

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME XIV.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.
1862.

BX
 8901
 S688
 v. 14
 DMPK
 YSV

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIV.

NUMBER I.

ARTICLES	Page
I.—THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY. By Rev. JOHN H. RICE, D. D., Louisville, Ky., - - - - -	1
II.—COLERIDGE. By Rev. ENOCH POND, D. D., Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me., - - - - -	44
III.—FEMALE EDUCATION. By Prof. JOSEPH LECONTE, M. D., South Carolina College, - - - - -	60
IV.—THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By Rev. THOS. SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - -	92
V.—BUNSEN ON THE BIBLE. By Rev. GEO. HOWE, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	96
VI.—A VINDICATION OF SECESSION AND THE SOUTH. By Rev. BENJAMIN M. PALMER, D. D., New Orleans, La., - - - - -	134
VII.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - - -	178

NUMBER II.

I.—THE SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE, AND THE UNIVERSITY, IN RELATION TO ONE ANOTHER AND TO ACTIVE LIFE. By Professor JOSEPH LECONTE, M. D., South Carolina College, - - - - -	185
--	-----

ARTICLE	Page
II.—THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES. By Rev. THOS. SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - -	227
III.—GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE. Anonymous, - -	246
IV.—PULPIT ORATORY. By a Georgia Pastor, - -	275
V.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1861. By Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	296
VI.—NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS, - - -	349
VII.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - - -	361

NUMBER III.

I.—THE BATTLE OF FORT SUMTER: ITS MYSTERY AND MIRACLE—GOD'S MASTERY AND MERCY. By Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., -	365
II.—THE WALDENSES AND INFANT BAPTISM. Ry Rev. J. L. KIRKPATRICK, D. D., Davidson College, N. C.,	399
III.—PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT. By Rev. J. B. HILLHOUSE, Laurens District, S. C., - -	431
IV.—ANALOGY BETWEEN THE FORMATION OF THE PIVEL CONJUGATION IN HEBREW AND THE PERFECT TENSE IN LATIN. By Prof. E. L. ROCKWELL, Davidson College, N. C., - - - - -	444
V.—THE PERSONALITY OF GOD, AS AFFECTING SCIENCE AND RELIGION. Anonymous, - - - - -	450
VI.—THE SCOTCH-IRISH, AND THEIR FIRST SETTLEMENTS ON TYGER RIVER AND OTHER NEIGHBORING PRE- CINCTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA. By Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.,	472
VII.—EXPLANATORY NOTE. By Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., -	502

CONTENTS.

v

NUMBER IV.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF REV. JAMES WOODROW, Ph. D., Perkins Professor Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	505
II.—ADDRESS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA TO ALL THE CHURCHES OF JESUS CHRIST THROUGHOUT THE EARTH, - - - - -	531
III.—THE ART OF CONVERSATION. By Rev. B. M. PALMER, D. D., New Orleans, La., - - - - -	550
IV.—TIMOTHY'S OFFICE. By Rev. THOMAS V. MOORE, D. D., Richmond, Va., - - - - -	569
V.—THE VICTORY OF MANASSAS PLAINS. By Rev. THOS. SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - -	593
VI.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT AUGUSTA. By Rev. JAMES A. LYON, D. D., Columbus, Miss., - - -	618

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 1.

APRIL, MDCCLXI.

ARTICLE I.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY.*

The appearance of the above named article in the Princeton Review, for January, 1861, has excited the profoundest emotions of astonishment and grief in the minds of all in the South, and many at the North, who care for the interests of our beloved Church. The standing and influence of the Biblical Repertory, as well as the character of the article itself, require us to give it our special attention. The chief end that we propose is the vindication of Southern Christians from the, no doubt honestly mistaken, yet most amazing misrepresentations of the writer. Many God-fearing men have gone heart and hand with the political movements of the Southern States, and we desire to show that in so doing they have not proved themselves to be either mad men or dishonest demagogues.

* This article comes to us from a much respected correspondent in one of the border Southern States, and we very willingly admit it to our pages, although, of course, it does not look at the subject from exactly the same point of view occupied by ourselves in these Confederate States.—Eds. So. PRES. REV.

Great and radical changes in the social or political institutions of a people are always the result of corresponding changes in public opinion; "and no revolution in public opinion is the work of an individual, of a single cause, or of a day. When the crisis has arrived, the catastrophe must ensue; but the agents through whom it is apparently accomplished, though they may accelerate, can not originate its occurrence."* There are points in the downward progress of men and nations from which they may retrace their steps. There are also points from which there is no return. There is an unseen line crossing every path, whether of individuals or communities, beyond which, if they go, they are lost. It is, however, contrary to all the facts of history, as well as subversive of the whole science of human life and conduct, to attribute the whole power decisive of the destinies of nations to the happenings of one brief hour. To the recluse, unobservant of the mighty sweep of events through years and centuries, or unaware of their true significance, it may seem very natural to refer the final catastrophe to its immediate antecedents of a few days, or even of an hour; but he who would truly estimate the forces which overthrow the loftiest structures ever reared by human genius and human might, must trace the streams back to their fountains, in distant years, and perhaps in the far past ages. This would be a trivial error, were it not for its influence upon all the efforts made to avert disaster, and upon the judgments of men as to the parties who must bear the responsibility of its occurrence. The article under review affords a very striking instance of the evil influence of this error in both particulars.

Another error, at the very outset, has led the writer into still greater mistakes. He says: "There are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule for political action is to be sought,

* Sir W. Hamilton.

not in considerations of State policy, but in the law of God. On such occasions, the distinction between secular and religious journals is obliterated." But the distinction between things religious and things secular exists in the very nature of each, and can, therefore, never be obliterated, nor even forgotten, without injury. The rule of political action is always to be sought in the will of God, and sound reasons of State policy must uniformly be coincident with that will. There is an Atheistic politics. There is, also, a Deistic, as well as a Theistic, politics. The Theistic is the only true political science, because it alone corresponds with existing realities. It does not admit of the total forgetfulness of God at all ordinary times; but, on great occasions, the removal of political questions from their own proper domain to the more elevated sphere of religion. Occasions never do, and never can occur, where political questions rise into the sphere of religion. They always belong to the sphere of ethics.

This very confounding of religion with politics has been the most fruitful source of the evils which have overtaken the nation. It has not been, however, the elevation of politics, but the degradation of religion; and this has uniformly been the result of every attempt to combine the two into one system. Politics and religion move in different orbits. Each has its own definite relation to a common centre. They deal with the same men, and often with the same subject matter, but upon principles and for ends wholly diverse. They can never come into collision without mutual injury. Like two planets, they exert upon each other a beneficial influence, while each fills its own peculiar sphere; and this is not an occasional, but a constant power. It might just as well be said that there are occasions where the harmony and well being of the physical universe require that the Earth should rise to the orbit of Jupiter or Saturn. Nothing but the crush of worlds and dire confusion could result from such a disturbance of the order of

nature. And a like catastrophe has always followed a similar derangement of the relations between politics and religion. Would that the Princeton Review had treated the state of the country from a religious stand-point. There the well known piety of the Editor, and his acknowledged ability as a theologian, might have done most efficient service in calming the minds of the people wherever his wide spread influence extends. He might have done much to restore harmony to our greatly distracted country, or, at least, to avert the civil war which he deprecates as earnestly as we do. At the very worst, he might have done much to preserve the unity and harmony of our beloved Church. This part was not chosen, and the political article now under consideration could hardly fail, as the event has proved, to stimulate passions already too much excited, and to exasperate still more the animosity which has long been growing between two sections of the country.

We are, therefore, constrained to treat this article, in accordance with its real nature, as a discussion of the political questions which now so deeply agitate all parts of this great continent. We repeat, that our main design is to prove that Christian men at the South have not been given up to delusion, nor are they destitute of virtue.

When we think of the Union of the States of North America as it was constituted by our fathers, we can go as far as the farthest in extolling the grand conception. Many stirring and many gentle thoughts cluster around our memories of the olden time, when, shoulder to shoulder, the men of the Northern and Southern colonies fought to achieve their independence as sovereign States. Imperfect as the Union has always been, under it our people have accomplished great and glorious things; and but for the black spirit of discord, which some thirty years ago began its destructive work, it might have realized the wildest dreams of the fathers, or the brightest hopes of the men of later generations. We feel the full force of all the tender

associations connected with our common kindred and common Christianity; and for these, and many other reasons, we do not undertake to estimate the value of the Union in dollars and cents, any more than we would to estimate "the value of a father's blessing or a mother's love." It must be remembered, however, that great questions of political freedom are sometimes necessarily brought to a pecuniary test, as was certainly the case in our contest with the mother country, which resulted in the independence of these States. There is, moreover, a still higher example. Our Lord Himself refers the paramount concerns of religion and the life eternal to the same standard: "One thing thou lackest," etc.—(Mark 10 : 21.) It would not be difficult, therefore, to answer the reproach, even though considerations of dollars and cents were as prominent as they are in fact insignificant, amid the causes which have dismembered this nation. We understand fully the reasons for Union, arising out of the geographical relations of the various sections of this vast country. The courses of its rivers, the direction of the mountain ranges and valleys, as well as the artificial means of intercommunication, all indicate that the States of North America should live together in harmony and the interchange of mutual benefits, if not absolutely under the same political Constitution. But human interests and human passions are greater powers than geographical boundaries. Persistent fanatical hate can raise higher barriers between two peoples, than the Andes on the summits of the Himalayas.

We do not intend to follow the reviewer through his exhibition, in contrast of the reasons which, he says, the politicians have assigned as producing the present state of things. It is not difficult to see which set of opinions meets with the hearty concurrence of the writer. We shall simply content ourselves with saying that we have not so read the history of the country, and especially of the Territory of Kansas. We do not believe that the Republican

party had its origin in the outrages perpetrated in the settlement of that Territory, as he says, by the South, and as we say, by the North. That party which has destroyed our Union has an older date, and a more enduring foundation, than the transient disturbances in Kansas.

We come now to the questions which he rightly regards as of paramount importance.

“What are the grounds on which the cotton-growing States advocate the dissolution of the Union? or what are the reasons why they desire to secede?”

These questions are propounded as though they were identical. They are, however, very different, and we shall, therefore, give them separate answers. To the first, we say, that neither the cotton-growing States, nor any others of the slaveholding States, nor any considerable number of the prominent citizens of either of them, have ever advocated the dissolution of the Union in any such sense as that contemplated by this question. The secession of the Southern States is not the expression of a wish. It is simply the declaration of a fact. It does not mean that they desired the dissolution of the Union. It only shows that, in their deliberate judgment, the Union has been dissolved, not by them, but by the so-called Republican party of the North. Many of the leaders of the secession movement have loved the Union as their own lives. Truer patriots never governed the counsels of any people. If the sacrifice could avail any thing, they would gladly have emulated the conduct of the noble Roman youth, who, clothed in his richest armor, and decked with his most precious jewels, leaped into the yawning gulf of the Forum. Some of these long ago abandoned the hope of preserving the Union against the growing power by which it has at last been destroyed. But a vast multitude of them continued to hope against hope, until the fatal blow was struck. It is well that the Princeton writer did not strike out the comparison between the disunionist and Benedict Arnold, as certain pencil marks

in the pamphlet edition indicated his intention of doing. No Southern man need be offended. Let the guilt of the disunionist be what it may, the South disclaims the responsibility. It is true that some of the political economists of the South have thought, for a long time, that the material interests of their section would be greatly enhanced by separating from the North and forming a Southern Confederacy. They have believed, very sincerely, that they were impoverished by their connection with the Northern States; but these have never been the opinions of a great majority, and they have had but little to do with the secession of the Southern States. The South has always resisted partial sectional legislation, designed to make her tributary to the North, as South Carolina did in 1832, when she constrained, not from the fears, but from the justice of the whole nation, a compromise of the tariff question. But if the whole South had been, as one man, fully persuaded that their continuance in the Federal Union would deprive her of uncounted thousands of dollars, they would never have dissolved the Union so long as the injury was wrought under the operation of the great laws of political economy, without the unwarrantable interference of partial legislation. They are a people who "swear to their own hurt, and change not." They would, therefore, have continued to bear the burden which was laid upon their shoulders, not by the tyranny of men, but by the stable laws of a great natural economy. The insinuation, or rather the bold assertion, therefore, of the Princeton Review, that the leaders of the Southern movement are actuated only by the sordid love of gain, and that they have taken advantage of the excitement of the people on another and very different subject, to precipitate them into unjustifiable revolution for their supposed advantage, can only be excused on the ground of profound ignorance of the whole subject of Southern principles, Southern interests, and Southern men. The arguments of Southern states-

men, to which he refers, have never been intended to stimulate the people, and to furnish the motive, to secession. They were designed to encourage the timid to stand for their rights, by assuring them that they would not be utterly ruined, but might even enjoy greater prosperity out of the Union than they ever had while in it. They were given in answer to such fearful predictions as those of the *Princeton Review*, and to the taunts of the North, when they say, "You had better submit to our rule. We do not intend to make it very oppressive. We will impose the yoke upon you very gradually, and it shall not gall very severely; but if you resist us, and prove stubborn and rebellious, it shall go hard with you. We will whip you back to the yoke. We will subdue you by force, as we do our unruly cattle; but even though you should succeed in breaking away from us, and we should leave you to roam wildly in untamed freedom, you will find no fat pastures—you will surely starve to death." In reply to all such predictions, or threats of evil, the Southern statesman demonstrates that the threat to employ force is nugatory. The South can not be subdued by arms, and her material wealth may even be greater than ever it was before. The South does not look upon disunion as the precursor of inevitable and total ruin; but, even though all the prophecies and threats of ruin should be fulfilled to the very letter, she says, "Let come what God may send of evil." She will never submit to the rule of a dominant section of the country, North, East or West, no matter how mildly they may promise to exercise their despotism.

Whatever benefits are to follow disunion, it is said, are to accrue only to the slaveholders—a small minority of the Southern people, not more than three or four hundred thousand of the whole population. The secession movement is, therefore, characterized as invidious, class legislation. All this sounds as if the writer in the *Princeton Review* had read the celebrated "Helper's Impending Crisis."

We can only say that, if any man who reads that book gives it one particle of his faith—if he does not reject it at once, as false in its statements, false in its arguments and inferences, fiendish in its spirit and in its design—he is himself beyond the reach of argument, and impervious to the force of truth and evidence on the whole subject of which it treats. There is no greater folly than this talk of class legislation for the small minority of slaveholders. The institution of slavery is so interwoven, yea, entwined, with the very texture of the social, political and religious life of the Southern people, that there is no diversity of interest among them. Whether they be rich or poor, white or black, bond or free, their interests are one. The non-slaveholders of the South, agriculturists, mechanics, merchants or professional men, would be the first ruined, and the most completely, by the abolition of slavery; and, for the most part, they have the sense to know it, and to show that they know it by their acts.

Let us proceed to the second question: Why do the cotton-growing States desire to secede? What reasons have induced them to brave all the real difficulties, and all the possible dangers, of secession? Among the reasons assigned by the Princeton writer, only one is true, and that one is stated as it never entered the mind of any Southern man, living or dead, and could not, therefore, be subjectively a motive for their conduct.

The fierce ravings of the Abolitionists have not caused the secession of the Southern States. This has, for many years, been a great annoyance; but it could hardly be called a grievance. The wild outcries of the Abolitionists have excited very various emotions in the breasts of different Southern men. Some have been aroused to anger and scorn; others have been amused; while those who agree, with the Princeton Review, that their language and spirit is execrably wicked, have heard them more in sorrow than in anger. They have felt that the danger to be feared was

for those in whose hearts these fierce fires were burning, and by whose lips such words of blasphemy were uttered. The high-spirited and fiery Southerners, as they are called, have borne for thirty years all that the fanatics could say, and they might very well have endured it a little longer.

The proceedings of the incendiaries sent to the South to entice the slaves to abscond, or to stir them up to revolt and massacre, have not caused the secession of the Southern States. This is undoubtedly a very great grievance, but by no means so formidable as the people of the North generally suppose. It is a great mistake to think that the Southern people feel like "persons who live in a powder magazine, into which others insist upon throwing fire-brands." Their great fault is, that they feel entirely too secure. They know that the blacks are a loyal race, and that they are bound to them by ties of interest and affection. In the African, the affections predominate over the intellect more than in any other great division of the human family; yet many of them have intelligence enough to see that the problem of their condition as slaves in this land, so far removed from the native home of their fathers, can not be solved by any scheme of abolition or emancipation, and that it would be very fearfully complicated by discontent or any violent outbreak on their part. Yet even this gentle, loyal people may be made the dupes of crafty villains. Reckless efforts, long continued, may seduce even them from their allegiance to their truest friends. Therefore, this sending of cruel and fiendish emissaries is a grievous wrong; but this, too, has been suffered for years, and the patience of the South might have held out a little longer.

Here let us pause a moment, to ask the solemn question: If the same assaults had been made upon the social system of the North by the pulpit and the press of the South; and if the same efforts had been made, for a period of thirty years, to excite the poor against the rich, to stir up

the laborer against the capitalist, would the labor of the South have proved so utterly fruitless as have been those of the Abolitionists? We think not.

The nullification of the fugitive slave law, and of the constitutional provision upon which it is founded, by the formal legislation of ten States, and the intense anti-slavery sentiment of the whole North, is surely a good ground of complaint, not so much on account of the actual evil which it works, though even in this respect the South are heavy losers, but because of its significance, as showing how majorities can, by law and against law, subvert the Constitution, which is the only defence of minorities against the worst despotism to which man can subject his fellow man. It is only in this aspect of the case that Northern nullification has any direct bearing upon the secession of the South.

The last reason assigned by the Princeton Review as influencing the cotton-growing States to desire to secede, is "the complaint that the South has lost its equality in the Union, or that they are denied equal rights." This complaint is then examined and dismissed as wholly groundless. This is the part of the Princeton Review article which has caused us the greatest sorrow. We have read these four pages but once, and we are thankful that the exigencies of our argument do not require us ever to turn to them again. We do not care to characterize these utterances as they deserve. We need only to quote the sentences that linger sadly in our memory :

"In the past history of the country the South has been dominant. Although in a minority as to population, it has shaped the whole policy of the country."

"This state of things is passing away. By the inevitable progress of events, the sceptre is changing hands."

"Southern statesmen have predicted that the time must come when the South could no longer control the policy of the country."

"Not to command, however, is, in their estimation, to submit. Not to be masters, in the logic of the extremists, is to be slaves."

"The thing complained of is not the irresponsible power of a majority."

These have been selected from four pages of similar assertions, filled with intense, exultant, defiant sectionalism. We do not intend to review the whole history of the United States, to prove that all this is utterly without foundation. The writer admits that it can not possibly be true, in acknowledging that the South has always been in a minority. In what possible way could a minority, however compact, dominate over a majority? We do not, however, intend to follow the Princeton writer through his honest, no doubt, yet total perversions of the plainest facts of history. We shall simply answer assertions by counter assertions, and we do it without fear of successful contradiction. The South never has been dominant in the government of the country. The South, though always in the minority, have never been a compact minority. All the Southern States have never been united in either of the great national parties which have alternately governed the country. Alas! they are not even now agreed as to the time and mode of resisting Northern domination, though they are united as one man as to the necessity of resistance. There never has been a sectional party organized at the South. Up to this very hour it has never been done. The Princeton writer does not hesitate to say that the party which nominated and supported Mr. Breckinridge was a Southern sectional party; yet, in another place, he admits that it would be wrong to affirm this of Mr. Breckinridge, or his party. We affirm that nothing can be further from the truth. The simple fact that John C. Breckinridge, a Union man, from the most Union-loving of all the States, was the candidate, is of itself the complete refutation of the charge. He was nominated as a national man, and, so far as the so-called Southern extremists supported him, it was on their part an effort, however hopeless, in good faith, to save the Union under the Constitution. We say, again, that up to this very hour there has never been a sectional party organized, or attempted to be organized, in the Southern States.

Whatever influence Southern statesmen have had in shaping the policy of the country, has always been the legitimate effect of their genius, talents, or political sagacity, and always in connection with one or the other of the great national parties. We can not, however, pursue this subject. Alas! for the day when the Princeton Review is found joining in such party cries as would never have been uttered by the more high-minded and honorable of the political leaders.

We are now ready to answer the question: Why have the Southern States seceded from the American Union? It may, however, be as well to premise that it is a very great mistake to suppose that the Southern people are a fiery, excitable race—a nation of hotspurs. They may, perhaps, be more excitable by nature than their Northern neighbors, though we have never seen the proof of the fact. We do know that they are ordinarily men of earnest thought and deep convictions. The views which they now take of public affairs have not been suddenly conceived, nor are they lightly held. They have been the slow growth of years. Indeed, the portentous shadows of these times loomed upon the vision of the great prophetic minds of the revolutionary era, and had assumed distinct shape before the minds of men contemporary with the adoption of the Federal Constitution. The present attitude of the South has not been assumed in a fit of transient resentment, nor are they acting under the morbid influence of disappointed ambition. Whether they are in error or not, the men of the South are acting under an awful sense of their responsibility to God and man, as well as the profoundest convictions of right and duty that ever sunk down into the depths of any human soul. But are they in error? Is their whole course a tissue of mistakes and blunders? This brings us back to the question: Why have the Southern States seceded from the Union?

It is because they are fully convinced that they have lost not only equality, but liberty, in the Union. The true cause of Southern discontent is the deep and solemn conviction that, in the Union and under the forms of the Constitution, they are a "conquered people." These are the very words of one of their leading men.

The South maintains that the following is a self-evident proposition, which needs only to be stated to command the assent of every man who knows the meaning of the terms: Make any question whatever a permanent political issue between geographical sections of a great republic, and the union between those sections is *ipso facto* dissolved. If one of the sections is numerically weaker than the other, there remains for it nothing but resistance or vassalage. The only possible hope of the restoration of the Union is in the recession of the dominant majority tendering the issue. The Princeton writer seems to be aware of the influence of geographical considerations upon the political and social interests of men. It is passing strange that he did not see the dissolution of the Union in the very formation of the great sectional party which has at length given its death blow. We assert, with perfect confidence, that the judgment of impartial history will confirm our views, that the separation of the American States was begun when the so-called Republican party was organized as a sectional party, and that it was consummated when that party triumphed over the combined Union men of its own section, in the election of Abraham Lincoln to be President of the United States. The Northern Republicans are the real disunionists. The dissolution of the Federal Union was accomplished by them, and by them alone. They have subverted the Constitution in its most essential principles. The South has only declared that they will never submit to the usurpation.

It is thought to be a perfect answer to all this, to say that the Republican party triumphed under the forms of

the Constitution, and that the election of Mr. Lincoln was strictly legal. What do men care for the casket, after it has been rifled of its priceless jewel? The empty coffer of the Constitution, from which liberty and equality have been extracted, can serve only for the coffin of freedom. What does the fond wife care for the form and features of her husband, if the body, once so dear, has become the possession of a demon, which may, at any moment, use her husband's hands and teeth to tear and rend her? She would feel such keen sorrow as men at the South now feel for the ruin of our Government; but she could not lie down in peace and security by the side of the once loved form, now become the abode of a fierce and malignant spirit. Neither can the South hope for safety under the mere forms of a Constitution, however grand and noble, when a great dominant majority have infused into it the fanatical spirit of Abolitionism, or the more comely, but no less cruel, spirit of sectionalism.

