology*; and, 4.—The adoption of religion, as a mere sentiment of the heart, called by some, Love, by others, Faith. * * * * *

“Now all these elements *were held in Christian Europe by vast multitudes*, many of them in the external communion of the Church passing themselves off as Catholics, though, in fact, occult heretics, centuries before Luther was born. At no period was Christian Europe, in point of fact, as Catholic, as first appearances indicate, and at no period were all the real heretics outside the external communion of the Church. Protestants cannot, indeed, maintain for their party or doctrines, an Apostolic origin, *but they can trace their succession from the Apostolic age.* Through the Bohemian brethren, Lollards, Beghards, Cathares Patarins, Albigenses, Bulgarians, Paulicians, Marichaeans, and Gnostics, they can ascend to the very times of the Apostles. These sects were *all of the same family, and were all essentially Protestant.* They were all condemned indeed by the Church, but by means of secret organizations, and outward conformity to Catholicity, they always contrived to maintain themselves to a fearful extent in her external communion. * * * * *

“Catholicity was indeed the official religion, but even in the thirteenth century, regarded by a modern school as the culminating point of the Ages of Faith, virtual Protestantism was hardly less rife, than in the sixteenth, and there was, we verily believe, more real Catholicity in the seventeenth century, than in either the fourteenth or fifteenth.”—*Brownson's Rev. Jan.* '55, pp. 64, 65, 66.

To this statement of the case by one of the great lights of Formalism, Puritanism makes no objection, in so far as it declares, that historically, the diversities that separate between the systems, are as old as the Apostles; nay, far beyond the Apostles even, the Puritan will say, runs back this distinction of these general phases of religious belief. The will-worshipper, corrupting and mingling with human elements, the ideas derived at first from God's Revelation. The Rationalist, scoffing at the idea of any direct revelation from God to man, other than that made through his reason, the Puritan, struggling for the preservation of the Revelation, just as God made it: these can be traced back beyond the age of Apostles to

Prophets—yea, beyond Prophets to Patriarchs—yea, beyond Patriarchs to Abel, the first martyr, and Cain, the first will-worshipper and bloody persecutor.

Nor will the Rationalist refuse concurrence with the other, in so far as relates to the case thus stated historically.

This brings us at once, then, to the main question, whence this singular antagonism between different forms of apparently the same Christianity? From what germinal principles?—and by what laws developed? Now, if we go back to the very first of all questions, concerning religion, we find, even there, an entire contradiction between these theories, in regard to the fountain source of all religion. In response to the first, and fundamental question—“How shall man know his duty, and the method of gaining God’s favor?—three different answers are given. The Puritan answers: *“The Word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify Him.”* The Formalist answers either more or less distinctly, in the terms of Pius IV.—“I most firmly admit and embrace Apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all the constitutions and observances of the same Church. I also admit the Sacred Scriptures, according to the sense in which the Holy Mother Church has held, and does hold them, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense of the Holy Scriptures.” Rationalism answers, in one or other form, with Parker, (*Theism*, p. 124:)—“How beautifully comes forth the calm, clear light, of *natural human religion.*” * * “How beautiful is the Universe: it is the great Bible of God; material nature is the Old Testament, millions of years old, spangled with truths under our feet, sparkling with glories over our head; and Human Nature is the New Testament from, the *Infinite God, every day revealing a new page, as Time turns over the leaf.*”

Here, then, at the very root of the whole matter of religion, there is an irreconcilable diversity—and that, too, in reference to the very germ and life of all religion, to wit: Where shall man get his ideas? From God—Man—or Nature? Each theory is very consistent with itself, but utterly antagonistic to the other. The Puritan declares, that the only authority that can demand faith of man’s soul, is the word of God, directly speaking. The mind of God has been declared, and written in a Book. That Book must therefore control all things that pertain to religion—Church order—ordinances—Faith. Not a line, not a word, of any less than celestial dignity, shall be heard, as of authority to direct the soul. Not only hath God spoken, but He hath spoken all that man needs to know. Of so great importance is it, in God’s esteem, to furnish such a Rule, that for a thousand years of the Church’s History, there was kept open communication between heaven and earth. The chariot of heaven, ascending and descending, brought even new intelligence of God’s will, concerning the infinite variety of human affairs, that no case might be left unprovided for; and record was

made of it, as a guide to the soul. For the recorded cases are intended to be representative cases. That it was intended to be the only rule, and an all-sufficient rule, is manifest from its structure. For it is not a mere code of laws, or a mere theology, left to be expounded and applied by some living human authority, but a report in full, of cases—application already made, to every variety of instance under Divine direction. Not only does it report the speech of the voice of God to the human soul, but the voice of the human soul, in all its phases and conditions, answering back to God. Now of a soul in its state of depravity, answering back in malignant defiance;—now in its state of godly sorrow, yearning after God, as the hart panteth after the water brooks—now in its state of peace and joy in the Holy Ghost—so that not a case can now occur in the history of men, that some representative case, to guide in all the details of it, shall not be found in this Rule, that God hath given to direct. God hath spoken from heaven, then—and spoken all that man can need to know of Him. Beside this speech, and these truths, let no other truths of any thing less than celestial dignity, dare seat themselves, in blasphemous impertinence!

On the contrary, Formalism, instead of this simple rule, the Word of God only, devises the conception of a rule, given through a living, embodied spiritual corporation, as *His agent* for revealing and communicating His will. The Church is the rule of Faith. The Scriptures are received, indeed, but simply as part of the report of what the *Church* hath decided in past times. It is obviously idle, to talk of the Scriptures as a rule, in part. From the very nature of the case, there can be no joint powers, no concurrent jurisdiction. A law that consents to give utterance to its truths, only in obedience to some other power, is plainly of no higher authority than the power which controls its interpretation; and, as matter of fact, in this case, the Church becomes the rule, and Faith is reduced to a simple act of obedience to a Church, commanding Faith. All this will appear manifest, from the slightest analysis of this Rule of Formalism.

How is one to believe the Scriptures, only in the sense of Holy Mother Church? How shall he know that there is a Church at all, save that Holy Mother *commands* him thus to believe? Or, assuming there is a Church, where is it? How can his rule determine that point in any other way, than on the ground, again, that the Church represented in the priest declares this is the Church. It is needless, however, to run out the illustrations. Nothing can be plainer, than that this theory of the rule of Faith, necessitates, logically, the proposition, that Faith is mere obedience to authority of a Church teaching, and not the apprehension of truth by the understanding, knowing and feeling it to be truth.

That the true ground of objection to the common use of Scripture, lies, as has been shown, in the practical rejection of Scripture, as a rule of faith, and not from mere expediency, and fear of danger to the ignorant, is manifest, from the utter denial by their more pro-

found thinkers, not only of the final authority of Scripture, as the arbiter of controversy, but of the propriety of appealing in controversy to Scripture at all.

If this seems an exaggerated statement of the case—hear again the acknowledged defender of the Faith of Formalism :

“There is no Catholic dogma, taken apart from the authority of the Church *that is defensible!* Deny, or waive the commission of the Church from God to teach, therefore her presence as infallible teacher, and there is nothing that she teaches as of faith that a wise man will undertake either to *deny or to defend!* To waive that authority, and descend into the combat with Protestants, is to concede to them in the outset, all they contend for, namely, the possibility of determining what is Christian faith, without an infallible Church. We can then combat *only* with arms *borrowed from the Scriptures*, and the Fathers (!)—and if with such arms we combat them successfully, the victory inures to them, not to us. We defeat ourselves, by our very success; for our doctrine is, that, without the infallible authority of the Church, Christian Faith is not determinable. We can, in our controversies with Protestants, appeal to the Scriptures and the Fathers only to prove what the Church has always believed, and taught, as Christian Faith.”*

Here is fully and honestly averred, precisely the conclusions which we have deduced from an analysis of the Papal creed, and the spirit and acts of the Papal Church, toward Scripture.

It is equally manifest, that, whatever may be the professions of respect, which Rationalism, in its less extreme forms, may ostentatiously display, yet, for like reasons here as in the case of Formalism, the admission of any authority save God's Word, practically sets aside God's Word as the rule. Whilst it may be only fully developed Rationalism, which accepts fully Parker's propositions, that it is only because of an unwillingness to accept the logical consequences of a principle, that must lead to rejecting all direct revelation of God to the soul of man, men frequently rid themselves of logical difficulties, by closing their eyes, and, ostrich-like, hiding their head from the train of consequences which they see pursuing them. It really is no relief to the theory of pure Rationalism, to admit a revelation from God, in part, as subsidiary to reason. The likelihood is, rather, as experience shows, that, in such a position, no man, with logical perceptions, can remain content—and that once started from his wrong ground, and losing confidence in it, he is only the more strongly tempted to general scepticism. Hence, so frequently, those who begin with receiving the Word of God as the rule in part,—a subsidiary rule—or one that may be allowed to come in at some later stage of the argument for religion, to modify the system of reason—will seldom be found to rest there. Step by step, the votary of Rational Christianity becomes, first, the votary

* Brownson's Review, July, 1852.

of Deism, then of Pantheism, then of Atheism. For, of necessity, as we have said, a religion that consents to utter its voice only in obedience to something which may claim to be reason, is of no higher force than the power which thus controls it. It must immediately dwindle, therefore, into a mere hypothetical and visionary system, which, in the nature of the case, can exert no real power over the soul. Nothing is more natural, than that to such a mind, this religion is found to be most meagre and unsatisfying. The God of such a system having first dwindled into an object within the reach of human reason, shall soon be degraded to the level of humanity; and finally, as an unworthy and unnecessary conception, be banished from the universe. We have not thought it worth while, therefore, to waste time and space upon any distinction of the several varieties of the Rationalistic Rule of Faith—since, though in any case, it may not be in fact a rejection of all revelation direct from God, the logic of Rationalism deserves no credit for the exception.

Such, then, are the answers of the three to this very first inquiry concerning religion. From this diversity in their answers to the fundamental principle, all other diversities between them are easily deducible.

In the first place, from the Formalistic theory of the Rule of Faith, comes necessarily, and most logically, the Formalistic theory of the Church, as a visible, corporate, external unit, and consequently, all other organizations false. For if the Church be God's agent to reveal His will, and the channel through which he communicates directly His grace—then it is vital to the whole system, that there should be shown to be therein exclusive official corporate powers; and vital, that every minister shall be able to show that he is an authorized agent of the corporation, to dispense the grace which comes through it alone.

Puritanism, in like manner, derives its idea of the Church, and the unity of the Church, necessarily from its Rule of Faith. As the Rule is the truth of God alone, as revealed in the book, so its Church is the body, formed of men, who have, through receiving that truth, been born again, spiritually, united to Christ, and through Him, to one another. While an external unity of government is essential to the very existence of the Church of Formalism—since the grace of God can come to the souls of men, only through the properly commissioned agents of the corporation,—the Church of Puritanism is a moral and spiritual unity, that may consist with great external diversity. Indeed, as its source of religious ideas, the revealed word in the book, is diverse—it is by no means singular, that the embodiment of these truths should be somewhat diverse. As there is a Gospel according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, and according to John—a four-fold Gospel, which is one Gospel, so there may naturally be a manifold Church, which is one Church—a Church according to Methodism, Episcopacy, Pres-

byterianism. As there is in the one theology of Christ crucified, a diversity ;—now theology according to Paul—of sinful man, raised from his degradation to God—and now theology according to John—of God, who is love, descending to man ; so it is to be anticipated, that, with entire spiritual unity, through a common grace to a common head, there shall yet be outward diversity in the embodiment of these truths in the living Church. So that the hue and cry of Formalism against the Puritan sects and divisions, has no foundation ; nor would it be even specious, save from the fallacy, not always discovered, of applying to Puritanism a measure of unity which is utterly incompatible with its fundamental theory, but which, in the nature of the case, is absolutely essential to the existence of the Church of Formalism. And the retort, of want of unity in Formalism, is tremendous, when it is borne in mind, that, while the points of actual disagreement between the various sects of Puritanism, when all is admitted, are by no means inconsistent with real unity—whilst the points of disagreement between the devotees and schools of Formalism, are those which are vital to the nature and claims of the sort of Church, which Formalism demands.

With a like consistency, Rationalism deduces from its Rule of Faith, Reason—or the Word of God, as measured and interpreted by reason—its conception of the Church, rejecting alike the theory of an authoritative spiritual corporation, bound externally together by one vast government, and the theory of a Spiritual Body, united to Christ, and to each other, in consequence of the act of faith. Rationalism has no Church, beyond a mere aggregation, as of sands, by the mere attraction of common opinions. As Jesus, according to Rationalism, is a mere teacher, so his Church is a mere School, or College. The union of his followers, is but the union of the disciples of Plato or Aristotle. And, as a matter of fact, it will ever be found, that just as the leaven of Rationalism at any time infests the Church, just in that degree will the tendency of the Church be, to independency and segregation. And so conversely, just in the degree that the Church loses hold of the great idea of her essential unity, will be the degree of her tendencies to Rationalism of opinion.

(*To be continued.*)

SECOND VOLUME OF THE CRITIC—OUR PLANS AND PURPOSES.

WE send forth on our cover, with this number, our Prospectus for a second volume of the Critic. It has been sent forth thus early, in order that we may have time before the end of the year to hear from our friends every where, and thus be better prepared to determine on the detail of our plans for the year to come.

In the advertisement on our cover, are set out somewhat fully the reasons both for continuing, and at the same time for making some changes in the paper. Of the validity of the reasons for continuance, and of the wisdom of the changes proposed, our friends and the public must judge. We have sought to do simply what, under all circumstances, we thought it our duty to do. As we have assumed the character of journalists only incidentally, and expect no recompense of our labors beyond the satisfaction of having discharged—and that at no inconsiderable expenditure of labor, patience, and good nature—an important duty to the church; we feel at liberty to undertake just as much of this sort of work as suits our convenience, and as is consistent with our regular duties as Pastors in the church. We were cautious in announcing ourselves at the beginning, as committed to this work only for a single year. Having tried the experiment and found just how much we can conveniently do, and what it costs us to do it, we have graduated our plans for the coming year accordingly. As we have, during the past year, done a good deal more than we promised—published more than we proposed to publish, having regard much more to what the interests required, which we seek to promote, than to whether the revenues from our subscription list would pay us, so it is likely we shall do again; but our choice is to assume the obligation to do no more than what we shall likely be able to accomplish well and faithfully, and accomplish in a way to save us from pecuniary loss.

In regard to the more important aspects of our work—its aim and end, we have but little to say. As to what general end we are aiming at:—if that has not been made manifest by what we have published during the past year, it would be idle to attempt the explanation of it within the short space allotted here to these observations. At the commencement of the work, it was perhaps the prominent idea of the project to inquire freely, and vindicate the right to inquire freely into the principles upon which the Presbyterian Church is grounded, and especially the principles which should control her activity, and the outward manifestation of her life. This end has been accomplished in some measure. And the result of our experiment is a much clearer conviction than ever before, of the importance of more discussion of principles, and of a clear and more discriminating apprehension of the distinctive principles of the Pres-

byterian order and government in their application to the work, which the church in this country is manifestly called of God to do. Also it is absolutely essential to our permanent prosperity as a church, to have brought out more fully in the practical working of the church, the theoretic principles, which so clearly and widely distinguish Presbyterianism as an order of Christ's House, from Prelacy on the one hand, and Independency on the other. We hold Presbyterianism to be not merely an ingenious expedient for accomplishing certain ends, but a divinely appointed order, for doing the great work which Jesus Christ left to be finished by the church. We hold that Presbyterianism is neither a merely liberalized and popularized Prelacy on the one hand, nor a new and improved edition of Independency on the other, nor an Eclectic compound of both, but a primary, positive, original, and complete theory of the Church of God, as a government on earth. We hold moreover, that the work which the church has to accomplish for the world, is a very distinct and peculiar work, and that under very distinct and peculiar instructions. From these views of the church and her work, we derive directly the obligation to have distinctly before her, and properly to regard in all her great enterprises, both her own intrinsic agencies for working, and the restricted nature of the work, which has been given her to do. If our fathers were right in contending against the notion of "the largest liberty" in the church, to ordain her own laws and worship, as a notion utterly fatal to the "largest liberty" of the people of Christ's Kingdom; then we may not be far out of the way in fearing as dangerous to the freedom of the church, and in contending against, the notion of "the largest liberty" in the church, to ordain at pleasure the agencies, and methods, and laws of action, whereby she will do the work Christ hath left her to do; or to elect to do some other work, which Christ did not specifically appoint her to do. Nothing can be more fallacious, than to talk of Christ having left the church "free to do," and at "liberty to do" thus and so, as evidence of the freedom enjoyed in the church. The true protection for the liberties of Christ's people, is manifestly in the fact that He hath *not* left the church "free to do," and "at liberty to do" any thing beyond what He hath commanded her to do—and *how* to do. Just as in political governments, the freedom of the people depends not so much upon the form of the government, whether Democratic, Republican or Monarchical,—as upon having a constitutional government to limit the powers of the governors, and not leaving the government "free to do," and at "liberty to do" whatever it may judge wise: so we maintain the true freedom of Christ's Kingdom, is not liberty to do in the church,—but restriction from doing any thing but what He has ordained, both the duty to do, and the agents for doing. We hold that whatever is of right, the work of the church, is to be demanded of the people as *of faith*, and as in obedience to positive command of Christ. And, moreover, that what is not "of faith" to the individual believer, as Christ's command, it is no part of

the church's authority to enjoin. And therefore the church has no work to do, which must be done by agencies supplemental, and governments supplemental to Christ's divinely appointed agencies and government. And, therefore, that special pains should be taken, to let the people understand, and see that the agencies employed, are part and parcel of the church government, not supplemental to it. We have no very great objection to the application of the term "High-Church" to our views, as is sometimes done in derision. Whether "High-Churchism" be a term of disparagement or of honor, depends altogether upon the *quality of the Churchism*, as according to, or departing from the simplicity of the Gospel—not upon the quantity and degree of it as "high" or "low." As applied to a party in a church that has gone astray from the order and government, whilst holding fast to the great theology of the Gospel, in her articles, "High Church" is justly a term of reproach; for it denotes such as glory in the shame of their church, and seek with mad devotion to make parade of its weakness before the world. But "*High-Church*," as applied to a party in a church that holds fast to the order and government which Christ gave, becomes synonymous with "Pure-Church," and "Free Church." Such High-Churchism, we shall take it as the highest honor to be the advocates of. We feel greatly encouraged in our purpose, to advocate such a Presbyterianism in our church, during another year, from what we have seen and felt as the result of the work of the year past. We have received a far greater share, both of censure and approval, than we anticipated. It is manifest that since the deliverance of our church from the troubles within her own bosom, and her firm establishment, there is beginning to be felt the necessity of a more consistent and more intelligent application of our system to all departments of our work as a church. Of this direction of the more discriminating and unbiased minds among our ministry, our position has given us a tolerably fair opportunity to judge. We care not to make a parade of the kind approval, which our work has met with;—yea, even our *manner* of doing our work. We say simply, as indicative of the growing feeling of interest in these views of the church, that, with all the faint praise, and all the denunciation of us in high quarters on the one hand, we have had on the other, in a large degree, and from sources quite as high, encouragement and commendation. None of our friends have in the excess of their enthusiasm pronounced the Critic "*the best paper in the church, or out of it*;" but some of them have gone a great ways in that direction, only with more caution in their expressions, touching our comparative merits. Of the past however, we have little to say—we have done our work, and leave it with the utmost confidence, to be tested by the lapse of time, and the future history of the Presbyterian Church. Our hope is, that from the position we have now gained, as well as from the definiteness of purpose with which we shall labor, we may accomplish much higher results in the year to come. We have no promises to

make, however, beyond the faithful fulfilment of our contract with the public, to continue the Critic bi-monthly through the next year, in advocacy generally of what we hold to be genuine Presbyterianism. It is not very likely, that those who have been so much annoyed by our "bad spirit"—"bad manners," and bad doings generally during the year past, will find any material improvement in us, should they continue their patronage during the year to come. The only hope of improvement in this direction, must be in some improvement in the spirit, manners, and doings generally of those with whom we have occasion to come in contact in the prosecution of our work. We assure our amiable friends of the "journals in the church and out of it," who have felt called upon in the discharge of their consciences, either to put the world on its guard against us, or to keep from the innocent, uncontaminated world, the secret of our existence, if possible, that they cannot possibly have a worse opinion of our *positive* than we of their *negative* delinquencies. And that in what we have said and done—as well as in what we shall continue to say and do, we are impelled by no passion, no vindictive feeling towards any body on the face of the earth, but simply by our convictions of the high importance of saying what we do say, and of the highest expediency in the manner and circumstances of our saying them.

We confess to some surprise indeed, at the charge of either of ill-nature, or ill-manners, in what we have had occasion to say heretofore. Considering the provocation we have had—in whatever else we might have failed—we regarded ourselves as models of good nature and moderation. Those who think hardly of what we may have said, leave out of view how many things we *did not say*. Had we published all that was offered for publication, there might be some ground for charging us with harshness and ill-nature. They must bear in mind, that we claim a large credit *per contra*, for what *we did not say* on this subject. The idea of men making an ado about the style and taste displayed, when the subject matter is of so immense importance, is to us infinitely absurd.

We ask the kind offices of our friends, to call attention to our Prospectus, and at as early a day as may be convenient—let us hear from them. It is our purpose to re-print, so far as may be necessary, a portion of the volume for this year, with a view to furnish new subscribers, who may desire it the first, as well as the second volume. By the first of January, we hope to have, ready bound, volumes of the Critic, at the subscription price and cost of binding, which we will send to the order of any who express a wish for the back volumes. We hope by the sale of a few hundred of these back volumes, to meet most of the expense yet unprovided for, of the publication of Vol. 1.