We shall inquire, presently, how far the Republican party is to be regarded as an Abolition or anti-slavery party. Whether it be distinctively such or not, we believe that Abolitionism has mounted it, as the old man of the sea upon the shoulders of Sinbad, and it can not be shaken off. Whether the great dominant majority of the North be abolitionized or not, there can be no question that it is a sectional party, claiming to govern, not only the minority of its own section, by laws operating equally upon themselves and the minority, which is essential to the very idea of free government; but also challenging the right to rule over the whole people of another section of the land, by laws affecting the interests of that section alone, and having no sort of bearing upon the law-makers themselves, except to promote their wealth at the expense of the subject States. In this point of view, it makes no kind of difference on what subject the issue is joined, or whether there is any issue made up between them, other than that of power on the one side,

and subjection on the other. It is, therefore, evident from the very nature of the case, that under the permanent domination of a sectional party, the South are a permanently subdued people. This may be made perfectly clear by an illustration, supposing the subjugation of another section of the Republic. Suppose that an effective majority in all the other States should organize themselves into a great political party, inimical to the manufacturing interests of New England. They obtain possession of the Government of the United States, by regular election, under the prescribed constitutional forms. They soon obtain all the offices of Government—legislative, executive and judicial—and proceed to enact laws forbidding New England mechanics to carry their mills and machinery, or their handicraft tools, to any territory of the United States, or any where beyond the limits of the six States. They then employ all the patronage and power of the Government, under the forms of law, to repress and, finally, to extinguish the manufactories in New England. Suppose that the history of the origin and progress of this party was such as to render it certain that its power would be permanent. What, under such circumstances, would New England do? Would she say: Freedom to move—the very life of the Yankee nation—is lost. The sources of our wealth are dried up. Our country is utterly ruined; but it has all been done under the forms of the Constitution, and we must cheerfully submit; we must give up our manufactures, and turn our industry into other channels? Would the sons of the men who threw the tea into Boston harbor reason thus? Would the children of those whose blood flowed at Lexington and Concord submit to such tyranny? No—they would never submit. We do not believe that they would endure half as long as the South has borne inconceivably greater wrongs and perils. The case supposed is evidently exactly parallel with the issue actually made between the great dominant party at the North and all of the slave-

holding States. We have only to substitute slavery for manufactures, and the Southern for the New England States, to show that the correspondence is perfect. If there is any difference, it can only be found in an assumed distinction between slavery and manufactures. We have no space to enter upon the discussion of the many questions here suggested. It is referred to, only because it leads to the inquiry: How far is the great dominant Northern party to be regarded as an Abolition or anti-slavery party? We think that we are as fully competent to answer this question as the Princeton writer, or any other Northern man. We have had much more imperative reasons for studying the history of the origin and progress of abolitionism, and we think that we can state the results of our observation so as to defy contradiction.

There are, first, the Abolitionists proper, relatively not very numerous, but absolutely a very large body of intensely earnest men and women, embracing a considerable variety of opinion, from the extreme views of Garrison and Phillips, down through the Beechers and Albert Barnes, to the mildest form of the doctrine. These are all agreed that slaveholding is a sin of the deepest dye. They all feel bound in conscience to bear testimony against it, and, by some means, to cause it to cease from the earth. Some of them would employ fire and sword, and even the coward murderer's weapon, poison. Others content themselves with railing and fierce denunciation. They all believe that they are under solemn personal obligations to labor for the extinction of slavery from this land, and from the whole earth.

The second class feel what the Princeton reviewer calls "a moral disapprobation of the system of slavery." The formula in which they sum up their views is: "Slavery is a great political, social and moral evil." What they mean by moral evil, as distinguished from sin, we know not. We give them, however, the benefit of the distinction. It

is not a sin, but a moral evil, to be discountenanced, repressed, and gradually, but as quickly as possible, abolished. There are various opinions among this class of persons, as to the nature and extent of the moral evil of slavery. Some of them can hardly be distinguished from the genuine Abolitionists, while others shade off gently into the next class. There is, however, among this great body of Northern men, one broad, well marked distinction, which is very pertinent to our present discussion. There are many whose moral disapprobation, like that of the Quakers in the South, does not demand an expression in outward word or action. Others, and, we think, by far the largest part, think that it is their solemn duty to prevent the extension of the great moral evil, and, by all lawful means, to labor for its extinction. These are the men who have swelled up the fearful majorities of the great sectional party.

There is a third class, who think that slavery is a social and political evil, analagous to despotic government, in the State. They contend, very earnestly, that it is not a sin, and, therefore, no bar to Christian fellowship in the Churches. They regard slaveholders as men who ought to be pitied, rather than condemned—as unfortunate, but not criminal. It ought to be said, here, that some of the “moral disapprobation” men, however, inconsistently take the same view as to Christian fellowship with slaveholders. Multitudes of this third class feel bound, not in conscience, but as wise and prudent men, to prevent the extension of slavery beyond its present limits, for the advantage of the white race.

There is a fourth class at the North, who look at the whole subject of slavery with the eyes of Southern men.

If these statements are even approximately correct, then it appears that the Republican party is composed of all who feel that they have any duty to perform with respect to the repression or extinction of slavery, either on religious,

moral, social, or political grounds. There are, therefore, two spirits, so blended that they can hardly be distinguished even by the analysis of thought, which constitute the life and soul of the great political party which has subverted the Constitution and dissolved the Union of the American States. They are abolitionism and sectionalism. The dominant party is manifestly a sectional party, and slavery is the subject upon which it has joined issue with the South, and upon which it has finally and fatally triumphed.

In political union with such a party, and under its uncontrollable domination, the Southern man feels that he is subjugated. He is the citizen of a conquered province—conquered in and under, through and by the forms of the Constitution, but in defiance of its essential spirit, and in spite of the solemn prophetic warnings of the great Washington. Under such rule the Southern man sees clearly, not only that he can never be a dominant power in the country, as he never has been, but that he can never again have any part in the Government. He can have no effective voice in making the laws which he and his children are to obey. No Southern man, nor his descendant to the remotest generation, except by being a renegade to his own section, can ever again aspire to the office of President of the United States, or Vice President. He can never again occupy a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court, nor hold a place in the Cabinet. Never more can he represent his Government at the Court of any foreign Power. In the halls of Congress he can do nothing but utter unavailing remonstrances, or make a factious, but helpless and hopeless, opposition to the designs of his oppressors. He can fill the offices of the Customs in his own State, or occupy the place of village Postmaster, but it will be upon the same condition of inevitable degradation which attended the Jewish Publican under the Roman domination. Under these circumstances, he feels that he can have no security for life or property, except in the forbearance of his rulers, or in his

own right arm. He sees that he is for ever shut up in his present home; that he can never emigrate to any other part of this vast unoccupied continent, unless he will consent to sacrifice his worldly wealth, and sunder domestic ties which wind around his heart with a tenderness and power not dreamed of by those who dismiss their domestic *help* with less regret than they sell a horse or part with a favorite dog. It is in no caviling spirit that he asks: How long will the Constitution retain its present form, to remind the oppressor of his wrong, and to recall the memory of those days when, for the maintenance of that Constitution as the fortress of his liberties, the Southern man poured out his blood, like water, upon every battle field where the armies of the Republic met a common foe? The Southern man sees that all this happens to him at once, under the Constitution as already subverted by the dominant sectional majority. All this was upon him, or in immediate prospect, on the very day that the fatal tidings thrilled along the magnetic wires, all over the land, that Abraham Lincoln had been elected by an overwhelming sectional majority, as a Northern, sectional, anti-slavery President of the United States.

There is but one other point that we need examine to complete the answer, under the first head, to the question: Why the Southern States desire to secede?

It is the deliberate conviction of the great majority of Southern statesmen, that the conflict of opinion in the Union is over. The last battle has been fought, and the combined forces of abolitionism and sectionalism have triumphed, finally and fatally triumphed, over the Constitution, over the principles of the fathers, over the rights and liberties of the South, and over the hopes of mankind. Southern men have watched, with intense solicitude, the rising from the abyss, first, of the spirit of abolitionism, and then of the spirit of sectionalism. They have seen them expand separately, and then coalesce. They have

anxiously watched their embodiment, and have beheld them, with unspeakable horror and grief, looming up into a gigantic living organism in the self-styled Republican party. They have seen the rapid growth of this giant in four short years, between the defeat of Fremont and the amazing success of Lincoln; and now they behold it, with one huge hand repressing national men and parties at the North, while the other is stretched out to subjugate and crush the South. So far as the Southern man can judge, this giant is destined to a long and vigorous life. The causes which have led to the origin, growth and final success of the great sectional party, are not merely constant in their operation; they act with accelerated force. Viewed in this aspect, the pervading and growing anti-slavery sentiment of the North becomes terribly significant. If other evidence were wanting of the prevalence of the sectional feeling, we have it sadly enough in this article of the Princeton Review—the very last place where we would have expected to find it. In this point of view, the denunciations of the Abolitionists; the John Brown invasion, and his canonization as saint and martyr; the activity of the under-ground railroad; the sending of incendiary emissaries to the South; the nullification of the fugitive slave law; the violent rescue of apprehended fugitives by mobs of free negroes and white clergymen; the rupture of the Democratic party, and, still more, the division of the great Methodist, Baptist, and New School Presbyterian denominations—together with a thousand minor manifestations of the anti-slavery and sectional spirits—have a profound and fearful meaning. The South believes that no power can exorcise these twin spirits of abolitionism and sectionalism but the mighty power of God. No power on earth can stem this flood. The conscience, the pride, the fanaticism, the sense of duty, the prejudice, the envy, jealousy and resentment of supposed Southern assumption, as well as the hatred of various persons and various classes against

the South, all have contributed to swell this ever-rising tide, which has, at last, in the triumph of the Republican party, overwhelmed the rights and liberties of the Southern States, and threatens to sweep away into indiscriminate ruin their whole social fabric. Is there any hope that this tide will recede? Does the history of the world present an instance where men who have, for years, with mingled prayers and curses, toiled for the possession of power, have, when the sceptre was within their grasp, voluntarily laid it down? What hope can the South cherish that the great sectional majority will not be permanent? She sees that Territory after Territory is ready to wheel into the line of this great host, while the fiat has gone forth that never again shall a slaveholding State be admitted to the Confederacy; and that the States where slavery now exists shall be surrounded by a cordon of free States, and, like a girdled tree, shall die.

The reply to all this is, that the Constitution is the safeguard of minorities. It may, perhaps, protect the rights of minorities, in the proper sense of that term; but, in the nature of the case, it can afford no security to a subjugated section of the country. It must be apparent to the dullest comprehension, that there is a radical and essential difference between the attempt of a majority to oppress the minority, when the two parties are intermingled in all the various relations of life, and an effort to subdue and tyrannize over a great geographical division of the land. If the majority should control all the departments of Government, the judicial, as well as legislative and executive, constitutional protection would amount to very little in either case, but it would be utterly nugatory with respect to the weaker geographical section. Besides, it has been loudly proclaimed that there is a higher law than the Constitution, which controls the consciences of the dominant majority to set at naught the stipulations of that solemn compact. We freely admit that there is a higher law than any earthly con-

stitution, but it is not registered in the moral instincts of fallen man. It is found only in the revealed will of God; but, find it where we may, it can never authorize men to swear to support a Constitution, and then to disregard its compacts, or, by false interpretations, to abrogate its plainest provisions. It never gave any man a warrant to add the baseness of fraud to the guilt of perjury. Such a law would have furnished a conclusive reason for not entering into the covenant, or it might now justify the Northern States in seceding from the Union, to which the South would most cordially yield her assent. When, therefore, the South is told that the Constitution is her security against the tyranny of the majority, they point to the nullification of the fugitive slave law; they listen to the wild outcry against the decisions of the Supreme Court, and, above all, to the solemnly declared purpose of the dominant party to reverse the judgment of that Court, and, by legislative enactment, to wrest from them the whole common territory of the nation. Who will stay the hand of this great party, when, clothed with the ermine and wielding the sword, it holds the Southern States as victims in its grasp?

It is said that the only use that will be made of power by the dominant section, will be to restrain the evil of slavery from spreading, by preventing its extension beyond its present limits. This, it is contended, is a very righteous course, of which the South has no right to complain; because, forsooth, "slavery is not natural or national, but a local institution, the creature of municipal law." If this were not so, it is argued that the slaveholder would have the right to reside with his slaves in England, or France, or any other State, in defiance of public sentiment and the laws of the land. This seems to be regarded as a *reductio ad absurdum*; and this is the reasoning by which the tyrannical majority think to justify the spoliation of the South of those lands for which they paid their money and shed their blood. If put to the proof, they would find it very

difficult to show the absurdity of the claim of the slaveholder to reside in England or France. If right prevailed over might, and, with respect to the true interests of the African race, mercy triumphed over judgment, it might well be that the Southern gentleman would be allowed to dwell securely, with his domestic circle of whites and blacks, within hearing of the eloquence of Exeter Hall. The Southern States, however, have made no such claim. They have never demanded such a privilege, as due either by right or courtesy. The South has always contended earnestly for the right of sovereign States to determine all such questions for themselves. Massachusetts or New York have the right, in their sovereign capacity, not by an *ex post facto*, but by a prospective law, to declare that, within their borders, there shall be no more property in horses or cattle, in sheep or swine, as well as in the services of the African slave, or in the services of any man by contract of hiring. If it be said that property in the beasts of the field is a natural right, by direct grant from their great Creator, we reply, that a right of property in the service of man, whether by hiring, by purchase, or hereditary descent, is, also, by the direct and positive permission of the Sovereign Lord. Though the conditions of the grant differ, according to the nature of the subject, the right is no clearer in the one case than in the other. As this right of property in any subject is simply by permission, and not by command, it may, perhaps, be true that earthly sovereignties, within their own jurisdiction, may modify its exercise, or abolish it altogether, for reasons of mere policy; but in no case can any right of property, in any subject whatever, be the creature of municipal law. If this were the only title of the Southern man to the services of his slave, he would have no right at all. If it could be made clear to Southern men that their right to hold their slaves had no other foundation than the laws which they themselves have made, there are thousands upon thousands who would at once abandon

all claim to their services. This favorite dogma of the Republicans, and also of multitudes of others at the North, is more erroneous than that of the Abolitionists. The only fault of their reasoning is, that the minor premise is false; but this statement, that slavery is only the creature of municipal law, involves the same false premise, with a fallacy besides. No honest man at the South would hold any property upon any such terms. The Southern-Christian will thank no man for absolving him from sin in holding slaves, when he is told that the standard of absolution is not the law of God, but the municipal law of his own enacting. If he holds his slaves by no other right than the might of human law, or the might of arms, he will not hold them at all. It would be interesting to discuss the right of human sovereignties to abolish the right of property without the consent of the individual holder, except for public purposes and with due compensation made; but, for all the purposes of this argument, it is admitted.

There is nothing in the nature of slavery to restrain its movements, any more than the possession of flocks and herds. So, when the patriarch Abraham emigrated to the new territory which God had given, he took with him not only his cattle, but his servants, born in his house and bought with his money. If, therefore, there is nothing in the nature of slavery to restrain him, the Southern man demands: What sovereignty under heaven prevents him from emigrating, as Abraham did, with all his household and all his wealth, to the land which the Lord has given him, as tenant in common with his Northern and Western neighbors? What power undertakes to deprive him of his just proportion of the land, for the acquisition of which he contributed not only his money, but the lives of his sons? Thinking thus, there is no logic, however specious, which can convince the South that the doctrine of "Free Soil" is any thing else than the doctrine of robbery. Both in what it grants and in what it denies, it is the old

principle, as old as Nimrod, that "might makes right." The great dominant majority have the might, and they have solemnly declared that they will make it right. When the Southern man complains that he is thus deprived of his equal rights of property in the Territories, he is answered by the puerile fallacy, that he can move into the common Territories with all the property that any Northern man can carry with him. Suppose that the dominant majority should declare, that no Southern man should settle in any of the Territories with more than two coats, or more than fifty dollars in his pocket. Why should they not? There would be more reason and right in it, than to forbid him to take with him all the members of his family. Suppose that he should have no more sense than to complain, would not his mouth be for ever stopped by the answer, You have all the rights that your Northern neighbor has; he is the possessor of only one coat, and has no money at all; you have, therefore, more rights than he has, and are more than his equal, by the full sum of fifty dollars? If the dominant majority was with the South, and the law should be enacted prohibiting the establishment of any sort of manufactories throughout the whole public domain, how would the sturdy New Englander look when told by the South, We do you no wrong, you are equal in all respects to us, we have no manufactures, and we do not desire to have any, so you have all the rights that we have? Would he, with a quiet smile, respond: You are right, and I must go back to Lowell, or Worcester, where alone I can pursue my avocations? No! He would say as the South says, Out upon such logic, and out upon such political morality! That honest, and even truly pious men can reason thus, can only be accounted for on supposition of an intense "moral disapprobation of slavery," deep down in their hearts, depriving it of all the incidents which pertain to every other human interest.

It thus becomes as clear as the sun at mid-day, that the great dominant sectional party was organized, either upon deep convictions of the immorality of slavery—upon the basis of the higher law of their own moral instincts, regardless of the covenanted rights of the South—or else it is a great robber-party, banded together with the intent to despoil their brethren of their share of the joint property, by the strong hand. Were we to emulate the charity of the Princeton Review, we might say that the latter was the motive of the leaders, and that they had taken advantage of the conscientious convictions of the multitude to secure the rich spoil. But no, we will not follow the example. We believe that the “moral disapprobation” of slavery, however wickedly erroneous, is, for the most part, honest; we believe that anti-slavery is the spirit, the soul and vital breath of the great sectional party, which has subverted the Constitution and dissolved the Union of the North American States. We believe that this “moral disapprobation” is increasing at the North, and that it is seeking more and more to find its expression in political action. We see it pervading the logic, the ethics, and the politics of the Princeton Review, and going far to neutralize its religious opinion that slavery is not sinful.

We come now to the second and last reason why the Southern States desire to secede. It is that the issue made up between the great Northern majority, and the Southern States, now in a hopeless minority, relates chiefly to the subject of slavery, a social institution existing at the South, and not existing at all at the North. In order to the full comprehension of this point, of transcendent magnitude and importance, it would be necessary to study, minutely and comprehensively, the history of the origin and progress of African slavery in North America. Then we must examine, carefully, the nature of the institution, and its vital relation to all the interests of the States in which it now exists. We have space only for a very brief, but we hope

that it will prove a satisfactory, glance at either of these topics.

The slavery of the African race in North America had its origin in what men call an accident; its beginnings were very small, and, humanly speaking, fortuitous. In the year 1620, a Dutch vessel, driven by stress of weather, entered the Capes of Virginia, having on board twenty heathen Africans, who were sold as slaves to the Virginia colonists. Within the next twenty years slaves were found in Massachusetts and Connecticut, and soon after in most of the British colonies on this continent. Very soon it became apparent that the African laborer could not be made serviceable, under the rigorous climate of the Northern colonies, and that the tendency of the system was, by a great law of nature, towards the more genial skies and balmy breezes of the South. This gave rise to very grave apprehensions in the minds of Southern men. The rapid natural increase of the blacks under the fostering wing of Christian civilization; the influx from the North, where their labor was not remunerative; as well as the direct importations from Africa, seemed to threaten that the white race would soon be overwhelmed by a countless horde of heathen negroes. These things excited the fears of the far-seeing statesmen of those days, and they made strenuous efforts to arrest the tide, which threatened to engulf all the dearest interests of the white colonists. The Southern colonies enacted laws to prevent the importation of slaves from the coast of Africa, and many very anxious thoughts were expended on the question, how they should dispose of those who were already in the country. All were agreed that the prospect was very gloomy, and that some thing must be done. The colonial laws prohibiting the African slave trade were annulled by the authority of the British crown, and this is one of the most prominent grievances assigned in the Declaration of Independence as the reason for the secession of the colonies from the British

empire. The importation of slaves, through the agency of British merchants and the people of the Northern maritime colonies, in which New England took the lead, was continued until after the acknowledgement of the independence of the United States. For a time the apprehensions of the South appeared to slumber, but as the numbers of the slaves continued to increase, they were again aroused, and by the earnest efforts of Southern men, against all the influence of those engaged in the traffic, the slave trade was finally abolished. The Northern States afterwards gradually abolished slavery. They were enabled to accomplish this, because the South afforded a market for those who were unwilling to sacrifice their money invested in slaves, and the scheme of abolition was carried out without difficulty, because the number upon whom the ordinance of emancipation took effect was too insignificant to render them a formidable element in the social state; while, scattered through the rural districts, the freed negroes could do but little harm, and caused, therefore, but little uneasiness. The natural tendency, however, of this class is to congregate in towns and cities, and they have since become a very troublesome element of crime and pauperism, causing much anxiety to the municipal authorities of Northern cities. After the line was distinctly drawn between the States employing hired labor and those in which slavery continued to exist, the still rapid natural increase of the slaves seemed to portend that their numbers would soon greatly exceed the possibility of their profitable employment, and even go beyond the productiveness of the soil, so that starvation stared them in the face. By natural causes slavery was confined to certain definite limits, just as the Free Soil party would confine it now. The prospect before the Virginia planter was gloomy enough, and his experience is too recent to make the South willing to repeat the experiment. The danger was, not that slavery would die of inanition, but that the lack of bread would,

as it always has, among all people, produce destructive convulsions, ruinous alike to the black and white races; the peril would have been much greater if they had had any other race to deal with. The fears of the slaveholders were greatly exaggerated, and we must confess that they were enhanced by an underlying moral disapprobation of the system of slavery, and an undefined dread that they were exposing themselves to the judgment of God.*

It was under these circumstances, and in view of these dangers, which were real, but not near so great as they appeared to them, that all those utterances of condemnation, and expressions of fear of the system of slavery, fell from the lips and pens of Southern men, which the Abolitionists of our day have quoted so dishonestly, yet with such telling effect upon the minds of the Northern people.

It was during this period that the various religious bodies made their deliverances on the subject of slavery, and among them the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted, in 1818, a series of resolutions looking very earnestly toward the gradual emancipation of the slaves. These resolutions were drawn up by Southern men, who were themselves slaveholders, and they were passed by the votes of Southern ministers and elders. With reference to other denominations, a rigid adherence to the modes of thought and feeling of those days has led to the disruption of the Churches; while the Old School

* There is some apparent discrepancy between some of the statements in the preceding historical sketch and some that appeared in the concluding article of the last number of this journal, in reference to the abolition of the slave-trade. The disagreement, however, is not real, for with reference to the States of South Carolina and Georgia, that distinguished writer and ourselves are speaking of different times. Moreover, we have, for the most part, had Virginia in our mind. The only points we wish to make are: First, the experience of some of the slaveholding States as to the confining of slavery; and secondly, the true historical and ecclesiastical status of the action of 1818, by our General Assembly.

Presbyterian Church, commonly regarded as so tenacious of the past, and even reproached as a fossil Church, and her doctrines derided as fossil Christianity, has had the wisdom given her to understand the progress of events, and to keep fully abreast of the age. The action of 1818 still stands upon her records, not as the law, but the history of the subject; and Southern Presbyterians are well content that it should so stand. It is, for them, the incontestible evidence that their fathers did, in good faith, and in the exercise of all the wisdom and philanthropy that God had given them, make an earnest and persistent effort to solve the problem of African slavery in America by some feasible and safe method of emancipation. In this they were joined, with all their force of talents, genius and virtue, by both Christian and infidel statesmen. Their combined power could accomplish nothing. The older men of that day continued to dream of emancipation as long as they lived. They all seized upon the scheme of African colonization, as opening a door of hope. Some were very sanguine; all were willing to give it a fair trial. It was, at last, made perfectly manifest, not only by their utter inability to discover the way, but by the fearful failure of the experiment, on a small scale, in the British West Indies, that the problem of slavery could not be solved by any scheme of abolition, emancipation or colonization. The two first could only complicate it, while the last was utterly insufficient. Still, the slaves continued to multiply, and the danger of over population grew apace.

When hope began to depart, and the evils of shutting up slavery within narrow limits began in some measure to be realized, the providence of God opened the door of safety, by the operation of causes originating at points distant from each other by the whole length of the continent and the width of the broad Atlantic. The invention of the cotton-gin in Connecticut, and the spinning-jenny in Britain, almost simultaneously with the opening for set-

tlement of the vast region of the South suited to the production of cotton, were the instruments by which the safety-valve of the huge machinery was raised. These things came just when Southern Christians and statesmen were at their wit's end. The hope of relief from emancipation had faded away, and all were dreading a terrible explosion from the pent-up elements of unknown power confined within limits too strait for them. From that day to this, amazing progress and prosperity have blessed the Southern States, threatened only by the foolish and wicked meddling of men, like silly boys, who know nothing of the nature and powers of the vast machinery which they so recklessly handle, the explosion of which would as surely cause their destruction as that of the men to whom God, in His providence, has committed its guidance and control. The South has great reason to be thankful that the great enginery that propels the bark which contains her social fortunes is so hard to disarrange, else ruin might have ensued long ago. We have before intimated our belief that one-half as much reckless and wicked interference with the social machinery of the North would, in much less time than thirty years, have produced an explosion, scattering it to the four winds of heaven. Its fragments could only be cemented again by the blood of untold thousands of people, and under the iron sceptre of a single despot.

The lesson which the South has learned from this whole history is, never to consent that her social system should be confined and restrained by any other limits than such as the God of nature interposes; and, above all, not to submit to the imposition of such restraints by another section of the country, whose fortunes are not embarked in the same vessel, whose motives can only be a spurious, fanatical philanthropy, or the lust of power; and whose domination, from the nature of the case, can be nothing but a fearful

and hateful tyranny—the tyranny, not of one man, but of a many-headed monster.

We come now to the nature of the subject on which the great dominant party have joined issue with the Southern States. Slavery has been very variously defined by different writers on the law of Nature and of Nations. Justinian defines it as “a constitution of the law of nations by which a man is made subject to another, contrary to nature.” In the sense in which nature is here used, all human governments, and the more complex laws of the social systems of men, are constitutions of the law of nations contrary to nature. According to Grotius, “slavery is an obligation to serve another for life, in consideration of diet and other common necessaries.” Rutherford makes it “an obligation to be directed by another in all one’s actions;” and Montesquieu says it is “the establishment of a right which gives one man such power over another as renders him absolute master over his life and fortune.” These definitions are all framed with reference to the system of slavery as it existed in the Roman Empire, and it is not a little remarkable that the mildest in its conception of the subject is that of Justinian, to whom alone, of them all, the system was a matter of personal observation and experience. They are none of them applicable to slavery as it exists in America. We shall endeavor to give a succinct description, rather than a formal definition, of the system as actually existing at the South.

Slavery, then, is a constitution of the law of nature and of nations, by which, under certain providential conditions, one man has a right to incorporate into his family institution, and to hold under his rule, as the head of the house, a class of persons of a different, and, in all the attributes which fit men for self-government, an inferior race; and to exact from them, while in health and vigor, service and labor suited to their strength and capacity. In return for this service, he is to exercise over them a just and equal

authority, restraining them, by appropriate rewards and disciplinary inflictions, from idleness, vice and immorality. He is to protect them from wrong and outrage on the part of others; to nourish them in helpless infancy and feeble old age; to treat them with kindness, and to feel towards them the regard to which they are entitled as the servants of his house and the subjects of his family-government. He is to afford them the means and opportunity of becoming acquainted with the Gospel of God's grace, in its purity and power, and to guard them, both by precept and authority, against the errors and heresies which would destroy their souls, or make them turbulent members of his family.

The providential conditions, mentioned in the description, may be various. With reference to slavery in America, they are the historical events which we have briefly detailed. Now, it is true that very few slaveholders fulfil all the duties arising out of their relation as masters. Neither do the slaves perform their obligations so fully as they ought. We frankly confess that there are occasional instances of caprice and cruelty. The same things must, also, be said of all the relative social duties which men owe in the various relations of life.

The conclusion to which we come, from this very imperfect exhibition of the history and nature of slavery in the South, is, that it is emphatically a domestic institution. The relation of master and servant is a family relation. Questions relating to slavery are almost all social questions. The great problem which the system of slavery presents for solution to the Christian, the philanthropist and statesman, is preëminently a social problem. As a vital social interest, it has very few points of contact with politics, even in States where it is recognized by the laws; and it touches the general politics of the United States only at the two points specifically mentioned in the Constitution. The Federal Government has, therefore, no more right to abolish slavery, by direct or indirect legislation,

either in the States or Territories, than it has to divorce, by general law, every husband and wife in New York or Pennsylvania. From the very nature of social institutions, the Congress of the United States has no more right to forbid a Southern man to settle in the common Territories with his slaves, as part of his household, than it has to enact that a Southern man shall not go thither with his children. The ground upon which we maintain this is not that the relation of parent and child is, as to all of its incidents, the same as that of master and servant. We only contend that they are both lawful social relations; and, therefore, it would be just as proper to make one the subject of political strife and political domination as the other. The territorial question, therefore, upon which the issue is specifically joined, is, not merely what property the Southern man shall or shall not take with him to the common heritage of the nation? but, What members of his household shall he be compelled to leave behind? From the nature of the case, as well as by the laws of the States where slavery exists, servants are both persons and property.

As a social institution, moreover, slavery has very close affinities with religion. The social and the religious life of man have ever been inseparably blended, while, even under the old Jewish Theocracy, they were related in a comparatively slight degree with the political constitution of the nation. Social questions, therefore, involve the conscience almost as much as those which relate to religion. And this furnishes an imperative reason why the subject of slavery should never have been drawn into the vortex of political strife. Above all other questions, this ought never to have been made the issue between two sections of the nation. It would have been exceedingly dangerous, even if slavery had existed in every State of the Union; but, in the actual state of things, it might easily have been foreseen, as the event has proved, that it would be fatal. We are sorry to say it, but we honestly believe that it would

have been safer for the perpetuity of the Union if the great dominant party had been organized upon a distinctly religious basis. We have neither time nor inclination to pursue the subject here suggested; but the political history of the country, embracing the period between the disappearance of the Whig party and the rise of the Republican, has very profound lessons for the statesmen of all free countries.

Such are the considerations which, in the minds of Southern men, give such terrible significance to the triumph of the sectional party. They feel that, under the government of the dominant sectional majority, they are reduced, not only to political subjection, but to social slavery. The very sanctity of their hearthstone is invaded. So far as the principle is concerned, they can see no difference between the abolition of slavery in the States, and their exclusion as slaveholders, and because they are slaveholders, from the lands to which they have equal title with their Northern neighbors. The right to do the one involves the right to do the other, and it is the certain expectation of the Northern anti-slavery men that, if they restrain the extension of slavery, they will thereby constrain its abolition. In either case, the Federal compact is broken, the Constitution subverted, and the Union dissolved, by that party which, by the mere force of numbers, has seized upon the Government with the boldly avowed purpose of domineering by the very firesides of the Southern people. Since the days of Papal interdicts and the Spanish Inquisition, no nation under heaven has ever quietly submitted to such tyranny. Did the Princeton writer think that the men of the South would submit?

We will now briefly sum up the causes which have driven the Southern States to secession.

First: The triumph of a great sectional party, which, if it be permanent, will for ever exclude the Southern people from all participation in the government of the country,

and from having any voice in making the laws by which they themselves are to be ruled.

Secondly: The certainty which they feel, from the history of the rise and growth of that party, that its power will last; the causes of which are still at work, with accelerated force, and there is no opposing power that can withstand their progress.

Thirdly: The basis upon which that party rests, is hostility, more or less violent, against an institution which exists at the South, and does not exist at all at the North; an institution in which the North has no manner of interest, and for which they sustain no sort of responsibility; an institution guaranteed to the South, by the compact which constituted the Federal Union; an institution which has been thrown upon the South by the inscrutable providence of God, and which, in the course of events, has become so interwoven with the warp and woof of Southern society, that they can not get rid of it, if they would.

Fourthly: This institution of slavery is social, and not political, and, therefore, the last of all subjects for political domination. As a social institution it has very close relations with the religious life of the people, involving grave questions of conscience, for the decision of which they are answerable only to God. This institution, therefore, belongs, not to the outward form of the State, but to its inner life, and, like the vital parts of the human frame, can not endure the delicate touch of the skillful surgeon, much less the rude handling of the ignorant quack.

The subject matter, therefore, concerning which the sectional party has declared its purpose of dominating over the South, is no mere question of political expediency or in expediency; it is no mere question of right and wrong. It is the simple question of existence, both for the master and the slave; it is a matter of liberty or subjugation, of life or death. Submission to the plans and purposes of the Northern majority is death—death with dishonor; resist-

ance may be death, if the Northern rulers should be so far given up as to attempt to subdue the South by force; resistance may be death, but it will be death with glory—the glory of the patriot. If resistance should be successful, the pen of history will inscribe the names of the great Southern statesmen by the side of Hancock and Henry, Adams and Jefferson, while their great captains will rank with Washington and Green, Putnam and Marion. But should the South be finally crushed, under the weight of superior numbers, her general, whose lot it shall be to hold the last citadel, and to fall in the final ruin of his country, may well claim brotherhood with Kosciusko. We trust that she will not fail; we trust that the good and righteous God—who has protected her, lo! these many years, will shield her head in the day of battle, and that He will enable His beloved Church in these Southern lands to fulfil the mission upon which He has sent her, to white and black, to bond and free.

After all that has been said, it is hardly necessary for us to discuss the right of secession. We are constrained, however, to offer a few words on this subject, because the conduct of the Southern people has been stigmatized as treason, and as involving “manifold absurdities, abnormities and evils,” subversive of the laws of God, and destructive of the rights of man. Southern Christians, who have taken part in this great movement for liberty, are called traitors, and denounced as guilty of the highest crime that can be committed against man, and one of the most heinous against the authority of God.

Until this new conflict between liberty and despotism began, we had always thought that the American Revolution had for ever settled the great principle, that government was made for man, not man for government, and, therefore, both as a historical fact and a necessary logical inference, the Union was made by and for the States, not the States by or for the Union. It seems, however, that we were

mistaken; the war of the American Revolution settled nothing. The despotic theory is now held more tenaciously, and exhibited more offensively, by men calling themselves Republicans, than by the ministerial party under Lord North. The great question of self-government is yet to be determined. The only change which eighty-four years of the conflict of opinion has made, is simply the substitution of a tyrannical sectional majority, for a tyrannical King and Parliament. If we had space, it would be very instructive to exhibit, in parallel columns, the absolute identity of the principles of government maintained by the ruling powers of Britain in that day, and by the leaders of the sectional majority of our own times. The only difference that we can see is, that our British masters were content with political domination, while our American rulers would extend their authority over the social life and consciences of the Southern people. If other evidences were wanting that the Republicans of our day have not receded a single step from the positions of Lord North and his fellow-coercionists, it may be found in the preposterous comparison of a State of the American Confederacy, with a county or district of a consolidated empire. This is a favorite illustration of the ruling party, and the Princeton writer can boast of the endorsement of President Lincoln himself, for he rang the changes upon it during his recent triumphant progress to his capital city. Now, even if this comparison were well founded, it would not prove that the people of the so-called Southern counties or districts were traitors, as tried either by the law of God or the principles of the Revolution. They would stand just where our fathers stood, with all the rights that they ever had to resist oppression, whether of monarch, parliament or sectional majority. In that case their resistance might be properly termed revolutionary, and then the lessons of the old war of Independence might well teach the Northern rulers to consent to the peaceful dismemberment of their empire. There is, however, no

sort of analogy between the sovereign States of North America and the counties or provinces of the British Empire ; the former are manifestly organic bodies politic, possessing each its own political life, the latter are simply convenient divisions for municipal purposes. They differ, therefore, in their essential nature, as widely as a living man differs from one of the phrenologist's divisions of the human cranium. This is an existing reality, palpable to the eyes of all observers ; it is a fact founded upon great historical verities, and not the out-growth of subtle political theories.

The wonderful providence of God, which determined the circumstances of the settlement of this continent by European colonists, and which decided the manner and the result of their struggle for independence, settled the question of the nature and condition of these States upon a basis which no constitution could materially alter, and which nothing but an absolute conquest could entirely change. The only possible union between States of such an historical origin must be founded either in compact or conquest. If, then, as all men know was the case, the union of these States was formed by agreement, any attempt, by the majority of the States or people, to change its essential nature from a union by agreement into one of conquest, does of itself break up the Government and resolve it into its constituent elements. The original contracting parties were not individuals or households, but independent, organized States. The right of secession, therefore, as exercised by the Southern States, is nothing more than the declaration that, the essential nature of the Union having been changed from compact to conquest, they will not submit to the usurpation. Who, then, are the traitors ? Surely not the men of the South.

Besides, it is clear that in a Government having such a historical origin, and such an inherent nature, a revolution, wrought, not by the people as an aggregate of individuals, but by the people as organized sovereignties, must be spe-

cifically different from a revolution accomplished under any other system. This manifest difference is expressed by the right of secession, as distinguished from the right of revolution. The chief characteristic of the difference is peace. The right of secession may, therefore, be called the right of peaceful revolution. The circumstances under which this right ought to be exercised, as determined by great moral principles, are the same that, in any other kind of government, would justify an appeal to arms. We have always thought that the one great benefit which our fathers secured for themselves and for us, their children, and which, under God, they were able to secure by the peculiar conditions of their colonial history, was the right, and the possibility, of maintaining their liberties in any future contingency, without the disintegration of society, and without a resort to war and bloodshed.

It is a faint and dim recognition of this great principle, as involved in the essential nature, as well as in the whole history, of the Government, that compels the advocates of "coercion" to resort to the miserable quibble about "enforcing the laws and protecting the public property." So, also, those opponents of coercion who fail to recognize or fear to acknowledge this principle, are reduced to the necessity of special pleading on the tremendous issues that now divide the country. They contend that the laws can only be enforced, or the possession of property recovered, by regular legal process, in execution of the judgment of a Court of competent jurisdiction, and that the military power can only be called in to aid the marshals in the lawful service of judicial writs. All this is true; but it renders the Government a nullity, and stultifies its makers inconceivably more than the doctrine of secession. If the dominant party should send fire and sword to desolate peaceful Southern homes, and slaughter unoffending people, the most horrible feature of the hideous attempt will be that it is done under cover of a mere subterfuge. This

is a terrible example of the fallacy called *ignoratio elenchi*. The thing supposed to be proved is: The laws must be enforced. The real conclusion: A noble people must be subjugated, or at least punished, for daring to assert that freedom is their birthright.

The right of secession, as we have thus briefly defined it, is the right of peaceful and orderly revolution, by the organized States, for adequate cause. The possibility of capricious, unreasonable secession, without the right to coerce by the remaining confederates, and without the possibility of coercion, except under the fallacy and subterfuge which we have now exposed, is one of the dangers incident to a free Government constituted as was ours. The Constitution of the United States was the best system of government for a free people ever devised by man; but, like all human things, it was imperfect. Like its authors, it contained in its own nature the seeds of death. The dangers to which it was exposed were just two—separation and consolidation; the possibility of secession, and the possibility of sectional domination. The danger arising from these two sources was by no means equally great, for secession was a moral impossibility so long as liberty and prosperity were enjoyed in the Union. Secession, therefore, from mere caprice or passion, has always been a possible, but by no means a probable, result. Massachusetts is said to have voted to secede upon the admission of Texas, but she had the good sense not to carry it into execution. If she had fulfilled her passionate threat, it would have done little or no harm. The Union would hardly have been jostled by the recoil. All the movements of the Government could have been easily and safely adjusted to the new state of affairs. The right of secession, therefore, involved only a remote possibility of danger, and that of no great magnitude; while, at the same time, it contained an element of safety, inasmuch as it was an effectual check upon the tendency to centralization and tyranny of the General Government.

On the other hand, the danger of consolidation and sectional domination was always imminent, and, if it should at any time be realized, fatal. This was the danger against which Washington so solemnly warned his countrymen, and all true patriots have feared it ever since the ratification of the Constitution. The right of secession, if it had been generally acknowledged, would either have prevented the attempt, or would have averted mutual slaughter, in a vain effort to maintain sectional authority. But, whether the Government were a Confederacy or a consolidated Empire; whether the States were sovereignties or only counties of one great nation; the successful effort of any one large section to rule over any other smaller section, by the mere power of numbers, must always have proved fatal to the perpetuity of the Government, unless the people had forgotten the deeds and principles of their fathers, and had lost the very memory of freedom.

This danger, so long apprehended, has come at last; in this the point of its greatest weakness, the Constitution has given way. Upon their heads must the guilt of this ruin fall, who, seeing the danger, have, with insatiate lust of power, broken through the only defence of the weak against the strong, at the only place where a breach could have been made, and where, if once made, it is irreparable.

The only alternative left to Southern freemen is, forcible resistance in the Union, or secession. Some of the States have chosen the latter, because they believe it to be the way of peace, others are hesitating between the two; none of them propose to submit. The seceded States declare, with a solemnity befitting the momentous occasion, that it matters not to them how their course is characterized. Call it the right of secession or the wrong of secession—the right of revolution or the wrong of revolution—call it sedition, insurrection, rebellion, treason, or by any other name drawn from the vocabulary of reproach, they never will submit to be governed by any section of the country on any issue

whatever, great or small. Above all things, they never will submit when the subject matter of the sectional domination is in no sense a matter of political concern, as between the North and the South, but a question involving the social life and the consciences of the people of the Southern States.



ARTICLE II.

COLERIDGE.

An attempt was made, some thirty years ago, by Prof. Marsh and others, to introduce the writings of Coleridge, and to give them currency and favor, in this country. A few young ministers were taken with them, and, for a time, were greatly injured by them. Their thoughts were confused; their style became inflated, obfuscated, filled with outlandish words and strangely constructed sentences, and the complaint among intelligent hearers was, that they could not be understood. They seemed conscious of having great thoughts, and of being the subjects of some special illumination, but few could tell in what the illumination consisted, or what benefit it was likely to be to the world. Coleridgeism had its run in those days, and after a little time it measurably ran out. It was not congenial to the taste and habits of the American people, and, consequently, did not prevail. Most of those who were infected by it, especially if they were pious and sensible men, recovered themselves from it, and returned to the plain teachings of the Bible and of common sense.

We then confidently hoped that our danger from this source was over, and that Mr. Coleridge would never again

be brought forward as a guide, in metaphysics or religion. But in this we have been disappointed. A new edition of his works has since been published, accompanied by an elaborate and commendatory introduction, by Prof. Shedd, of Andover. Mr. Shedd does not, indeed, become responsible for all the strange opinions of Coleridge, yet he highly commends him: first, as "the foremost and ablest opponent of Pantheism;" and, secondly, as "an able defender of the doctrines of Christianity, on grounds of reason and philosophy." What we now propose is, to look into this matter, and see how far these commendations are just. Will it be safe for our Christian youth, young ministers, theological students and others, to accept the guide which is here proffered them?

However much may be said in honor of Coleridge, as a man of genius, we hold that he is *not* to be trusted as a teacher and guide; and we shall endeavor to show as much as this: first, from his manner of life; secondly, from his intellectual character, studies and pursuits; and thirdly, from his latest and most mature opinions on the subject of religion.

We recur, then, first of all, to his general course of life. We naturally wish to know some thing of the characters of those with whom we converse, and who are commended to us for their wisdom.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was born at Ottery, England, in the year 1772. His father, Rev. John Coleridge, was a clergyman of the Church of England, who died when Samuel was eight years old. By the assistance of friends, the child was placed at a public school in London, where he continued for several years. He was distinguished, at this time, for precocity of genius, which showed itself in the ardent and indiscriminate devouring of books. While the other boys were at play, "My whole being," says he, "was, with half-closed eyes, to crumple myself up in a corner, and read, read, read." Nor was he an inattentive or forgetful

reader. His young mind was laden and overladen with the contents of books, crowded together without much order or skill, and about which he could converse, to the admiration of those who heard him.

At the age of nineteen, he became a member of Jesus College, Cambridge; but so bent was he upon indiscriminate reading and conversation, and so averse to the prescribed routine of study, that his connection with the University was of little avail to him. While here, he became a Socinian in religion, and became involved in pecuniary embarrassments. He was also disappointed in an affair of love, and in his desperation he ran away from College, and enlisted in a company of cavalry. After a few months his friends found him, procured his discharge, and got him back to his place in the University; but the confinement did not suit him, and he was soon dismissed.

Fired with French notions of liberty and equality, his next plan was, in connection with several other enthusiastic young men, to migrate to America and set up a new social organization, some where on the Susquehanna river, which they agreed to call *Pantisocracy*. But this project ended, as it began, in talk. It was never consummated.

Within a year of this time, he was married to Miss Sarah Fricker, a sister of the wife of Robert Southey, expecting to support himself and her by his literary efforts. And this he could easily have done, if he had been at all reliable; but, as Mr. Southey says, "No dependence could be placed upon him." Whether he announced a lecture, or promised an article for the press, or accepted an invitation to dine, he was very likely to fail, and thus disappoint and provoke his friends. It was at this time that the Unitarians persuaded him to preach; and he did preach two sermons—one upon "the Corn Laws," and the other upon "the Hair Powder Tax."

In the year 1798, being supported by some liberal friends, he went to Germany, where he continued between one and

two years. Here he drank in, with great avidity, the philosophy of Kant and Schelling, of which he continued to be the admirer and advocate as long as he lived.

At an early period of his life—it is not certainly known how early—Mr. Coleridge became addicted to the use of opium. He commenced taking it to relieve a painful swelling of the knees, and continued it for many years, until he was all but ruined by it. Mr. Southey informs us that “his ordinary consumption of laudanum was from two quarts a week to a pint a day!” Nor was this all. He was addicted to the use of ardent spirits, and “drank them in prodigious quantities.”* In these ways, he not only ruined his health, but wasted his substance, so that he entirely neglected his wife and children. He did not even write to them, or so much as open their letters to him. They were kindly taken in and provided for by Mr. Southey, at his own expense.

Through the kind care and ever watchful restraints of a benevolent physician (Dr. Gilman), to whom Coleridge was induced to commit himself, he was enabled to overcome his intemperate habits, but he never recovered from the effects of them. He remained in the family of Dr. Gilman some eighteen years; but they were years of disease, and often of exquisite suffering, and here he ended his life, in the year 1834, at the age of sixty-two.

If it be asked, here, What have Mr. Coleridge's habits, and his course of life, to do with his opinions, and with his qualifications as a teacher in philosophy and religion? we answer, *Much, every way.* Who would be willing to commit himself to such a teacher? Who can have any confidence in opinions formed and uttered under the hallucinations of opium, or flowing from a mind disturbed and broken down under such an influence? In the language of another: “Mr. Coleridge's intemperance had much to

* See Cottle's Reminiscences, pp. 289, 376.

do with his mental idiosyncracies, and with the incomplete and fragmentary character of his published writings; and, beyond a doubt, aggravated those fitful and desultory intellectual habits, which were inherent in him, and ever fostered by him. Nor were the effects of this intemperance, either on his mind or body, ever wholly obliterated, even after he abandoned it."

We come now to speak of the intellectual character and pursuits of Mr. Coleridge, and inquire whether *they* were of a nature to inspire confidence in him, as a guide.

That he was endowed with intellectual abilities far beyond the average of his race, there can be no doubt; his perceptions were keen and quick, and his memory retentive, so that he was enabled to acquire knowledge with great rapidity, and to hold it fast when he had gained it; his thoughts flowed easily, and in channels of their own; they were original and striking, often, and his imagination enabled him to combine them in all the forms of beauty and of art. Nor was he wanting in emotive energy. His feelings were impulsive and strong—too much so, often, for the other parts of his mental constitution; and then, his powers of conversation were unrivalled. All his acquaintances speak of him with admiration in respect to this; the principal difficulty was, he talked too much and too long; he engrossed conversation, and had it all to himself. "Did you ever hear me preach?" said Coleridge, one day, to Charles Lamb. Answer. "I never heard you do any thing else." He could talk with equal fluency and earnestness, whether he had any thing to say or not. Says Carlyle: "I have heard Coleridge talk with eager, musical energy, two stricken hours, his face all the while radiant and moist, and communicate no meaning whatever, to any individual of his hearers, leaving it most uncertain to our ears whether he was uttering oracles or jargon."