LITURGIES, INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC, AND ARCHITECTURE.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is, we believe, one of the purest branches of the Church of Christ on earth, and we desire to give thanks continually to God for His wonderful goodness to it, and the distinguished post He has assigned to it, in the arduous but honorable warfare against the powers of darkness and of evil. But it cannot be denied, that the same unbelief which has made other branches of the Church drift gradually away from the great principles of the Gospel, and seduced them to put their trust in an arm of flesh, is working in her also, and threatens her spiritual, which is her only true prosperity, by beguiling her, and corrupting her from the simplicity that is in Christ. She is in danger perpetually of a practical denial of her glorious confession; with her voice acknowledging God, in His word and by His Spirit, to be the only source of light and strength, and herself to be nothing except as He enables her, but in her heart, and with her hand, going after the idols of men who have their portion in this life. She finds it hard to cling to the ordinances of her invisible Head, and to maintain her assurance of faith in His ability to make the weak things of the world confound the things which are mighty, and the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and things that are base and despised, and things that are not, to bring to nought things that are. It is easier to go into Assyria, or down into Egypt, the house of bondage, and to trust in horses of flesh and chariots of iron, than to look to the God of Israel, who hideth Himself, or trust in those horses of fire and chariots of fire, which are visible only to the eye of faith. We build the altar, and arrange the wood, but cannot like the majestic old prophet of the Law, wait for the flame from Heaven to consume and accept the sacrifice; much less can we pour the water over the work of our hands, to make it all the more evident that our's is the God that answereth by fire.

These reflections have been forced upon us, by the innovations which have been made or proposed in our forms of worship: and the signs of the times seem to indicate the possibility, at no distant day, of another rupture in the Presbyterian body, upon the ground of worship, analagous to those which have already taken place upon the grounds of doctrine and order. For we cannot believe that our Church can always patiently endure a mass of corruptions which hamper and trammel her. Her constitution is too full of vitality and vigour, to allow any excrescence to remain long enough to exhaust, or utterly to poison the living blood that courses through her veins. Her whole history teaches that she *must* slough off, when the morbid incumbrance reaches such a degree of virulence as seriously to endanger her existence, or her distinctive vocation. Nor

can her unity ever be, for a great length of time, a mere external unity, a thing of brass or iron. The Church of Rome, considered in its relations to God, and to the eternal destinies of mankind, is but a congeries and aggregation of a multitude of putrid parts, kept together by the pressure of outside hoops and bands. There is no spiritual life, no organic action, no "body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part," but a decomposed corpse, ready to crumble into a thousand pieces, when the ligaments and cerements of authority shall be removed. But such the Presbyterian Church can never be: she must be one in life, one in principle, one in aim, as well as one in external organization. When she ceases to have this real unity, it will not be long before the rupture will betray itself in open separation. Does any man imagine that, if a liturgy were substituted for the "Directory for Worship," in half our Churches, the other half adhering to the Directory, would long continue in nominal unity and communion with it? The whole genius and history of the Presbyterian body, everywhere, forbid it. This question, therefore, of liturgies, and the affiliated questions of instrumental music, and ecclesiastical architecture, deserve to be considered in time, as their solution may involve the question of the integrity of our denomination. Our people have hitherto said little, and thought little, about them, because they judge the disease to be sporadic, and easily prevented from spreading, by the conservative intelligence of the Church: but when it shall become apparent that the disorder is an epidemic, or at least, that the predisposition to it is wide-spread and general: when the issue is openly made, between resisting these rags of Popery, and abandoning all the distinctive features of our system—then will come a storm in which either the Church or the innovations must perish. The danger is not an imaginary one. The article on Liturgies, in the July number of the Repertory, and that on Architecture, in the number for October, together with the doings of St. Peter's Church, Rochester, still in nominal connection with the General Assembly, show that it is not. Even the "Presbyterian" objects to the last named article, as savouring too much of an ecclesiastical spirit: and surely such restless agitators and Church disturbers as we are, may be pardoned for doubting whereunto these things may grow; especially when we remember that solemn lesson of history, that the most enormous corruptions in the Church have arisen from the smallest, and apparently the most harmless beginnings. Our readers will please give us their indulgence, therefore, while we throw out some hints for their reflection, upon this subject. As there is nothing which God, in His blessed word, defends with more exquisite jealousy than His worship; as there is nothing that He rebukes with more severity, than the impertinent assumption of man to determine forms of worship for himself; as there is nothing in which, notwithstanding, man has been more prone to intermeddle, than in this very thing, it is of vital importance to us to ponder

it. If we know our own hearts, we are seeking no paltry party ends, but the glory of our common Lord, whose sovereign prerogative we believe to be invaded, and the true welfare of that Church which is the mother of us all.

What we have to say will be directed, for the sake of brevity, chiefly to the subject of Liturgies; but the general principles will, for the most part, be equally applicable to Instrumental Music and Ecclesiological Architecture.

1. It ought, in the first place, to excite our suspicion about these things, that they have been generally thought of, only in a time of spiritual declension in the Church. When the spirit of grace and of supplication has, in a measure, withdrawn Himself, and the people lose that lively sense of God's majesty and mercy, which once found expression in spontaneous adoration and thanksgiving; when there no longer exists, except in a very feeble degree, that profound conviction of their needs as creatures and as sinners, which pours itself out in constant confessions and petitions; when love waxeth cold towards their brethren, and they feel no promptings to importunate intercessions in their behalf; when, in a word, there is no gift and no spirit of prayer, then they seek for a form of devotion, "to be said or sung." Instead of crying mightily to Him who has "received gifts for men," and is more ready to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him, than parents, who are evil, are to give good things to their children; to Him who is able to bless the barren ordinances, and quicken their languishing souls into life, they resort to their own inventions, and make a Holy Ghost of the work of their own hands. Being unable to rise to God, they would fain bring God down to themselves. In the first three centuries of the Christian era, no such crutches of devotion were needed, and none were employed, for the Church was kept near to the fountain of life by the rough discipline of persecution. It was only when she began to enjoy the insidious favor of the world, and was committed to the deadly nursing of Constantine and his successors, that she began to crave forms of devotion ready made to her hand, and to make up, by the splendour of outward signs, for the departing glory of spiritual fellowship with God. The only gift of prayer, which in the course of time was needed, was the gift of knowing how to read: and finally, it came to pass, that all prayer became the business of the priesthood, and was done in an unknown tongue. The whole of religion became a thing of proxy, and had well nigh perished from the earth. When the Reformation came, and along with it, a sense of personal responsibility; when men were made to feel their tremendous consequence as individuals under the government of God; that they must believe, repent, grow in grace for themselves, they also felt that they must pray for themselves. The Spirit that made intercession for them with groanings which could not be uttered, refused to be confined by the meagre, stale, flat and unprofitable forms, in a foreign tongue, which they had been repeating with parrot-like intelligence and devotion. The new liberty of the sons of God demanded something

more. The foreign tongue was laid aside, that the worshippers might at least know what they were praying for; and doubtless all forms of prayer in public worship would have been laid aside, if the leaders had not been afraid of producing an insurrection against the great truths of the Gospel, by a sudden change in the forms to which the people had been used. They argued, that as the people knew the forms, and could not judge of the doctrines, and as the doctrines after they were received, would gradually give life to the forms, if not entirely do away with them, it was better, in all the circumstances, to preserve the forms, translate and purge them. But it was a deep conviction in their hearts, that these forms were inconsistent with, and destructive of those gifts of the Holy Ghost, which had been showered, in almost pentecostal profusion, upon them. Liturgies are felt to be tame things in a revival of religion.

We are not at all surprised, therefore, at the following remarks of the writer on Church Architecture, in the Repertory for October, (p. 625):—"Protestant Christendom finds no art to its hand. It has been *hitherto above art*. It has been doing battle for the truth; and in the meantime has gone into the Roman Cathedral, into the oriental basilica, into the pseudo-Greek temple, into plain houses, and even into barns and caves to worship, scarcely stopping to see whether the tower, the dome, the plain ceiling, or the rafter, were over its head. But now, as the strong man in the period of his vigour, finds it well to go back to the poetry of his youth, even so has the Protestant Church arrived at that point of progress, where she may stop to recover the beauty which she was constrained to pass by, in the warfare of her early progress." There is a very sad meaning in all this; and more truth, than the writer in his chase after figures of rhetoric, took time to see. It is because we have given up contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, that we have time for art. The world, the flesh, and the devil, are not done with the truth of God, but we are; they have not given up their assaults upon it, but we have given up defending it. The battle is all on one side now: we have put off the harness, we have conquered a peace, and now for architecture, music, and the arts of peace. The time was, when Protestantism was "above art:" the sphere in which it moved, the work it had to do, was lofty; it soared and gazed upon the sun; but not so now; its wings are clipped, and it has fallen to the earth, and is ready for the plastic arts which work with earth. The time was, when it dwelt in the thick darkness upon the mount with God: but now, it has come down, to make the golden calf in the vale below! "The poetry of its youth!" Would to God, it might return to it! For that poetry is found in the Acts of the Apostles; and its sublime vocation was to testify against the shrines and temple of the Great Diana of the Ephesians, and to point, with unspeakable sadness, to the glorious structures of Athens, as monuments of apostacy from that God, who dwelleth not in temples made with hands! Said we not truly then, that these things spring out of a declension of religion? They are the funeral of faith.*

*As it is quite common to sneer at those in our Church, who oppose the tenden

2. In the next place, however, the question of liturgies may be decided upon its merits,—to that point we shall come hereafter,—it ought not to be considered an open question in the Presbyterian Church in the United States. And so with Instrumental Music.

It may be well, at this point, to state what that question is, as there is a prevailing misapprehension in regard to it. The question is not, whether a man may compose or select a form of prayer for his own private use, or for the purpose of family worship. Whether he may lawfully do this or not, will depend upon circumstances of which his conscience alone, in the sight of God, is to judge. He may find it better for his own edification, or the edification of his household, to read prayers. But in publick worship, the edification of all the worshippers is to be consulted, and the mode of conducting the worship must be made the matter of a covenant, either expressed, or implied, among themselves, subject always to the authority of the Word of God. In a particular Church, for example, there may be many, who, in their private devotions, assume a standing posture; more are in the habit of kneeling; some few, perhaps, as Richard Cecil tells us was once his practice, walk backwards and forwards while they pray. When they all come together, some one mode must be agreed upon: it would be a violation of decency and order, for each man to assume the posture to which he is most accustomed in the closet. They must all stand, or kneel, or walk, or sit. For the last two modes, there is no example in publick worship in the Word of God; and the choice lies between standing and kneeling, which are both recognized postures of reverence. It would be an indecent thing, for one part to be kneeling, and the other standing, though both postures are Scriptural. What is true of postures, is true of the method of prayer. In like manner, a Christian may find it to edification to use a musical instrument in his private or domestic worship, as the sweet singer of Israel seems to have done, and as Martin Luther did; but it is a very different affair to introduce apparatus of this sort into the public worship of God. Before it can be done, there must be a covenant to do it; and before such a covenant can be righteously made, the Word of God must be consulted: a thing it would be well for those to do, who laugh, in the fulness of their self-conceit, at their brethren, for seeing any *principle* in the matter.

It appears to us, that this statement, if it be a just one—and we cannot see how it can be denied—is itself argument enough to show

cy to Romanize our worship, as if they were the mere victims of vulgar prejudice, fanatical iconoclasts,—albeit, they stand upon the platform of the Confession, and the testimony of the great Presbyterian body, from the beginning,—it may be well to say, that we do not object to the adoption of a style of architecture which is suited to the purposes of Presbyterian worship, nor do we think it wrong to consult and conform to the general principles of the art, in building our meeting houses. We agree with the writer in the Repertory, that the Gothic style is not suited to our purposes; we meet for something else than to burn wax candles, and to practice postures and impostures. It is to the principles upon which he urges the creation of an art; the symbolical idea, the ritualistick spirit of the whole article, that we object, as unsound and dangerous.

that such innovations in worship are contrary to our Standards, and involve the sin of covenant-breaking. Suppose all the Presbyterian people in the United States,—we mean, of course, those connected with our General Assembly,—to be assembled in one house for worship, to make to the world an exhibition of their unity, what sort of exhibition of unity would there be, if each section, as it now exists, were to worship according to its accustomed mode? Here, in one corner, is an organ blowing, the performer, perhaps, an ungodly infidel, who is laughing in his sleeve at the simplicity of the saints, and the bellows-blower, it may be, a pious negro, who is prevented by his occupation from joining in the praises of God;—there, in the body of the Church, an immense throng, *singing* forth their joy, in a volume of sound like the roar of many waters;—here, in another corner, a collection of violins, little and big, with flutes and “soft recorders;” there, in another, an ambitious little thing, called a melodeon, whose squeaks can be heard high above the vocal noise that accompanies it;—here, in a nook almost invisible, is heard the intonation of a liturgy;—there, from the vast body, breathes the ready, reverent, and fervent supplication, under the influence of the interceding Spirit;—here, some are standing;—there, others are kneeling, in the same act of devotion; and others still, even lazily sitting, in the act of addressing the King of Kings;—what a glorious unity is this!—And yet this is no exaggerated picture of our Church, as it actually is, with the single difference, that it does not, because it cannot, meet in the same place. Her doctrine is that the Church is one, (See the note on Chap. XII, of the Form of Government,) and as physical necessity demands that she should be broken up into particular congregations, yet to preserve and exhibit this general idea of unity, upon which her whole government is built, the “Directory for Worship” has been framed; a covenant has been struck between the different congregations,—analogous to that which we supposed to be necessary between the members of a particular Church,—to secure uniformity of worship: not the dead uniformity of a liturgical service, which degrades all to the level of the class which has no gift but that of reading; but a uniformity which affords ample scope for the exercise of spiritual gifts in their boundless variety. So that how far soever, a Presbyterian sheep may wander from his own immediate fold, within the limits of the United States, it is the benevolent intention of our Church, that he shall find, not only the same sort of pasture, but the same habits and order in the flock, with which he was familiar at home. How shockingly this benevolent design has, in many places, been frustrated, it is needless for us to say. Are there not many Churches in connection with our Assembly, in which a plain Presbyterian man would feel no more at home, than if they belonged to a different denomination? Here again, we see the deadly influence of Independency upon us, blinding us, and making us insensible to the distinctive glory of our ecclesiastical organization. No wonder the Congregationalists of the North presume to call themselves Presbyterians; they have an ample apology for doing it, in the practice of some of our Congregations,

which have added to the covenant, and thereby annulled it, and virtually declared themselves independent. As to the horror expressed about the doings of the S^r Peter's Rochester, we have only to say, that it has done violence to no principle which is not violated at this moment, by a hundred of our Churches, about which no fuss is made. They have framed a book of their own, and frankly abandoned that of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Others have quit our book, without announcing their deed formally to the world.

3. Once more—for our space is nearly exhausted—the introduction of the forms and usages in question being, as we have shown, a violation of our Presbyterian covenant, is for that reason, an intolerable act of tyranny; intolerable in principle, and oppressive in operation. Supposing all the members of a particular Church in our communion, to be in favor of a liturgy, or an organ; to introduce either, according to the principles already illustrated, would be pro tanto, a virtual declaration of independence. But in point of fact, there probably never has been a case in our Church, in which there has not been opposition to such an innovation, when attempted; nor many, in which the opposition has not been decided, and even violent. More than this, the opposition has generally been manifested by those members of the Church whose religious profession was most intelligent and consistent: and the innovation has been carried by the influence of those, who, if not men of the world, were, at least, not remarkable for their crucifixion to it. So that here we have vanity and folly oppressing the freemen of the Lord; those “dear children” for whom Christ died, and, by his death, delivered from all other commandments but His own, put under the intolerable yoke of the commandments of men! O shame! But it may be said, that these weak people, who cannot keep pace with us in our progress and improvements, have the privilege of going elsewhere. Yea verily; the citizen who resists an outrage upon the Constitution of his country, has the privilege of expatriation and exile, of leaving the dust of his fathers, and the consecrated scenes around which cluster all his earliest, tenderest, and holiest associations; the captive in the hands of a band of pirates, has the privilege of walking the plank, if he prefers that to lying in his blood upon the deck. The non-conformists, when they refused to submit to *imposed* forms and ceremonies, had the privilege of leaving their homes, with their wives and little ones, or even, if they preferred it, of going to jail, and rotting there. An inestimable privilege, truly, and one which, no doubt, ought to furnish ample consolation to all, who, after they have labored hard, and prayed long, for the prosperity of the Church of their choice, are at last driven out by those who felt nothing of the burden and heat of the day, but are willing to enter into other men's labors. “It must needs be that offences come, but wo unto that man by whom they come.” But it is not the will of our Father in heaven that one of his little ones should perish. Let them look to it, who walk about in the house of God, and issue their commands, as if they were sovereign there. “He who scourged the money-changers out of the temple still lives.

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

EPISCOPAL IMPERTINENCE.

We notice in the discussions raised in some of the Episcopal prints by the liturgical whims of St. Peter's Church in Rochester, a display of the insolence of Episcopacy, which tempts us to reply "etched in aqua fortis." Some seem to be shocked at the idea of a "dissenting" congregation presuming to call their "meeting house" a church, and particularly to give it the lordly title of St. Peter's, since it has been perfectly well understood that all such names are the exclusive property of the Episcopal Church and her respectable sister, the ancient harlot of Rome. So far as this title is concerned, we are inclined to agree with them, though for a different reason; but to the insolence involved in the peculiar claim asserted to the names and the glory of the Apostles and martyrs we do have an objection—an objection composed of the same elements of mingled disgust and pity, which we feel for a Broadway fop, who overwhelmed by the contemplation of his own glories, superciliously esteems all men who have sense enough to do something besides dress, the proper objects of his genteel contempt. Whenever we hear the emphatic distinction so often drawn in society between "the church" and "the sects," we are tempted to inquire whether Episcopal gentlemen and ladies have forgotten the fact that they are such, when they employ an odious term of distinction in the presence of others of equal respectability with themselves, and which cannot fail to be received as injurious and insulting. There is but one course open to a "churchman" who has not resolved in his zeal for his church, to sacrifice his personal respectability as a gentleman: this is, to either be silent on these topics, or to employ terms which are not personally insulting. But our wrath grows wonderfully mild in the infinitude of our contempt, when we hear people pretending to an ordinary degree of information, using the term "Dissent" as descriptive of the differences between the Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Churches. This is a favorite term with the "churchmen" of this country; but the fatuity of its application here baffles all description. The use of it indicates an ignorance, a stupid want of common knowledge, which is absolutely amazing. The term "Dissent" is a relative word, which has a meaning as well established as the meaning of any other relative term in the

language. There is as direct and inseparable a correlation between the terms "Dissent" and "Church Establishment," as there is between the terms "father" and "son," or "husband" and "wife." All who do not belong to the church established and supported by the State, are styled "Dissenters." Presbyterians are "Dissenters" in England, where Episcopacy is established, and Episcopalians are "Dissenters" in Scotland, where Presbytery is established. To prove this, we refer to any good dictionary in common use, and to all correct English writers who employ the term. The ludicrous folly of the application of the word in this country, is perfectly transparent. Since this is the case, we cannot but regard the application of it as a wanton attempt to wound and insult us. Let it be understood then, by all who are accustomed to this petty and ridiculous malice, that in using this term in public or private, they are only making themselves either contemptible for their ignorance or hateful for their impertinence. Whenever an intelligent and well-bred Episcopalian is about to designate Non-Episcopal Ministers as "Dissenting," or Non-Episcopal churches as "meetings," we beg him to remember that he has a reputation for sense and breeding to maintain, as well as for immediate churchmanship. It would be fully as courteous to ask an Episcopalian if you are going to "Mass," as to ask a Presbyterian if you are going to "meeting." The sense and the courtesy would be as broad in the one case, as they are short in the other. The use of terms so offensive, and particularly in the latent spirit of contempt in which they are generally used, is a foolish and wicked indulgence, which deserves the strong reprobation of all who really love the Church of Jesus, and are impatient when they see nine-tenths of it subjected to such wanton and censurable contempt. A "DISSENTER."

Our Neighbors of the Metropolitan and the New York Freeman's Journal.

We had occasion heretofore to notice (see Critic, p. 148) the very unbrotherly treatment by Romish Journals elsewhere, of our neighbors of the Metropolitan, a Romish monthly of our city. It will be remembered how unkindly the Freeman's Journal in March, 1853 scoffed at the title "Metropolitan," and told his readers of the "grocer in one of the by-streets of New York

who advertises "Metropolitan Pea-nuts," and why not as well, 'Baltimore Metropolitan Magazines?'"