Coleridge's great weakness seemed to be one of *will*. He had comparatively no *power of will*; no power to restrain

himself from indulgences to which he was prompted, or to carry out the purposes which he had formed. Hence, the ease with which he ran into intemperate habits, and the invincible control which such habits held over him. He saw the gulf of ruin which yawned for him, and yet he had no power to withdraw, or to stay his footsteps; and hence the many projects—some of them wise, and some foolish—which, in the course of his life, he formed and abandoned; hence the repeated literary efforts which he undertook, and in which he failed, not from any lack of intellectual ability, but simply from the want of a persevering executive power; hence, too, the fragmentary, unfinished character of nearly all his publications, little more than prefaces, introductions to great works which he had in his thoughts, but which he had no power of will to execute; hence the truth of what his brother, Southey, rather pettishly said of him: “There is no dependence to be placed upon him.”

This original infirmity of Mr. Coleridge’s mental constitution, which might have been remedied by early discipline, was greatly strengthened by indulgence. Instead of submitting to be directed in his studies, he preferred to direct himself; instead of pursuing any thing methodically, and to the end, his habit was to “read, read, read,” just those things which pleased him, or which chance threw in his way.

Almost the only thing to which he adhered with unfaltering tenacity, was the German transcendental philosophy, and this, though quite adapted to his genius, was vastly more an injury than a benefit. It was, to his dreamy and partially diseased mind, about the same as opium to his body.

The truth is, we have no faith in this transcendental philosophy; we have no patience with it. It has deluged half Europe with Pantheism and infidelity, and unless stayed in its progress, it would soon deluge the earth. It has corrupted the entire field of German literature, so that, as Mrs. Austen says: “There is not a fairy tale of Tieck, nor

a song of Goethe, nor a play of Schiller, nor a criticism of Schlegel, nor a description of Humboldt," nor (she might have added) a history, ecclesiastical or civil, "in which the under current of speculative philosophy is not visible."

Mr. Coleridge's great teacher and guide, while in Germany, was Schelling. And who was Schelling? What was he? He certainly *was*, in those times, whatever he became afterwards, an *open Pantheist*. He held that "the universe is God, and God the universe; or that God, developing Himself in various forms, and according to general laws, is *the only existence*." "God," he said, "is the absolute identity of nature and thought, of matter and spirit. Nor is this identity the cause of the universe, but the universe itself—a God—a universe." "In this philosophy of Schelling," says Mr. Coleridge, "I first found a genial coincidence with much that I had toiled out for myself, and a powerful assistance in what I had yet to do." So much was Mr. Coleridge enamored of Schelling, that he translated from him, not only entire passages, but whole pages, and published them, without acknowledgment, as his own. Thus, the discussion in the *Biographia Literaria*, on the reciprocal relations of the *esse* and the *cogitare*, is a literal translation, without acknowledgment, from the Introduction to one of Schelling's works.*

Prof. Shedd thinks that Coleridge renounced the philosophy of Schelling, and fell back upon that of Kant. But we find no formal renunciation of Schelling. Or, if he did renounce him, and return to Kant, it is not certain that he gained much by the change. Kant was the great leader and head of the transcendental philosophers of Germany; he gave the initiative, and those who came after but carried

* That Coleridge plagiarized somewhat extensively, not only from Schelling, but from the German poets, is now pretty generally acknowledged. His friends attribute it to inattention and carelessness; others, to design. See Tait's Magazine for September, 1834; Blackwood, vol. 47, p. 287; and Sir William Hamilton's Notes on the Works of Dr. Reid, p. 890.

out his plan. Kant all but ignored the outer world; they ignored it quite. Kant called it, in his algebra, an x —an unknown quantity; they called it nothing. Kant said that neither the understanding nor the speculative reason can give us any knowledge of God; they said, there is *no God*—no *personal* God—none but the universe. Kant held that “it is of no importance, whether our notions of God are theoretically correct; it is enough that we have a subjective knowledge of Him, in the idea of duty.” His followers insisted that it is of no importance whether we believe in any God, or not. Kant was undoubtedly an infidel, and if his followers pushed their infidelity to a greater logical consistency, it is not certain that they were much worse than he.

From these statements, our readers will decide whether Coleridge's change was very much to his advantage, on supposition that he did retreat from some of the extreme positions of Schelling, and take his stand upon the doctrines of Kant. Beyond all question, Kant laid down the principles, he opened the way, which led to the Idealism and Pantheism of his followers. How, then, shall the man, who is set before us as a disciple of Kant, be regarded and trusted by our young ministers and Christians as “the foremost and ablest English opponent of Pantheism?”

It remains that we speak of the matured opinions of Mr. Coleridge, more especially on the subject of religion. Prof. Shedd tells us, that his opinions are not to be gathered from his works generally, but only from his later works; since, in the course of his life, they underwent important changes. And this is undoubtedly true. He renounced Socinianism, and embraced a form of evangelical religion; and it is only of his opinions subsequent to that event that we propose to speak.

Nor are we to expect consistency even in these, for Mr. Coleridge was not a man of consistency. It did not enter into his nature to be consistent. He had bright thoughts, and was able to present them in striking attitudes and lights;

but he had no capacity for contemplating them in their several relations, and uniting them harmoniously into a system. Instead, he seems to have had a singular facility for entertaining propositions that are destructive of each other, without being aware of their inconsistency. From many passages in his writings, it would seem that he believes in a *personal God*, the creator and sovereign of the universe; while in others, his God is but an idea, and that, too, of his own creation.

The Apostle Paul tells us that "the invisible things of God are clearly seen, *being understood by the things that are made*;" or, in other words, that the existence and perfections of God may be demonstrated from His works. But Mr. Coleridge, like Kant, utterly denies this. "Assume the existence of God," says he, "and then the harmony and fitness of the physical creation may be shown to correspond with it, and support it; but to set about *proving* the existence of a God by such means, is a mere circle—a delusion. It can be no proof to a good reasoner, unless he violates all systematic logic, and presumes his conclusion."*

Nor can the intellect or reason arrive at the knowledge of a personal God in any other way. "The dialectic intellect may enable us to affirm the reality of an *absolute being generally*, but here it stops. It can command neither insight nor conviction, concerning the existence, or even the possibility, of the world, as distinct and different from the Deity. It finds itself constrained to confound the Creator with the creation,"† and so ends in Pantheism.

But, if the existence of God can not be proved from His works, nor established by dialectic reason in any other way, how is a knowledge of Him to be gained? By *direct intuition*, says Mr. Coleridge, in one place. The mind has a power, which "bears the same relation to spiritual objects

* Table Talk, vol. 2, p. 429.

† Letters, 28, 29.

—the universal, the eternal and the necessary—which the eye bears to material and contingent phenomena.”*

In other passages, Mr. Coleridge represents the idea of God as one “commanded by the conscience, and required by the interests of morality.” For, says he, although reason can not itself demonstrate the existence of a God, it can furnish us with “the *assumption* or *hypothesis* of a *One*, as the ground and cause of the universe, which is eternal and immutable.” Well, the idea, which is the basis of religion, commanded by the conscience, and required by morality, contains the same truth,” viz: that “there is a *One*, the ground and cause of the universe, which is eternal and immutable.” “But this idea presents itself to the mind with additional attributes,” such as “holiness, providence, love, justice and mercy. It comprehends, moreover, the independent existence and personality of the *Supreme One*, as our Creator, Lord and Judge. The hypothesis of a one ground and principle of the universe is thus raised,” by the command of conscience and the requisitions of morality, “into the idea of the living God, the supreme object of our faith, love, fear and adoration.”†

What will devout Christians among us think of this mode of coming to the knowledge of God? A mere hypothesis of the reason, raised by the command of conscience, and the requisitions of morality, after having been clothed with some new attributes, into the idea of the living God! And how much better is this new mode of coming to the knowledge of God, than the old Pauline method of inferring His existence from the things that are made?

Mr. Coleridge’s Trinity is no other than his idea of God in *three different aspects*, or as exerting the three attributes, of will, reason and love. Thus, he says: “The distinctive title of the Father, as the supreme will, is *the Good*; that of the only begotten Word, as the supreme reason, is *the*

* Aids, pp. 142, 308.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 110, 111.

True; and the Spirit, proceeding from the Good, through the True, is *the Wisdom*." Again, he says, more expressly: "The Trinity is, first, *the Will*; secondly, *the Reason, or Word*; and thirdly, *the Love, or Life*. As we distinguish these, so we must unite them, as one God."* Is this the Christian doctrine of the Trinity? Or is it a specious form of Sabellianism, *alias* Unitarianism?

We come now to Mr. Coleridge's doctrine of *the Will*, which his followers regard as the key to his whole system. That he not only rejects, but grossly misrepresents, President Edwards' doctrine of the will, is certain. "The doctrine of modern Calvinism," says he, "as laid down by Jonathan Edwards, which represents a will absolutely passive—clay in the hands of the potter—destroys all will; takes away its essence and definition, as effectually, as in saying, 'This circle is a square,' I should deny the figure to be a circle at all."† The most charitable conclusion is, that Coleridge had never read Edwards on the will, and knew nothing about it, except from its enemies. For, if he had read it and understood it, he could not have so grossly misrepresented it. Does Edwards make the human "will absolutely passive—clay in the hands of the potter?" No man ever urged more forcibly than he the unembarrassed freedom of the will, or vindicated it more successfully.

As might be expected, from the above statement, Mr. Coleridge holds to the *self-determining power* of the will, and that in its most offensive form. The will, he says, "*Originates* its own acts, or is the cause of its own state;" else it is not a will. "This is the essential character by which will is opposed to nature, and is raised above nature; its power of originating an act or state." "The will is ultimately self-determined, or it is no longer a will under the law of perfect freedom, but a nature under the mechanism of cause and effect."‡

* Table Talk, vol. 1, p. 99.

† Aids, p. 206.

‡ *Ib.*, pp. 263, 272, 285.

And yet, after all these high-sounding statements as to the self-sovereignty and independence of the human will, they have no application, on the theory of Coleridge, to human beings in their natural state. For we are a fallen race of creatures, and by the fall have utterly destroyed our freedom, and can hardly be said to have any will left. We have "received a nature into our will," and so come "under the mechanism of cause and effect." By his fall, says Mr. Coleridge, expressly, man "receives a nature into his will," and "a nature in a will is as inconsistent with freedom, as a free choice is with an incapacity of choosing aught but evil." It follows, therefore, notwithstanding all that has been said about self-determination, that there is no freedom in this fallen world, unless it be among the regenerate, and it can hardly be said to have an existence there. The depraved human will is utterly bound and helpless, and has no freedom except to do evil.

Mr. Coleridge has much to say of *original sin*; but by original sin he means, not the sin of our first parents, nor any thing which has come to us in consequence of their sin, but it is, to each individual, *his own first transgression*. Every one commits original sin for himself, and so plunges himself into the state above described. He thus "receives a nature into his will," after which he has no liberty except to do evil. But why it is that all men, from the first, *commit* original sin, and so plunge themselves, one after another, into this deplorable condition, Mr. Coleridge does not inform us.

Mr. Coleridge's doctrine of *regeneration*, in which he supposes the whole of redemption to consist, will be readily inferred from the foregoing statements. "A spiritual *seed* is impregnated and evolved—the germinant principle of spiritual life." It is the work of an Agent, who can at once act *on* the will, as an exciting cause, and *in* the will, as the condition of its potential, and the ground of its actual,

being.”* Regeneration, according to Mr. Coleridge’s principles, is the raising of a man from a state of hopeless, helpless bondage, to one of comparative liberty. It is the giving back to him of free will, after it had been by his own act destroyed. The subject of it can have no responsibility in regard to it, except to rejoice in the gift when it is bestowed, and endeavor, henceforward, to use it properly.

I said that regeneration, as above described, is, with Mr. Coleridge, the whole of redemption; since he not only ignores, but utterly *rejects*, the doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ. He regards all those Scriptures in which this great doctrine is set forth, much after the manner of modern Unitarians—as *figurative*. They merely denote, under a variety of high-wrought, Oriental imagery, *recovery from sin*. “Is it possible,” he asks, “to assent to the doctrine of redemption, as at present promulgated, that the death of an unoffending being should be a consequence of the transgression of humanity, and its atonement?” As much as to say, that such an assent is impossible. Accordingly, his editor adds, in a note upon this passage: “Such were the opinions which Mr. Coleridge ever expressed to me; and they are to be taken as evidence, not of doubt, but of *disbelief*, in the corruptions of the vulgar Christianity in vogue,” *i. e.*, in the atonement.†

It may moderate our surprise that Mr. Coleridge should have rejected the doctrine of atonement, when we learn that he scouted the idea of God’s having any *right of property* in creatures, or any *right of dominion* over them. “What is this,” he asks, “but flying to the old supralapsarian blasphemy, of a right of property in God over all his creatures, and destroying that sacred distinction between person and thing, which is the right and the life of all law, human and divine? Right of dominion, nonsense! Things are not objects of right and wrong. *Power of dominion* I

* Aids, pp. 194, 318.

† Letters, p. 116.

understand, and right of *judgment* I understand ; but right of dominion can have no immediate, but only a relative sense. I have a right of dominion over this estate, that is, relatively to all other persons. But, if there be a right of dominion over rational and free agents, then why blame Calvin? For all attributes are then merged in blind power, and God and fate are the same.”*

If Mr. Coleridge believed as he here wrote, we do not wonder that he rejected the doctrine of atonement. If God has no right of dominion over His rational creatures, then He has no right to institute a government over them. He has no right to give them laws, or claim their obedience, or punish them for disobedience. His whole attempt to act as a moral governor is a usurpation, and all necessity for an atonement is taken away.

Among other essential doctrines which Mr. Coleridge rejected, was that of *the inspiration* of the Scriptures. On this point, he accepted the loose and dangerous positions of Eichorn. He denounced the common veneration for the letter of Scripture as *bibliolatry*.

Mr. Coleridge had no faith in the Scripture account of *the origin and apostasy of our race*. The Adam and Eve of Genesis he regarded as mythical personages, and the first chapters of the Bible as an instructive allegory. “No unprejudiced man can doubt,” says he, “that if, in any other work of Eastern origin, he should meet with trees of life and of knowledge, or with talking and conversible snakes, he ought to regard it as an allegory he was reading, and intended to be understood as such.”†

Mr. Coleridge taught that men would have needed a Christ, an incarnate Divinity, even though they had never sinned. “Man must have had a Christ,” says he, “even if Adam had continued in Paradise ; if, indeed, the history of

* Lit. Remains, vol. 3, pp. 330, 331.

† Aids, p. 267.

Adam be not a myth."* The reason he assigns is, that otherwise God had been "but an ether, or gravitation," and we could have formed no idea of His personality.

Like most of the Germans, Mr. Coleridge denied that we have any scriptural authority for *infant baptism*, though he regarded the observance of it as suitable and useful. "The texts appealed to, as commanding or authorizing infant baptism, are all, without an exception, made to bear a sense neither contained nor deducible; and there exists no sufficient positive evidence, that the baptism of infants was instituted by the Apostles, or was practiced in the Apostolic age."†

Among other strange ideas, Mr. Coleridge insisted that "if human nature would make itself sinless and perfect, *it would become, or pass into, God.* Or, if God should abstract from human nature all imperfection, it might, without impropriety, be affirmed, even as Scripture doth affirm, that human nature is God."‡ If this be true, then the spirits of the just made perfect in heaven either become so many gods, or, losing their individuality, they are absorbed—swallowed up, in the sense of the Panteists—in the great ocean of being out of which they came. It is said, in the above extract, that the Scriptures affirm as much as this. We wish Mr. Coleridge had given us the chapter and verse.

But we will not pursue the vagaries of this bewildered and eccentric genius further. That he *was* a genius, and that, too, of an high order, there can be no doubt. That his pages abound with the flashes, the coruscations of genius, all who have studied them will agree. And it is chiefly on account of these that he is worthy to be studied, and is so much admired. His thoughts often are striking and suggestive. They may well be entitled "Aids to Reflection." Nor would we deny that Mr. Coleridge has some *sensible*

* Lit. Remains, vol. 3, p. 319.

† Aids, p. 337.

‡ Lit. Remains, vol. 3, p. 79.

thoughts. Some of the essential truths of morality and religion he inculcated in an original and forcible manner. In particular, his refutation of the Paleyan utilitarian theory of virtue is complete.*

But his style is one of the worst conceivable, and consistency of thought he never aimed at; or, if such were his aims, it is certain that they were not realized. He knew not how to connect one thing with another, and consequently ran into perpetual inconsistencies. For example, his doctrine of the will would naturally lead to the boldest Pelagianism; and yet he insisted on the fallen, ruined state of man by nature, and on the necessity of the direct interposition of Divine power in order to his recovery. He discarded what he called the Necessitarianism of Edwards, and yet, without seeming to know it, he advanced the same thing. "The elements of necessity and free will are united," he says, "in the higher power of an omnipotent Providence, which *predestinates the whole, in the moral freedom of the integral parts*. It is God every where, and all creatures conform to his decrees; the righteous by performance of the law; the disobedient by the sufferance of the penalty."† Again. Mr. Coleridge represents obedience as following from faith and love, by "*that moral necessity, which is the highest form of freedom.*"‡ If Mr. Coleridge had carefully examined Edwards, he would have found that he contended for no other than a *moral necessity* in the acts of the will, and that this was "the highest form of freedom." That view of the will which admits of its becoming so enslaved to evil, or so attempered to goodness, as to sin or obey, by a moral necessity, which is compatible with a predestinating Providence, to whose decrees "all creatures conform," is quite as high a style of Necessitarianism as has ever found favor among reputable Calvinists.

* See Friend, Ess. 11.

† Statesman's Manual, p. 42.

‡ Aids, p. 185.

But we stop here. We cannot pursue the subject further. We would not dissuade from the reading of Coleridge, if he be read with caution, discrimination, and prayer. But to accept of him as a guide, either in thought or expression, in style or system, in morals, metaphysics, or religion, is what we can neither do ourselves, nor recommend to others. We would as soon think of following a *Will-o'-the-Wisp*, or a *Jack-o'-Lantern*.

ARTICLE III.

FEMALE EDUCATION.*

Youth is universally and rightly regarded as the most critical period of human life. But I think many go too far in regarding youth as, beyond all others, the period in which the character for good or bad is formed; and for this reason, early childhood is too apt to be neglected. My own belief is, that character, in all its main points, is already formed before youth—that youth is the period, not so much of the formation, as of the developement, of character—that the seeds, whether good or bad, are planted in very early childhood, yea, even commencing within the first year, but remain more or less dormant until youth; when, feeling the warmth of passion, and illuminated by the light of reason, they expand into leaf, flower and fruit, filling the air with

* This article was delivered as an Address at the Annual Commencement of the Laurensville Female College, in this State. It appears on our pages as a further exposition of the writer's views on the subject of education, which he partly unfolded in two previous numbers of our journal. See Vol. XII., p. 310; and Vol. XIII., p. 39.—[Eds. S. P. R.]

fragrance and beauty, or poisoning it with noxious odors. Youth is, then, the critical period—the period which develops character—which shows of what stuff we are made. Every parent, therefore, watches with trembling anxiety the period of youth, because the period of planting is passing away for ever, and the period of fruition is commencing; the period of plasticity—of moulding influence, is not yet gone, but rapidly going, and the process of setting into comparative rigidity and permanence of form has begun. We must wait now, not idly, true, but in much anxiety, to see what is the result of all our labor and pains. When we recollect, then, the moulding influence of *woman* on the plastic mind of childhood—when we reflect that the character of every one of us has been in a great measure formed at our mother's knee—when we reflect, further, that the influence of woman is not confined to this most important period, but mingles with every phase of human life, and permeates every fibre of human society—when we see how the rudeness of the young man is subdued, his character elevated and refined, by contact with pure-minded, cultivated women—how the coarse jest and the vulgar oath is exchanged for expressions of noble sentiment; and, more than all, when we reflect, when we feel and know that, next to the love of God, the noblest, the purest, the holiest feeling of which our fallen human nature is capable, is the ardent and virtuous love of a noble woman—when we feel, as every manly heart must feel, the thousand ways in which woman influences human society for good—the holy influences which ever attend her steps, like nymphs which attend the steps of the chaste Diana—when we feel and reflect upon all this, surely it will be superfluous to say any thing on the importance of female education—the importance of training woman to fill the glorious sphere which Providence has assigned her. A noble, cultivated woman! ah! who is worthy to speak her praise? Let not folly, with its simper-

ing flatteries and affected gallantries, dare attempt it. Even wisdom approaches with mute admiration and holy fear.

Leaving aside, then, as self-evident, the transcendent *importance* of female education, let us attempt to explain its *principles*—let us endeavor to show in what consists its distinguishing characteristics. Now, as the object of all education is not to change, destroy or distort our nature, but to develop it to the fullest in its normal direction—not to fit us for impossible spheres of activity, but for that sphere of activity to which our natures have been adapted by Providence—it is evident that *the distinctive character of female education must find its basis in the distinctive nature and sphere of woman*. Our first object, therefore, will be to show, as briefly as possible, what *is* the distinctive nature and sphere of woman.

Within the last twenty or thirty years, there has commenced and rapidly developed, particularly in sections of our own country, a movement, called “the woman’s-rights movement,” the ostensible object of which is to assert the dignity of the female sex. Its watchword is equality of the sexes in mind, character, dignity, rights, and sphere of activity—meaning by equality, identity. Not content with her own distinctive character and sphere of activity, woman, it seems, would invade and appropriate that of man also. Like “Bottom, the weaver,” in the play of “*Midsummer Night’s Dream*,” she would undertake to play all parts at the same time. She would play not only the lover’s part—“the true performance” of which “asks abundance of tears”—but her “chief humor is the Ercles vein; a part to tear a cat in, to make all split.” Not content with the lady’s part, she would have the lion’s part also. Thank Heaven, her roaring, however terrific it may be in certain sections of our country, with us at least is any thing but lion-like. In our own Sunny South, at least, she “aggravates her voice so,” that she “roars as gently as any sucking dove,” and “as sweetly as any nightingale;” and, best of all, her own

sweet face, with merry eyes twinkling with jest, peers out from beneath the lion's skin, and "so puts us out of fear." But, to be serious: the tendency of this movement is to assimilate the male and female character, the male and female spheres of activity, and the male and female education. The madness, the frenzy, the absurdity of this spirit has not touched us here at the South. Woman has not unsexed herself here by invading the sphere and donning the habiliments of man; but, nevertheless, we have not entirely escaped the mania. With us it has taken the higher, nobler form of female education. It displays itself in modifying somewhat our female education, assimilating it more to the male. Now, in so far as this has resulted in elevating the standard of female education, and in making it more solid and thorough, (as I believe it has,) I rejoice in it—I hail it as the promise of a glorious future; but in so far as it turns female education from its legitimate direction, (and this I believe it also has in some degree,) it can not be productive of any thing but harm.

I seldom or never hear the intellectual equality of the sexes either maintained or denied, without a certain feeling of sadness. It may seem strange to some, but every attempt I have ever heard to assert the dignity of woman, has tended to degrade her instead. The whole spirit of the argument generally shows, on both sides, an entire misconception of the true character, and an entire want of appreciation of the true glory, of woman. The whole argument proceeds upon a palpably false premise, and one, too, in the last degree degrading to the female sex, viz: that there is but one standard of human excellence—one ideal of humanity, and that is the male standard. To this standard, therefore, the female mind and character must be brought. On this Procrustes bed her tender limbs must be stretched. Is it surprising that the unnatural experiment fails? Is it surprising that, measured by this standard, the female falls below the male? Is not the very fact of such an experiment—

of such a comparison—the strongest proof that the female character is not understood? The fact is, there is a female as well as a male standard of excellence; and these two are in some degree distinct, and can not be compared. They are the necessary counterparts and complements of each other, and all comparison is unjust to the one or the other, according as one or the other is taken as the standard of comparison. It seems to me that the essential difference between man and woman, in their whole natures, is perfectly illustrated by bodily conformation, and is summed up in the two words—Strength and Beauty. The essential characteristic of man—that which constitutes his manhood—is Strength, bodily, intellectual and moral (the last two being, of course, by far the most important constituents of manhood); while the essential characteristic of woman—that which constitutes her womanhood—is Beauty and Grace; Beauty of person, of mind and of character, refinement, modesty, purity; in a word, all that ineffable grace which floats like an aroma about the person of a refined, pure-minded woman, and which, like a halo of glory, shrouds her from vulgar gaze and unholy thoughts. Beauty of person and refinement of mind and heart may and do infinitely adorn and elevate a man, but do not make him man. So, if to the essentially womanly characteristics of beauty, grace, refinement, modesty, purity and tenderness, there be added some thing of strength of intellect, power of will and physical courage, it may dignify, but can not make, the woman. No amount of refinement and tenderness can redeem the character of a man in whom the essentially manly characteristic of strength is wanting; and no amount of strong-mindedness can compensate in woman for the want of the true feminine virtues of grace, modesty and purity. The absurdity and injustice of the usual comparisons between man and woman, as if they were competitors for the same prize, is, then, perfectly evident. Suppose one should seriously start the question, as to whether the male or female body is

most perfect—most elevated in the scale of organization ; do we not see at once the absurdity of the comparison ? So much clearer is our perception of things material than of things spiritual. In such a comparison, if we make the male body the standard of comparison, *i. e.*, if we compare them in strength only, of course there is no doubt about the superiority of the male ; but if we compare them as to beauty and grace, then the superiority is as evidently on the other side. So, also, if we compare male and female intellect or moral nature, as regards simple strength, then there can be no doubt of the superiority of the male ; but compared in respect to quickness, dexterity, and a certain graceful movement of the mind, and, above all, in refinement, purity, tenderness and gentleness of heart, how infinitely is the superiority on the other side.

The very existence of this dispute—the very existence of the so-called woman's-rights movement—proves, no doubt, that woman is not yet completely appreciated—that amid much gallantry, chivalry and pretended, or, at least superficial, admiration for the sex, deep in the very centre of the heart there is a general feeling of the inferiority of woman—that we admit their superiority in some respects, as we admit the superiority of children in innocence and purity. Our very gallantry and chivalry is but the generous sentiment of a superior nature towards an inferior. I believe the complete equality of the sexes, though admitted at once as almost self-evident, is not yet fully realized and acted upon. Like many important truths in religion and morals, we assent to it at once, as a matter of course, and yet daily act as if we believed the contrary. It is intellectual assent without faith. In most men there is a secret assumption of superiority, even in the midst of the most profuse gallantries ; in most women a tacit admission of inferiority, even when she most stoutly defends her sex from that charge. But, while I believe that woman has not yet been exalted to her true position as the equal companion of man, yet I am equally,

yea, much more certain that woman's-rights women, more than all others, mistake the true dignity of their sex—that all their efforts tend to degrade instead of to elevate the sex, by ignoring the essential distinction, bodily, intellectual and moral, between the two, and by making the masculine standard the single standard for both. We are apt to think that this woman's-rights mania has not invaded us here at the South; but it is visible here also, although we are certainly free from its worst ravages. In fact, it is one of the legitimate and necessary results of the philosophy of the last century, culminating in the French revolution—a philosophy which, pushed to its extreme, destroys distinctions of every kind; overthrows every relation of society, that of the ruler to the ruled, the master to the servant, parent to child, and, in the universal overthrow, destroys, as far as possible, even the distinction and the relation of the sexes. The effect of this spirit has been, to some extent, every where, to assimilate the male and female standard of excellence in every respect—among others, to assimilate the male and female standard of education. Now, I am as perfectly sure as I can be of any thing, that female education can never be improved by assimilating it to the male. But of this we shall speak more fully presently.

If woman is not to be elevated by woman's rights—by contending with man for the palm of victory in man's own field, whether of education or of activity; then how is she to be elevated? Evidently, by a more thorough appreciation and a more genuine and sincere admiration of her essential nature; and this can, I believe, only be accomplished by a more thorough and cordial appreciation of Art and of the precepts of Religion—a more heartfelt admiration of the Beautiful and the *Pure*. For further light on this subject, let us turn to the history of the influence of woman, and the causes of its steady progress.

In every thing human, there are distinguishable two elements which may be called masculine and feminine. The

one is variously called strength, power, energy, expression, life; the other delicacy, refinement, grace, beauty, harmony, purity. In character, the two elements are strength and refinement. In art, they are expression and harmony. In history, they are progression and conservatism. They may be briefly called the element of Power and the element of Beauty. Now, it is the natural tendency of the human mind to place the element of Power above the element of Beauty, as an abstract principle. In the earliest and rudest conditions of humanity, Power only is admired, and that, too, in its grossest form, as physical strength, and man is admired in proportion to his bodily strength and physical courage. Hence, the heroes and gods of this period are Giants and Titans. As civilization advances, the element of Power still holds its ascendancy, but is now most admired in the higher form of intellectual and moral power. This it is which makes Milton's Satan so universally admired as a hero, even by those who are loth to confess their admiration; it is "the unconquerable will, the courage never to submit or yield," even though united with "immortal hate and study of revenge." Is it possible that in either of these periods, under either of these circumstances, woman could occupy any but an inferior position? Surely not. A passing admiration she might extort through man's sensuous nature, an homage rather degrading than elevating; but the higher homage of the intellect and the heart, she could not attain. In the mean time, in proportion as civilization and refinement increased—in proportion as more leisure, more thoughtfulness, more repose of mind, prevailed, the subtler and less imposing element of Beauty received a gradually increasing share of attention and admiration. But has it yet received a fully equal share of admiration? Is there not in the masses, and even in the most cultivated minds, a fuller and heartier admiration of Strength and Power, in the abstract, than of the opposite principle? I am compelled to think that there is. There is some thing in Power which

imposes upon and compels admiration under all circumstances and without reflection. On the contrary, the element of Harmony or Beauty is less gross, less conspicuous, less imposing. It does not *compel*, but *attracts*, admiration. The mind must be attuned—the heart must be prepared—or no note in the soul vibrates in unison with it. The admiration for Power is more intense, more constant, more universal; that for Beauty is weaker, more rare and occasional. Is not even this an evidence that this last is the higher feeling? Alas! for our poor human nature, it is our lower and grosser feelings which are also most intense, constant and universal. Our highest and purest emotions are also weakest and most occasional. The former abide with us, and often become our masters; the latter are occasional visitors, which must be hospitably entertained and tenderly nurtured and strengthened, that they may come oftener and abide longer. We must purify and “sanctify our souls as temples, and then only will the angels of noble thoughts not disdain to appear in them.”

It will be admitted by all that Christianity has done more to elevate woman than all mere human institutions put together. But how has it done so? Obviously by insisting upon the intrinsic dignity of the essentially feminine virtues—by teaching that gentleness, meekness, goodness, tenderness, in a word, Beauty, is intrinsically as noble and as worthy to be admired as Power and Courage. The spirit of the old world taught, blessed are the strong, the proud, the self-reliant. The spirit of the new era teaches, blessed are the poor in spirit, the meek, the pure in heart. But this doctrine of Christianity, though universally acknowledged, is not yet felt with the whole heart. Until it is completely realized, woman can never take her true position as the entirely equal companion of man.

This general want of appreciation of the true dignity of woman, is not by any means confined to man, but is, I think, still more common among women themselves. Some

factitious creature of fashion, modelled by society, is too apt to be the beau-ideal of woman among women; or else, spurning so frivolous and hollow an ideal, she is apt to run to the other extreme, and take the ideal of man as the ideal of woman also. I know nothing more important, and yet more rare among women, than a true appreciation of woman. Even when the true ideal is presented, it is, most likely, repudiated as unnatural and unfeminine, because, foorsooth, unconventional. Alas! how little of independent taste there is in this world, especially among women. Beauty is not recognized as beauty, unless dressed in fashion. Grace, delicacy, feminine beauty of character, is not recognized as such, unless clothed in conventional proprieties. It is only on this principle that I can understand the general want of appreciation of the exquisite, the matchless women of Shakespeare. It is only on this principle that I can understand how it is that young ladies and gentlemen will weep in transports of admiration over the female characters of second-class novels, while Imogen, Miranda, Cordelia, Portia and Desdemona are neglected. Oh! let me entreat you, young ladies, to study earnestly the women of Shakespeare. Oh! that I could express one-tenth part the admiration I feel for these exquisite productions, or one-hundredth part the benefit I have received from admiring, reverencing, loving them. I can not even think of them without being purified and elevated—without feeling every generous and chivalric sentiment stirred within me—without offering the sincerest homage of my intellect and heart—the homage of deep reverence and fervent love. To Shakespeare, the female sex owe a debt of gratitude which can never be repaid, except by unbounded admiration. It is a remarkable fact, that no where among the exquisite productions of ancient genius, do we find any thing even approaching our modern idea of woman; for this idea was born of Christianity. Even among Christian writers, the natural embodiment of woman's character in its higher

phases, is found only in Shakespeare. Others, such as Walter Scott, have drawn women to the life—natural women—women such as we might hope to find and know in this world; but Shakespeare alone, of all writers, ancient or modern, has given us women, at the same time perfectly natural and attaining the most perfect ideal. Shakespeare alone, among all writers, ancient or modern, has held up to our view the feminine ideal as a thing not only to be loved and admired, but to be revered, yea, I had almost said to be worshipped. It has been said by some critic, that Shakespeare's genius was too bold, vigorous and masculine, to succeed well in his female characters. Whoever made this remark was intent only on saying some thing striking, but had no just appreciation of Shakespeare's genius. Delicacy, subtleness, electrical swiftness and energy were distinguishing characteristics of Shakespeare, even more than massive power. I have no hesitancy in asserting that among all his characters, his women are his master-pieces. His men were blocked out with comparative ease, with heavy but sure blows, which never missed their aim a hair's breadth; but his women, ah! on these he has delighted to linger; these he has finished with the most delicate touches; in these even the microscopic power of the most refined criticism tries in vain to follow the exquisite touches of his chisel.

Before taking leave of this subject, I can not help speaking of and earnestly recommending the admirable criticisms of Shakespeare's female characters, by Mrs. Jameson. It seems to me that, next to Shakespeare, Mrs. Jameson's "Characteristics of Women" contains the truest conception of female character; and that, therefore, this work is really the finest criticism of Shakespeare's women that exists in any language. I do believe that of all female writers, Mrs. Jameson is the most truly feminine, and therefore that one of which the sex has most reason to be proud. I do not believe any young woman can read, carefully and thought-

fully, the writings of this authoress, without being elevated and purified—without receiving a higher and truer conception of the character of woman.

I have thus attempted to show the essential difference, and yet equal dignity, of the masculine and feminine ideal. Let us next compare their spheres of activity. Even here, the tendency of the age has been to assimilate; but in this case the absurdity of the assimilation is so obvious, that there can be no difference of opinion. The invasion of the sphere of man by woman, or *vice versa*, is looked upon with disgust or ridicule by every well-constituted mind. I think, however, that there is, nevertheless, a secret feeling of self-gratulation almost universal among men, and of humiliation among women, on comparing these two spheres of activity as to their respective dignity. There is, I think, an almost universal feeling, undefined or unexpressed, perhaps, but none the less real, that man has been blessed with the higher, broader, nobler and more dignified sphere of activity—the sphere which calls out to a greater extent the higher faculties of the mind. Now, I think that if the previous point, viz: the essential difference, yet equal dignity, of the masculine and feminine character is clearly apprehended, the question of comparative dignity of their respective spheres of activity is already answered; for there can be no doubt that the spheres are exactly suited to the corresponding characters, and severally adapted to cultivate them to the highest degree. But, perhaps I can make this point still plainer—perhaps I can still farther vindicate the character and the sphere of woman from the charge of inferiority, by placing the subject in another point of view.

It is true that man's sphere is the great public world, and woman's the narrower and more private world of home. It is true that the infinitely diversified operations of the State, the Church, and the still more diversified operations of industry, belong to man, while woman is confined to the one function of government of the household. It is true

that the sphere of man, *in the abstract, i. e.*, of all men, is wider, more comprehensive, more diversified, and requiring more varied talent, than the sphere of woman in the abstract. Yes, in the *abstract*, but how is it in the *concrete*? How is it in the individual man and woman? Is not the advantage on the other side? Man's sphere is, indeed, great and noble, varied, immensely broad; but, alas! it is divided into a thousand petty domains by division of labor, and each man occupies but one. Woman's sphere is, indeed, narrower; but every woman occupies the whole. Is not, then, the sphere of the individual man often much narrower than that of the individual woman? Is not the management of a household and the education of children, a nobler and wider sphere of activity than that of most trades and professions of man? Thus it is seen that woman's sphere, though more confined, is really what its name indicates, a *sphere*, perfect and complete in itself; while the field of activity of each individual man is but a mis-shapen *fragment* of a great sphere. Now we find, as we might expect, a corresponding effect upon the male and female character. The division and sub-division of labor in the sphere of man, by confining the intellectual and moral energies within the limits of a single trade or profession, miserably distorts and contracts the spiritual nature of man. In proportion as division of labor increases—in proportion as competition is more severe, and the struggle for life more intense, in the same proportion the whole mind and sympathies become more and more absorbed within the narrower and still narrower limits of each particular trade or pursuit. Thus, with advancing civilization, the field of each man becomes narrower and narrower, the struggle and competition becomes more and more severe, the absorption of the mind becomes more and more complete, the character becomes more and more distorted and fragmentary, until often the only salvation of the man is the influence of Home and the family circle; in other

words, contact with the purer and more perfect sphere of woman. Oh! who has not felt that his spiritual nature is daily strengthened, and his moral, independent dignity vindicated, by this contact? Who has not felt that but for this, he would become a mere drudge, a slave, a senseless wheel in the complex machinery of society! Thus, even though we admitted the superiority of the *ideal man* over the *ideal woman*, we would still have to admit that the *actual man* falls below the actual woman. The actual man, from the very nature of his field of activity, is generally one-sided and fragmentary. To make the *ideal man*, we would have to combine together many *actual men*; but the ideal woman is almost attained in the actual. It is a remark of the poet, Pope, that "most women have no characters at all." This remark, which was intended as the most biting satire, is certainly true in one sense; but in the sense in which it is true, it contains the highest possible compliment to woman. Remarkable men have generally been one-sided men. Men become remarkable by the inordinate development of some peculiarity or faculty, generally to the detriment of other faculties. Their natures, from the fact of being fragmentary, are angular. It is these very angles and depressions which constitute the distinctive individual characters of *most men*. But women, on the contrary, from the completeness and absence of division of their sphere of activity, are more complete and symmetrical in their development—less angular, and, therefore, less distinctive. Thus, the individual differences among men are more striking, and stand out in bolder relief; but the reason of this is their greater departure from the ideal. Thus, in nature we may possibly find some approach to the ideal woman; but we look in vain for any approach to the ideal man. In Shakespeare, too, we find the most perfect embodiment of the ideal woman which art has produced, but no where any attempt at the ideal in man. Shakespeare

well knew that such an attempt would be vain, because the result would be unnatural.

Having thus spoken of the distinctive nature and sphere of woman as compared with man, and since the object of education is to develop our nature and prepare us for our peculiar spheres of activity, we are now in a condition to speak of the distinctive character of female education.

As there is a common humanity which underlies all sexual distinctions, so there are common and universal principles of education based upon this common humanity. But as this common humanity is modified by sex, to a degree which it is the tendency of the age to overlook, so, also, the universal principles of education must be modified according to sex, to an extent which it is the fashion of the times to ignore. Again, as the characters of the two sexes, commencing in infancy from an almost common point, gradually diverge, until they reach their greatest point of difference in mature age, so, also, the education of the two sexes, similar at first, must gradually diverge, as their natures do, until the difference culminates in active life. It is principally, therefore, the latter portion of the educational life of which I shall speak, since in this part only its distinctive character should be prominent.

1st. It will be admitted by all that there are two distinct kinds of education, or modes of teaching, viz: the formal and the informal. The one is the communication of knowledge by formal rules and didactic methods; the other is the moulding of the character, feelings, tastes and moral nature, by daily contact, informal conversation and example. Now, of these two, the informal education is evidently of the most transcendent importance. In the simple departments of pure knowledge, where the intellect alone is involved, we may teach by formal rules and by strict methods. We understand clearly what we are doing, and the best mode of doing it—we can measure accurately the exact amount of knowledge communicated from teacher to pupil;

but in the higher departments of knowledge, and still more in the formation of character and tastes, where the emotions are involved as well as the intellect—the heart as well as the head—it is impossible to teach entirely in this manner. We can not analyze and understand the process of teaching. We can not always teach only so much, and what we like. We can not say, thus far will we teach and no farther. In a word, it is no longer formal teaching alone. It is the silent, involuntary, often unconscious, communication of the habits, tastes, feelings, in short, of the whole spirit of the teacher to the pupil. The formal method may be compared to the construction of an edifice, in which we proceed by square and level, adding stone to stone, and marking at every step the exact amount of progress; the informal education is rather the silent growth of a living germ planted and daily nurtured in the heart, to blossom and bear fruit in after life. It is true that the first is generally considered characteristic of school education, while the latter belongs peculiarly to home education; but it is evident, I think, that the two kinds should be combined, only in different proportions, both at home and at school. It is certain that the moulding influence of familiar contact with higher and nobler natures should not be neglected in school education.

Now, the first characteristic of female education upon which I would insist is, the predominance, at all times, both at home and at school, of this silent moulding influence—this informal teaching. As important as this is in all education, I am convinced that it is still more important in female than in male education. I believe so, because, from the very nature of the female mind, it is more susceptible of indirect teaching, and less susceptible of formal, didactic teaching, than the male. Woman's character and woman's mind is certainly more plastic—more easily influenced and moulded, less proud, self-reliant and self-poised than man's. I have said that the distinguishing

characteristics of man are Strength and Courage; and of woman, Beauty, Purity. I now go farther, and say that these characteristics are perfectly adapted to their respective spheres—that the only safety of man, in his contact with the world, is *strength*, intellectual and moral; while the safety of woman is her *purity*. Man's sphere is the great public world. He must of necessity come in contact with vice and temptation in every form. His whole safety depends upon his strength and courage to fight the battle of life—upon his intellectual and moral power to resist and beat back temptation. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that this power of resistance should be educated, by allowing a gradually increasing freedom, and thus cultivating the capacity of self-government. The boy of necessity passes from the private life of the family to the public life of the world—from parental influence and parental guidance to self-government and self-direction amid the infinitely diversified temptations of the world. If this change takes place suddenly—if up to the age of twenty-one the young man has been entirely under parental influence and parental guidance, and then is suddenly launched upon the sea of life, without having practiced his limbs in buffeting its waves, or his intellect in guiding his bark, either he is quickly lost, or else, lacking boldness to venture his unpracticed bark on so dangerous a sea, he contents himself with a timid and fearful *coasting*. Alas! his coasting should have been in boyhood. The illimitable sea is the province of manhood. Boyhood is the period in which alone difficult arts can be learned to perfection. He will strive in vain now to acquire skill and courage. He has missed the golden opportunity; he has failed to take the tide at its flood. Like Rasselas, he may be immured until maturity in never-so-beautiful a valley, surrounded by the warmest hearts, and every desire gratified, except the inextinguishable longing for the outer world; but when he escapes, the glowing vision of this outer world

will change into a terrible reality of struggle and conflict, for which he is totally unfit by previous preparation. Thus, I believe, some latitude, some freedom, some contact with the world, is important for the boy, while still under parental control and guidance, in order that self-reliance, self-control, self-government may be practiced under the eye of the parent, and thus danger be avoided. In one word, the boy must be taught to walk alone, intellectually and morally, as well as physically, and somewhat in the same manner. He must first be held constantly by the hand; he must then be allowed to go a little way alone, but not beyond the eye of the watchful parent, lest serious, perhaps fatal, injury befall him; then he must be allowed to rove far away, still followed by parental counsel; until, finally, he has learned to take care of himself, and the parental influence is no longer necessary. Woman, on the other hand, never passes from the private to the public life. She seldom walks alone, but leaning on the arm of another. She remains in port, while man battles with the storms of life. Man's safety, the integrity of his character and the maintenance of his virtue, is mainly dependent upon his strength and courage. Woman's safety and virtue, on the other hand, is mainly dependent upon her *purity*. Man must meet vice and overcome it. Woman shrinks instinctively from it, for to her even its contact is pollution. For this reason, therefore—a reason which is based in her distinctive character and sphere—woman's education should be more monastic than man's. For this reason, the character, moral and religious, the tastes, feelings, habits, etc., of her teachers, are even more important than their attainments. For this reason, the intercourse between teacher and pupil should be more familiar than it is generally in male schools and colleges. Parental influence, rather than rigid law, should reign in the school.

It is instructive to observe how these two systems of education—these two methods of forming character—the

one adapted to the development of strength, and the other the maintenance of purity, is illustrated in every family, showing that they are based not only in reason, but in the truest instincts of our nature. As might be supposed, the father is the advocate of the former, and the mother of the latter. The father's motto is, "Nothing is learned without experience—nothing is accomplished without venturing." The mother's motto is, "Keep out of harm's way—do not venture until you learn—do not go into the water until you learn to swim." The father's idea of education is, to place the child under favorable conditions, plant the seeds of virtue, and allow him to develop himself. The mother's idea is, to leave nothing to chance, nor even to self-development; but rather to mould the character according to a preconceived ideal. Now, both these systems are undoubtedly right—they must be and are combined in every family, but in different proportions, according to the sex; the former predominating in the education of the boys, the latter in that of the girls.

You will, I am sure, pardon me another illustration of the same truth, taken from the Dramas of Shakespeare; even though it may have no other merit than as a criticism on the great bard. In the infinite multitude of criticisms on Shakespeare, it may seem impossible to say, or even presumptuous to attempt, any thing new; but I am sure every appreciating mind and feeling heart knows that the glory of Shakespeare is like the glory of Solomon, "the half has not been told us." I have already said that no writer of any time understood female character as did Shakespeare. Nothing shows this more wonderfully than the difference in the manner in which he treats the two sexes—a difference founded in the deepest knowledge of the characteristics of the two, and therefore in strict consonance with a sound education in each case. I do not, for a moment, suppose that Shakespeare had any philosophic views on the subject; but it only shows how the

intuitions of genius are confirmed by a rational philosophy. There are two methods of teaching by example, whether in the world or in its transcript, the Drama. First, by the exhibition of a strong, noble nature, struggling manfully, but finally overcome and ruined by temptation; second, by the exhibition of elevation and purity of character almost unapproachable by temptation. In the first, we are repelled by the deformity, the ugliness, of vice, or shrink back, appalled by its fearful consequences even in the noblest natures; in the second, we are attracted towards virtue by its intrinsic loveliness. In the first, we are conducted, like Dante, through the infernal regions of vice, and view with horror the tortures of evil passion; in the second, fixing our eyes steadily upon ideal Beauty, like Dante gazing into the eyes of Beatrice, we are drawn upward in ecstasy to the seventh heaven. Now, in his male characters Shakespeare uses the one method, and in his female characters the other; and thus, to the appreciative mind, the Dramas of Shakespeare become more moral than all formal moral treatises put together. In Shakespeare we find man in struggle with vice—in conflict with evil passion. The great dramatist holds up to our view a strong, noble nature, like Macbeth or Othello, but marred, as we all are more or less, by some evil passion, as ambition or jealousy. We see this noble nature in a moment of weakness yielding to temptation and becoming the slave of passion. Then comes the terrible struggle with the consequences. In this struggle the man is beaten at every step; his character gradually undermined, demoralized and ruined, as the necessary consequence of the first act of weakness. Is not this a spectacle, of all others, the most moral to the thoughtful mind? But how differently does he treat woman! Such a spectacle of woman struggling unavailingly with vice, gradually demoralized and ruined, would be not only shocking to our taste, but could not be in any way improving. On the contrary, he draws

the character of woman in its ideal beauty and perfection, full of innocence and purity, an object to be loved and revered, an example to draw us to virtue. Man, he depicts in desperate contest with vice and evil passion, finally overwhelmed and ruined; woman, in contest with misfortune, overwhelmed, perhaps, but unsullied, and even purified. In the one case he teaches the necessity of active strength and courage; in the other, of passive strength and fortitude, and, more than all, of that beauty of soul, that harmony of spirit, which is unassailable alike by misfortune or by evil passion. Even Lady Macbeth is no exception, but a confirmation of the rule. She participates in her husband's first crime—true—but to have represented her undergoing a process of demoralization similar to that of her husband, would have been utterly unartistic, because contrary to nature. Man goes down step by step, fighting at every step; the very existence of the fight showing the possibility of victory, or at least offering a sublime spectacle of manly courage. Woman, when she stoops to crime, when once she yields to evil passion, when once the purity of her soul is sullied by vice, gives up the contest, and succumbs at once. Either she becomes utterly depraved, or else, if of nobler nature, shrinks back aghast at the fearful consequences—the endless succession of crimes entailed—succumbs, and dies crazed or broken-hearted. Thus, the character of Lady Macbeth is not merely coarse, vulgar and fierce, as generally conceived, but thoroughly womanly.