We observe that the ill-blood seems still to exist toward our neighbor on the part of Archbishop Hughes' Organ. In the Freeman's Journal of October 27—in a notice of the *London Rambler*, occurs the following paragraph:—

"By the way, is there no one ready to undertake the task of supplying the want of our American Catholic public in the way of a monthly periodical? We know there would not be any great encouragement for such an enterprise for a while, but it is a matter of regret, that in the whole United States, *no such monthly periodical as either for a moderate share of talent, or a passable amount of decent manners a Catholic is desirous to see in his family.*"

Now to think of such an utterance in face of the fact, that our Papal monthly, the Metropolitan, has been working away for years past—and that too of late years, with a stock of new machinery, in the way of editorial brains—provided for the purpose of making our Baltimore monthly a *crack* magazine—is more than even our well known patience and forbearance can endure. Were it not for the principle of the thing, though we have been a subscriber for the Freeman's Journal for years past, and perhaps in advance in our subscription, we should forthwith write the editor of the Hughes' Organ the terrific rebuke, "stop my paper." Next to our natural indignation at seeing ourselves badly treated, we feel indignant at indignity offered by foreigners to our neighbors. Nay, we venture to assure the Metropolitan, that we feel quite as indignant, and are fully as much hurt by the abuse thus heaped upon them, as we have at any time felt at the injustice done the Critic by certain journals out of Baltimore. We venture to console them however, with the reflection, that Archbishop Hughes' Organ is not infallible—even if Archbishop Hughes as representing the Pope is—especially in the matter of what is possible, either as "talent," or "decent manners." And, moreover, even if Hughes endorses his organ, that the natural jealousy of New York men, may be participated by New York Ecclesiastics—for, doubtless, they are "men of like passions with other men,"—nay, we Protestants think, of somewhat *worse* passions than other men.

One thing however, has impressed us in our meditations upon this case. Namely, that after all "Catholic unity," which shudders at our Protestant strifes, seems to be little more successful than Protestant freedom in keeping down strifes. We of the Critic for instance, during the year past, have had an unusually small share of ex-

pressed good will from our fellow laborers in the cause of Presbyterianism. We console ourselves, as doubtless our neighbors of the Metropolitan do, by attributing the want of good will in large measure to the natural jealousy of Baltimore—especially as our city has so recently loomed up as a Presbyterian metropolis, and given her name to a Synod. But, still our strife-loving contemporaries of the schismatic Presbyterian sect, have never gone so far in their malice towards us even, as this organ of the New York diocese, of the church with all *the unity*, has gone toward their ecclesiastical brother, our neighbor. They have indeed ventured to hint darkly at something like our want of a "passable amount of decent manners" sometimes, when we have as faithful physicians in extreme cases applied a blister. But in no instance, that we are aware of, have they either put us in the same category with the advertiser "of pea-nuts," or insinuated the want of "even a moderate share of talent." We feel bound in candor to say to our neighbors, that our faith in the theory of Catholic unity, is somewhat shocked by this practical exemplification of it. Suppose now we should catch at the enchanting bait of the "Catholic unity," which not unfrequently of late has allured uneasy minnows in the Episcopal fish-pond, when stirred by the little tempests that prevail in that quarter. Suppose, we say, that we worried by the strife against us, had been caught by that bait, and going over, had carried our Critic with us—agreeing for instance to take in Dr. Brownson as co-partner, and absorb his Quarterly in our Monthly. In what respect should we have bettered ourselves as amiable peace-loving journalists? Would the Arcadian visions of the "Catholic unity," amid which we should then revel, make us oblivious of such a thrust under our ribs, as a taunt at our "pea-nut" articles,—want of "moderate share of talent," and "passable amount of decent manners."

Correspondence between Commodore R. T. Stockton and C. Van Rensselaer, D. D., in relation to the Camden and Amboy Rail Road accident.

We have received a pamphlet containing the Report of the Directors of the Camden and Amboy Rail Road, in relation to the terrible catastrophe on that Road, on the 29th of August last—exculpating of the Company and its Agents; a review of the Report, analysing its statements and reasonings, by Dr. Van Rensselaer; and letters that passed between Com. Stockton and Dr. Van Rensselaer, on the subject of the report and review thereof. That this is one of the most remarkable productions of the times—our readers—especially those

of them who know Dr. Van Rensselaer, need not be told after reading the following specimen of the correspondence from the opening paragraph of Com. Stockton's letter.

PRINCETON, Oct. 11th, 1856.

To the Rev. C. Van Rensselaer, D. D.

SIR:—In the indulgence of a prurient proclivity to perform the functions of censor universal over all departments, social, political, economical as well as religious, you have entered the arena alongside of those clerical "friends," who have recently engaged in the work of traducing the Directors of the Joint Companies; and have published an anonymous pamphlet in reference to the accident which occurred on the Camden and Amboy Rail Road, on the 28th of August.

The assassin of character, as well as of life "loves darkness rather than light," and as your designs were incompatible with the character and propriety of a Christian gentleman and minister, you have in some measure assumed the anonymous mask, rather than disgrace a time-honored ancestry by affixing your name to a production replete with slander and misrepresentation.

Your pamphlet seems likewise to indicate that you are on the popular side in your labors to criminate the Companies; and that notoriety is another object of your most unexpected and puerile attack. I am not aware of any particular qualification possessed by the Clergy, which enables them to instruct Rail Road companies.

I must be permitted to express the hope, that the General Assembly of your church, will assign that duty to some one who can perform it with better temper, more wisdom and discretion, and in a more Christian spirit."

We have said this will be regarded as a most remarkable document by such as know Dr. Van Rensselaer. It will be still more so, to such as do not know Com. Stockton. Such as know both, Dr. Van Rensselaer and Com. Stockton, will doubtless regard it as the most remarkable of the inventions of the Commodore's brain since his big gun, the "Peace-Maker;" nor will they consider this explosion much less unfortunate for the Commodore's reputation for common sense, or less for the comfort of the Commodore's Rail Road friends, than the explosion which immortalized the big gun above alluded to. That question, however, we feel little disposition to discuss, nor are we disposed to interfere with this Jersey fight in any way. All we have to say on that head, is that we have most implicit faith in Dr. V.'s competency to do his own fighting—once the war is unavoidable. He would be among the last

we should fix upon for a volunteer expedition, going to war just for the love of the thing. But once he is fairly in for it, as appears in this case, he is a most formidable antagonist—at every round a point blank shot. We have rarely seen an instance of more scientific and demolishing firing than in his review of the Rail Road report. Com. Stockton has done some brave things in his time!—he bantered the British officers—he intimidated with his pistol the African King and his savages,—but we doubt not he will find the attempt to bully Dr. V., and intimidate him a far more serious affair, than to "back out" all the British officers in the Mediterranean, and frighten all the dusky *Sans Culotte* monarchs in Africa. With all his brave things, Com. Stockton has done his full share of silly things—which, however, the public have been disposed to treat with great leniency, as the American public are wont to treat, and ought to treat, the numerous cases, in which a high degree of personal bravery is found in unfortunate conjunction with a somewhat lower degree of good sense and modesty. But this exhibition of himself, will prove to have been the silliest he has yet made—and the one which the public will be least disposed to forgive.

"The Joint Companies" of Jersey may be as wise, skilful and powerful a body as Com. S. thinks them to be, and may have in Com. S. as wise, skilful and powerful a leader and defender, as Com. Stockton evidently thinks they have. They may be able to compel the United States travelling public, to pay tribute at pleasure, and to prove demonstrably, when they manage to kill a score or two of them, that it was done most rightfully, necessarily, skilfully and scientifically; but they cannot either compel or persuade any sensible man who ever had even an hour's chat, with Dr. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer, to believe that he either has "a prurient proclivity to perform the functions of censor universal," or ever could be an "assassin of character," or ever could write "a production replete with slander and misrepresentation," or that "notoriety is another object" of any thing he does—or that the General Assembly could find any one likely to instruct Rail Road companies "with better temper, more wisdom and discretion, and in a more christian spirit," than Dr. Van Rensselaer has in this case exhibited in his instruction to the "joint companies," touching fallacies in logic.

To us however, the most significant feature of this pamphlet, is its *representative character*—if we may borrow, for the occasion, Mr. Emerson's word. It might pass very well for a sort of *Rasselas* story—illustrating how men must expect to be dealt with and spoken of, who in their is-

nocent credulity, hope to do some good, by suggesting defects in the working of "joint companies," either in State or church. And how inevitably, all such, no matter how earnest and honest their aim, will bring down upon themselves rebuke of their "prurient proclivity, to perform the functions of censor." Indeed, we are at a loss to know how we came to get this pamphlet. Is it from some of our waggish friends in Philadelphia?—intended to be inscribed—

"—Quid rides? mutato nomine de te Fabula narratur."

Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical, by the Rev. Wm. Henry Foote, D. D., Second Series. (pp. 596, 8mo.) Philadelphia, J. Lippincott & Co., 1855.

The public are already so well acquainted with Dr. Foote and his general idea—through his previous volumes on N. Carolina and Virginia, that this volume needs no other notice by way of introduction than simply to say, that it is of the same order of book with its predecessors.

This volume will probably be found to have additional attraction for the younger portion of our generation—as we have found in our own case—from the fact that many of the sketches in this series, are of more recent men and things of the generation just passed—and of whom we have only heard hitherto through oral tradition. Of these sketches, as history, we do not feel competent to speak. Covering in large part, that zone, which lies between the history of a past, and the current events of the present generation in the church, we have neither the extensive acquaintance with the current events of the past quarter of a century, which alone could qualify us to speak as cotemporary witnesses, nor on the other hand has the history of that period yet been settled sufficiently to become a standard of appeal in disputed cases. We have, therefore, found ourselves far more disposed to read the book, than to criticise it. To us many portions of it have been peculiarly fascinating. For the first time we have obtained a distinct view of characters, that in our early days flitted in such vague and vast proportions before our imagination, from hearing them constantly spoken of among the older Presbyterian people of Virginia. To borrow the transcendental style of speech, the nebular myths, which in the "heroic" age of our life had floated before our imagination, here in Dr. Foote's book, are condensed into tangibility, and take definite form. Turner, Hill, Alexander, Rice, Baxter, Spence, Brown, and a host of their contemporaries,—“Sketches” of the life scenes of such men, cannot fail to fascinate all who

know any thing of Virginia, and of Presbyterianism in Virginia.

In connection with the sketches of Drs. Baxter & Hill, Dr. Foote presents at some length, selections of the sayings and doings of the men of 1837. This is obviously a delicate task—how he has accomplished it, we feel incompetent, as before intimated to decide. We suppose the time has come for putting the events of 1837 among the historic, finished things of the church. Their results have been clearly enough manifested, to allow the judgment of history to be made up. But he who first begins the work of transforming contemporaneous into past history, has for most obvious reasons a very difficult task to accomplish. No other historic writing is perhaps so difficult;—no other need perhaps to heed the poet critic's caution in a similar case:—

“Periculosae plenum opus aleae
Tractas; et incedis per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso.”

However, this may be, we are greatly obliged, and the church in Virginia ought to be greatly obliged, to Dr. Foote, for his work. It is especially desirable in such an age and country as ours, to have the spirit of the great men, who under God laid the foundation on which we are now building, still animating the active life of the church—and none perhaps do better service to the church than those who turn out of the crowded thoroughfares of passing events, into the quiet grave yards, to gather up from the tomb stones, the fragments of the history of a past generation, before “Time's effacing fingers” shall have rubbed off the tracings—so perishable even when inscribed upon the marble. The heroes of these scenes, were men remarkable for their indifference to the fame, which the world's heroes covet. But we should by no means be indifferent to the value of the inheritance which they have left us—of a godly life, full of useful labors. To all who love communion with such men, we commend Dr. Foote's Volume.

ALLEGHAN: *A Poem in Nine Books, by N. M. Gordon, Cincinnati: Moore, Wiltstach, Keys & Co., 1856, pp. 343.*

We do not remember ever to have met with a book, whose whole style and manner of introduction to us, more disposed us to regard it with special favor. It comes to us through the mail, without an accompanying word of explanation, as to whence, by whom, or for what. It announces itself as above, on the title page; without essay introductory by any patronizing notability, without parade of puffs, Editorial and Doctorial, without preface, with-

out programme, without table of contents, or caption of chapters. As to dress and appearance, though from a provincial town in the interior, a perfect model of book printed on model paper,—in short, in every thing of this sort, a sort of prodigy considering the taste and fashion of this book making age. And the manner and style of the book's publication, seems to be perfectly in keeping with the spirit of the Author whoever he may be—for we know nothing of him, nor remember ever to have seen the name before. We dare affirm that he is a true hero—whether he be adjudged to be a poet or not. The mind that could conceive the idea in these days, of constructing "a Poem in nine books," on a theme announced in the first lines as:

"A song of early missions, and the field
Of holy enterprise, in the dark West,
Whose ancient tribes first heard the Word of
Life
When the bold Northmen tempted ocean's
breadth,
And sought her peopled shores,"

Is surely no ordinary mind; and the manly modesty that chooses, in such a manner to send forth the poem when executed to the world, surely deserves a candid and indulgent reading. What is still better, and doubtless that which is the secret of the peculiarities above mentioned, is the spirit of genuine evangelical piety, and earnest love of "the truth, as it is in Jesus," which seems to pervade all the thoughts of the Author.

We have neither the time, nor the dis-

position for a criticism upon the merits of this production as a specimen of literature, or as a poem. Our notions of poetry are of the most rigid order. We would perhaps have judged it wiser, had he chosen some really historic missionary subject; we might have differed with the Author in taste as to his choice of verse as the vehicle for the utterance of his thoughts,—we might judge him deficient in many of the most important elements of a great poet; yet ability to conceive such an idea as this, and to execute it with such a degree of skill, vindicates his claim to genius of a high order, as well as an ambition noble in its aims and purposes.

We must content ourselves at present, however, with saying merely, that the general aim of the poem, is to illustrate the causes and reasons why the gospel mission to heathen men, is rejected by them. This is done by a story—imaginary of course—of the labors of certain Culdee missionaries from Scotland among the generations of the American Continent many centuries ago. An imaginary description is given of three great political divisions of North America, and the labors of the missionaries among them, and their results, till they were utterly exterminated by the people whom they came to call; and these people given over to judicial blindness, as a punishment for the rejection of the Gospel. We prefer however, to let our readers read for themselves. The book will be found both interesting and edifying to christian people—whether the critics ever admit it into the category of great poems or not.

ADVERTISEMENT.

We take the liberty of calling the attention of our readers to the Prospectus on the 4th page of the Cover of our No. for this month, and to our article, "Second Volume of the Critic."

We will have ready by the 1st January, a supply of bound copies of the 1st volume. We have issued in pamphlet form the article on "The General Assembly of 1855," running through three numbers of the Critic. And also this article bound together in pamphlet with the article on "The General Assembly of 1554," from the Southern Presbyterian Review—which will be sent, 10 copies for \$1, to any order.

THE
PRESBYTERIAL CRITIC
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

No. 12.

DECEMBER, 1855.

Vol. 1.

THE SWEAT OF THE BROW—THE BRAINS—THE
HEART.

HE who hath said of the Sabbath day—"in it thou shalt do no manner of work"—hath said with equal emphasis of all the rest of our time—"six days shalt thou labour." Remember, therefore, it is not less really your duty to work six days, than not to work the seventh: no more a part of heaven descended religion, Oh! sluggard,—Oh! idler—Oh! self-indulgent dishonourer of God and your own nature, to keep the Sabbath holy—than to keep the rest of your time occupied with labor—with work. He who will not work six days, is an infidel at heart, and a rebel in act, as really as he who will work on the Sabbath of the Lord our God. Neither the preachers, nor the commentators, nor the moralists, will take the pains to tell you this, and enforce it as they should: nay they will, it is very like, rend us for telling you so. Some of them, never heard, or imagined such a doctrine; some of them will tell you it is not of the least consequence, even if it were true; very many of them, if they told the whole truth, would confess, that a damnable doctrine, that condemns six parts out of seven of their own dreamy lives of voluptuous idleness, must needs be a doctrine utterly mundane, sensual and devilish. Believe them, if you like: it were far better for you, nevertheless, that you believe them not,—as, mayhap, you may suspect before we are done. He who worked six days, before he rested on the seventh, and blest and hallowed it as sacred to himself; he said,—work six days—and then keep the seventh holy. It is His idea of your only hope of blessedness here below. He has embodied that idea, in the heart of that divine summation He has made of the vital elements of all the duty which man owes, distinctly to Him—the only true God. He has brought all the weight of the

majesty of heaven, to enforce his idea. If you are not already more in love with self-indulgence than with life, then, pilgrim to the narrow house, it may do you good to suspect that there is something at the bottom of what we are saying to you.—It is, we know, a strange parable, in this most pert and shallow generation. It has been in our mouth many a weary day—through a long, sharp, pilgrimage: and Oh! how often, and by times, how sadly have we uttered it! Alas! they work, many and many of them, hard enough, even to kill both body and soul. But how few, *because He bade them*: how much fewer, *as He bade them!*

Who can tell, of how many virtues, industry is the parent? Who can imagine, how much that primeval curse was mitigated, when it was added to it—“in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground!” Thy bread and thy water are sure—if there be sweat on thy brow: not otherwise. Tempt not God, poor worker!—thy young life will grow strong within thee, thou child of many prayers—if the dew of thy youth is allowed to settle in big, bright drops across that noble brow; bent under toil to-day—only to be more certainly lifted up before princes in the gate, to-morrow.—Cease thy repinings, thou palid and languid sufferer; rise up, take thy life in thy hand; work six days: thou mayest die before the seventh, and thy works shall follow thee; if thou livest, then thou wilt hallow that Sabbath, as thou hast never done before! Mother, wife, sister, daughter—alas! we would spare thee, if indeed it were not desperate cruelty—that which this world would call sparing thee. Be up and doing then, thou bright and good handmaiden of the Lord: be up and doing—for verily thou shalt reap, if thou faint not. Thy father and thy son, thy husband and thy Master—all will bless thee—even forever more! Toil worn art thou? Well do we know it. Have we not wept over thee, to the very breaking of our heart—if the heart would break? Take courage—for there is an eternal rest: and this is the appointed, the only way, whereby as you hasten to it, you may escape the boundless temptations of sinful idleness—and as their fruit, the boundless pollutions those temptations nourish. Man of God—dost thou refuse to work? Thy master worked: knowest thou that? Knowest thou any *holy, idle* man? Thou wilt eat, but thou wilt not work? Demandest thou, what work? Aha! Any work—every work—all work: six full, honest, toilsome days work—before every Sabbath day. And you must have your special contract too? Your penny a day—agreed on—fully secured? Did you not hear *Him* say, “whatsoever is *right*, that will *I give thee?*” Good friend, believe us, this is the best secured wages in all this universe—and the most glorious! We never behold a gaily dressed, gorgeously appareled person—but we wonder if that person bears in mind, that man was naked as long as he was innocent; and that the fact of our pollution is a strange one to celebrate with such care and pomp! We never see the proof of persistent, God obeying, God fearing toil, standing in big drops on a human brow, without an emotion at once joyful and hopeful! Oh!

what a different world would this be—if every mortal in it, would labor six days diligently—and *then* truly hallow the seventh! Who can estimate the change—upon the earth itself—upon fallen man—upon all things relating both to man—and to the earth? But did not *He* know—who gave this great command?

Now you will lie under a most portentous mistake, if you suppose for one moment, that it is in the order of nature, or the ordination of Providence, that the great law of labor terminates upon man's physical being, or even relates mainly thereto. We have magnified the sweat of the brow: but what is that compared to the *sweat of the brains*? Do you not see that it is the sweat of the brains, which gives imperial force to the sweat of the brow? Work—yes work: it is your destiny to work—your glory to work out your destiny: your grandest privilege, naturally as a fallen creature, to lean on none but God, and to work at his bidding and under his smile: the enduring proof that although you are under the curse—yet that curse itself is mitigated to you: not to the devils—but to *you*. Then let the brains work, ten thousand times more than the hands: let them sweat ten thousand times more than the brow! And what is more still, let them work, not six days—to rest the seventh—but six days to work more gloriously on the seventh. Day and night: every day and every night: week-day and Sabbath—each after its kind: let the sweat of your brains, be to your immortal existence—what the sweat of your brow is to your mortal.

You ought to know that it is by exertion alone, that all growth is manifested, any progress possible: you may not believe,—but it is true—that with exertion *all* progress is possible—which is possible at all. He who is strong and earnest, will, of course do more with the same effort, than he who is weak and earnest. But he who is strong and *not* earnest, will not do more than he who *though* weak, is earnest. Activity, even in the particles of dead matter, is the first condition of every change of which they are susceptible. Effort, is the fundamental necessity of all physical growth and development. Exertion is the very vital principle of all mental progress. Repose, inertia, inaction, rest, torpor, stupor: how can any thing be begotten out of these—except by first supplanting them with activity, effort, exertion? You have no mental faculty whatever, whose improvement is possible any otherwise than by its use: not one whose improvement is not illimitable, by its unlimited exertion. The awkwardness, unprofitableness and feebleness of your bodily members, are perfect illustrations of the normal condition of your intellectual faculties: the skill, power and efficacy of those bodily members after long and earnest training are also perfect illustrations of the progress, development, and exaltation of which your mental faculties are capable, *but also* after long and earnest training. For the inevitable effects on themselves, first of all; after that, for the fruits they will produce, the dignity they will impart, the comfort they will diffuse, the elevation they will ensure, Oh! idler, Oh! faint-hearted, Oh! unbelieving, self-indulgent, voluptuous, self-destroyer—rise up and

work! At what,—dost thou ask? At any thing; at every thing; all the time; so that it be God fearing, God honoring work. What is there of which you know every thing? Then learn the rest—of something! What is there of which you know nothing then know something of that! What is there which you have thoroughly turned over, thought out, and reached the limit of what you can fathom? Assail it again—yea and again: the barrier will burst open by and by, and glorious light will pour in: for your power and skill both augment, even after every recoil from a manful effort to break through, what, as yet, you could not master. Dost thou not hear, from the depths of antiquity that joyful cry—which has rung through all ages, and been taken up day by day, by every earnest worker, through all time—*eureka—eureka!* Oh! work, poor sinner—for in that at least, thou art like Him who neither slumbers nor sleeps. And note well,—the lines you cut the deepest, are the longest and the hardest to be obliterated: the moss will soon cover up the thin lines which were idly traced: but those deep, sharp furrows, the eternal ages will respect. That gush of brain sweat—and that heart echo of that old, wild cry—they mean that thou hast found, what can no more be lost!