Thus, the nature of woman, the instincts of parental government, and the intuitions of genius, all admonish us to guard well the beauty and purity of female character—all teach us that in the education of woman the maintenance of Purity is even more important than the development of Strength.

2d. The second characteristic of female education is one which I am sure will astonish many. It is that *woman's*

education may be made more practical than man's—that the utilitarian idea may be introduced, and even made prominent, without the bad effects which are sure to attend the introduction of this idea into the elementary education of the male sex. The reason of this difference is the fact to which I have already called attention, viz: that the sphere of *woman is one, perfect and undivided*, while that of *man is infinitely sub-divided*. The narrowing, contracting, distorting effect upon the nature of man of this excessive sub-division; I have already spoken of above, and more fully in my address “on the principles of a liberal education.” All who are engrossed in active life, must feel and deplore it. But if this idea is carried into education also—if boys are educated for particular trades and professions from early childhood—in a word, if education is made but an apprenticeship to active or business life, then the effects upon the mind and character become disastrous in the extreme—then schools and colleges become manufactories where business men are made—where each individual human soul, the image of God, is hewed and sawed, or filed and hammered, until it fits a particular place in the great machine called human society. The beauty, the symmetry, the completeness of manhood is gone; a miserable fragment of humanity—a senseless wheel in the complex machinery of society—is all that is left. I have striven to show, in the address just alluded to, that the educational life is not an apprenticeship, but the complement of the business or active life—that education should strive, as far as possible, to counteract the distorting effects of active life—that in proportion as active life tends to narrow, sharpen and contract, education should strive to expand and give symmetry—in proportion as the one tends to the special, the other should tend to the general. The whole idea there conveyed may be condensed into the single proposition, that it is the object of education to fit each man for the *sphere of man in the abstract, i. e.*, for the whole

sphere of man, and not for any sub-division of that sphere which the necessities of material existence may compel him to choose. Thus, a liberal education forms a broad common basis of sympathy between men of all classes and pursuits. Thus, we see the very great importance of carefully excluding the utilitarian idea from a course of liberal education, of the male sex. But this danger does not exist in female education, because the sphere of woman is not thus sub-divided. To educate a woman for the practical duties of life, is to educate her, to some extent, for the whole sphere of woman. Surely, it can never injure a girl—but, on the contrary, it will be of the greatest possible benefit to mind and character—to serve an apprenticeship, even from earliest childhood, to the most practical household duties. In the male sex, there is a sort of antagonism between the educational and practical life, as also between the world of thought and the world of reality. In the female sex, these two are beautifully and harmoniously blended together, so that it is difficult to separate them. It is true, that this practical education—this apprenticeship to the practical duties of life—is best undertaken at home, and therefore it may be unnecessary to introduce it into school education. All I wish to insist on is the fact that thorough, practical education, whether at home or at school, can never produce any other than good effects upon the mind and character of woman.

3d. I come now to the last, most difficult, and perhaps the most important point connected with female education: How should the ordinary curriculum of didactic teaching be modified for the female sex? What should be the difference between the male and female curriculum? I have little doubt that there will be much difference of opinion on this point; but it seems to me that the view which I am about to present, follows legitimately and necessarily from the view of female character and woman's sphere already

presented. If we admit the one, we must admit the other also.

To those who have read my address, already referred to, "on the principles of a liberal education," I could make my views intelligible in a very few words. But, as I have no right to suppose that many, if any, of my audience have had either opportunity or disposition to do so, I am compelled very briefly to recapitulate one of its leading ideas, referring you to the address itself for a fuller statement.

In this address, then, I endeavored to show that in every complete course of education, there are three, and but three, subordinate courses, viz: the Scientific course, the Philosophic course, and the Art course. The first commences with Mathematics, and, passing upwards through Mechanical, Physical and Chemical Sciences, finishes with Organic Science and Geology. The second commences with Logic, and passes upwards through Psychology, Metaphysics and Theology. The third commences with Classics as its base, passes upwards through Modern Languages, Literature and Art, (including Composition, Rhetoric, etc.,) and finishes with History. I have attempted, moreover, to show that each of these courses is by itself incomplete—that the three are complementary to one another, and only in their union constitute a complete course of education, and produce symmetry of mental developement. Thus, a complete course of education may be compared to a magnificent building, composed primarily of three subordinate buildings, viz: a centre building and two wings, each in some sense complete in itself, but all much more complete in their union. This I conceive to be the ideal of human education. But as the common humanity is modified by sex, so must this ideal of human education be modified according to the sex to be educated. In other words, in both male and female education, the educational structure consists equally of centre building and two wings; but the department which constitutes the main building must be

different. It may be a matter of doubt which of the three courses should be predominant in male education—whether, *e. g.*, Science or Philosophy should constitute the centre building; but in female education, it seems to me, there is no room for doubt. *In female education, the Art course must for ever constitute the main building.*

The third characteristic of female education, then, upon which I would insist is, *the predominance of the Art course.* The ideal of female education, as I believe, consists in a thoroughly complete Art course, supported on the one side by sufficient culture in mathematics and physical science—on the other by sufficient training in logic and metaphysics, to maintain the symmetry of the mind. Do not mistake me as advocating the neglect of other departments, and particularly of science. On the contrary, I look upon the physical and natural sciences as being peculiarly adapted to stimulate activity and awaken inquiry in all minds. All of these are, beyond question, necessary, but I must think that the largest share of time and attention should be given to the Art course. If any must be sacrificed, in part or wholly, let it not be this. In order to show this more clearly, let us again compare the two sexes. I have already compared them as to character. I wish now to compare them as to their purely intellectual faculties. I will not say, as some have done, that man is a more rational being than woman; but I do say that the reason of man is *more formal*—that the mind of man, whether in the discovery, or the communication, or the reception, of truth, *proceeds more according to regular rule, distinct process and methods*—rules which may be understood, processes which may be taught, and methods which may be practiced. The education of man, therefore, must consist, in a large measure, in the clear apprehension and the dextrous use of these methods, *e. g.*, the method of induction, the method of deduction, and all the sub-divisions of these, *e. g.*, the method of notation, the method of experiment, the method of comparison, etc.

The mind of woman, on the contrary, rapidly discovers, communicates and receives truth by processes which, by their subtleness, escape analysis. The mind of *man creeps* from point to point, linking one proposition to another, in an unbroken chain of induction or deduction. The mind of *woman leaps* from premise to conclusion, often with wonderful clearness and precision, disdaining the intermediate links by which these distant points are connected. In man we have the predominance of the *formal* reason; in woman, of the *intuitive* reason.

Now, if the distinctive feature of the female character and mind is such as I have attempted to show, the peculiar adaptedness of the Art course to the cultivation of her mind becomes at once evident. Of the three courses I have already spoken of, as together constituting a complete education, the scientific and the philosophic make most constant use of regular methods. It is impossible to make progress in these except by the strictest use of severe methods. These, therefore, are admirably adapted to the cultivation of the *formal* reason, so characteristic of the male mind. In the Art course, on the contrary, the methods and processes are less rigid, formal, and severe. In fact, much of this course may be best taught without method. This course, therefore, is peculiarly adapted to the cultivation of the *intuitive or informal* reason, so characteristic of the female sex. "The sense of an expression in a foreign language is both a grammatical and an intellectual problem; this problem is suited to the comprehension of every pupil. At first he understands only the words; then he ascends to the conception of the phrase, finally to the charm of the expression, its force and harmony." When we have attained the signification of the words, and have a perfect knowledge of the grammar of the phrase, we are then conscious of an intellectual process which has been called "guessing," but which is rather a rapid process of comparison and combination—in other words, a rapid process of reasoning, so rapid

that the separate steps are lost—by which we arrive at the meaning of the author. Having obtained the thought, there still remains the task of embodying it in appropriate and graceful form of our own. Thus, the study of language cultivates, to a remarkable degree, the memory, the perceptive faculties or intuitive reason, the imagination, and the power of expression, or the power of turning thought into appropriate language. Are not these the most important faculties in the mental character of woman? Quickness of intuitive perception, a rapid arriving at correct conclusions by processes which she does not care to analyze, a warm imagination, and a power of ready, graceful, easy expression—ah! who can resist the charm of these in woman!

Language, then, as the most fundamental of human Arts, forms the natural basis of the entire Art course. But, in order that this basis be broadly and firmly laid, the Language course should commence with the Classics. The great importance of the Classics in a course of language, both as a means of mental culture and as a basis of sound knowledge in modern, and even in our own language, I have already insisted on in the address so often alluded to. It would take me too far to discuss the subject here. Suffice it to say, that Classics is equally important in female as in male education. I believe that one of the most important defects of our female education, is the general neglect of Ancient Languages. The study of these would, I am persuaded, give an entirely different significance to the whole Art course. It would be viewed less in the light of mere *accomplishment*, and more in the light of *mental culture*.

And now, need I say any thing of *Art* proper? Purity, grace, harmony, in a word, Beauty, is the distinguishing characteristic of woman, the brightest gem in her crown of glory, and Art is confessedly the embodiment of Beauty. The highest evidence of female culture, I believe, is a deep,

pervading, sincere love of *Art*. We are unconsciously assimilated more or less to whatever we sincerely love, admire and reverence. A sincere love of Beauty, ideal and high, generates beauty of character and purity of soul, especially in the plastic nature of woman. There may be such a thing as a radical discordance in the nature of man—as the simultaneous existence in the same mind of the most opposite and irreconcilable principles, motives, feelings; like Lawrence Sterne, he may be capable of the purest sentiments and the noblest feelings, and yet live the most flagitious life—may be the devout worshipper of the most beautiful ideal, and yet the slave of the lowest passions; but I do not believe this anomaly is possible in woman. *Her* heart and intellect is cultivated, *her* character elevated and purified, even *her person* beautified, to an inconceivable degree, through her tastes, her sentiments, her imagination. But if the *love and appreciation* of *Art* cultivates the imagination, the taste, the sense of beauty, *the practice of Art*, in addition to these, cultivates, also, like language, the perceptive faculties and power of expression. Indeed, language is but the most primitive and universal *Art*, and *Art* is but a refined species of language. They are both but different methods of embodying thought and feeling. Thus, then, in woman I would have cultivated, not only the love of *Art*, but the practice of *Art*—not only the appreciation of Literature, but the practice of Composition. This last, viz: the practice of Composition, I conceive to be of the very greatest importance.

But it will no doubt be objected by some, possibly by many, that education in the *Art* course—acquaintance with languages, music, drawing, and the like, and practice in the art of composition—does very well in its place as a finishing off; but these, after all, are but accomplishments, and such education only superficial—that the so-called *solid branches* should predominate and form the ground-work of every education. The objection is founded in an entire

•

misconception of the object and function of the Art course, if not of education itself. The very words, "finishing off," "accomplishments," "solid branches," prove it. All branches are equally solid when pursued in the right spirit, and the whole idea of finishing off, and of accomplishments, should be banished from our schemes of education. No one can despise more heartily than I do mere accomplishments. No one can condemn more thoroughly the wasting of time and talent, the frittering away the depth and earnestness of the character, in learning arts and languages merely for the purpose of shining in and imposing upon society—the pursuit of education for mere purposes of vanity, instead of a sincere love of truth and beauty, and a sincere desire to ennoble and purify our nature. Alas! that the noble cause of education should ever be made to pander to the miserable vanities of society. To get a smattering of several modern languages by committing phrases to memory—to learn to finger dextrously on the piano even the immortal works of great composers—which even to approach without mental preparation is sacrilege—while the mind is engaged in frivolous vanities; to learn to manipulate the crayon rapidly and dextrously with conventional touches in copying the works of third-rate copyists, while the glory, the beauty, the holiness of Nature stir no emotion in the breast; to practice the pen in the manufacture of jingling verses, which come not from the heart, but full of borrowed sentiment and affectation; alas! of all vanities with which our poor human nature is afflicted, surely this is one of the most utterly light and frivolous. I admit, at once, that of all education this is the most superficial. But, on the contrary, to have grasped the spirit and genius of any language, so that its best literature is thrown open to us; to have succeeded, by the study and practice of music, in strengthening and cultivating the love of harmony and song, latent within the soul; to have learned, through our sincere, though humble, and perhaps

unsuccessful efforts, to imitate the forms and colors of nature, to see a richer glory in those colors and a higher beauty in those forms, and thus to love nature with a purer and holier love; to have our taste directed, and our love stimulated, in the higher walks of poetry, until the great old bards, becoming our constant companions, shall guide our steps into higher and purer regions of thought; perhaps, above all, to have practiced the noble art of composition until every thought awakened in the soul, by Nature or Art, shall find expression in noble, melodious language; every sentiment fitting like summer cloud across the pure heaven of the female mind, shall bless mortals with its shadow of appropriate expression; every tender emotion nestling timidly in the soft bosom of woman, concealed from mortal ken, may, when necessary, reveal its holy presence in fitting words of sympathy and love; every fancy, even the lightest, most graceful and delicate, floating like gossamer in the warm sunshine of woman's imagination, invisible to mortal eyes, shall sparkle in the rich drapery of gorgeous expression, like the same gossamer sparkling with morning dew. Surely, this is an education any thing but superficial—surely, this is *the* education which most fits a woman not only to fill, but to adorn, the sphere to which she is called. Recollect, that the principal object of the study of Art is not to make artists, but to *cultivate the love of beauty*, and thus to open to the soul the treasures of Art and the glories of Nature—to remove the scales from the mind's eye, that every thing beautiful may be mirrored in the soul—to unstop the deaf ear, that it may hear the music of the spheres. If the pupil acquires proficiency in the Art itself, and continues to practice it through life, so much the better. But if household cares, the stern duties, anxieties and responsibilities of life, compel her to give it up, her time has not, therefore, been lost. Far from it. Her nature has been beautified, refined and spiritualized; the treasure-house of beauty has been

opened to her, never to be closed again; the divine harmony of the universe has struck a responsive chord in her soul, which will vibrate with deeper and deeper music through eternity. The harmony within will diffuse itself outward, creating happiness and communicating refinement to her household. Yes, the sense of beauty, like the principle of Love, is never lost; the object may be lost, but the living principle remains. A new nature is born within us, which is immortal. But oh! let us not commit the fatal error of mistaking accomplishments for true Art. The sense of Beauty is the soul of Art, as Love is the soul of Courtesy, and Faith the soul of Religion. But Art, like Religion, in fact, like every thing great and noble in this world, has its counterfeit, in which we have the *form only*, but no living soul. *Accomplishments are but the form of Art, without the soul.* Art, without a deep sense of beauty, like artificial courtesy without love or kindness, or works without faith, is utterly worthless and dead.

I have insisted thus strongly on a thorough Art course, and, at the same time, have attempted to indicate its true nature and dignity, in order to guard against two prevailing and opposite errors. The first is the degradation of the Art course into a mere school of accomplishments, in which the very purposes of education, and even the dignity and destiny of the human soul, is lost sight of in the frivolous vanities of an artificial society. This is, beyond all doubt, the worst possible education—perhaps worse than no education at all. It is, in fact, the introduction into education of the utilitarian spirit in its worst form, since it makes education subservient, if not to the vanities and frivolities, at least to the amusements and recreations, instead of the duties and responsibilities, of life. It destroys the whole dignity and seriousness of female life, and degrades woman into a mere trifle, by making fashionable society, instead of home, her true sphere. The second is a violent reaction against the mere vanity and absurdity of the other. It is

an attempt to elevate the standard of female education by assimilating it to the male. The tendency of this error is to introduce the severer and more masculine studies of mathematics and science, on the one hand, and of logic and metaphysics, on the other, to the at least partial exclusion, and generally to the complete mutilation, of the Art course, degrading it to a position of secondary importance. They say our daughters shall have as good education as our sons—meaning thereby the same education. The defenders of this system are really earnest, sincere men, but somewhat too practical, if not material, minded. They feel deeply the frivolousness of mere accomplishments, but do not appreciate the dignity of true *Art*. They appreciate woman in the capacity of a thrifty housekeeper, affectionate wife and mother, ever watchful, ever busy; but do not appreciate her glorious mission of refining, elevating and ennobling the human race—do not perceive that in the performance of simple household duties in her humble, circumscribed sphere, and in her quiet, unobtrusive way, the truly noble and cultivated woman is performing the greatest work with which mortals are intrusted here below. Yes, the noble, cultivated, refined woman, by mere presence and contact—by the exhibition of noble virtues and elevated tastes, is moulding, unconsciously, perhaps, to herself and to them, but still moulding, purifying the character and cultivating the minds of her children, her husband, and all with whom she comes in contact. And yet so quiet, so unobtrusive is this influence, that it is only perceived by philosophy, unless revealed by love. And she, the magician who works these miracles—she, occupied with her own quiet duties and the tender, self-sacrificing promptings of her own heart, walks amid the happy world she has created, all unconscious of her own greatness.

ARTICLE IV.

THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.*

IV. The Scriptures declare the three persons of the Trinity to be equal in all that constitutes God.

We proceed to remark, as a fourth proposition deduced from the teaching of Scripture, that these three persons are equal in all that constitutes God. We assume, as undoubted by any one, and as agreeable both to reason and to revelation, that there are attributes and operations (or by whatever more suitable term we may designate them,) which are peculiar and essential to the Deity; such as creative and preserving power, absolute prescience, moral sovereignty, and the like. These are necessarily included in our notion of the incommunicable nature of God; “ever present, actively coöperating, and exerting their own distinguishing influence in all His laws, providences and acts. Thus, if God be eternal or omnipresent, we consider His

* We resume in this number, and shall complete (*D. V.*) in our next, this argument, which we commenced in No. 1, Vol. XI., and continued in No. 2 of the same volume, and resumed again in No. 2, Vol. XII. Circumstances which we could not control have hindered the progress of it until now. We state here, for the purpose of distinctly exhibiting the course of the argument, that it consists of five propositions, as follows:

- I. The Scriptures teach that *God is one.*
- II. The Scriptures teach that *the unity of the Godhead admits a plurality of persons.*
- III. The Scriptures teach that *the distinctions in the Godhead are personal, not nominal.*
- IV. The Scriptures teach that *the three persons of the Godhead are equal in all that constitutes God.*
- V. The Scriptures teach that *the three Divine persons of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are not three Gods, and therefore that they are one God.*—[EDS. S. P. R.]

power, knowledge, and holiness to be coeternal and coextensive with Him. Moreover, it would be an absurdity to form a comparison between these and God Himself; to regard them as numerically distinct from Him; to investigate the particular mode of their existence in the Divine mind; or to treat them as parts of God, inasmuch as they are all included in the idea of the one indivisible Godhead." This, however, is not a matter of doubt or speculation, for we are most expressly assured that the blessed God has a name which He alone can possess,* and a glory which he will not give to another.† God, then, who is a jealous God, and whose name is jealous, must be characterized in His own Word by those titles, attributes and works, which are peculiar to His name and glory.

If, therefore, we find that in Scripture God ascribes to the Son and Spirit the very same names, and represents them as in all respects to be honored with the same glory, as that which is ascribed to the Father Himself, we surely must conclude that, however otherwise the Father and the Son and the Spirit are distinguished from each other, they are not three separate Gods—one supreme and two subordinate Gods—but that they must necessarily be one and the same God, in three persons—that is, a triunity of persons in one Godhead.

The Son of God, as mediator, and, therefore, as God manifest in the flesh, and the Spirit of God, as the attribute or agent of the Deity, might, indeed, have the name of God *figuratively* applied to them, and yet not be really God. But, while this is conceivable, it will be surely admitted that, in a book given to convey the only knowledge of God's nature which is possible to his creatures, such a figurative application of the title and glory of God would be so cautiously used, and so carefully guarded and explained, as to leave no doubt as to its real and figurative import.

* Ps. 83, 18.

† Isa. 42, 8.

This, however, is very far from being the case. Throughout the Scriptures the names or titles appropriated to God—the attributes and works attributed only to the Supreme Being—and the divine worship, in which this God is reverentially and exclusively adored, are all ascribed to the Son and to the Spirit, as well as to the Father, and hence the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are in this way most unquestionably proved to be severally God, coequal, co-existent, and coeternal, in nature, power and glory.

The proof of this position we design to advance in a separate discussion of the supreme Deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. At present, we assume that the proof is at hand, and we conclude that, as there is only one Godhead—as in this Godhead there is a plurality of persons—and as these persons are the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, that, therefore, these three are one. This doctrine is plain and comprehensible, as a fact revealed, but unsearchable and irreconcilable, as are many other primary and demonstrable truths.

This is a fact respecting the mysterious economy of the Divine nature, which the Divine wisdom has been pleased to reveal. As a fact, it is at once plain and indubitable. God, by revealing it as a fact, makes that plain to our comprehension, by the manifestation of its actual operation and practical effects, which, in its nature, is a mystery that ever has been, and ever must be, incomprehensible, and past our finding out.

St. Augustine determined to give three days and nights in succession to prayer and meditation, that he might understand the mystery of the Trinity. On the third night he was overcome with sleep, and dreamed he was walking on the sea-shore. There he saw a little child, who was scooping a hole in the sand, and filling it with sea-water from a shell. "What art thou doing, my child?" said the saint. "I am going," was the answer, "to put all the sea in this hole." "My child, you can never do

that," said Augustine. Then the child looked up, the Light of the world beaming from his divine eyes, and said, "I can do it, Augustine, as easily as thou canst comprehend the subject of thy thoughts." *

But the fact is neither incomprehensible nor "hard to be understood." All it requires, is the "obedience of faith," the acceptance of God's testimony, as the most infallible of all evidence. And, surely, there can be no excuse for hesitation in believing, as a fact, what is revealed and manifested in all the doctrines and duties, of which it is the foundation, when we are compelled to believe in the existence of our own mental and moral nature, while we have not even the consciousness of its existence, or of the existence of any one of its powers, except as they are manifested by their effects. †

It is precisely on the same ground we believe in the eternity of God, or His duration without beginning and without end; in the omniscience, in the omnipresence, in the providence, in the power and in the moral government, of God. These all surpass the power of the human mind to grasp them. In believing them as facts, it is unable to comprehend what it assents to, or to reconcile one with the other, in their apparently contradictory conclusions. The truths or facts are established by indisputable evidence, but their apparently contradictory principles and conclusions remain inexplicable. And this is true of all natural and revealed religious truths. When God is a term in any proposition, we can not reason—we can only listen and adore.