But we are not yet in the depths of this great law of God—this stupendous needs-be of all existing things—this vital essence of all that is capable of good to fallen man. “Deep calleth unto deep!” Do you not understand their sublime utterances? Did you never *feel* them in your soul—even when the very silence was awful? “Deep calleth unto deep!” Yea and *they* comprehend one another, whether we do or not: they stimulate, and exalt, and magnify one another—even while we take no heed to their mutual influence, for boundless good, or boundless evil, one upon the other! If thou art wise, and wouldst live—take up thine abode amongst these depths within thee: control their vehement calls—every one of them: no “deep” shall call, except as thou permittest: no “deep” shall answer, except as thou givest leave! Let them moan: let them rage: but they shall neither call—nor answer, deep unto deep, but by thy God-fearing allowance! Aha! Dost begin to see, there is other work for thee—besides that of thy hands—which, even it, thou art bidden to do with thy might? Dost perceive a little, that there is a labour for thee, far more terrible, yet far more glorious than even that labour which knows no rest of that intelligence which raises thee above the beasts that perish? Pass by the brow—pass by the brains—enter the portals of the heart. Now look around, and then say, what shall he do who hath this charge, and will not work?—What shall he do? He shall perish! The keeper of a den of wild beasts has not half the stern necessity to rule them, or to perish!

Brother, know full well, that every good thing in thy soul, is made better by its diligent use. Then work with thy might. Know moreover that every evil thing in thy soul, is made worse by every indulgence granted to it. Again, be up and doing. Some of these evil passions must die: there is no help for it: take them by the

throat at once: if you conquer—well: if not—farewell! That grain of mustard seed must grow up into a great tree: the life of thy soul depends upon it. That little leaven must pervade and transform thy very heart of hearts: nothing else can do thee good. Under heaven, just the Balm that is in Gilead, can heal your polluted soul. Oh! work out your salvation! Remember the stupendous issue—and tremble as you recall it—day by day. Remember Him with whom you have to do—and let his awe and his dread be upon you. But Oh! remember also, that He works in you: and take double courage, as He tells you, that it is with the delight of an unsearchable—yea a divine goodness,—that He thus works in you, both to will and to do! Now will you not also work? Is your soul of no value? Is heaven not worth as much as the self-indulgence of a day or two of hypocritical idleness? Is it worth no effort to keep out of hell? Alas! Alas! It is the fashion of the times not to work: and you will not work. Amen! Let us part here—and in peace. For, by God's grace, we will work, while we have breath: mourning only that we have worked so little: and panting for that very enjoyment of God, which shall consist in an exalted and eternal service of Him!

We talk about happiness. In short, what do we not talk about? Do we know what we mean, when we talk about happiness? Is freedom from toil, a part of it? Is absence of thought, another part of it? Is heart-ease the main part of it?—Then away with it, if that is what you mean: for no such thing as that is attainable on this earth: and if it were, it would defeat man's highest attainments in every thing. This is not the place for us to be crowned: this is the place to fight the battle for eternity. Tears are often sweeter than smiles—much more than the loud laugh. Self-denial that blesses others, is boundless luxury by the side of any self-indulgence. Is the heart made pure, or generous, or intrepid, or tender, by keeping trials and sorrows far from it? Is the grand intelligence in which we will shine forevermore, nourished and expanded in this world, as we saunter undisturbed, through all earthly enjoyments? Surely no: surely No.—Let not the sweat dry upon thy brow: let not thy brains forget their mighty toil: let not thy heart settle down, either into security or indifference. What happiness is attainable here below, must come with these great necessities, commanded of God, and that in infinite mercy. What comes not so—comes misnamed, and only to make our lot more hopeless.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES TOUCHING THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

THE argument in our last number on Liturgies, Instrumental Music and Architecture, was addressed chiefly to the officers and members of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; and, we think, was perfectly conclusive upon the point, that it is not an open question in this church, whether in its stated publick worship, liturgies and organs may be lawfully used or not. These things were put together, because they are naturally and historically connected: are parts of one system, and the outgrowths from one root. Accidental hinderances may prevent the full developement of the system; but where no such hinderances exist, Popery is the inevitable result. It was also shown that the introduction of such forms of worship being a violation of covenant stipulations, was, both in principle and fact, an intolerable tyranny; and, consequently, that they are the true defenders of Christian liberty, who stand by the federal constitution in the strict construction of it. We rejoice to know that the argument referred to, has met with the hearty approbation of some of the ablest and soundest ministers in our church; and it is, therefore, no presumption in us to hope that our General Assembly,—the writer on Church Architecture in the Repertory, to the contrary notwithstanding,—is not quite ready to convert the Chair of Polemick Theology, in its Seminaries, into a Chair of Presbyterian Art.

We propose now, by way of illustrating still more fully the general question, to state as briefly as the demands of perspicuity will allow, the principles of the Word of God in regard to it. We earnestly beseech our brethren to consider them. The sovereign authority of our Lord Jesus Christ is concerned in them, and His Epistles to the Seven Churches show with what jealousy He regards any encroachment upon that authority on the part of His people. The purity of the faith is involved in the purity of worship, and the history of the Church tells a fearful tale concerning the corruptions in doctrine which follow innovations in worship. O that our faith might stand, not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God!

What hath God the Lord spoken? We open the Bible at the Ten Commandments, that comprehensive and perpetual rule of duty, and we find the first four prescribing with the greatest precision and under the most solemn sanctions, the principles which should regulate our worship. The first forbidding the worship of all false gods, that is, any other gods than Jehovah the one only living and true God. The second forbidding all false worship of the true God, that is, any other worship of the true God than that which He Himself has prescribed. The third forbidding any abuse or irreverent use of the rule He has given to regulate our intercourse with Himself, such as straining, wresting, explaining away, adding to or taking from, or

in any way perverting the rule. The fourth forbidding the neglect or abuse of that day which he has specially consecrated for His worship. But the warnings against tampering with the integrity of the rule, and consulting our own wisdom, are, every where, explicit and abundant. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." "Add not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." "They have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hin-nom to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart." "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." "Every plant which my Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." See also Rev. 22: 18, 19: and for exemplifications, Lev. 10: 1—4. Josh. 22: 10, &c. Judg. 8: 24, &c. 1. Sam. 15: 21, &c. 1. Chron. 15: 13. et mult. al. The reader will pardon this old-fashioned way of quoting Scripture: it is a habit we have got: and know not what better we can do, even in this enlightened and progressive generation. We are ready, however, to give it up, when any body will show us a more excellent way.

Now that these passages clearly teach that the church is bound by the written word, in the sense that she is not only to do what God has enjoined, in the matter of His worship, but to abstain from doing what He has not enjoined, is almost the unanimous faith of the Reformed Churches. And we hazard little in asserting, that in as far as any branch of the Reformed Church hesitates to accept this interpretation, in so far it still needs to be reformed. "The sins forbidden in the second commandment,"—says the 109th answer in the Westminster Larger Catechism—"are all devising, counselling, commanding, using, and any wise approving any religious worship not instituted by God Himself, * * all superstitious devices, corrupting the worship of God, adding to it, or taking from it, whether invented and taken up of ourselves, or received by tradition from others, though under the title of antiquity, custom, devotion, good intent, or any other pretence soever; * * all neglect, contempt, hindering, and opposing the worship and ordinances which God hath appointed."

Now, says old Dr. Owen, with a spice of satire quite unwonted in him, "Men who having great abilities of learning, are able to distinguish themselves from under the power of the most express rules and commands, should yet, methinks, out of a sense of their weakness (which they are ready to profess themselves convinced of when occasion is offered to deliver their thoughts concerning them,) have compassion for those, who being not able to discern the strength of their reasonings, because of their fineness, are kept in a conscien-

tious subjection to the express commands of God, especially conceiving them not without some cogent cause reiterated." *

But, to accommodate the words of the learned Vice-Chancellor,—lest the present exasperation of the spirits of our brethren who condemn our "High-Churchism," and hair-splitting metaphysics, should frustrate this expectation, let us consider what these Scripture testimonies mean. Can they mean any thing less, than that God is absolute dictator in this affair of worship; and, consequently, that every invention of man therein, is a grand impertinence and wickedness? Will it be said that the prohibition in regard to things which have not been commanded, extends only to those things which are inconsistent with express commandments? Then we ask in return, what means this phrase "adding" to the commandment? Does it mean, after all, nothing more than "transgressing," or "coming short of," a particular law of God? What should we say of a writ in law under a merely human government, which could be interpreted in this wise? It directs certain things to be done, and to be done by certain persons, and in a certain manner, but its meaning is, that all other things can boundlessly be done, provided the authority of the writ be not denied, or its provisions be not contradicted? What would become of the liberties of this country, if such principles of interpretation were allowed to be applied to its constitutions, general and local? We say that the command to add nothing, is an organick part of the whole law,—as law; and, therefore, that every human addition to the worship of God, even if it be not contrary to any particular command, is yet contrary to the general command, that nothing be added. And so said those men of God, who chose to meet bonds and death, rather than submit to rites and forms imposed by men. So must the Presbyterian people of this nation say, or witness the destruction of that liberty wherewith Christ the Lord hath made them free.

But some will say, this interpretation confines the action of the church within very narrow limits. Are we not adding to the law, when we appoint a certain hour for publick worship, when we elect a moderator of a church court, when we erect a Synod covering such an extent of territory, when we appoint a chorister to lead the singing, or that chorister uses a tuning-fork to pitch the music? This question has been answered in the article on "the Wisdom of Man vs. the Power of God," in the July number of this work, p. 313; and to that we refer the reader. We stand immovably by the first chapter of our Confession of Faith, in its obvious sense, and believe, *ex animo*, in the absolute sufficiency of the Scriptures as the Rule of Faith and Practice. No foolish charge of bibliolatry from any quarter, shall make us ashamed of this confession. We not only build the sepulchres of the glorious non-conformists of the seven-

* Discourse on Liturgies. Works, Vol. 19, p. 440. We commend this masterly discussion to all who wish to understand the true doctrine of the "discretionary power" of the church, so much talked of in recent debates amongst us.

teenth century, in which many who sneer at their principles and ours, are willing to join us,—but we love their principles, and pray that God will make us worthy to walk in their steps, and enable us to contend to the very last extremity against any other voice being heard within the fold, but the voice of Him who has laid down His life for the sheep.

But our brethren who defend the innovations in question, and object to our stiff conservatism, may say again, “we join issue with you upon your own ground; we grant for the sake of argument, that your interpretation of the law, stringent as it appears to us to be, is just: yet the Bible sanctions the very modes of worship you condemn.”

1. As to Liturgies: we find that our Saviour Himself gave to His disciples a form of prayer to be used by them in their publick devotions. We answer, *first*, that we are at a loss to conceive where the argument lies; where the connection is between a directory given by Christ, as to the matter of His people’s prayers, and forms of prayer composed by men, who either make no claim to the possession of the “mind of the Spirit,” or furnish very indifferent evidence to authenticate the claim. There is a great gulf fixed between the act of Christ and an act of Parliament, or even an act of an ecclesiastical convocation. *Second*, the Lord’s prayer, as given in the Sermon on the Mount, seems to have been intended as a directory in *secret* worship: like the directions in regard to alms-giving and fasting, with which it is immediately connected in that sermon. And our business now, as before explained, is not with private and secret, but with social and publick worship. If it is said, that, as given by Luke, it was designed for social devotion; we say again, we do not object to its being so used, but we cannot see how this proves that forms of human invention are also lawful. The burden of proof is on the other side: let them show that the Lord’s prayer was designed to be so used; then let them show that any other form may be used, *because* Christ’s may, and we give up the point. If it be said again, that the Lord’s prayer was composed out of forms in common use among the Jews; we reply, let them prove this, and then show that because a form made or selected by the great Prophet of His people may be used, a form made or selected by uninspired men may be used: and that the use of forms in an effete and carnal church, justifies the use of them in a church replenished with the gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of grace and supplication. *Third*; “the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.” Even supposing, therefore, that our Saviour designed that prayer to be used as a publick form by His disciples then, when they were so carnal as to be looking for earthly glory as the reward they should receive for having faithfully attended Him, and to be unable to hear patiently of His ignominious death upon the cross, it does not follow that it must continue to be so used, after His ascension into heaven, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost with mighty

power. And here is the strong point against the use of liturgies, that they are inconsistent with the promise of the Spirit, which is given to ministers to enable them for their work. Where is the necessity for *gifts* in a church, in which every thing but the sermon is put down in print; and the only requisites for a canonical performance of the worship, can be obtained from the tailor and the common school-master? And as to the sermon, nobody needs to be informed of what sort that is, and what gifts are required to make one, in those churches where liturgies are “almost adored.” The truth is, as we said before, it is only in the absence of gifts and grace, that the need of a liturgy is felt. Then, indeed, it is one of those circumstances which are of the nature of a “necessary adjunct” of an action: for if the man is to pray at all, it must be by book. But what right has a man to thrust himself into the pulpit, and undertake to lead the people of God in their devotions, if he has no other gift than that which all the people, perhaps, have as well as he, to wit, the ability to read? Suppose, for one moment, that the General Assembly should prescribe a form of prayer to be read in all the churches, would not the ministry of the church speedily descend, as a mass, to the level of that portion of it, which could read only? It would make the weakest the standard of the strong, and a degradation well nigh universal, would be the melancholy result. Gifts would cease to be valued, to be sought, to be cultivated; and a tame, heartless, gloomy formalism—settle down upon us, like the pall of death. Depend upon it, let men deride “gifted brethren” as they may, if we cease to have gifted brethren, we are ruined. The task of those who defend liturgies, therefore, is to prove that a man endued with the Spirit and the promised gifts of Christ, cannot pray to edification without such help. It is, in other words, to show that it is a necessary “circumstance” of the action in his case. If this be not done, then the whole tenor of Scripture teaching is against them. See Eph. 4: 7—16.

2. As to Instrumental Musick: it is said, “that it formed a part of the stated worship of the temple under the Law, and that the frequent allusions to the harp, psaltery, &c. in the Psalms, show that instrumental musick may be associated with sentiments of true spiritual devotion.” We remark: *First*, that it is a little singular, that our brethren who have such a horror of Jewish bondage, and protest so earnestly against making the ancient people of God,—who were not allowed to do what was right in their own eyes,—an example for us who enjoy the liberty of the Gospel, should not be able to find in the notices of publick worship in the New Testament, any traces of the use of instrumental musick; but must needs go back to the days of bondage for their precedents. We hear of “*singing* the praises of God” in the church of the Apostles; of “*singing* with the spirit and with the *understanding* also;”—that is, so as to be understood, as the connection (1. Cor. 14.) shows the meaning to be, implying that as the human voice is the only organ which can *articu-*

late sentiment, is the only organ to be used ;—of “ *teaching and admonishing* one another, in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs ;” but not one word about wind or stringed instruments, which can neither feel nor speak. *Second* : even upon the supposition, that instrumental musick was a part of the stated publick worship of the temple, it does not follow that it is lawful under the Gospel. The fact that it belonged to the temple service, is a strong presumption that it was peculiar to the worship of the ministration of death. It seems to have been associated whenever it was performed, with the *offering of sacrifice* ; but Christians know no other sacrifice but that of Jesus, which has been offered once for all. Let the Papists who believe in temples, priests and sacrifices, stick to their organs : let not the freemen of the Lord, who have boldness to enter into the holiest of all, through the blood of the Son of God, who has passed into the heavens, borrow their pitiful machinery. We prefer the synagogue to the temple. *

Third : but it is more than doubtful whether musick of this sort ever formed any part of the stated publick worship even of the temple. Upon this point we quote the following sentences from a short essay on Instrumental Music, by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, first printed in the Presbyterian Herald, and reprinted in Baltimore three years ago. No attempt, as far as we know, has been made to answer the argument. Why, it is not difficult to divine :

“ The very nature of the sacrificial system of the Jews, was incompatible with the stated use of music of any sort in direct connection with it ; and it is positively certain that instruments of music formed no part of the divinely appointed means, or utensils of the tabernacle, or temple service. For everything lawful to be used in every part of that service, by every person any way connected with it, is expressly recorded in the Bible ; and everything else is forbidden to be used, or even made ; and yet no musical instrument is ever mentioned as amongst them, or connected with their use. We have four catalogues preserved by God, in his word, of everything made according to the pattern shown to Moses in the mount—catalogues embracing the minutest as well as the most important thing ; but no allusion is made to any musical instrument. The temple service of the Jews, which was full of Christ to come, had no such machinery. As to the syna-

* We once heard a Doctor of Divinity in a “ Free Conversation on the State of Religion,” intimate that his faith in organs had been somewhat confirmed by reading that “ Jubal was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ.” An organ had been recently introduced into his own church ; and we thought at the time, that his conscience was in distress, and therefore, ready to put into any port in the storm. We have heard of some people arguing for immersion, from the phrase “ *divers baptisms*” in Heb. 9, 10 : and though we do not think it possible that the readers of the Critic could attach any consequence to the text in Genesis, as touching this question, yet out of deference to the doctorate, we will say ; 1. That Jubal was of the children of Cain, who “ went out from the presence of God.” 2. That, by parity of reasoning, as “ Jabal was the father of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle,” we ought to worship in tents and sacrifice cattle : and as “ Tubal-Cain was the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron,” we ought to use a brass band or brass cannon in our public worship.

We do not desire to call any man “ father on earth :” but if we must have a metaphorical father, the line of Cain is about the last we should go to.

gogue system—that system after which, both in its model and in its objects, the Christian Church was confessedly and undeniably formed—it allowed no instrumental music. Probably in the tens of thousands of Jewish synagogues which have covered the earth during the whole career of that wonderful people—not one can be found, in which a congregation of enlightened Jews, who adhered to the institutions of their religion and their race, allowed any instrument of music—much less an organ, to form any part of their system of the public worship of God.

10. These statements may excite surprise in those who have not paid attention to the subject. And it may be demanded, what are we, then, to understand was the exact position occupied by instruments of music, in the religious system of the Jews. To this various replies may be made. 1. It is not at all material, to the question now under discussion, what position they occupied; the only thing needful to be shown, being that they were not a part of the stated worship of God. 2. The greater the obscurity concerning their proper place and use, the greater the absurdity of making their place and use, in the Jewish system, control the nature of the Christian system of public worship. 3. It is for those who cite their use to justify innovations on our established and covenanted ordinances, to be able, at least, to show us clearly and certainly, that the Jewish use they rely on, was not contrary to our ordinances. 4. It is manifest that if this Jewish use could be shown, and when shown had the weight attributed to it,—the argument would be far deeper and broader than merely to justify the proposed innovation, in our churches; it would render that innovation an absolute and universal duty. For if God established amongst the Jews, as a part of his stated worship, the use of organs, or other similar instruments; and if he has done nothing since to change that institution; then it is still universally binding. 5. But not to leave the point wholly in the dark, as to the Jewish use of instruments of music in God's worship, I suppose, that use chiefly as follows: *First*, on great, and extraordinary occasions, such as the dedication of the Temple—the bringing up of the ark of God—national rejoicings—national mournings, and the like. *Secondly*, on the occasions of the assembling three times every year of the whole Jewish people at Jerusalem, to celebrate their great annual feasts—the tens of thousands of Israel, in their vast processions through the city—chanting as they ascended to the temple, the “Songs of Degrees,” accompanied by the sound of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of harps, psalteries, cymbals, and the like. *Thirdly*, in the meetings of the Priests, Levites, and others exclusively devoted to a religious profession and service amongst the Jews; official meetings, so to speak, for prayer and mutual instruction, instrumental music connected with sacred praise, seems to have been an object of special attention; and what is said in the two immediately preceding heads, shows how natural and important this would be. *Fourthly*, on the whole, the system of instrumental music, for religious uses, amongst the Jews, was no part of their synagogue system, and no part of their Temple system—but seems rather to have been an offshoot, connected incidentally, but intimately, with their great sacrificial system in its combined aspect, as a system at once religious and national. And it is to be remembered, that it was not Moses, nor the prophets,—but it was David who arranged the whole musical economy of the Jews, whatever it may have been; David, the king, as well as David the Psalmist—as the latter composing divine songs for God's people in his own and all other ages—as the former suit-

ing the use of instrumental music to them, in the peculiar aspect of his own people, considered in a religio-national point of view,—and not as either, strictly speaking, Temple worshippers, or Synagogue worshippers.”

It will be observed that the argument of this paper has been strictly confined to the point of the warrant of Scripture for the innovations in worship, which some of our brethren are disposed to defend. Many pages might be written upon the desolating influence in fact of these corruptions: but all we want to know about any thing is, that it is *bad*: its effects must correspond with its nature. As the tree is, so must the fruit be. Let our brethren on the other side distinctly understand, that we are the conservatives, and are acting on the defensive. They are bound to show cause why these imitations of Rome are to be tolerated in the Presbyterian Church, and a taste cultivated in our children, which they must go to Episcopacy or Popery, fully to gratify. We stand upon the platform of that great Westminster Assembly, “by the advice of whose leading members, the Long Parliament passed an act, declaring the use of organs in churches to be a part of idolatrous worship—and ordering every one to be removed.” What have we to do with the drums of Tophet? Alas! what madness is it, to come down from that lofty elevation on which God and the blood of our martyred fathers have placed us, to go into the market and bid for men with the gew-gaws and follies of those, who, we say, are totally apostate or only half-reformed! Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts! Cause thy face to shine; and we shall be saved!

[For the Critic.]

PREROGATIVES OF 'THE PRESBYTERY IN THE TRANSLATION OF MINISTERS.

THERE seems to be a considerable diversity of opinion in the church in regard to what is due to the authority of Presbytery, and what to the judgment of the individual minister, in the matter of translating a minister from one pastoral charge to another.

It seems to be the view of many, that the whole matter falls properly under the cognizance and jurisdiction of Presbytery alone, the minister in question having nothing to do with it,—nothing to know, nothing to consider, nothing to decide. If a church has made out a call for a minister's pastoral services, he must be blind to the fact, much more must he refuse to think upon it, most of all must he decline taking any action in regard to it. He must leave it to the

Presbytery to take the initiative, conduct the progressive, and reach the definitive in his behalf.

On the other hand, it seems to be the view of many, that the minister, as the person primarily concerned in the matter, has most important responsibilities devolved upon him in regard to it, and hence must have conceded to him wide liberties of investigation and judgment. If a church has made out a call for his pastoral services, he may properly be apprised of the fact, he may take the matter into consideration, he may, with such information as can be obtained, decide whether he ought to accept or decline the call. If he is satisfied that it is his duty to decline the call, he may communicate his views to the church calling him, and prevent them from prosecuting the call before Presbytery; or, if he is satisfied that it is his duty to accept the call, he may again communicate his views to the church calling him, and permit them to go forward in the prosecution of the call. And then, the matter coming before Presbytery, that body—ascertaining the views of the minister—has no proper liberty in the case, but must conform its action to the minister's judgment—place the call in his hands, and, he accepting it, translate him.

Such diversity of sentiment often gives rise to warm discussion. The advocates of the former view meet their opponents with such questions as these: Where is the use of the Presbytery, if the minister decides everything? Why enact the farce of voting just as he dictates? And the advocates of the latter view retort: Where is the conscience and intelligence of the minister? Is he a mere puppet, committed to unquestioned obedience?

The advocates of the former view see great advantages resulting from the carrying out of their view. Presbytery will often arrest unsuitable calls before they reach the minister, and both himself and his congregation will be saved a needless disturbance, while the minister, by the same action, will be prevented from the possibility of mistake in accepting such calls. But the advocates of the latter view see equal advantages resulting from the carrying out of their view. The minister will often arrest unsuitable calls before they reach the Presbytery, and thus save the congregation calling him, as well as his own congregation and the Presbytery, a needless trouble; and, in general, the peace and edification of the church will most be promoted, by permitting ministers and congregations to sort and suit themselves, as best they may, without Presbyterial or other outside interference.

The advocates of the former view make a confident appeal in support of their views to the teaching of our Form of Government. There, they say, is given to Presbytery all the power in the matter that we ask. But the advocates of the latter view reply: Your views of the teaching of our Form of Government are narrow, superficial, mistaken, and would condemn the practice of nine-tenths of the most intelligent ministers of our church.

It may be of use now to glance at the teaching of the Form of Government, and see how it is conceived to sustain the former view referred to, and then, alongside of this teaching, to place the actual practice of our ministers as cited above.

We find in the chapter on translations, at the outset, this distinct statement: "No bishop shall be translated from one church to another, nor shall he receive any call for that purpose, but by the permission of the Presbytery." Presbytery, then, is the only channel through which a call can come into a minister's hands. It is not properly in his possession until Presbytery has acted on it. Nor is the action of Presbytery a mere thing of course. Presbytery may, if it will, refuse to place the call in the minister's hands. And the action of Presbytery, deciding whether the call shall go to the minister or not, is determined, not at all by the minister's known desires or convictions, but simply by the conceived reasonableness of the plea for his removal, made by the commissioners of the church presenting the call. The minister does not yet appear for any purpose. He may or may not have desires or convictions,—the Presbytery does not notice him. Now, as the Presbytery founts its decision to place the call in the minister's hands, on the character of the plea made for his removal, it is an easy supposition that the Presbytery, in this decision, gives its judgment that it is the minister's duty to accept the call. Likewise, it is an easy supposition, that if the Presbytery is not convinced by the plea of the commissioners, that the minister should go to the church calling him, it will not suffer the call to be placed in his hands. Under these suppositions, how wide the control of Presbytery! But even after this, if the Presbytery, judging it the minister's duty to accept the call, places it in his possession, and he accords with their judgment, the power is reserved by Presbytery to reconsider the matter, when the minister and his congregation shall have been heard. And these parties being heard—the desires and convictions of the minister being now fully expressed, Presbytery with perfect freedom deliberates and decides "upon the whole view of the case," whether to continue him in his old charge or to translate him.

Does it not seem that Presbytery has all the control in the case, demanded by any?

But what now is the actual practice of our ministers? Is a Presbytery ever asked to receive and issue a call, when no previous consultation has taken place between the church calling and the minister called? Are not calls declined every day which no Presbytery has seen? Are not calls prosecuted only when the consent of the minister has been previously obtained, and, in almost every instance, a consent so expressed as to make plain his conception of his own duty? And do not Presbyteries almost invariably conform to the convictions of the minister as declared to them by himself, and use their large liberty only when he invites them? Do not the warmest advocates of Presbyterial authority depart from their views

the very moment they become personally involved in the matter of a call? These are notorious facts.

And thus the practice of the church agrees with the views of others.

It certainly were a happy result, if this diversity of opinion could be done away,—if such a conception of this whole subject could be obtained as would accord to Presbytery its proper authority, and yet secure for the minister a reasonable liberty; and it were a happy consummation, if individual ministers involved in the affair of a call could concede to Presbytery its proper authority, while Presbytery would grant to them a reasonable liberty, and yet both feel that no undue concession had been made. And is not this possible?

All that will be further attempted in this article will be, to throw out a few hints, which may be useful in solving any difficulty attending the matter in question.

It is evident that supervisory and definitive power in regard to translations must be lodged somewhere. And very properly it is lodged with the Presbytery. As it is the Presbytery who ordains the minister and installs him over a particular congregation, as it is the Presbytery who watches over the individual pastor in his care of his flock, and as it is the Presbytery who cares for the several churches within its bounds as well as their pastors, (and the translation of a minister affects at least two churches,) very manifestly the Presbytery should have the general control and final decision of all cases of translation. But now the question arises, does it follow that, because such power is lodged with Presbytery, it must be exercised blindly and without guidance? The question, indeed, may be asked, whether Presbytery, holding its power as a veto, to be exercised in extreme cases, ought not in ordinary cases to be content with regulating and sanctioning the movements of ministers and congregations? It may be that this question suggests a view of the subject not far from correct.*

The question, where, in the great harvest-field of the world, shall I labor for Christ and for souls?—is of most solemn interest to every minister of the gospel. It is a question which, for many reasons, he is often better capable of deciding than any body else, and which therefore, he is bound to decide. Presbytery may not come in between a minister's conscience and the Great Head of the church, unless manifestly capable of enlightening his conscience, and of expressing, better than he has ascertained it, the will of the Head of the church. A minister is bound to submit to his brethren—but only "in the Lord."

* Those who regard those powers of the church, by which the order of the church is regulated, as its powers of life, to be faithfully worked to the utmost of their scope in every case, make a mistake very similar to that of the boy in regard to heat, who, smarting from the effects of a mustard draught, took it from his neck and applied it to a thermometer to ascertain its strength.

Now it is perfectly idle to suppose that, as a general thing, a minister has no opinion concerning his duty, in regard to a call pending before Presbytery for his pastoral services. How comes there to be a call? Has not the church calling the minister an acquaintance with him, such as implies his acquaintance with them? The language of the call is—"having good hopes, from our past experience of your labors," &c. It may be presumed that a *mutual* acquaintance has been formed. While the people were obtaining their experience of his labors, the minister was carefully studying the character of the congregation, and the claims of the field opened to its pastor. In all probability he is far better acquainted with the church calling him, than any or all his fellow Presbyters combined. He may be, indeed, the only person capable from his circumstances, of forming any intelligent opinion whatever as to the merits of the call. This will often be the case when the church presenting the call belongs to another and remote Presbytery. He alone may have had, in such instance, any personal intercourse whatever with the church.

Very often, too, a minister is the only competent judge of the claims of his present congregation for his continued services. His intimate acquaintance with it may enable him to see reasons, which no other person can see, for his leaving them.

Besides this, the minister knows his own heart, his own nature, his own necessities and adaptations, and possibilities for usefulness and plans for life, as no one else does or can know them. The whole subject, so far as it involves the minister, has an interior aspect of great importance, from any view of which all Presbyteries are of necessity excluded.

It would seem clear, from such considerations as these, that the Presbytery must have continual respect to the minister's judgment in all its action. And in order to this, full opportunity must be allowed to the minister to express his judgment, before Presbytery makes a final disposition of the call. Otherwise the action of Presbytery will often be blind and oppressive, and its consequences only disastrous.

This view of the matter will not, we think, degrade the action of Presbytery to a mere formality. Frequently cases arise, in which Presbytery, having good opportunities of knowing the claims of both churches concerned in the proposed translation, and the minister being in doubt as to his duty, it will properly devolve on Presbytery to decide whether the minister ought to be translated. There may be another class of cases, in which, although the minister may declare it as his judgment that he ought to be translated, there is yet evidence of a precipitate judgment, or a judgment formed in view of only a part of the fact in the case; and here Presbytery may properly take upon itself the *onus* of the decision. And again, Presbytery may have an important duty to discharge, other than simply voting in the case, when the church from which the minister is called, resists his translation, on serious and reasonable grounds.

In illustration of the main points of our view, suppose a case: A minister is apprised that a certain church has made out a call for him,—what may he, or what ought he to do? We answer, he may properly take the subject of his removal to the proposed field of labor into immediate and full consideration. If, aware that he comprehends the case, he feels satisfied that it is his duty to remain in his present post, he ought to state the fact to the church calling him, and use his influence to prevent the call coming before the Presbytery. Or if not thus satisfied, he may state the fact, and let the call be prosecuted. He may not indeed accept the call, nor declare his determination to accept it, save with a qualification which shall provide for Presbyterian action. Now let the call come before Presbytery. The question arises, shall the call go to the minister to whom it is directed? And our Book, as we have seen, represents this question as being decided by the reasonableness of the plea of the commissioners of the church giving the call. But according to our view—and we call especial attention to the statement—the decision of this question was never intended, as is often conceived, to involve the merits of the whole case. The plea of the commissioners may be of a highly reasonable character, yet not at all sufficient to convince the Presbytery that the minister ought to be translated. Yet if the plea be only reasonable—if the arguments used by the commissioners are not of a trivial or preposterous character, making it perfectly evident that the minister and his congregation ought not to be troubled with the call, the Presbytery must place the call in the minister's hands. And not until after this, not until after the minister and his congregation have been heard in full, and their views can be taken into consideration in connection with the plea of the commissioners, do the merits of the case come up.*

And it is just here, we conceive, that the Book provides for the views and convictions of the minister, in a way that is often overlooked. It is in making the question, whether the call shall be placed in the minister's hands—a question upon which the minister has nothing to say—it is in making this a mere preliminary; and in deciding upon the merits of the case only “upon the whole view of the case,” after the minister has had opportunity of being fully heard.

In the foregoing remarks, we have regarded Presbyteries as disposed to claim undue authority. We might look again at the whole subject from another point of view, and obtain strong confirmation of the correctness of any conclusions already attained. Not only may Presbyteries claim undue authority, and err in not conceding to

* The ordinary language of our Presbyterian minutes in the case of translations is this,—that the call having been placed in the brother's hands, and he having signified his acceptance of the same, it was resolved that the pastoral relation between him and his congregation be dissolved, &c. The frequency with which such language is used, indicates the prevalence of the misconception, that the merits of the case are disposed of in the decision to place the call in the minister's hands.

the individual minister a reasonable liberty; but the contrary procedure is possible. The minister may *demand* of Presbytery to exercise in his behalf the extreme power committed to it, and may err in not consenting to assume the responsibility which evidently devolves on himself. Not only is power sweet, but responsibility is fearful. Sometimes men would gladly escape it.

Now what is a Presbytery to do, when called to sit in judgment on a case involving most important and most delicate interests and relations, when the grounds upon which a proper judgment may be formed, although perfectly well known to the minister, are yet beyond the knowledge of Presbytery, and when the minister yet declines to give his own judgment? Such instances are not wanting. It may not be a mere dread of the responsibility of deciding his own course, which prevents the minister from giving his own judgment. It may sometimes be his dislike of seeming to say to the faithful and loving people of his present charge,—I feel inclined to leave you. Or it may be many another thing. The responsibility is on many accounts unpleasant, and the minister, notwithstanding he has desires and convictions which incapacitate him from an acquiescence in an adverse decision of Presbytery, yet demands that they assume the entire responsibility of a decision. Can a Presbytery properly be compelled to go forward in such case? Does not every Presbyter feel that, although he may have the constitutional right to vote in such case, just as he pleases, yet that he must have the convictions of the minister to help guide him, before that vote, or the decision which it goes to establish, can have any moral force—can be regarded as in any sense an utterance of the Master's will? Yet there is no escape from such compelled and vain decisions, on the supposition of unlimited Presbyterian authority.

The conclusion to which we come from a consideration of the subject, in its various aspects, is that already indicated; to wit, that Presbytery while holding large powers in its possession, may not exercise those powers blindly and without guidance,—not exercise them to the utmost in all cases,—but, in all ordinary cases, should merely regulate and sanction the movements of individual ministers and congregations,—exercising its high powers with a wise discretion;—that while it does this it cannot be compelled to do more; and that the individual minister has an important part to discharge in the matter of his own translation, whether that part be regarded as a privilege or as a responsibility.

We are now done with the particular matter in hand. Yet it occurs to us to say, before concluding, as the subject is involved in that of ministerial translations, that the question, whether a minister and his congregation, having learned that a call is coming before Presbytery, may take action in reference to the proposed translation previously to that meeting—that this question ought not to occasion much difficulty. In our view, if a congregation, in such case, choose to assemble and to agree upon their action previously to such meeting,

they are at perfect liberty to do so. And they may hold any conference with the minister esteemed by them desirable, and may found their action upon such conference. Yet the minister may not, on his own authority, call his people together, and compel their action. And it may be that our Book contemplates such voluntary congregational meeting and action, as in most cases likely to be had, when it says, "If the parties be not prepared to have the matter issued at that Presbytery,"—as though, in all likelihood, they would be prepared. At all events, we cannot but consider it altogether more honorable, and more befitting the confidential character of the relation of pastor and people, that a pastor apprised of a call for his services which he feels bound to consider, or, having considered, feels inclined to accept, should freely confer with his people in regard to it, rather than studiously conceal the fact of the call having been made, or his feelings in reference to it, until the whole matter, to the great grief and surprise of his people it may be, is suddenly sprung upon them in a meeting of Presbytery.

FORMALISM—PURITANISM AND RATIONALISM—THE THREE RELIGIONS AS DEVELOPED FROM THEIR GERMINAL PRINCIPLE.

—
CONTINUED FROM THE LAST NO.
—

TAKING these three terms to denote three general conceptions of religion, severally represented by Popery in any of its forms, by a pure Presbyterianism, and by a consistent Unitarianism; we have shown that they are utterly antagonistic in the very sources from which they severally derive their religious ideas. That according to the first, the will of God is made known to men through a visible corporation on earth—the church; according to the second, through His word declared and recorded in His Book; according to the third,—through the natural reason of man.

Proceeding next to develop the three systems of religion from this starting point—their Rule of Faith, we have shown how in the first place, these widely different conceptions of the nature of the church of Christ naturally follow from these diverse Rules of Faith. According to Formalism, the church on earth must be a spiritual corporation—the agent of God for making known His will, and the channel of His grace to the souls of men. According to Puritanism the church is the body of believing men, spiritually united to Christ, and in him to one another, through the truth revealed in His word.

According to Rationalism, the church is simply an aggregation of men who adopt similar opinions;—the church of Jesus Christ is but as the band of admiring disciples who rallied around Zeno in the Porch, or Plato in the Academy.

We now proceed to show how the same self-consistency characterizes each of the three, and the same contrariety to each other, in reference alike to all the aspects of religion—whether as a theology to be received by the understanding, as a spiritual experience of the heart, as a mode of divine worship, or as an practical influence over the life of the individual or of society.

We observe then, in the second place, that as a natural sequence from the Puritan Rule of Faith, comes the conception of Theology as the science of God and the relation of man to God. A science whose truths are gathered from the broad field of his revealed word and systematized, analogous to the mode in which all natural science gathers and systematizes truths from the universe of the works of God. To this all other sciences are but ancillary. The highest truths, even though they be of the profoundest laws of worlds, suns, and systems, are but the simplest elementary truths relative to this science, which, transcending suns and systems, rises to the grand keystone truth,—“God so loved the world that he gave his son,”—even Him, “who is the brightness of the Father’s glory and the express image of his person”—and “by whom He made the worlds”—and so constituted the relation between Him and a fallen humanity, that “whosoever believeth on him shall have everlasting life.” The truths of this great Theology, according to Puritanism, must constitute the substratum alike of all true Philosophy, and all spiritual life in the soul of man. To illustrate and enforce these truths upon the world is the church’s great work of action, to bear testimony to them even with her blood, the church’s great passive act of martyrdom. Accordingly, Puritanism exhibits its life and activity through the profound Theologies of its great writers; the skillful adaptations of theological truths to the minds and hearts of men by its great preacher—and the practical development of this theology, apprehended by the understandings of its people, and thus supplying the life of holy emotion in the heart, and the impulses to a holy life.

But Formalism in perfect consistency with its rule of Faith, knows theology chiefly as an art, rather than as a science. It is but the skillful application in individual cases of the decisions and precepts of the corporation,—God’s agent—the church. It is thus chiefly a casuistry. The great truths of Theology, which Puritanism conceives of as eminently practical—yea, essential to religion—because they must underlie all spiritual life in the soul, become in the theory of Formalism but so many high and curious speculations, to be debated of indeed by the metaphysicians by way of sharpening the wits, but having no essential relation to religion as a practical life. Hence Formalism exhibits its tomes of “Moral Theology”—endless hair-splitting of points of conscience—its confessors in the box to shrive the penitent; rather than the preacher in the pulpit to enlighten

the people—and its practical life of obedience to precepts of the church in place of obedience from principle to God—faith working by love.

The theology of Rationalism, again, with its Rule of Faith, cannot in the nature of the case be of any higher character of certainty under the light of revelation, than was theology as taught by Socrates, Plato or Cicero. It must be at best but an ingenious speculation. The only advantage of a revelation to the Theology of Rationalism—even when it is inconsistent enough to admit a revelation at all—is, as a means of advancing and improving a Theology, already supposed to exist. But such a theory can manifestly be merely a starting point in an endless progress of improvement: nor is there any resting place for a logical mind short of the “Absolute Religion” of the latest and more consistent Rationalists. According to which all theology is derived from that revelation of God, which is contained in the universe; the outward universe of matter and the inward universe of man. Of course on such a theory, there can be practically no Theology as a certain science of God. If men agreeing that God hath spoken directly and made record of the speech in a Book, yet differ so widely in the interpretation of the written language—how shall there be every certain interpretation of the mysterious hieroglyphic—unwritten in word, unexpressed in speech, and to all practical intents as yet, unconceived in idea—which are revealed in the universe.

And this general view of the subject, will be found to be as remarkable in its application in detail to all the branches of theology, as to the science itself, viewed as whole. Take for example, that branch of Theology which treats of God’s providence and grace as manifested in the history of the church. In ecclesiastical history, Puritanism finds a great cloud of *witnesses* to the correctness of its interpretations of the revealed will of God. Formalism finds an ever-augmenting list of statutory enactments, authoritatively demanding obedience. Rationalism finds but so many land-marks, whereby to indicate the progress and development of religious ideas, all along that ascending grade by which its own imagined superiority of position has been attained. Puritanism calls the Fathers to the witness’ stand, and earnestly questions them as to the facts of which they have been eye witnesses, ear witnesses, heart witnesses. Formalism placing the Fathers upon the Judge’s Seat, waits with obsequious reverence and bows with implicit obedience to their decision as authoritative and final. Rationalism, as a curious bystander, becomes interested in the story of the Fathers as a curious legend of past ages and men—interesting for the same cause that renders interesting the legend of mythology; to wit, that it is a reading in reverse order, “the New Testament of human nature, every day revealing a new page, as time turns over the leaf.”

3. The same self-consistency, with the same mutual contrariety, marks these three in their views of religion as an experimental, spiritual truth. From the very nature of its view of Theology, Puritanism necessarily conceives of the gospel of salvation, as “a

ministration of the spirit,"—Formalism as a ministration of a law-giver,—Rationalism as the ministration of a school master. Religion on the Puritan theory, must be a life of God in the soul. The truths of God, apprehended with the understanding, and accepted with the heart, will necessarily work out their natural results, in a mind enlightened and expanded; a heart desiring the love of God and panting for communion with him; a taste seeking to be like God; and a life whose acts spring from a living faith in God. Religion, as a life and practice, according to Formalism, must be a mere congeries of external acts of obedience to authority, and compliance with prescription. According to Rationalism, religion as a practical life, can be nothing more than a higher order of mental and aesthetic culture. Consistently enough, Formalism demands ever a visible, tangible representative of God, some Pope, Vicar of Jesus, to give validity and efficiency to its ministrations. Hence Formalism, though in theory standing fast to the great declaration of Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" yet like Peter also, in his ignorance, would regard all as lost if the bodily human presence of Christ be taken from the church. It never rises to the lofty faith that can receive the saying, "It is *expedient* for you that I go away"—(as to the bodily presence) and send the Paraclete—the true Vicar of Christ on earth. The fundamental idea of Formalism being of a visible presence of Jesus in the body, still abiding with the church, rather than the invisible presence of the comforter; moving upon the minds of men, as the "wind which bloweth where it listeth;" all its conceptions of religion must be unspiritual, in the nature of the case, and its practical religious life, a life of outward obedience to rules and prescriptions, rather a life which is but the outward manifestation of a spiritual life in the soul.