The necessity of believing as facts or truths what we can not comprehend in their nature or harmonize in their relations to one another, is not peculiar to these logical

* The visitor to the Vatican Palace, in Rome, will see this significant incident, designed by Raphael, on one of the panels of the famous picture, "Stanzas of Raphael."

† The mind and its powers are entirely out of consciousness, and only known by their effects.—*Sir Wm. Hamilton.*

truths. It is equally true of mathematical science, in which there are not a few propositions which are demonstrably certain, and yet, so far as reason can comprehend them, incredible, or impossible; and yet they are not only believed, but are made the foundation of other principles, and of incalculable results.

The same is true of natural science, also, in which such laws as gravitation, chemical and magnetic attraction, electricity, vegetable and animal life, etc., demand assent, while nothing is or can be known of their real nature. To carry out the principle on which Unitarianism rejects the doctrine of the Trinity, viz: That a man can not rationally believe any thing he can not understand, is both absurd and unphilosophical, and would reduce man to universal ignorance and idiocy.*



ARTICLE V.

BUNSEN ON THE BIBLE.

Bunsen's Bibelwerk. Vollständiges Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde. In drei Abtheilungen. Von CHRISTIAN CARL JOSIAS BUNSEN. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus; 1858, 1859, 1860. Large 8vo., pp. cccxciv., 345, 826, 642.

The above is the general title of a work on the Scriptures, by the Chevalier Bunsen, designed for the people

* For to pretend to apply reason to subjects with regard to which our own short views, and even our experience, will shew us it can not be depended on, (and of such subjects he had before given, as examples, those of infinity, immensity and eternity, as ascribed to God,) this is vanity and conceit and unreasonableness.—*Butler's Anal. Pt. 1, ch. VI.*

speaking the German language, and embodying, for general use, what the distinguished author regarded as the main results of modern criticism. Germany, almost alone, he affirms, of all Christian nations, has, for nearly a hundred years, and especially since the commencement of this century, bestowed upon the Bible that thought and research which its own importance, and the love of truth, as well as the religious and moral wants of the present age, demand. The time, in his view, had now come, when the real results of Biblical Science should be submitted to the people in some intelligible form, as a precious, common treasure, which could not longer be withheld. It has been, he says, his life-long desire and labor to set the entire truth before the community of Christians, to the best of his knowledge, and in all fidelity, so that each part might contribute, systematically, to their information, and enable them to form their own individual judgments. This work the author proposed to bring forth in three divisions, the first to bear the title of the Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Covenant, translated according to the traditional text of the original, and accompanied by a popular exposition, and to embrace in its three Parts—I. The Law; II. The Prophets; III. The (didactic) Scriptures, with the Apocrypha; IV. The Scriptures of the New Covenant. The Translation of Luther, notwithstanding its high merits, is, in his view, no longer adequate. He aims to give another after the same noble model, but nearer the original text, and embodying, as far as practicable, the results of modern learning. The Second Division bears the title of *Bibelurkunden, oder Bibeltexte*, etc. The Bible Records, or The Biblical Text, historically arranged and explained. This, also, divides itself into three Parts, and embraces discussions respecting the origin and age of the original Text, and its authors and collectors. The Third Division, under the Title of *Bibelgeschichte*, or Bible History, is to comprehend, in one volume, The Everlasting Kingdom of

God and the Life of Jesus, embracing the great events and persons of the Old and New Covenant. This, also, falls into two sections: The Bible in the World-History, and the World-History in the Bible, the central point of the last being, the Life of Jesus. The whole work will be completed in eight volumes. The first two volumes of the First Division have reached us, embracing the Law, with a Prolegomena of cccxciv. pages, and the Prophets. Of the Second Division, we have received the first portion, which is numbered as the fifth volume, and contains the *Bibel-urkunden*, or Bible Records, with Essays on them, and an Atlas, prepared by the practiced hand of Dr. H. Lange, according to the latest and best authorities.

The Chevalier Bunsen has enjoyed a reputation, at home and abroad, for many years, both in the republic of letters and as the representative of Prussia at foreign courts. His early studies were chiefly philological, in which he enjoyed the instructions of Heyne and Heeren, at Göttingen, and subsequently of De Sacy and others in Oriental studies, at Paris. Having studied the Sanscrit, he conceived the idea of visiting India, but being disappointed in this, he went to Rome, became the secretary of Niebuhr, by whom his studies were in some manner directed, and whom he succeeded as minister at the Papal Court. The work which he there prepared, in connection with Platner and others, on the Antiquities of Rome, is an excellent and almost indispensable aid to him who would be acquainted with that city of ancient ruins, and would ascend to those early times in which their foundations were laid. It is specially rich in Christian antiquities, and his monograph on the ancient Basilicas is marked with an exhaustive fullness. In Rome he formed the acquaintance of Champollion the younger, and commenced with him the study of the Hieroglyphics. In 1838 he left Rome, and for many years was Prussian Ambassador at the Court of St. James, London. His attention being turned in two main directions

by these early studies, he produced two extensive works of antiquarian research, the first, "Hypolitus and his Age," which in the second edition reached to seven vols., 8vo., he having hung upon this text other broad and divergent discussions, as "The Philosophy of Language and Religion," in two octavos, and "Analecta Ante-Nicaenæ," three volumes more. These volumes are marked with varied but ill-digested learning, and though they breathe a pious spirit, and are penetrated with admiration for the heroic past of the Church, disclose theological leanings which were greatly regretted by the friends of evangelical truth. The same remarks apply to his "*Egypten's Stelle, in der Weltgeschichte*,"* "Egypt's Place in Universal History," which was written partly at Rome, Munich and Berne, and revised and completed at London, where he enjoyed the aid of Birch and others, as he had done of Lepsius before. The English translation, by C. H. Cottrell, Esq., the first volume of which was published in 1848, and the fourth and last during the last year (1860), were prepared, to a great degree, under the author's inspection, and are, especially in the first three books, a great improvement on the German original. He has also published, recently, a large work, "God in History," in which he has reproduced the general views which he had given summarily in the "Hypolytus," before. In 1847 he published "The Constitution of the Church of the Future," the occasion of which was the establishment of the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric of Jerusalem. This half-Lutheran, half-Anglican establishment gave rise to much discussion, in which Gladstone, Dr. Arnold, and Bunsen took part. In this the German philosopher and statesman put forth many noble and just views in favor of the freedom of the congregation, as opposed to a clergy-Church, and some lofty anticipations in reference to the Church of the Future, vitiated, however, by the idea that

* Book I., published in 1843, Books II., III., in 1855.

the congregation is none other than the Christian nation, through whose chief magistrate the chief bishop is to receive his ultimate appointment; involving thus the vice of all European Church establishments, a dependence, more or less direct, of the ecclesiastical upon the civil power. His ideal of Church government would seem to have been a moderate Episcopacy, with large privileges accorded to the people. In 1856, after his retirement to his own country, he found time, amidst his labors upon the Biblical work whose title we have given, to write his "Signs of the Times," in which he took up arms against the bigotry of the old Lutheran party and Church despotism, in favor of what he regarded as religious freedom.

The author's own account of his preparation for the work now before us, leads him to rehearse several points of his personal history. He assures us that this is no accidental or recent project, but one arising out of a systematic plan and preparation for it. For fifty years the intellectual efforts of the author, he says, have been directed to investigations and thought, the conscious central point of which, for the last forty years, (from 1858,) has been more and more a work like this. No one can object to him that he approaches it without mature consideration. The convictions of a life-time, have a worth in themselves, if honorably gained, and subjected to conscientious proof; and at best, no one can do more than devote an entire life to a regular education for a scientific work. His attention, he tells us, was directed to Christ and the Scriptures by pious and experienced parents. In 1805, while at school, he read Genesis and the Gospels in the original, and the latter in Syriac in 1807, under a scholar of Michaelis. At the University, in 1808, whither he went for the study of theology, he had the good fortune, in his exegetical studies, to find in Arnold and Hartmann thorough teachers. In 1810 he applied himself to investigations in Classical Antiquities, not losing sight of Biblical research, to which he

intended to return. He rehearses the story of his seven years' academic course, begun at Marburg and pursued at Göttingen under Heyne, with Wilhelm Hey, Karl Lachmann and Friedrich Lücke as companions, substantially as we have before related; of his study of the Persian and Arabic at Paris, under the kind instructions of De Sacy, of his six years' friendly cohabitation at Rome with Niebuhr, the master of historical criticism, who frequently exhorted and encouraged him to carry out his critical labors upon the field of the Bible. He had already, in 1817, resumed his work, and made a public announcement of it at the Tricentenary of the Reformation, held that year. During the twenty-two years of his residence at Rome, he continued his Biblical researches on the central point of the whole, the life of Jesus. The first sketch of this and of the life of Paul was prepared in the years 1823—1834. He brought the whole together in the year 1835, in a complete criticism of the Gospels, the central point being the Gospel of John, as the work of an eye-witness. He then resumed the study of Genesis. In 1837 he translated the prophets Joel and Jonah, with a critical elaboration, which, in the year 1856, he allowed to be printed as a contribution to the work, "God in History." In 1842 he employed himself upon a translation of a selection of sixty Psalms, which appeared anonymously as an "Evangelical Hymn and Prayer Book," in 1846. In Rome, as well as in England, where he lived nearly fifteen years, as a man of letters and an ambassador, he had frequent occasion to know the inestimable worth and necessity of the Bible, and its use to a free people. In 1849 he finished, according to the sketch made in 1835, a complete harmony of the four Gospels, and the summer of the fatal year of 1850, he had the leisure and comfort of writing out the Life of Jesus, as he presents it to the public in his present work. In the summer of 1854, after forty years' absence from his native land, he obtained the leisure, for which he had long sought, of

bringing the present work to a termination, on which, however, he continued to bestow methodical labor, down to the period when its publication began. The experience of a long life, the fresh courage and undiminished mental vigor received from God, lead him to hope that it will be yielded to him in his gray old age to discharge the vow made in his youth. From his researches upon allied and neighboring domains, to which a translator and expounder of the Bible in this our day dare not be a stranger, he has laid before the German and English people, if he may venture thus to say, sufficient proof that he had not busied himself with this thing incidentally, as a make-shift, or from an incompetent amateurship.*

Such is the venerable author's own account of his preparation for the work now before us. The advantages he enjoyed were certainly such, in some particulars, as fall to the lot of comparatively few. And yet, for a translator of the Scriptures, and for an exegete, skillful and worthy of entire confidence, we would wish to be assured of other acquirements and convictions than this course of study and these aspirations necessarily imply. First of all, we would wish to be assured that the author relies with a simple faith on the Lord Jesus Christ as the only Saviour, as the Light of the world and the Life of men. Assured of this, we would wish to know if he holds the Scriptures as an inspired Revelation of the Will of God, an infallible rule of practice and of faith. We would value his conclusions far more, if we knew that his life had been spent in a careful study of the original Scriptures, till he had become familiar with every shade of doctrine, and every verbal idiom, than if we knew he had spent his days in decyphering the hieroglyphics of Egypt, in the baffling attempt to adjust the dynasties of Manetho, or in bringing forth the long buried writings of some ancient, almost

* *Erster Halbband p. cxviii., et seq.*

forgotten, Father of the Church, who apprehended but imperfectly those doctrines which look forth in the Scriptures with resplendent purity. Far rather would we have one trained in the believing school of the English Puritans, with the superaddition of all that is valuable in modern Biblical learning, than amid the destructive criticism of a Niebuhr, who believed in the Bible, probably, only as he did in any other book of high antiquity. Nor do we know in which department his labors were the greatest, whether in the pursuits of Biblical and antiquarian research, or in Diplomacy and Statesmanship. We give him all credit for noble aspirations, for varied and discursive learning, for a kind and genial nature, and for strong religious sensibilities, and for a hatred of all oppression; indeed, how could we withhold a just praise from one who called forth the glowing eulogies of Arnold; but not one nor all these things, of themselves, qualify one for so great and responsible a work as this distinguished scholar and diplomat has undertaken.

What were his views, for example, as to the plenary inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures? There are many expressions of the author which show, in various directions, a high valuation of the Bible as the Word of God. "Bible-Christians," says he, "have no longer to contend for the outworks, but for the very centre of the castle of their faith. Without, the unbelieving world buzzes around, and urges on with its surging violence, with its giddiness and lust for gold, while within, ferocious enemies advance from every side. Some German scholars have given forth the Gospel of testimony, the annunciation of the Word of Life, that which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, as a myth, an invention of the Gnostics. But it is an easy blindness, or a more bitter jeer, if men should now arise among ourselves, or elsewhere, who should make themselves or us believe that there could be any common Christianity more, after such an assumption. If the Gospel

of John is a myth, and no historic account, but a myth, then is there no historic Christ, and without a historic Christ is all popular faith in Christianity a delusion, all Christian profession hypocrisy or infatuation, the worship of God a juggle, and the Reformation a crime or a frenzy." "Over against these views stands the assault of a priestly party, with their claim to an absolute dominion over States and over the consciences of men, and their death-struggle against liberty and science, with deadly hate against the Bible. They tear the Word of God from the hands of the people, and burn faithful translations of it as the most pernicious of books. An evidence this of unmistakable unbelief; for whoever believes in the Bible, and the Spirit which inspired it, can neither hinder its diffusion nor bar the people from its investigation."*

He proposes to treat the Bible according to the strict demands of a devout but historical criticism. And though none can object to the just words which we have now quoted, his views of what a devout or believing, yet scientific, criticism is, may be very different from ours, and what the Church of God is willing to receive. "In such a treatment," he says, "we secure ourselves as much as possible against special disappointment on the soil, and as to the results, of critical science; but we also gain thereby an invincible weapon against the prejudices of unscientific and slow-minded men, and against the oracular decisions, whether of theologians or philosophers. Biblical historic science opposes not a child-like faith in the letter of the Bible, but protects this faith, while it purges it. It attacks its three enemies, who, to a certain extent, act under the same cover, though they apparently war with each other. These are, first, flat unbelief, or the absolute denial of any connection of historical tradition with our inner life; then its opposite, often its offspring, artful, outright bigotry, and

* Erster Band, p. x.

withdrawment of the word of the Scriptures; and, finally, that systematic tyranny which adorns itself with the name of the Bible, but in fact supplants it. All these three enemies the scientific investigation of the Bible did not bring into existence, but found already. This third enemy is the worst. We allude expressly to that mechanical idea of inspiration of the mediæval clergy-Church, increasing in many regions, strengthened by the dullness and bibliolatriy of many theologians of the seventeenth century, and the ignorance of their successors in the nineteenth. Other opposers of Biblical faith incur the danger of treating the Bible as a legend, and rashly accusing it of self-contradictions. But only the mechanical idea of the Bible's inspiration makes the Bible, whether it will or nill, in historical things, a legend—in spiritual, a lie, and kills the life in both. It is necessary, throughout, in this department of Biblical inquiry to tear off from this spirit of darkness this angel-mask of faith, to wit: in the name of God's Word, and this can only be done hand in hand with true Bible-knowledge and historical criticism. And this must be done, not alone on account of the undeniable right of truth, but especially because that form of unbelief has disfigured the true evangelical faith in the Spirit of God (existing) in the Scriptures, and is now perplexing and unsettling many of the best and noblest minds.”*

This is lofty language, and has in many respects the ring of genuine coin. But base metals, in this our day, are so skilfully compounded and concealed as to pass current with any but the most practiced assayers. “This mechanical idea of inspiration has no other notion,” he says, “of the letter of the Bible, than the Hindoo has of his Vedas, the Mohammedan of his Koran, the obdurate Pharisee of his Law and Tradition, of his Thora or Masora. The Bible is to be regarded as a historical ground of faith, because

* Fünfter Band, 7-10.

it is some thing entirely different from the Vedas and Koran, and for this reason, is no Pharisaic Thora, because it assumes throughout, and plainly, the letter only as the expression of the Spirit, and the Spirit as working according to its own divine laws, upon the mind of honest, pious men, through their reason, and its conscientious application to the realities around them."

"Consider," says he, "only the contradictions of this system. According to it, the exalted heroes of faith and prophets, the divinely appointed champions of humanity, are not the objects of the working of this divine energy, but he who composed the books which tell of them. And where both coincide, as in the Apostolic epistles, it is again not the mind and heart of the man of God, which are moved by the breath of the Divine Spirit, but it is the tongue unconsciously speaking, and the finger writing involuntarily, that are the instruments God uses. That speaks, this writes what is suggested to the speaker or writer, without its proceeding from his inner life and its history. Thus they speak in languages they do not understand, and preach as God's Word that of which they know nothing. They are infallible in this speaking and writing, whether they announce their religious convictions, and speak of divine things, or of outward circumstances, things which have nothing to do with religion. The sun must go round the earth, if the passage seems to say so. 'What is written stands,' they cry, and none give themselves less trouble than they, to know what stands written. 'The letter is inspired,' that is their watch-word, and yet they make no effort to know what the letter really says!"*

Now, we do not know what this writer means by mechanical inspiration, unless he refers to the common idea of it, entertained by the truly evangelical Churches of Christendom. And he has no right to call this an assertion of

* Band, V., p. 8.

mechanical inspiration. The laws of matter are one thing. The laws of mind are another. The human agent, used by the Divine Author of the Scriptures, is a moral and intellectual agent, and not a machine, with joints and pulleys, and nothing more. The lips and fingers do not move without the writer's own intelligent guidance. The product betrays his intellectual character, bears the marks of his previous education, and is imbued with his own genius. But there is another agent, one higher and Divine, whose heavenly influence inter-penetrates all his powers, and acts upon them and in them. The product partakes of the character of both agents. The words are the words of men, and they are, at the same time, the infallible Word of God, who can not lie. The exalted heroes of faith, the divinely appointed champions of humanity, the Joshuas, the Gideons, the Davids, were moved by God to act, and directed in their action; but the writer who recorded their exploits or their errors, was also inspired to write them, and the Scripture that he thus wrote is the product of this inspiration, is itself the inspired Word of the Almighty, or is to us no infallible rule of faith and duty. Inspiration is analogous to the work of divine, efficacious grace upon the heart. In this "God does all, and we do all." And yet, it has its own specific differences. The Holy Spirit must have impelled the sacred penmen to write, must have revealed to them the truths to be recorded, or brought to their recollection what had been revealed to them before, must have been with them in the selection of that which was either already a matter of human record, or was attainable by their natural powers, and must have continued with them, aiding and guiding, till that which was to be spoken was uttered, and that which was to be written was traced on the parchment before them. It is in reference to these very Scriptures of which Bunsen, in what is now before us, chiefly speaks, that the Apostle says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and Peter declares that

“Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved, (*φερόμενοι, borne on*) by the Holy Ghost.”

We can not make the language and the assumptions of this writer consistent with any just conception of the inspiration of the Scriptures.

His view as to the origin of Genesis, is as follows: He rejects the theory which has now but few advocates, that the account of the creation, fall, confusion of tongues, etc., is a pure fiction. The disclosures of Comparative Philology have taught us the perfect historical truth of the account of the dispersion and derivation of nations, which it gives us. He rejects the mythic hypothesis, according to which, it is a detail of distorted and very early recitals of astronomical and philosophical myths. “The mythic notion has had its sway, like an infectious disease, for two generations, and has led many intellectual and learned men to the verge of madness.” He maintains that an actual reality lies at the bottom of all that is said about the primeval world, whether it be in the territory of the *ideal*, or strictly historical. Yet, that we can not demand of the late compiler what we would of an original eye-witness. It will not only be lawful, therefore, but obligatory to distinguish between his subjective views and the objective matters of fact. This he maintains he can do without calling in question the writer’s capacity to bring in a trustworthy report. “Wherever there is an honest and pious mind, there is inspiration.” “Inspiration is in the Scriptures, because it is in the Church.” *

In Abraham we have an entirely historic character, who lived in the historic times of Asia and of Egypt, who cast off the fetters of the degrading superstition which surrounded him in Mesopotamia and Canaan, and raised himself, and mankind with him, to a consciousness of the

* Band, V., pp. 11-18.

Eternal. Migrating from the Aramæan soil, he brought with him the traditions of the region whence he came, which had been preserved in his own family, and transmitted them to his immediate descendants in Canaan, the dialect of which country he now adopted. The history of the creation is compiled from two ancient narratives. The first, in which the name of God is Elohim, is the oldest and most historic, and is from a Semitic source; the other, in which the name of God is Jehovah, is more philosophical, is used by the compiler of the book of Genesis to supplement the first, is more in the spirit of the Israelitish people, and originated probably in the times of Moses.

These traditions were at the latest written down by Moses, and in the times of Hezekiah were placed at the commencement of the narrative of the beginning of that people. The traditions of the antediluvian times were handed down by Abraham from an Aramæan source. The history of the creation is ideal, and the days of creation are not natural days, yet in the general succession of events there is a striking correspondence between it and the requirements of the nebular hypothesis of La Place, and the general results of geological research. The flood was local, confined to the central parts of Asia, which, before this catastrophe, were exceedingly fertile, though now waste. The Egyptian people passed over from the region of the Euphrates to the valley of the Nile before this event, indeed, some eleven thousand years before Christ, and retained no traditions of a deluge.* The ages of the antediluvian patriarchs are not historic, but are to be judged of according to the general method resorted to in adjusting oral traditions.

Some of the views of this writer on this and the kindred subjects of chronology are most extraordinary. Here, and in his book, "Egypt's Place in Universal History,"† he

* Band, V., pp. 19-35, 61, 62.

† Vol. IV., B. V., Part V., pp. 385-402.

considers that there is a double list of the antediluvian patriarchs. That which is commonly supposed to give the descendants of Adam through Cain, is only another form of that which gives his descendants through Seth. The latter came from an Aramæan source, the other from a Canaanitish. The so-called antediluvian generations are so many cycles, at the head of which the several persons, if persons they are, whose names are mentioned, stood as landmarks in the course of time. Very strangely, he considers the Seth of the one to be the same with the Jehovah Elohim of the other, and the Adam of one to be the same as the Enos of the other, for no other reason, that we can see, than because he has found Set as the name of a God in the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and because both Adam and Enosh, in the Hebrew, are names for man, and, in his view, are here the name, not of an individual, but of mankind. So the four hundred and thirty-eight years of Arphaksad, after the flood, is simply the time of the residence of Shem's, descendants in Arapakitis, and the four hundred and thirty-three years of Selah (Mission) is the period in which the race pushed forward their settlements. Only gradually did this number pass into the date of individual persons. These things belong to the ideal, rather than to the historic, just as the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil also do. We desire to know nothing of mystic numbers, whether they be astronomical or theosophico-cabalistic. We dare not come to the honest historical inquirer with facts which oppose natural science or philosophy. We leave to dogmatic Church theologians the sorry privilege of treating the Biblical narratives as if they were fables."

Others must judge whether this, or the theory that the duration of human life was reduced after the flood, is the true one—whether this or that is most consistent with what claims to be the Word of God. As we proceed upward from our own date, till we reach the period of

Abraham, we find the generations as they now are, and find him lamenting that his days were few and evil, and reached not unto the days of the years of his fathers. An evidence, this, if these narratives are in any way historic, that old age had come on Abraham far earlier than upon the generations that preceded him. And Bunsen fully admits that this Abraham lived in the strictly historic period.