Puritanism, as a practical religion, in harmony with its theory, declares, "we walk by the faith, not by sight." Religion is a life in the soul, beginning with receiving of Christ by faith, evidencing itself by acts of loving obedience to him, "whom having *not seen*, we love, in whom though now we see him not, yet believing we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." This life not only originates in an act of the Holy Ghost upon the soul, but is sustained and nourished at every stage by the power of the same spirit through the truth; and therefore, a first element of practical religion must be the constant communion of the soul with the Comforter; who "taking the things of Christ sheweth them to us."

Rationalism in like consistency, utterly ignores all such spiritual life. Though perhaps using the names, Christ, Holy Spirit, Faith—yet these are but terms to express certain speculative ideas. Its Jesus, Saviour, is not the actual Jesus, "the same yesterday, to-day and forever;" the advocate and High Priest of his people, standing before his Father in the Heavens; not the Jesus that still receives, as he once received, the lowly and broken hearted—that still takes, as he once took, the children in his arms—that still stands weeping, as he once stood weeping, over Lazarus at the grave. Whilst reason is specu-

lating of all these matters, they become dim and shadowy visions to the soul—no longer great realities of faith. The heart cheated is left to adore a shadowy, sublimated idea—to weep at an empty sepulchre, and wail under a cross, upon which no Saviour “is lifted up.” No wonder that, left thus dark and bewildered, the soul should soon be searching in uncertainty for a Father through His immense dwelling—the universe; and at last sit down in despair at hearing no voice responsive to its call, save the clank of an infinite engine, driving the machinery of the universe!

4. This will be still more plain if we come now to consider generally the several conceptions of religion as a system of worship and ordinances; a method of special approach to God by the human soul. Here the contrast runs through every elementary branch of the subject. The conception of Formalism as to the approach of a sinful human soul to God, is in exact harmony with its idea of the church as God’s agent,—her priests as the channel of communication between God and man. The returning prodigal is exhorted to go to the “hired servants in his Father’s house” and secure their interest and intervention with the Father, in his behalf. Peace is made through messages sent back and forth. The Father makes treaty of peace and reconciliation with the Son by power of attorney given to one of the servants—and in due theatrical form a reconciliation scene is gotten up. Puritanism conceives of the approach of a sinner to God, as of the prodigal returning with a heart yearning toward a Father, whose heart yearns still more towards him. And therefore, without waiting to send through servants, the erring child rushes confidently to arms already open to receive him.—Rationalism eschewing all such familiarity of relation, and denying any important cause of quarrel, would teach the erring son to stand upon his dignity, and through occasional message from the “far country,” keep up simply a recognition of his relationship, and his rights as an heir.

And according to this general conception, are the three worships. In Formalism, instead of the direct communication between the soul of the worshipper and God, which Puritanism teaches, all grace must come through the authorized channel—God’s agent. And so all worship of the soul must go back through the same channel. The act of faith in devotion, becomes not the act of a soul-hearing, God’s-calling voice and apprehending it, and the response of the soul thereto; but simply an act of obedience to a visible human representative. The act of petition, is not as on the theory of Puritanism, the cry of the child to the Father for bread; but of the child going around to all the servants beseeching them to ask for him; of the Father, that he may be fed. The act of contrition, not the cry of one rushing directly up crying, “Father I have sinned,” and the interview of tenderness and love; but the formal making confession and promises through an attorney, authorized by full legal powers, to receive the submission, make the terms of reconciliation, and sign, seal and deliver the papers. Rationalism, rejecting all such conception

of man's relation to God, finds no room for any strong sentiment of sorrow and contrition in its religion. Its only conception of the approach of a soul to God, is of one coming into the presence of God with propriety and reverence of demeanor ; to demand respectfully his rights ! Saying, "Lo these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment, give me a kid that I may make merry with my friends."

Now corresponding with these diverse views of the nature of worship, are the diversities of view in regard to the ordinances of worship. According to Formalism, the divinely appointed sacraments, must necessarily be the means of communicating grace—otherwise they can have no meaning. Through these mysterious channels, grace is given ; therefore they are essential to salvation. And for a like reason the tendency of Formalism must ever be to multiply sacraments ; since the graces needed by the soul are many, and each sacrament can convey only its own special grace, therefore, the church must have many channels for giving grace. On the theory of Puritanism, the sacraments are in a high sense essential to salvation, but essential by no means because they are the alone channels through which the grace of God is given. These sacraments being seals of the covenant are an aid to faith ; as commanded of Christ, they secure his blessing to all who properly partake of them ; while on the other hand they are essential as outward expressions of the internal feelings of the soul. "*Believe*," is the command, indeed—but not "*believe*" only ;—"believe and be baptized"—"believe with thy heart and confess with thy mouth." Just as the natural affections of the heart have their proper forms of outward expression, so also the spiritual affections. Just as the natural affections are found to be strengthened by the outward expression of them ; just as the affection for the child—which, though it may have come a stranger into the household, yet by acts of kindness and continually manifested sympathy for it—grows into a love almost as the love of one's own child ; so with the spiritual nature. The belief of the heart must be "*confessed*." Rationalism however, ignoring religion as an act of faith—a faith working by love, and conceiving of religion rather as a *thought*,—can of course perceive no necessity for sacraments beyond the accommodation to the propensity of mankind, for commemorating, in some method, great historic occurrences.

The same general principle is illustrated in the diverse views of the three theories concerning the office of the ministry in the church. On the theory of Formalism, the minister, as agent of God, duly appointed is a priest, ministering at an altar, administering grace through sacramental ordinances. As the agency for salvation is all a sensible agency, there must be a sensible sacrifice—and a visible priest at the altar to offer it. On the theory of Puritanism, since the rule of Faith is God's will as revealed, and written in a book, the minister is an expounder of that law ; an ambassador proclaiming pardon to men ; not a priest to offer a sensible sacrifice, but a herald of the news of "a sacrifice offered up once for all." Not a spiritual conjurer

table to operate on the soul, by means of some potion administered through the senses; but an administrator by virtue of his office, of the signs and seals of a covenant between God and the soul. On the theory of Rationalism, the minister is a lecturer merely, expounding as from a professor's chair, the truths which philosophy, aided by a *quasi* revelation, inculcates upon mankind, as essential to their highest welfare.

Hence too, the modes of worship and the direct results aimed at in worship are entirely different. Formalism addresses the imagination and the senses chiefly. Architecture must lend all its skill, painting and statuary, all their arts; music, all its enchantments to aid in the work of spiritualizing and refining a worship of the senses. Visible forms must be presented to the eye of the worshipper, instead of ideas direct to his soul; mysterious symbols must sensualize for him spiritual truths. Puritanism, from its fundamental maxim—"God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;" aims to appeal directly to the spiritual nature of the worshipper, to enlighten his understanding, and so affect his heart. It eschews all worship, whose tendencies are to terminate upon the imagination merely, as degrading to the soul. Its first principle is, that God is in his nature, too exalted to be properly conceived of under any similitude. For "to whom will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare to him?" True, "God was manifest in the flesh," but it is not as flesh merely that we adore him. God is seen in his works, but it is not simply for his infinite skill and wisdom that he is to be worshipped, but "because he is Holy." And by what similitude shall the idea of His holiness be conveyed to the mind? Is it the great object of worship to elevate the taste and impress the imagination with noble ideas of God? Then degrade not the idea of Him, by attempting to represent it by works of man's device. Rather make the humble confession that the glory and greatness of God is too infinite to be expressed by the skill of man. Let the simplicity of the worship itself, be that confession. Without pomp and pageantry; in simplicity and lowly reverence, let his saints bow before him, and instead of the homage of the imagination, offer the homage of the heart. The cross of Jesus Christ embodies all the truths which it is the end of worship to bring before the soul, viewed from the cross how utterly insignificant all this empty parade; how utterly *bathetic* all the magnificence of the most pompous worship! To Rationalism, on the other hand, viewing all from the stand-point of a cold, self-sufficient morality, the cross of the God-man seems wholly unnecessary, and therefore, all worship out of place, which involves any thing more than simply *thought* of God. As incidental to the worship, taste and sentiment may be very proper. The fundamental idea of worship being *thinking* rather than *feeling*, such aid only as may enliven and quicken the thinking faculties, may be allowed—nothing more.

Our space forbids any further illustration of these contrasts. We pass over even the illustration which we intended to draw, from

the effects of the several systems as seen in the character and lives of their votaries. We cannot conclude however, without a suggestion or two by way of inference from the foregoing views.

Obviously the current idea of what constitutes true liberality ; to wit, the general recognition as Christians of all who assume the Christian name—is as absurd as would be the demand to recognize a man among the forms of religion, Mahommedism or Buhdism. The three things which we have been contrasting are not three forms of the same religion—they are *three different religions*. They are not more the same from *seeming* to come from the same source, than are the oak, the poplar, and the chesnut, parts of the same tree, when, as we sometimes see in the forest all three *seem* to grow out of one root.

It is equally evident that all idea of any *via media*—any compromise of the three, is utterly absurd. We occasionally hear insanity plead, as the cause of men's going over from Modern Anglicanism to Romanism. The insanity, if such, manifested itself still more strongly in the previous folly of dreaming of a *via media* between Rome and Geneva. And equally insane on the other hand, must be the dreams, of which, through the journals lately we have an utterance concerning a *via media* between Puritanism and Rationalism. Of all "the strong delusions" sent of God upon men for not liking "to retain God in their knowledge," that is by no means the least delusion, that leads men to talk of a "more *spiritual* Unitarianism ;" and the possibility of a compromise between it and more *liberal*, that is to say, *less spiritual* Puritanism. Hardly less obvious again, is the inference, how utterly absurd, the persistent attempts of men to modify Puritanism, either by borrowing modes of worship from Formalism on the one hand—or modes of stating doctrine from Rationalism on the other. Puritanism, in its most direct and simple development—as knowing nothing but Christ crucified, has ever shown itself to be the power of God. But whenever turning aside from its path to give the Jew "a sign,"—in hope of removing his "stumbling-block ;" or to debate "wisdom" with the Greek, with a view to escape his satire and avoid his charge of "foolishness," it becomes powerless ;—yea, the most "silly" of all the sections of "God's silly people"—if peradventure, they be any longer God's people at all.

LETTER OF A VIRGINIA PASTOR TO AN INQUIRER
CONCERNING THE PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAP-
TISM.

(CONCLUDED.)

4.—That *servants* were admitted to the seal of the covenant, under the ancient order of the church, and are therefore equally entitled, with children, to the ordinance as now in use.

To this we reply, that admitting the argument just as it stands, it would not affect the right of children to the ordinance: it would only prove that another class of members of the family besides the children were included in the *kingdom of God*. But all the enactments of God are to be taken together and interpreted as a whole. It is certain that *not all the children of Abraham* were admitted to the church in their simple capacity as his descendants, *after certain limitations had been put upon the covenant subsequent to its original formation*. At first, Abraham circumcised Ishmael, and his sons by Keturah: but afterwards the operation of the covenant was limited for its spiritual signification, to preserve its symbolic meaning more perfectly to the descendants of Isaac, according to the saying, *In Isaac shall thy seed be called*. The consequence was, when Edomites, or any other of the lineal, but uncovenanted descendants of Abraham wished to enter the *Congregation of the Lord*, they came in on a personal accession to its terms, not in virtue of their descent from the great patriarch of the church. The descendants of Isaac were born into the ecclesiastical relations held by their parents; but all others came in on personal grounds. A profession of faith was necessary to a lawful entrance of any heathen or uncovenanted person within these relations, and to the reception of the seal of them. We see then, from this case of the modification of circumcision in application to the children of Abraham, how necessary it is to interpret the application of circumcision to his servants in full connection with all other parts of the record, and under the limitations set forth therein. Interpreted in this way, we conclude that all the adult servants of Abraham were circumcised as believers, and the children of these servants as the children of believers; nor can any argument merely resting on the name *servants*, prove that they were circumcised merely as servants, and apart from other considerations, so long as we interpret the transaction in the light of other passages, which declare the necessity of a profession of faith in order to circumcision. We have never seen any reason to believe that the circumcision of the servants of Abraham, did not rest upon the general law regulating the rite—the law requiring public profession of allegiance to God in the adult, and the admission of children on their relations to their parents. But allowing that they were circumcised as *servants*, and in virtue of their relation to their masters, it will not follow, either that there was any intrinsic folly in the fact, or on

the other hand, that it is not subject to modification from other established principles in the regulation of the Kingdom of God in its existing form. By the clear demand of repentance and faith in adult persons, the law of infant baptism is restricted, and *adult children* are not baptized on the faith of their parents. The same demand would restrict the baptism of adult *servants*; and the precedent of the Abrahamic circumcision of servants, even admitting it to be a circumcision of servants, *as such*, would be restricted to the children of such servants as were not themselves believers, and as believers entitled to have their children circumcised. But then would not the principle limiting the right of the child to the faith of the parent, modify to extinction the alleged right of the children of unbelieving servants, to be circumcised on their relation to their believing master? In other words, the alleged circumcision of Abraham's servants, in their capacity merely as such, is completely extinguished by the modifying force of the admitted principles which regulated the affair. Thus we arrive by another route at the same conclusion, reached from a general view of the law regulating the rite. Abraham's servants were not then circumcised *merely as servants*, unless we are to suppose a specific suspension of the law of circumcision for their benefit; they were circumcised partly as believers in the true God, and professed adherence to the true religion, and partly as the children of such believers. We repeat, we see no reason to believe that these servants were circumcised merely as such, and apart from other considerations demanded by the law of the rite. On the contrary, that very law is conclusive evidence of the contrary. The mere fact that it is said he circumcised his servants, does not prove they were circumcised merely *as such*, so long as we interpret the action by the explicit law of the rite—a rule of estimate which we must employ in considering the case. They were not circumcised merely *as servants*, but *as believers, and as the children of believers*.

5.—The last objection is, that baptism as the symbol of purification, and a pledge of spiritual blessings, ought not to be applied to those who have not the purification symbolized, and the spiritual qualification to which the promise is annexed.

To settle this, let us look a little into the significations of baptism, and see if it is not rationally as applicable to an infant as to an adult. Baptism has a variety of imports. It is a symbol of dedication. It is the expression of an obligation as imposed and assumed. It is a sign of purification, expressing its necessity, and binding over to the attainment of it. It is a seal to attest and verify a covenant with all its promises and pledges contingent and positive. In none of these senses, is there one solitary shadow of impropriety in its application to infants. Let us recur to our analogy again. The parties agreeing to the association supposed, assume a specific character *as devoted* to God: they take upon themselves new obligations, and pledge themselves to the attainment of certain ends. If they may

do this, they may express it. If they may express it in words, they may express it by symbols: they may adopt some visible rite, sign or symbol, which may be made to express all these ideas, or as many of them as they may please to make it express. If they please they can have two symbols or more, to express different parts of the general obligations of the covenant. Nay, they may have two classes of citizens in the institute, and but one symbol for the use of both; yet this one symbol may express different ideas as it is used by one or another of these classes. Now, let us see how the various senses of baptism may be applied to an infant and a believer.

1.—It is a dedication. An adult dedicates himself to God: a parent dedicates his child: and baptism is the symbolic language used to express the idea in both. If there is no impropriety in a parent dedicating his child to God, there is no impropriety in his using a symbolic rite to express the idea. The voluntary association to which we have alluded, dedicates *all* its members, adult and infant, to the service of God, and there is no more impropriety in applying the symbol that expresses that idea to the one, than to the other. If man may do this by a voluntary impulse, he may do it with an equal, nay a greatly increased propriety, at the command of God.

2.—It imposes an obligation: it is a symbol of allegiance: it is the assumption and imposition of a solemn and unalterable bond of obedience to Christ. Now, may a parent thus bind over his child by a new and specific obligation to the service of God? Certainly none can deny this: it results from the power to dedicate all that he has to the service of his Maker. It is no interference with the rights and liberties of the child. He may ratify or not, the act of the parent which devoted him specially to God, when he arrives at the age of maturity. The parent may impose this bond upon the child by virtue of his unquestionable right to devote all that is his—so far as it is his, to the glory of God. Now if the parent may thus impose this obligation, there is no impropriety in his using a symbolic rite to express it. The sign expressing *obligation to the divine service, may be properly used upon all subjects, by their own act, or by the covenant of the parent, to the operation of this obligation.*

3.—It is a sign of purification, expressive of its necessity, and binding to its attainment, *but not asserting in all cases its actual occurrence.* Where is the authority for saying that this is the universal assertion of baptism. So far from this being the *universal* assertion, or import of baptism, it is very questionable whether it is even a *part* of its import. Certainly those passages that require a spiritual qualification in an adult, in order to receive it, do not determine this question. An application for the rite, on the part of the adult, implies his conviction, that he is prepared to receive it; but what does he express by the rite itself? A certain qualification of character is requisite in an adult, to receive the ordinance; but supposing him qualified, what does he express by the rite itself? Does he express his actual qualification to receive it? This would seem to be

superfluous: his application for it, *implies* his conviction, that he is qualified to receive it, but it is exceedingly doubtful whether he expresses that conviction in employing the rite itself. What then does he express by it? Not so much, if indeed at all, his belief in his conversion and partial purification, but his sense of pollution, his apprehended need of a part, and a prospective sanctification. The application then of the rite, *so far*, even in its application to an adult, is *prospective and future*. Now cannot these same ideas be expressed in regard to an infant? Is it not true that is depraved and needs a constant sanctification, progressing through the entire future of its life? Why then may not these truths be symbolically expressed by an infant as by an adult? It will be seen then, that the significance of baptism as a rite of purification, does not involve an essential difference in its application to an infant or an adult. When we are asked why we apply a sign of spiritual purification to an infant before that purification has actually taken place, we reply by inquiring, why apply a sign expressive of a *prospective purification* to an adult before it has taken place? If it is proper to express a prospective purification in the one case, why not in the other? We reply moreover, that the rite in an adult does not express an existing purification, although it implies it: but it does express certain ideas which may be properly expressed upon an infant, as upon an adult. We reply again, that all such rites as baptism, all confessions of pollution, all obligations imposed on children, all promises made for them, *must necessarily be prospective in their operation*, and to deny that confessions and obligations, having prospective reference, can be imposed on children, and expressed symbolically upon them, is to deny that such obligations can be imposed at all. Even an adult may assume at present, obligations which are prospective in their application: much more then may it be done upon an infant. But admitting the necessity of a present qualification in an adult, in order to the rightful assumption of an obligation, or the truthful confession of a need of purification, there is no inconsistency whatever in allowing such an assumption or confession in an infant, to have a *future or prospective reference*. The reason that warrants the difference lies deep in the nature of the case: it is impossible to deal with children in determining their relation to a visible organization, on the same principle with adults: for there is a vital difference in nature between the two, which compels to a difference of treatment. All obligations imposed upon children, must be *prospective*, or they cannot be imposed at all. It is in itself, partly at least, a matter of conviction, whether the purification symbolized, shall precede in fact, the application of the symbol, even in the case of adults: God could have ordered otherwise if he had chosen to do so: the symbol could have been made significant of the prospective nature of the *whole*, as it is admitted to be actually of a part of the purification expressed by it. But admitting that it was morally indispensable, that the fact should precede the expression of it in the case of adults, it by no

means follows that it is equally indispensable in the case of infants. All confessions of pollution, and all obligations to seek for purification, must be expressed prospectively upon an infant, if expressed at all. Therefore the symbolic import of baptism, as a rite of purification, has in the main, the same significance applied to infants, as applied to adults, and whatever of *difference* there may be, arises from the very nature of the case, as existing between the parties. We may as lawfully declare the pollution of a child, its need of sanctification, and bind it over to seek the cleansing efficacy of grace, as we may declare it of an adult, and bind him over to a similar obligation. This declaration may be expressed in a symbol as well as in words; and therefore baptism, as symbolic of purification, may as lawfully be applied to infants, as to adults. Let me recommend the article on the Nature of a Christian Profession, in the sixth volume of the Southern Presbyterian Review, to your perusal: it may give you some new views of the subject before us.

4.—Lastly, baptism is a seal of the covenant of grace, and it is said to be a mockery to put that seal, to what in the case of many infants growing up in impenitence and dying in sin, must be a blank—that it is to attest a falsehood, to make even the solemn rites of the Church of God, the vehicle of a lie—that it is to seal the covenant of grace to many who are not entitled to its benefits, or to receive any attestation that they are.

To this plausible and strong statement it is easy to reply, by reference to the complicated nature of the Church of God, and the various contingencies on which its blessings are suspended. The blessings promised to Abraham and his seed, although all based on the covenant of grace with Christ, are very various in nature. God promised certain blessings to Abraham. These blessings were procured for him by the death of Christ. Among them was the means of grace, the privilege of prayer, the ordinances of his worship, the revealed knowledge, through which sanctification was to come. These were precious blessings: yet they did not require any spiritual qualification to admit the children of Abraham to their use: they were as lawfully used by his unconverted children, as by those of them who were converted. But the covenant contained other and higher promises, suspended in their application personally, on personal qualifications. This was the promise of salvation contingent on faith in Christ. This *truth* was the common property of the unbelieving, as well as believing children of Abraham, and the seal of the covenant which attested it to both, was equally true to both. But the believing children had not only received the truth, but obeyed it, and the seal of the covenant applied to them expressed *more* than it expressed to those who did not believe. In short, the covenant contained various pledges and promises—various privileges and immunities—some of saving, others of mere formal value—some contingent—some not contingent—some benefits, spiritual and saving—others merely instrumental and temporal. But the seal of the cove-

nant attested all these to the classes of persons entitled to them. It attested one thing to those who had complied with the contingent promises, and another to those who had not. It attested to all the common truth of salvation by faith: it attested an actual salvation to the actual believer. It is perfectly obvious that the seal of a complicated instrument, asserting contingent ideas, promises and pledges, must attest different things to different persons, according as they have complied or not complied with the conditions of the promise; and consequently the seal of the covenant expresses no lie *when it seals an actual participation in the covenant of grace to a believer, and does not seal such a participation to an unbeliever.* It seals a general truth, equally to both—salvation by faith; but it seals a particular application of this truth only to the believer. It seals the use of certain privileges to the sinner—the use of the means—the institutions of the sanctuary—and all the general truths of the gospel, to the unbeliever, and seals no lie in admitting him to these privileges, in certifying these truths. But there are other privileges suspended on a contingency of faith—communion with God—pardon, peace, salvation, full communion in the visible church, which it seals only to the believer. Does it seal a lie in either case? Does the ordinance of the house of God become the vehicle of a lie, in asserting thus an attestation of one truth, or one benefit to one, and of another to another? The seal attests *the whole instrument*; but it attests it as it is, with all its contingencies, conditions, pledges and grants, conditional or unconditional, with all its privileges, whether merely formal and instrumental or spiritual and saving. It asserts no contradiction and seals no blank, even though it may seal one kind of privileges to one class, and a totally different kind of privileges to a class entirely different. It seals one class of rights, privileges, and blessings to infants, and seals another to them as *believers.* There is no contradiction or absurdity in the arrangement.

I really hope, my dear Sir, that you will finally see your way clear, not to deprive your child of any part of these privileges of the covenant of grace. It is certain that the responsibility of the decision is yours: it is a responsibility so serious, that I could not refrain from some effort to assist you to a right conclusion. To my mind, this is no slight or unimportant matter. If I were about to devote myself to God, by forming with others such an association as the one we have supposed; it would be a most interesting inquiry whether I might not include my children in the arrangement. If I had my choice between the two plans of bringing them in or leaving them out, I should not hesitate for a moment. I should rejoice in the privilege of putting God's mark on my children, and making them stand before the world, bearing the peculiar mark of being devoted, consecrated and set apart to His service. If God should undertake to make a covenant arrangement himself, it would greatly enhance my sense of its value, if he would so arrange it as to permit me to bring my children in with me, no matter what position

He might assign them, or how he might limit and circumscribe their privileges. It would be an exquisite delight to know that they were *His* in a peculiar sense—that He had condescended to assume peculiar relations to them—that He did not hold to the world at large—and that with additional responsibility on them, they had also been brought under the operation of peculiar privileges. But if God has really made such an arrangement, I should count it an irreparable loss, that from mistake or misdirection, I had failed to obtain for myself or my children, the benefits it conveys.

May God guide you to a right conclusion. Examine this question thoroughly. You may not be able to solve every difficulty; but if we are to wait to reduce every difficulty before we assent to the substantial evidence of truth, we shall remain in the condition of a hopeless and imbecile scepticism. All that I ask is, that you will seek the guidance of divine grace on a sincere and thorough examination of this question, suppressing everything but a desire to know the truth, and to obey it. If you should still find difficulty enough to retain you in your present attitude, while I shall regret it sincerely, I shall always retain the high sentiments of respect and affectionate regard for yourself and for the interests of your family, which have prompted me to the composition of this explanatory argument. I am by no means satisfied with it as a whole, and I beg you to use it, more to stimulate and suggest your own investigation of the matter, than to look upon it as even attempting to exhaust the question. No one treatise ever published does this: no one man can do it; and you must learn to select the sound parts of the different articles you read on the subject, from the misconceptions of different points in the argument to be found in every treatise upon it. Please examine the articles herewith transmitted at your leisure. Give yourself time, and determine in the fear of God.

YOUR FRIEND AND PASTOR.

WHAT ARE THE CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF GOD, AS ORGANIZED AND VISIBLE?— WITH SOME INFERENCES.

No diligent reader of the Scriptures can fail to notice, that they set forth, as an essential and fundamental fact of the scheme of redemption by "Christ crucified," the organization of a visible society of men—a community under constitution laws, and ordinances—a church of God—a "Kingdom of Heaven" *in* the world, "though not of this world." And this visible organization is not less clearly

distinguished from the mystical body of Christ, the elect of God—the invisible church, known only to God, than are the invisible movements of the Spirit, whereby souls are made members of the mystical body, distinguished from the external means of salvation,—the Sabbath, the word, sacraments and prayer—whereby the spirit communicates to the souls of men, the benefits of redemption. So prominent indeed, is this fact, that the Bible is not more a book of Theology—technically so called—than a book of ecclesiastical history. It may be said to be mainly the history of the four eras of the Church of God. First, of the church, as separately organized and set up in the family of Abraham, the father of the faithful. Secondly, of the church, as the outgrowth of this, when the family had become a nation—re-organized as a commonwealth under Moses—the “church in the wilderness.” (Acts 7: 38.) Thirdly, the church as the outgrowth of this again, re-modeled under the covenant with David, (1 Chron. 17: 7, 27) as the kingdom “set in the holy hill of Zion;”—“the church in the midst of” which David “sang praises.” (Heb. 2: 12.) And, lastly, the church, as the new kingdom of heaven, announced by John Baptist and Jesus as at hand, and re-organized by special commission from its Great Head to the Apostles;—that church to which “the Lord added daily;” and which is declared to be the final form of the organization till the end of the world; being the church of “the last days,” and “the last time.”

It is very obvious, if such be the prominence and importance of the visible church in the revealed system of salvation, that correct views of the nature and principles of the government so established, must be of the highest practical importance. If the abstract truths, which God hath revealed for the guidance of men, to eternal life, are thus inseparably embodied, just as the great truths relating to the civil and political freedom of men ever must embody themselves, in the outward and visible shape of a government, it is manifest that a proper understanding of the government, is essential to the highest success of the truths themselves, as regenerating power among mankind. The question of the church, is practically therefore a question of Theology. Fundamental error on the subject of the church, must involve, sooner or later, fundamental error in Theology. For however, for a time, men who are in error, touching the nature and order of the church, may still cling to a right system of Theology; yet human nature in the long run, is a very consistent thing in its logic, however inconsistent any one individual mind may be, and the result will never fail to be, that the right doctrine of Theology will give way at last to the wrong doctrines concerning the church. Let these views of the matter be our apology for the prominence which we give in the pages of the Critic, to the question of the church.

Among the various questions relating to the visible church, as among the questions, relating to any form of organized society, no one is more really fundamental in theory, or more far-reaching in its

practical consequences, than that which concerns the elements of the society itself. Hence, we find in all processes of forming constitutions for States, in our times and country, this question in one form or other, holds a prominent place. For this question, underlies either the proposition for distributing representations, or on the proposition for the qualification of electors in any constitution. And on this question, Who, in the contemplation of the constitution, are the parties represented in the government? decides the character of the government. If on the one hand it be the individual men of the crowd, we have the wild French Republicanism, which formed government upon an imaginary social compact, between isolated men in miscalled state of nature. If on the other hand, it be men in the relations, which grow out of the divine obligation of marriage—men contemplated, not as isolated individuals, but as representing families, either in *esse* or *in posse*, we have Saxon republicanism, Mosaic republicanism, practical and enduring republicanism.

Now, not less important to our practical views of the Church of God, is the theoretic inquiry, what are the elements represented in it, as a scheme of government for men? Are they men and women contemplated as individuals? If so, in what character? as men and women regenerate, or unregenerate? Or are the constituent elements of the church—families—men and women, as representing families? According to the answer to this question, must many of the most important practical questions, relating to the life and action of the church be answered.

Among those who receive the Bible as authoritative, not only on all subjects of theology strictly so called, but also upon all subjects pertaining to human welfare generally on which the Bible incidentally makes any deliverance—it is admitted that there are three distinct forms of social organization of divine appointment; the Family, the Church, and the State. It is equally clear, from the scripture account of the origin and progress of the race, that of the three, the family is first, both in the order of nature, and in the order of time, and the source of the other two. Though indeed no detailed account of the origin of the State, as a form of social organization is given in scripture, yet enough is indicated to show, at least, that the Bible teaching, is not in any way, contrary to the teaching of the best modern theories of the nature of government; to wit: That government political, originated from government patriarchal. That the family supplied the source, as parental authority supplied the foundation of the authority of civil government. That in that great law of marriage, “a man shall leave his father and mother, and they twain shall be one,” is contained the germ of all society, since the family, so constituted, contains the elements of the State. It is not only the divinely appointed normal school, in which mankind are trained to become capable of being governed, but is in itself a government, which enters as a unit into the aggregation which forms the state, kingdom, or empire. Such is manifestly the theory which one would form from

the Bible account of the origin of human society; and it is confirmed by all profane history, so far as that history throws any light upon the subject.

The theory of the rights of man, as derived from an ideal social compact, however convenient as a mere fictitious illustration of certain relations between the citizen and the state, is, we conceive, utterly to be deprecated on this ground, if no other, that it contemplates the individual isolated man, in what it miscalls the *state of nature*, as the original constituent element of the government. It cannot form the basis of any system of government, other than that of European Jacobinism. However, it may have received the endorsement of so great a name as Mr. Locke, and even the seeming endorsement of some American writers of the Revolutionary era—it has had, and can have, no other practical exemplification than Jacobinism. In our own country, it has had no exemplification, chiefly for the reason, that the law of the family—the essential unity of the family, as embodied in the Saxon law of marriage, (which is the Bible law,) was what we may term the *common law* constitutional element of the social structure; and that practical principle imbedded in the popular heart, proved an antidote to all imported French theories of the rights of man. The first American constitutions therefore, whatever metaphysical principles might be enumerated in their preliminary declarations of rights, yet in their practical provisions, evidently contemplate the families, rather than the individual persons, as the constituent elements represented in the government of the State. Many of them indeed, carried the principle to the extent of conferring the right of suffrage upon *house holders* as such.

We dwell upon this principle of civil government at the greater length, because it illustrates the point we make in reference to the constituent elements of the church. Whatever be the true theory of the origin of civil society, yet in regard to the relations of the church, as originally an outgrowth of the family, we are not left to speculation. It is distinctly declared to have thus originated. For a series of generations, the family was the only divinely appointed government. In the family, as a government, were lodged both State and church; the head of the family being both magistrate and priest. Long after the State had been constituted its—government extending over many families—at a period when there were kings of Egypt and of Canaan, the church was formally organized a separate—and separating organization, in the family of Abraham. When that family increased to a nation of three millions of people, the church was re-organized, and adapted to the new circumstances. It became now a distinct government, embracing many families—as *families*, for not only were the families theoretically the constituent element of the government, but the actual representation in the government, was by heads of families—elders of the people. And when in the fulness of time, the last and complete organization of the church took place under apostles, specially commissioned by Christ, to do

for the church what the convention of 1789 did for the American people ; and the church of one nation was adapted to become the church of all nations ; the same principle was announced,—“the promise is to you and to your children.” When a citizen was received under the new form of naturalization, “he and all his household” were thereby received. And hence, the record makes allusion to the church that is in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, of Nymphas, and of Philemon. (Rom. 16 : 5. Col. 4 : 15; and Phil. 1 : 2.) In accordance with these statements of the Scripture, our standards declare “The visible church consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, *together with their children.*” And this, as distinguished from “the invisible church,” which “consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof ; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.”

These two peculiar features will be found to characterize the scheme of redemption for man, as revealed in the scriptures. First, that God hath chosen to present the overtures of his grace to men, not merely as individuals of the race, but in form of a covenant, or contract, made with an organized body of men,—His kingdom. Secondly, that under this general covenant with the church, all the promises and covenants as respects the constituent members of this kingdom contemplate the older institution out of which the church grew,—the family. He covenants specially with the heads of families. Just as before the era of the church as a separate institution, covenanting with the father for the whole house, he said to Noah, “come thou with *all thy house* into the ark, for I have seen *thee righteous*” (though some of his house were wicked;)—so He said to Abraham in that covenant, which is the *Magna Charta* of the visible church—“I will establish my covenant with thee and *thy seed;*”—and so to David, “I will raise up thy seed after thee.” This peculiarity of the scriptures manifests itself in such various and multitudinous forms that no one can have failed to observe it. And all this but makes more manifest, that in the constitution of the church of God as a community—a kingdom on earth—the elements comprising the government, are contemplated as families, not as isolated individuals. If therefore, there be high probability—nay, almost certainty, that the true theory of civil government is that which regards the family as a Divine governmental institution, and prior to the State, and which conceives of the families, and not the individual persons, as the constituent elements of the government; much more is it manifest that the true theory of the church of God, as a government, is that which conceives of the families and not individual persons as the elements entering into the structure of the church, as a visible spiritual government on earth.

From these general views of the subject, may be derived several most important practical inferences touching the government and order of the church, a few of which only can here be presented.

First, for the same reason, that in the case of the civil government, the theory of the social compact contemplating isolated individuals merely, as the constituents of the State, can work out only *Jacobinism*; so likewise the analogous theory of the church, as constituted of isolated persons, can work out no other practical form of church government, than radical Independency. Whatever modifications the theory may be made to assume, its natural and inevitable tendency will, in the end, work out the same result. Of this all Antipaedo-Baptist societies are at once an illustration and a proof. Their polity and order are the natural and necessary result of their theory, which regards the church of God as having for its constituent elements simply *persons*—individual believers. And indeed the converse of the general proposition is not without its illustration, in the case of Independency adopted as a church order by other than Baptist churches. We hear of late continually, of the growing neglect of the Baptism of infants, in the New England churches; and that in apparent proportion to the progress of those churches away from their ancient associated congregationalism, toward absolute dissociation and Independency. May not the complaint which we begin to hear from certain portions,—even of the Presbyterian church, of a growing neglect of the baptism of infants, be accounted for by the spread of the leaven of Independency in our own body?

Secondly, it is very manifest from what has been said, that Presbyterianism and Independency are utterly distinct theories of the church. That they differ not merely in the form of embodying principles, but are utterly contrary, each to the other, in their fundamental theory. It must be idle therefore, to conceive of blending the two ideas in the same form of government for the church. The government vested in the body of the people, implying a competency alike in all the people to rule in Christ's house, and therefore, implying that these individual persons are members of the kingdom,—is one conception of a government. The rule in the church vested in office bearers, who have their vocation of God, and their call to the exercise of their office by the people, is altogether a contrary conception of church government.

Third: It is manifest that the controversy touching the baptism of infants, involves the fundamental question of the nature of the church. The denial of infant baptism is not merely an inexpediency, or even the neglect of an important ordinance of God's appointment; but when made a part of faith as well as practice, it is a denial of all that the scriptures teach concerning the visible church as composed of families, and the affirmative of a theory of the church, which, when adopted as a theory of the State, leads to the utter subversion of all scriptural teachings in regard to the constitution of civil society. On the other hand, assuming the foregoing views to be correct, the meaning and the reason of recognizing infants as members of the church is very apparent. They have just the rights in the church as children of citizens of Christ's

kingdom, which they have in the State as children of citizens of the State. While they have no voice nor any of the peculiar privileges of citizenship in either—yet they form a part of the family represented in both the church and the State. As in the State they shall be entitled to all the privileges of citizenship, when they shall have by proper years and intelligence *naturally* become endowed with the qualifications needful to the exercise of citizenship—so in the church they shall be entitled to the full privileges of citizenship, when they shall have *supernaturally* been qualified for the discharge of the full duties of citizenship. Just as in the civil government, the great principle of the family as the constituent element represented in the State, is recognized in the naturalization laws; and the naturalization of the father, naturalizes all the children under age—so that they enter upon the full privileges and duties of citizens, at the proper age, without any act of naturalization on their part. So in the church of God; when the head of a family, as the gaoler at Philippi, or Lydia,—is naturalized in the kingdom of Christ, the act of the parent is not only personal but representative, and all his house are to be recognized as entitled to all the privileges and prospects of a citizen's children.

Lastly: The views which have been presented, suggest a method of settling the recently mooted question, of suffrage in congregational affairs—especially the call of a pastor. A most equitable basis of suffrage may be found in the *families* represented in the church. If by any mode of presenting the qualifications of voters, the voice of the families as such could be ascertained—then the basis of suffrage would conform completely to the theory of the society. There are objections of some force, we admit, to the extension of suffrage to all members of the church individually—chiefly the objection that certain households—supposed to be practically a unit—or if not, then still worse, divided households—have undue control, from their greater number of members of the church. This however, we regard as a far less serious evil than the conferring the right of suffrage upon those who repudiate, by their life, the privileges of full citizenship. But neither of these are necessary to a just distribution of the suffrage of a congregation in spiritual matters. In the only case in which there can be even plausible ground of complaint against the exclusion from suffrage of those not members in full communion—the case of pew-holders in the house—whose *temporal* interests are supposed to be affected materially by the choice of a pastor—the objection would cease to be of practical force. For in such case, each pew held would ordinarily represent a family; and the rule prescribed might be, that any one of a family holding a pew, who is a member of the church shall cast the vote for the family. For analogous to the principle on which the membership of either parent entitles the household to recognition in the church by baptism, and to all the privileges of the children of citizens, would be the principle that the membership of any one of the household aiding in the

support of the ordinances, should entitle the household to representation in the important acts of the church.

A far higher end would be attained, however, by such a distribution of the right of suffrage in the congregation, than any mere solution of a difficulty of form. It would bring the congregation into practical contact continually, with the great principle which underlies our views of the church of God. Every one knows how important it is that the every-day customs of the church, however trivial, should conform in spirit to the general truths of the system. No matter how constantly these great truths in their abstract forms may be pressed upon the attention of the people;—if meanwhile the practical doings and fashions of the church are contrary to them. The contrariety of the practice will at first prevent the truths from being understood clearly. Next they will induce gradually, opinions in harmony with the practice, and positively hostile to the truths which it is sought to inculcate. Our church has already suffered much from this error. In the suggestion just made, we mean of course not to propose a rigid, definite, restricted law of suffrage—but only a general principle to be modified as may suit the peculiar circumstances of each congregation. Thus, while adopting the rule of a vote to each family holding a pew, to be given by any of the household who may be a member of the church—this need not be to the exclusion of any other description of voters,—who may be members of the church, and yet not represented among the pew-holders. Each congregation would as now, arrange the rule to suit themselves. The result of the adoption of the principle, however, would be to make “the congregation,” as an assembly for the transaction of business, a definite body of voters, capable of determining intelligently, and uttering its voice intelligibly, neither of which can well be done as the “congregation” is at present constituted.

THE NEW PHILOSOPHIC PRESBYTERIANISM—PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

THE December number of the Presbyterian Quarterly Review has recently come to hand, and, as usual, we have read it with a good deal of interest:—partly the interest which arises directly from the reading of that which is in itself valuable; partly with the sort of interest which arises from regarding a production,—not from what it is in itself, but from its character as exponential of a curious phase of opinion and taste in Theology and Criticism. The articles on “The Foreign Mission question,” and that on “the Life, Character and Services of the Rev. Robert H. Bishop, D. D.,” are those which excited chiefly the interest of the first sort. The former discusses a question of practical importance, in a style a good deal to our mind. * The latter is a manly tribute to a good man—one of those peculiar many-sided, good, great men, of whom the church in the west has produced so many in the first generation of men in the west. The remaining three leading articles of the number, are all philosophical, as their titles indicate. They are, “Are the planets inhabited?” “Dr. Hickok’s works—The Rule of Right,” and “Professor Lewis’ views of the “Days” of Creation.” They embrace a wide field of philosophical speculation—in Theology, Morals, Natural Science Terrestrial, and Natural Science Celestial. Their chief interest to us, in the reading, has been, as already intimated, their significance, as indicating the style and scope of thinking on such subjects, in that quarter of the Presbyterian world. Our purpose is not by any means to enter into the “high argument,” either in the way of affirmation or denial; but for the information of our readers, many of whom lie altogether without the high philosophical latitudes, we here devote a page or two, to a sort of “Anthologia Philosophorum”—or perhaps what might be still more properly termed in modern style—a “Cyclopaedia of the latest Constitutional Presbyterian Philosophy.” Our first specimen shall be taken from the article—“Are the planets inhabited?” which is a review of “The Plurality of worlds,” an essay, and also of a review under the same title in the Presbyterian Quarterly Review for March, 1855. The writer thus gives expression to his very natural sympathy for Jupiter, in the treatment which that Prince of Planets, has recently received at the hands of the Philosopher of the Essay :

“Hoping, at least that the Essayist’s view of the condition of Jupiter is incorrect, as it would destroy the possibility of his ever being inhabited, and leave him for count-

* We were struck with the following ominous foot note to this article by the Editors :

“The Presbyterian Church, we are informed, has given about two millions of dollars to the American Board; its donations every year are perhaps one hundred thousand dollars.” * * * The question recurs, then—what are these Jaffna Churches? Are they to be Congregational or Presbyterian?

The Churches at home must have an answer, and they will pass judgment upon the whole system. If the Prudential Committee wish to retain the Presbyterian Church as co-workers in the American Board, their course in a plain one. It is simply to satisfy our ministers and people, that the Committee mean to act with entire fairness. It would be possible so to hold the elements that will ultimately be formed into churches, while in a state of fusion, that when they crystalize, these churches may all be found to be Congregational. If it should be so, it needs no prophet to predict the ultimate result. The Presbyterian Church is acute enough to see the actual facts, and powerful enough to execute its will.”

less ages to fill up his cycles, a gloomy monster of half-melted snows and ice, enveloped in mist, and peopled with semi-fluid dragons—interminable gloomy realms of swimming shadows and enormous shapes, some fully shown, some indistinct, and all mighty and melancholy, as the sixty thousandth generation must be, in its dull, damp degeneracy, literally,

Monstrum horrendum informe ingens cui lumen ademptum,

the bare idea of which chills the sensibilities—we will examine the theory of the writer in the Review, which gives us at least the prospect of future usefulness to this greatest body of our system.

This theory, like that of the Essayist, presumes the truth of the Nebular Hypothesis, so far as our system is concerned. As Jupiter is five times the distance of our earth from the sun, he must have been thrown off from the mass of revolving fire-mist, a period long enough to allow this mass to contract, four hundred millions of miles in a direct radius, or eight hundred millions of miles in diameter, before the matter of the Earth was detached; if, as is probable, this matter was disconnected in the form of a ring or segment, large enough to form our world. How many immeasurable myriads of years this mighty mass of fire-mist, three thousand millions of miles in circumference, spun round on its centre, before it gave birth to the home of humanity, is a mystery of the past. There is reason in supposing that time was given for this elder brother to cool his fires, before his humbler sister was whirled into existence. If, in so much uncertainty, we take the only tenable ground, a medium between the icy, watery, never-to-be-habitable body of the Essayist, and the seething, steaming mass of the Author of the Article, and presume that Jupiter has cooled sufficiently to form a crust like our earth, sustained by the expansive power of internal fires and gases, we may be able to accommodate him to the uses of embodied mind." (! !)

The editors of the Review, kindly explain in a foot note to this article—to quiet the alarm, we suppose, of such as are old-fashioned enough to wish that sound Calvinists should inhabit this world, whether anybody inhabits Jupiter or not—how the nebular hypothesis may be Calvinistic. We here cite their explanation :

"It is but just to remark that there are philosophers who adopt the Nebular Hypothesis as their theory of *the way God made the universe*, without denying at all the orthodox view of a particular Providence. The Most High made the universe on *some plan*, say that of the Nebular Hypothesis, with successive creations, and perpetual watching over his works. This, they think, is quite consistent with Calvinism, which holds only to the Creation and Providence of the Almighty, without defining its exact method."

Now we humbly suggest—without undertaking to determine after their remarkable feats, in that way, heretofore, how far the wonderful ingenuity of our Philosophical Presbyterian neighbours may avail to reconcile the "nebular hypothesis" with *their views* of Calvinism,—that to our notion, their's must be a very "*nebular*" sort of Calvinism. We see not how the affinity between so nebular a theory of God's work of creation, and so solid a thing a Calvinism can be brought about, save by first *nebu-lizing* the Calvinism to such a degree that it shall take as many ages to condense it down to a solid again, as according to the "nebular hypothesis," it took the original revolving "fire-mist" of our universe to cool down into solid, and then successively to "*slough off*" the various Planets, habitable and uninhabitable, of which our system is now composed.

But our restricted space admonishes us to descend—even though with undignified abruptness—from the celestial to the terrestrial philosophy, and here we can make but a single short extract, which we take from the article on Prof. Lewis' new theory of the "Days of Creation." The editors inform us, concerning this theory—"we see difficulties to which we have, as yet, no satisfactory answer." This we think quite likely.

"Prof. Lewis begins then with the idea, that the record itself presents us with periods in the beginning of the creative week, wholly remote from the sun-measured days of later time. The 'days' he regards as cycles of alternating periods of light

and darkness; or more properly, of creative action and of natural development. The 'morning,' he conceives to be constituted by the introduction of new laws and new forces; by a creative impulse supplying what was not before in nature, and what nature could not have reached. The 'evening,' he considers the period in which these new forces work, exhaust themselves, and decay; as all limited and created things must. The 'day' is thus no definite and measured amount of duration, no specified number of hours; but a cycle of two contrasted periods analogous to light and darkness, into which the idea of measured time does not enter. It is one of the periods—be they greater or less, in amount of time—of God's creative energy, with its preceding period of natural progress to exhaustion and decay, in a previous nature, or world."

We must be allowed to express a little disappointment at finding that the new cosmological toy which is to furnish us with amusement during the next philosophical "Season," is nothing but our old toy brushed up again. This indicates that the cycle of the philosophic fashions is much more contracted than we thought for. It is not yet over fifteen years, since we were taught this "Days" theory in college, and yet the eminent geologist who taught us himself, has long ago abandoned it—nay, denounced it. In those days we beheld, with infinite concern, the sad predicament in which Geology placed Moses, and rejoiced at the condescension of Dr. Pye Smith, and several other scientific men, who interposed their friendly offices to "reconcile the parties"—Moses and the Geologists—and who in due time announced that Moses was ready to make a "personal explanation." And taking up the gratifying intelligence, peripatetic lecturers "passed round" the notice—and for a shilling a head, in any one of a thousand village Lyceums, any body might hear Moses "ably defended." As we grew older, however, and became ourselves a little acquainted with Moses, we found to our surprise, that he could get along very well, without the aid of these officious friends. We beseech our philosophic friends of the New School, not to get up again this oft enacted scientific play, of "Moses patronized and defended." The results of their officious kindness in making satisfactory apology to modern philosophy for the uncourtliness of Calvinism—have not been such as to justify the hope that their patronage of Moses among the philosophers will do him any material service.

In illustration of this last remark, as well as for the sake of making complete our anthology, we may cite from this number the editor's note on a remark of the reviewer of Dr. Hickok's "Rule of Right." After expounding Dr. Hickok's singularly hazy solution of the question, "what is the solution of the ultimate Rule of Right?"—which Dr. H. declares to be simply "*worthiness of spiritual approbation*"—the writer happens, in discussing the general question, to use this language, in reference to the Atonement:

"In either aspect, it is a clearing up of the divine government, and so it may undoubtedly be regarded; but a more prominent idea of the Scriptures is that which represents it to be the procuring of a righteousness for man, a recovery of his lost spirit-worthiness. To this look all the Scriptural terms. It is that transcendent act of virtue by which our sins are '*covered over*,'—lost, we may say, in the splendor of its glory. It is a robe in which, and through which no stain is seen. It is, in other words, that old doctrine of 'imputed righteousness,' forensic yet real—the Redeemer's righteousness made man's by the virtue of that mysterious union and spiritual headship, which he may believe, although unable to comprehend."

Now, to this sentence, the editors put in the following caveat, by way of foot note:

"The Editors, in admitting this phraseology into their pages, wish it understood, that certain ideas sometimes connected with it should be guarded against. * * * Our chief objection to the doctrine of 'imputed righteousness' is not that it is erroneous,

but that it is defective. *The essence of the Atonement lies in satisfying justice and magnifying law, through substitution and sacrifice.* It is the attempt to confine men rigidly to this one poor 'forensic' illustration, that is objectionable in 'Old Schoolism.' Atonement is not *strictly* legal, especially after the manner of human law. If it were, law would be only upheld. But Atonement does far more. It glorifies law, makes it more illustrious, magnifies it.'

To these specimens of the higher Philosophy, in its various departments, we must add at least one specimen of literary criticism—and that the more as it includes a professed model of Biblical Exposition. This is from one of the twenty-seven critiques, on new books, which make up the last article—the notice of the venerable Dr. Spring's new work, "The Contrast between good and bad men : illustrated by the Biography of the Bible."—We present the following "kitchen knife" cutting up of Dr. S. :

"It has never occurred to us to know an example of a man as much overrated, intellectually, as Dr. Spring. He has, indeed, certain good qualities, such as a kind of solemn dignity, mingled with the intelligence and experience of a moderately intelligent man, and the vein of piety, which runs through all the sermonizing of Calvinistic divines."

"We are tired of paying these prescriptive Sound Dues to solemn mediocrity. We will praise any man cheerfully who deserves it, of whatever 'school' or denomination he may be; but one of the privileges and characteristics of the Church we belong to, is to estimate men and things just as they are, and to give the public our opinion, with entire fearlessness."

"So little do we know personally of Dr. Spring, that it was not until we had written the above, and the printers were waiting for it, that we heard, by the merest accident, that he had been afflicted, during the last six months, by bodily disease, from which we were glad to learn he is recovering. Our first thought, on hearing this, was to cancel the whole that we had written. On second thought, we concluded to let it remain. Personally, we need hardly say, we desire the welfare of Dr. Spring, and of every other good man. But, as critics, we are vexed and pained at the state of literature, and if we allow the common place of high degree to go scathless, we shall have no heart to encounter the small fry."

So much for the critical observations on Dr. Spring, which we suppose, the Critic, that received so gentle a lecture from this Review for its roughness, is to keep before it, as a model of dignity, delicacy and refinement. This, we would infer from the style in which this Reviewer undertakes to "set a copy" for Dr. Spring, when he would portray scripture characters. Here is the model :

"Let us see how Dr. Spring handles Joshua :—

1. Joshua was influenced by a supreme regard for the command of God.' Take away the name 'Joshua,' and put 'Abraham,' for instance, or 'Enoch,' and the description is just and true.

2. There was 'an humble sense of his entire dependence upon God.' Take out 'Joshua,' and put in 'Jeremiah,' or the 'Apostle John,' and would it not be quite as good, or rather better.

If the reader turn on us, and ask us for something that will characterize Joshua and no other Scriptural model, we will try to meet that demand.

Joshua was *the Jewish hero*; his character was essentially military; he was, a pious captain. His faith took the form of implicit obedience to the Lord of Hosts, the Commander in Chief of the Universe, and as a consequence of this implicit faith and obedience, he had perfect confidence in himself as the chosen instrument of God. All great captains have this. It may be seen in Mohammed, Gustavus Adolphus, Cromwell. The early Greek and Roman commanders felt it; even Attila thought that he was the scourge of God, and Napoleon had a singular idea that he was an instrument of fate. Joshua's mind had comparatively little of the range of that of Moses or of David. He never wrote a Psalm. His speeches are military orders, or else pithy statements like Wellington's: 'As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.' His courage was military; unswerving, unflinching, straight-forward, like Jackson's or Taylor's. He had too, the courtesy and grace of a soldier, and in his expeditions, the *coup d'œil* that always characterizes

great leaders ; for example, Hannibal, Conde, Washington. The Gibeonites, with their old shoes and stale provisions, would not have imposed upon David ; and yet as a purely military stratagem, as at Ai, Joshua was capital. His piety, in short, had every characteristic of a soldier's, and the man was a simple-hearted and noble hero. If one wishes to draw a parallel after the manner of Plutarch ; let us say that Joab was a great captain, but he was fierce, cruel, irreligious and selfish ; Jonathan was a most noble and brave gentleman, who *could* fight with even romantic bravery, but his fighting was like Sir Walter Raleigh's, an accomplishment rather than a profession or taste ; David was a great strategist, but he was king, statesman, poet, scholar as well ; but Joshua is very like Claudius Lysius, the Roman captain, who came down on the mob at Jerusalem that were misusing Paul, examined impartially into the case, treated him courteously, and then, without troubling himself with either the politics or religion of the business, sent him skillfully, by night, with sufficient escort, to the Roman procurator. Heroic, simple, faithful, pious, generous, courteous, straight-forward, without much scholarship or extraordinary range of mind, except as a general ; such was Joshua. Could Dr. Spring's hearers get any idea of such a man from his common place generalizing, in which every saint is made pretty much like every other saint?"

Surely every body will know Joshua, from this very spiritual view of him ! We hope Dr. Spring will profit by this model—and learn the art of philosophical discrimination. The Reviewers tell us, in their notice of Mr. Barnes' new book—"Mr. Barnes' associates in this Review, feel as if they could not say less : *while their position towards him precludes them from saying more!*" We think Mr. Barnes peculiarly fortunate in his position, if inquisition is to be made into his power of *diserimination*—as evidenced in *his* Scriptural Expositions. Certainly we have rarely seen a more unlucky hit than that—"paying Sound dues to solemn mediocrity:" and that too in a Review of which Mr. Barnes is one of the editors. We have heard it stated as fact—though we doubt not it must have been intended as merely the theory of the creation of the "Notes"—analogous to the "Nebular Hypothesis" as a theory of the Creation of the Universe—that in the process of making the "notes," a sort of long table or *counter* was erected on which all the obtainable commentaries were laid out, open at the chapter and verse, to be annotated upon—and the commentator passing along from book to book, culled any remark that struck his fancy. Certainly the *want of discrimination*, so often manifesting itself in utterly contrary interpretations of the same passage, would seem to make this theory, as plausible at least, as that of the Nebular Hypothesis aforesaid. If Dr. Spring's venerable years and great services to the world should not have spared him this ferocious attack, yet one would have supposed that the instinctive dread of turning the public attention upon the book-making performances of his censors, should have prevented its coming from such a quarter. But most remarkable of all, in our view, is the fact that any one, while in the very act of *throwing stones*, should have set up *such a glass house*, as this *piling-on-the-agonny* description of Joshua. We have not the least idea, that Dr. Spring, could ever rise to the lofty height of that model ! Let it stand rather like that immortal Assembly of '54—"one by itself." And as men are wont to speak of the Appollo Belvidere, —the Venus de Medici, or the "Death on the Pale Horse," so let this model stand forth among Biblical students, as "The Joshua."

EDITORIAL EXCHANGE.

"A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judiciary of the Presbyterian Church, from its origin in America to the present time. With notes and documents explanatory and historical: constituting a complete illustration of her polity, faith and history. Compiled for the Board of Publication, by the Rev. Samuel J. Baird. Philadelphia, 1856."

We return our thanks most heartily, to the author of this compilation. We know him well, and love him as a laborious and self-denying servant of Christ, and as a sound and true hearted Presbyterian. There is little glory to be got, of course, from a compilation; but we doubt not that any work which has been undertaken for Christ's sake, and for the edification of His people, will be remembered by Him, who does not forget even a cup of cold water given to a disciple in His name. We know nothing of the nature of Mr. Baird's engagement with the Board, but we earnestly trust that his labour will be amply remunerated. Such a Digest was greatly needed; and now that we have it, we hope that it will be a book of constant reference among our ministers and elders. An acquaintance with it will save a great deal of trouble. It is true, the decisions of the Assembly have not always been uniform on all points; on some points of immense importance, we believe, that venerable court has greatly erred: and so long as the principle of rotation continues to be the basis of the election of commissioners, to so great an extent, and the size of the body remains the same, we must expect these conflicting and unsatisfactory decisions. Still there are some points of order, upon which the Assembly's interpretations have been tolerably uniform: and brethren who carry up matters from the lower courts, may save themselves the mortification of being thrown out sometimes, by looking into this Digest.

The work may be had at Mr. Guiteau's Book Store.

"The Christian Life, Social and Individual. By Peter Bayne, M. A., Boston, 1855." (From Rev S. Guiteau's Book Store.)

We have been reminded in reading this book, of Dr. Johnson's criticism upon Beattie. "Sir," said he to Boswell, "he has written like a man, conscious of the truth, and feeling his own strength. Treating your adversary with respect, is giving him an advantage to which he is not entitled. The greatest part of men cannot judge of reasoning, and are impressed by

character, so that if you allow your adversary a respectable character, they will think, that though you differ from him, you may be in the wrong. Sir, treating your adversary with respect, is striking soft in a battle. And as to Hume, a man who has so much conceit as to tell all mankind that they have been bubbled for ages, and he is the wise man who sees better than they,—a man who has so little scrupulosity as to venture to oppose those principles which have been thought necessary to human happiness—is he to be surprised if another man comes and laughs at him? If he is the great man he thinks himself, all this cannot hurt him: it is like throwing peas against a rock."

The writer, against whose conclusions Mr. Bayne's book is mainly directed, is Thomas Carlyle: and we cannot but think that the frequent laudations of that eccentric genius in which Mr. B. indulges, will have the effect of boxer's gloves, and very considerably abate the power of his blows. We do not mean that he ought to have abused him, but why praise him? The two great rules for conducting controversy, according to Warburton, are contained in Prov. 26: 4, 5: and his interpretation,—which, by the way, was vastly better than his practice—was, if our memory serves us, that we are to answer the fool according to his folly, by convicting his principles of folly; and we are not to answer him according to his folly, by abstaining from the use of his manner and spirit. And there is always a "difference" to be "made" (Jude 22, 23,) according to the nature of the opinions we oppose. Errors which we believe to be subversive of the very foundations of all truth and goodness, we are called upon severely to denounce. It is upon this ground, in part, that the imprecations in the Bible, especially in the Psalms, are to be justified. We freely confess, that we have little patience with the man, who can "unmask a grand imposture," with as much *sang froid*, as he would point out a vicious element in a mathematical demonstration. We very much fear, therefore, that Mr. Bayne's discussions will turn out to be, in regard to a large class for whom they are designed, "like peas against a rock."

This fear is increased, too, by the apparent want of maturity in the results. Somebody has said of Coleridge, or he said of himself,—we forget which—that he resembled the lion in Raphael's account of the creation:

— now half appear'd

The tawny lion, pawing to get free
His hinder parts.

The products of his mind seemed to be, generally, in the process of evolution, rather than completely evolved. And so, we might say of our Author. He says himself in one place (p. 40):—"We can but add a few fragmentary remarks, which we pray readers to regard rather as *partial indications* of what might be said, than as any *unfolding* of the momentous and inspiring themes to which they relate." This it appears to us, is a correct description of the book generally, so far, as we have been able to examine it. Let any man compare the "Eclipse of Faith," or "Reason and Faith: their Claims and Conflicts;" and he will understand the difference between Mr. B. and a lion who has fully pawed himself out. We have felt, while reading "The Christian Life," as if we had before us, a daguerreotyped picture of the author's mind in the *study* of the subjects he intended to discuss: those *spontaneous* musings into which he might be supposed to fall, while poring over the pages of Carlyle, rather than the mature conclusions of a *reflective* exercise of thought. But we judge, from a certain ambitiousness of style, that he is still a young man.

Having said this much with great diffidence, we will add, that, notwithstanding, we believe him still to be a lion; and that the world has a right to hope great things of his future career as a writer: and we recommend all who can, to get his book and read it. He has a noble spirit, and we trust that some of our self-conceited babblers in the dialect of Carlyle, may catch a little of it. A little modesty will do them no harm.

"*A Memoir of S. S. Prentiss. Edited by his Brother.* 2 Vols. N. York, Charles Scribner, 1855." (From Mr. Guiteau's.)

This Memoir consists mainly of the Letters and Speeches of the distinguished Lawyer and Statesman, who is the subject of it, with a thread of narrative sufficient to weave them together. The lives of our public men, furnish an impressive illustration of the effect of our complicated system of government, in developing the intellectual resources of the nation, as well as of the vanity and vexation of spirit which attend the pursuits and conflicts of ambition. The letters in these volumes, present a very attractive view,—specially attractive, because somewhat rare, 'we fear,—of Mr. Prentiss's domestick relations. The Speeches, of course, give no adequate idea of Mr. P.'s powers as an orator. "Eloquence," says Robert Hall, "cannot be painted."

"*My Father's House; or The Heaven of the Bible.* By Jas. M. Macdonald, D. D.—Charles Scribner, New York, 1855." (From Mr. Guiteau's.)

This treatise appears to be the substance of a course of sermons on Heaven, and is well printed. The Sermon-style, however, we think, is not well adapted to the purposes of a treatise. It is true, that nearly all the valuable matter of this sort, that has come down to us from the old Puritan divines, was first delivered in sermons: but then the sermons were not sermons, but treatises. We hope this book may be useful: but we despair of seeing, in this generation, any devotional writings, at all comparable to such works as Howe's "Blessedness of the Righteous," or Owen's "Meditations on the Person and Glory of Christ."

"*Readable Bibles.*"—Stopping in at the store of our friend Mr. Guiteau, a few evenings ago, we found an aged servant of Christ, looking for a copy of the Word of God, which he might read with comfort: and it has occurred to us as a wonderful thing, that with all the zeal of Christian men in the circulation of the Bible, more adequate provision has not been made for the wants of this class of Christ's people. If the type is large enough, then the bulk and weight of the volume is so great, as to render it impossible to hold it in the hands, for any length of time: if the volume is reduced to a convenient size, then the size of the type must be correspondingly reduced, to say nothing of the nuisance of double columns. Cannot the American Bible Society issue a cheap edition of the Bible, in several volumes? There are some good suggestions—among other very questionable ones—in an article in the last number of the Edinburg Review, on "Paraphrase Bibles." We hope to be able to recur to this subject again.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. Oct. 1855.—We have read this number with more than usual pleasure. The subjects discussed are all of them of high interest—and the tone and manner of them full of life and vigor. We were particularly struck with the spirit of article on "The Philosophy of Utility," and the spiciness of the "Types of Mankind." Every critic knows how laborious an operation it is to lash an ass. We commend to attention of all whose calling it is to have that duty to perform, to study this model. We are gratified to find such an article in a Quarterly as that "On Organs;" because it indicates that the importance of the principles involved in that subject are beginning to be appreciated. Our limits, however, forbid a more extended notice of this No.