But it is necessary that we possess ourselves of the chronological system which Bunsen advocates, that we may be able to conjecture the length of way these traditions, according to his scheme, have travelled. We find him, by means of the dynasties of Manetho, which Champollion, Wilkinson, Roscellini, Seyffarth, Nolan, Osburn, Prof. Rask, and Poole, bring into consistency with the Biblical chronology, placing Menes, the first historic king, often identified with Mizraim, three thousand six hundred and twenty-three years before Christ, or one thousand three hundred and thirty-three years before the Hebrew, and six hundred and twenty-five years before the Septuagint date of the deluge. The period of hereditary kings in Lower Egypt, ascends to 5414, B. C., of elective kings to 7230, B. C., or three thousand one hundred and twenty-nine years before the Mosaic date of Adam's creation. The birth of Abraham, he places in the year, 2927 B. C. In 2900, B. C., this patriarch withdraws, with his father, Terah, to the south-western part of Mesopotamia; in 2867, B. C., he migrates to Canaan. In the last half of the same century, his venerable form was seen at the court of the Pharaohs, where he appeared as the prudent Semite, the cautious husband of the beautiful Sarai, where he beheld the massive pyramids, some of which were erected five hundred years before, and witnessed those religious rites, which must have filled him with horror. Nearly half-way between Abraham and Christ, he places Moses and the exode, dating this in the year 1320, nearly two hundred

years later than the ordinary computation, and making the interval between Abraham and Moses one thousand five hundred years, instead of the three hundred and thirty which the Scriptures seem to give.

If we are surprised at this, we may look into his "Egypt's Place in Universal History,"* and behold the *aliquid immensum infinitumque*, with which this wonderful chronologist is all the while in travail. There we shall find "that the flood of Noah can not have taken place later than about ten thousand years before Christ, and could not have taken place much earlier," and that man existed upon the earth at least ten thousand years before that, or twenty thousand years before Christ. He assumes, in the first place, contrary to the tenor of the Scriptures, that the earliest state of man was that of barbarism. From the rise of the Romance languages of Southern Europe he learns that it requires five hundred years, or fifteen generations, for new languages to be formed. Again, he argues that it requires, in like manner, long periods for the various systems of Pagan religion to arise. The chapter on this subject is a wonderful specimen of German mist, "a darkness which might be felt." The results to which he comes are these: That in the first five thousand years of the world's history Primitive Language was formed, which was spoken with a rising or falling cadence; elucidated by gesture; accompanied by pure pictorial writing; every syllable a word, every word a substantive, representable by a picture. This language was deposited in Northern China, and Sinism arose. Religious conscience was polarized. Objective worship was addressed to the firmament, and subjective worship to the souls of parents. It was the manifestation of the divine in the family. Another thousand years passed away, and words were agglutinated, polysyllables were formed by unity of word-accent, particles

* Vol. IV., 475.

came into existence, and, finally, complete parts of speech. The germ of mythology was developed, language itself leading to it; the powers of nature became personified as divine forces. In the fourteenth millenium before Christ, stem words became roots, and derived words appeared. In the thirteenth, declension and conjugation, with affixes and suffixes, came into being. The twelfth brought symbolical hieroglyphics, representatives of ideas, without any phonetic element. Eleven thousand years before Christ, the phonetic element was introduced, and the ideo-graphic character was used to express a syllable, without reference to its original meaning. This stage of language in Egypt was owing to an immigration of West-Asiatic Shemites.

Behold the theory! Adam, of which Enos is the equivalent name, is humanity, and probably no person, though he is in the New Testament always spoken of as such, the head of the first covenant, as the personal Christ is of the second. The contest between Cain and Abel is there no contest, as Bunsen represents it, between the agriculturists and the shepherds, which lasted through a long cycle, but Abel is the man of faith, seeking expiation for sin, and offering a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, who had the religion only of nature. Enoch does not mark an epoch or cycle equalling the years ascribed to him, but is a man, the seventh in descent from Adam, who prophesied of the advent of the Lord. He admits this, but affirms that, even in the times of Solomon, the original traditions about Adam, Seth, Enos, Enoch, and others, had ceased to be understood. Language, too, in this theory, is a human invention, and not a divine endowment of the first man as he came perfect from the hand of his Creator. The idea of miracle in the confusion of tongues is indignantly rejected.* It is a providential event, interrupting the civil bond which united one common people. It is to be compared with that which gave

* Bibelwerk, V., 38.

rise to the five or six Romanic tongues, by the destruction of the Roman empire in Italy, France, Spain, and Wallacia. "The miracle of the confusion of tongues is an invention or myth of the moderns." The whole proceeds from the organism of man and the principle of development of the human mind. But, even if so, why these interminable ages for the formation of existing tongues. The substantial union of idioms which gave rise to the Romanic languages, must have been accomplished in one or two generations, for men who have always spoken, though it be different tongues, must continue to speak, and contrive to be understood. "The process of handing down languages through centuries, without break or loss," says Max Müller, an authority which Bunsen was wont to respect, "is possible only among people whose history runs on in one main stream. But no nucleus of society or civilization has ever been formed in the vast Turanian wildernesses. Empires were no sooner founded than they were scattered again, like the sand-clouds of the desert; no laws, no songs, no stories outlived the age of their authors. How quickly language can change if thus left to itself, without any standard, and kept up only by the daily wants of a savage life, may be seen by the endless variety of idioms in America, or on the borders of India, Thibet, and China. There it has happened that colonies from the same village, settled in neighboring vallies, have become mutually unintelligible after one or two generations. The peculiarities of a rising family may change the whole surface of a language, and the accent of a successful Khán may leave its stamp on the grammar of all the tribes that follow him. It is when a language is once fixed by literary works of a national character, that change becomes difficult, nay, impossible, without political convulsions." * The men of barbarous nations,

* Max Müller's *Survey of Languages*, pp. 87, 88, 93, 94. On the Turanian Languages.

while their languages were yet flexible, seem to have made word-building an amusement, and a high intellectual gratification. Hence the copiousness of forms, and the highly philosophical structure, of the dialects of some barbarous nations, of which scholars were unaware till our missionaries have made them known.* The process of the dropping of forms of declension and the shortening of words, is observable in our own English tongue; and the least inflected language may disclose a more modern state than one more inflected and more apparently artificial. All these states of language are found coexisting, and it is not always easy to show which exhibit the later stages of language, the polysyllabic, the dissyllabic, or the monosyllabic tongues. The argument from language utterly fails.

If the rise of languages does not require these almost countless ages, neither does the rise of Pagan Mythologies. Religious instincts exist in all men. If they do not like to retain God in their knowledge, He gives them over to a reprobate mind. Their decadence is rapid. They are eager in seeking out many inventions, and change the glory of the incorruptible God quickly into images made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Nor does the similarity of heathen superstitions prove their rites and worship to have been historically connected. There are but a few principles on which all pagan worship rests. The worship of heroes and benefactors, the adoration of the heavenly hosts, the deification of the powers of nature, or human passions, and the fear of demons, may give rise to rites among distant nations, in one and the same age; and these religions may have surprising coincidences, without any real connection one with another. Nor does the very welcome discovery of Mr. Horner, who, in boring at the foot of the colossal statue of Rameses the Second, brought up a fragment of

* Compare the Paradigm of the Verb in Wilson's Mpongue Grammar.

pottery from the depth of thirty-nine feet below the surface, which he regarded as evidence of the existence of man thirteen thousand three hundred and seventy-one years before 1854, which Bunsen has dwelt on with evident satisfaction, both in his "Bible Work" and in the preface to his third volume on Egypt, afford grounds for any such deduction. It could have fallen into some previous excavation or fissure; it could have been entangled with some floating timber, which the continual action of the water should have worked through great depths of slime, as it does the "sawyers" of the Mississippi. Rivers do not take counsel of men. Some times their eddies scoop out deep chasms in a few hours, to be again gradually filled, and some times the waters gently wanton around some imperishable substance, sinking for it a deep recess, or wearing away a profound grave for its burial.* How are any of these alleged proofs to be compared with the uniform testimony of Christ and the Apostles, as to the infallible testimony of Moses and the Prophets?

As to the Dynasties of Manetho, a portion of them, twenty-five thousand years, are by him assigned to the rule of Gods, Demigods, and Spirits. The five thousand years of the remainder were reduced by Manetho himself, according to Syncellus, to three thousand five hundred and fifty-five. Why? unless he suspected that many of them

* See a similar alleged fact in reference to the Mississippi River, referred to in Vol. IX. of this Review, p. 257. The Nile, like the Mississippi, some times changes its course. One thousand years ago it flowed hard by the present limits of Cairo, from which it now is a mile distant. Pottery might be found, probably, twenty feet below the present surface, where the old bed once was, deposited within the last one thousand years. At Sigiul, Mr. Horner says, the auger brought up burnt bricks and pottery from a depth of forty-five and fifty feet; and at Bessouse, from the depth of fifty-nine feet. Alas, for the argument! There is no structure of burnt brick in Egypt older than the Roman domination. The bricks and the pottery must have been deposited there since the Christian Era. See For. Quarterly, April, 1859, p. 232.

were contemporary. If his own faith was shaken in a portion, may he not, out of that desire to exalt his own nation, of which Egypt and other ancient nations afford so many examples, have left some doubtful points still remaining. Egypt was divided from the beginning into nomes, or districts. Heptanomis, the seven districts, is one of the names of Middle Egypt. It was customary in ancient times to call the sovereigns of very limited territories, kings. The kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Bela, five in number, had all together a domain, now covered by the Dead Sea, which could hardly exceed forty miles in length by eight in breadth. There was a time, mentioned in Herodotus, when a Dodekarchy reigned in Egypt, one of whom, Psammeticus, subdued the rest, and became sole monarch. The idea of contemporaneous sovereigns and dynasties belongs especially to Egypt. Kings, too, were often co-regent.* How, we ask, is it possible that the knowledge of Germany should be unknown to France? And how was it possible that the Jews, an intelligent people, living now in Egypt, and always on its confines, should not know of a discrepancy between the chronology of the two nations, if such truly existed? How could Moses, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, have permitted his countrymen to be so ignorant of what he must have himself known. Or how could he have imposed a false chronology upon them if he had desired? Especially, if a rectification of the current Hebrew chronology was attempted in the Greek version, prepared for the library of Ptolemy, why should the figures in that copy reach no higher? After reviewing the reasonings of Bun-

* This idea of contemporary dynasties was adopted by Eusebius, and is received by most modern Egyptologists. The able writer in the *Foreign Quarterly* rejects it. He puts an end, however, to the credibility of the *Manethonic Dynasties*, as handed down to us, claims that they are full of irreconcilable inconsistencies, and annihilates the entire chronological argument of Bunsen.

sen and Lepsius on the Manethonic Dynasties, Kurtz holds that, "in a scientific point of view, we are warranted in abiding by that Biblical chronology, the trustworthiness of which has not yet been shaken by any doubts cast upon it." To the same result have Rawlinson and Delitzsch both arrived.

After this long, but somewhat necessary digression, we return to Bunsen's idea of the authorship of the five books of Moses. As to the materials out of which they are composed, he finds—1. Genealogical registers, or pedigrees; 2. Brief memoranda, appended to these, or detached from them; 3. Songs or hymns in commemoration of great events; and, 4. Detailed narratives. The distinction between the historian, the collections, and the documents, (or original traditions,) must, he says, be preserved throughout. There is no reason to suppose more than one real author. That is, before the author of our four first books of the Law, there was no book of Genesis, nor of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. Yet this one author found before him more than one collection, both of songs and genealogies, and these collections, so far as they related to the days of Moses, are already written down. On the contrary, in relation to the ante-Mosaic period, and especially that of the origines, we find the traces of an originally oral tradition, which can only be referred to Abraham and his descendants of the next five or six generations, who have handed it down. The true author of the books could not have lived earlier than the reign of Hezekiah. The book of Deuteronomy, which Delitzsch makes the oldest, is wholly post-Mosaic, and was written in the last years of Hezekiah. Such are the conclusions of Chevalier Bunsen, which he has brought no new arguments to establish, none but what Hengstenberg and Hävernick had before considered and abundantly refuted, as we have shown in an early volume of this Review.

However high the inspiration he may give to Moses himself, the facts of those early histories, according to Bunsen, were handed down, in part, by a varying and uncertain tradition, or clothed in the garb of poetry. The narrator, who lived in the reign of Hezekiah, and "who was a man of wisdom and learning," gives with unmistakable honesty what he found lying before him at that time. But whether this is to be literally received, is another question. The popular tradition represented Pharaoh as drowned in the Red Sea. But Menephtha, whom he makes to be the monarch then reigning, did not thus die, but lived ingloriously fifteen years longer. Nor did the waves stand upright as an heap on either hand. All is founded in popular error. The fact of the case was, Palestinians, or a Bedouin host, perhaps instigated by Jethro, invaded the country, and the great Sicilian vespers took place, in which Asia took her revenge on Africa. These were the messengers of the Lord, who slew all the first-born, even in the king's palace. The exode then occurred. A body of troops were dispatched to attack the retiring multitude. These perished in the waves, but Menephtha himself fled with his son, then five years of age, to Ethiopia, and returned again thirteen years afterwards." *

These declarations we can not stop to refute. We can only say that the whole of this identification rests entirely on conjecture, and only shows how slight is the author's reluctance to go directly counter to the Scriptures. If Bunsen's speculations as to chronology are at all wrong, he will not be likely to fall on the name of the monarch then ruling in Egypt. Osborn makes him to have been Sethos the Second, who was an idle and profligate prince, who suddenly disappears from history, whose name appears on the face of his tomb, which was begun, and left unfinished, by him, and whose memory was consigned to infamy and

* *Egypt's Place*, IV., 558. *Bibelwerk*, V., 141, *et seq.*

oblivion by his subjects.* A writer in a contemporary journal identifies him with Thothmes the Second, predecessor of Thothmes the Third, of whom there remain "almost auto-biographical inscriptions at Karnak," recently deciphered by Brugsch, fixing the date of his accession, and of course of the death of his predecessor, in coincidence with the period of the exode, and of the drowning of Pharaoh in the Red Sea.† Both these can not be true, but either of them is as much entitled to be received on monumental and historic grounds as that of Bunsen, and neither comes in conflict with Scripture.

The Israelites are said to have wandered forty years in the wilderness, and to have eaten manna that length of time, and our Saviour speaks of this manna as *bread from heaven*.‡ But Bunsen says the forty years was the time between the exode and the passage of the Jordan, thirty-seven or thirty-eight years of this time being spent quietly on the east-Jordanic side of Palestine. The manna was local, and for a single season, the product of the Tarfah bush, found only in the Wady Pharan, and the account of its preservation over the Sabbath, and not on other days, belongs to popular poetry.§ And yet the manna of the Tarfah or Tamarisk exudes at the puncture of an insect, does not become rancid and breed worms, may be spread like butter or honey, but can not be ground in a mill, nor pounded in a mortar, nor made into bread, like the manna of the Israelites. It is produced by the labors of "lice and chafers," and can not be the "bread from heaven," nor the "angels' food," of which the children of Israel partook.

The Apostle Peter says that Balaam was rebuked for his iniquity; the dumb ass "speaking with man's voice, forbade the madness of the Prophet." But the Prussian Am-

* Monumental Hist. of Egypt, II., p. 594, *et seq.*

† British Quarterly, October, 1860.

‡ Num. 14 : 33 ; 32 : 13 ; Exod. 16 : 35 ; Neh. 9 : 21 ; John 6 : 32.

§ Bibelwerk, V., 160, 161.

bassador says this is a great mistake. The ass shied and fell under the Prophet's blows, like any other poor beast. The rest all passed in the thoughts and accusing voice of the Prophet. Paul says the Israelites did all drink of that same miraculous rock; and the idea is found in various places of Scripture. The Chevalier Bunsen says, No. The writer in Hezekiah's time honestly thought so, for so the popular tradition, five hundred years after the facts, incorrectly reported. As to the repetition of the act in Kadesh, (Numbers xx : 8, 12,) the account is obscure and perplexed; all that can be authentic is the discovery and opening of a spring situated in the rocks of Kadesh. Yet the "waters of Massah and Meribah" are echoed and reëchoed throughout the Old Testament.

In like manner he speaks of Elijah. He was the most highly gifted and holy man of the heroic age, the only one of them, indeed, whose life did not end as a tragedy. His departure was not a sun-set, but a transfiguration. Yet, not the apotheosis which is believed. The whole narrative of his life is a popular epic from beginning to end, a legend, but not a myth. The historicalness of his life and personality is, says our author, not thereby endangered. Nothing but boundless ignorance, fool-hardy hypocrisy, or weak-headed fanaticism, can demand the faith of the Church for such a miracle as a historic truth. It is evident, from the narrative, that his disciples, more than a hundred in number, had a presentiment of their master's determination to separate himself from them, without a formal adieu, never to return. Elijah had already often lived apart from them in the wilderness of Judah and Arabia, as well as under the protection of the Sidonian republic, quite alone. He had, in the heights of Horeb, seen the Eternal. There, or in some other quiet spot, he sought, renouncing all earthly strife and passion, the life of God. An animated eulogium of his beloved disciple, Elisha, on his departing master, spread among the people: 'My

Father! My Father! The chariot of Israel and horsemen thereof!' The defence, *i. e.*, and the glory and honor of thy people! Does not this truly historic expression, with the promise made to Elisha, that if he should see him when he should be taken away from him, he should receive a double portion of his spirit, shine through and explain the legend? 'And it came to pass, as they still went on and talked, that behold! there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up, by a whirlwind, into heaven.'"

But we withhold our hand from any further introduction of these exegetical feats of our learned author, as extraordinary in their boldness as they are trifling and godless in their spirit. The author himself acknowledges, in reference to this last conjecture, about the translation of Elijah, that we need some objective statements of a chronological character, to justify the view of the epic (?) records respecting that prophet, and some critical apparatus by which to subject the story of his translation to the test of a historical criticism. We agree with him. He does, in truth, need some kind of apparatus. He seems to us to be working in the very fire, and wearying himself for very vanity. If there is a supernatural revelation, it should be sustained by supernatural testimony, and may be expected to record things beyond the regular succession of natural events.

We will only here say, that the same destructive criticism which Bunsen has applied to the Pentateuch, he has also applied to the books which immediately succeed them. He says, 1. That we have contemporary records for many points of the internal and external history of the seven centuries, from Moses to the downfall of the kingdom; 2. These documents are partly historical, partly poetical—statistical notes, or songs and proverbs; 3. Some of these have been wrought over, and others retained in their original form. The last go back to the passage of the Jordan, or

even to the year 1280 B. C. ; 4. Oral tradition has been written down, some times soon after the events, some times by later collectors and the historian to whom these books owe their present form ; 5. The writer of the histories of the last times of the monarchy, can not be earlier than the second half of the captivity, yet lived before Ezra ; 6. The preceding books are earlier, but Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, bear traces of a later hand. If, now, it be inquired if these naratives in general are authentically historic, and if the authentic portion can be distinguished from that which proceeds from popular tradition, he answers in the affirmative. He says, however, that they are only in a small portion strictly historical. The chasms in the history are numerous, much which has the historic form belongs to the realm of the ideal, and we possess, for the times before the exile, only late, and, in great part, legendary accounts, and later ideas are borne over into the earlier narratives. To the inquiry, whether these different materials do not unite, in the principal points of the narrative, into a harmonious historical form, though the tradition is not exact and complete, he answers affirmatively. We can separate the authentic documentary portions, and they are more important, especially for the earliest times, than is commonly allowed. The book of Joshua is composed, 1. Of contemporary documents, being historical records, purely authentic ; 2. Of very ancient popular songs relating to isolated expeditions ; 3. Of a traditionary narrative which was reduced to writing before David. Samuel and his prophetic school wrote down, probably, these oral traditions. The final Reducteur lived in the times of the captivity, or soon after. The book of Judges has the same elements, substantially authentic, but partly historico-epic, and received its final form in the times of the later kings. The two books of Samuel are founded upon the traditions which proceeded from the school of the prophets over which he presided, but obtained their final form in the

days of Hezekiah, or soon after. He was, in some respects, a second Moses. The maintenance and restoration of the Law Moses gave, was his life-long effort. He is the preserver of the original documents, which assumed their present form four centuries and a half later. He preserved, also, the memory of the words and deeds of the old prophets, and to his school we owe the preservation, in general, of those sources whence the books of Joshua and Judges afterwards came. In his day, the Scriptures we now have did not, in any proper sense, exist. Neither the men of God of a former time composed any thing, nor Samuel himself. But the collections of the school over which he presided furnish the ground-work of the first portion of the former prophets. The two books of Kings were composed during the exile whose thirty-seventh year is named in the history of Joachim. Chronicles was written after the book of Ezra, but before the Maccabean age. The book of Ecclesiastes was written under the Persian rule. It is an open question whether the book of Daniel was written in the times of Nebuchadnezzar, or in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, about 169 B. C. *

We confess ourselves wearied by the greatness of the way over which this German philosopher and statesman has carried us. And lest we should, on our part, weary others, we will make no attempt to discuss the points involved in the immediately preceding statements. Though his work on the Scriptures is yet imperfect, and the part already published contains his views only on a part of the Old Testament, we can judge of the Hercules from the foot now exposed to us. With all Chevalier Bunsen's professed regard for religion, he assumes, with other Rationalists, a most scornful air towards the clergy; those, we presume, who oppose him, who wonder at his pompous intrusion into their own domain, at his contemptuous sneers at any

* Band, V., *Bibelurkunden*, pp. 475-555.

who differ with him, at his claim to immense superiority of learning, at his disposition to hustle them out of the temple of theological science, and to take possession of it himself. Shall they dare to contest these matters of chronology with this hierophant of the mysteries of Egypt, to whom the hieroglyphics yield up their secrets, and who can tell so well how many milleniums it took before a man out of a noun could manufacture a verb, and how many more it required to learn how to attach terminations of gender, number and person. How superior this mighty man to that clergy who "fabricate even historic truth, who strenuously exert themselves to destroy historical science where ever it is possible, in order to bring us back to the dark ages," whose worship is "a dogmatizing Bibliolatry," who use "their Bible as a cloak for indolence and want of reflection," who, "from cowardice or superstition," maintain still the great length of the antediluvian generations, who make the Bible "the fig-leaf of ignorance and indolence." All these things it is reserved for German research to set right. They are the people! endued with the gift of clairvoyance, if not into the future, yet into the past, and the Prussian Ambassador the most clairvoyant of them all. And yet we seem to hear a mighty voice out of the whirlwind, saying to all this, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding."

We can only very briefly indicate our reasons for still entertaining the traditional faith of the Church respecting the Scriptures. With the same force of reasoning might the theory of Eichorn, that the four Gospels came gradually into existence, and were received and pronounced upon by the Church at the close of the second century, and not before, be propounded as a matter of fact, as the theory of Bunsen and his predecessors of the skeptical school has

been in reference to the books of the Old Testament. He has, however, condescended to say that the Gospel of John is no myth, no invention of the later Gnostics; that there is a historical Christ, and that if there were not, all Christian faith were a delusion, our creed hypocrisy, our worship a juggle, and the Reformation a crime or a mistake. If the Christian Scriptures are indeed to be received, then are the Jewish to be received also. The quotations from the Old Testament in the New, count by hundreds; the allusions by many hundreds more. The views of Christ and the Apostles can not be mistaken. They held the men who wrote these Scriptures, and not merely the men of whom they wrote, to be inspired. The writing itself is inspired by the Holy Ghost, and is an infallible record. It is not the jotting down, however faithful, of popular tradition and legendary story, which one is to receive or not, as he pleases. But with these men, "Thus saith the Scripture," is the authoritative decision that settles all. *Ἡ γραφή λέγει*, and *τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει*, "The Scripture saith," and "The Spirit saith," are terms of equal value. Ninety of these direct quotations are from the Pentateuch, and there are one hundred references to it besides. In many of these Moses is spoken of as the author, and not simply as the one whose history is given, in the Book. "When Moses is read," says Paul; "Moses describeth the righteousness of the Law;" "We have found him of whom Moses did write." "MOSES wrote," says the Saviour, and not the compiler in Hezekiah's day, "if a man's brother die," etc. This which he thus wrote stood then, as now, at the beginning of the Scriptures. "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." The Scripture thus written was *θεοπνευστος*, inspired of God; the men who wrote it were moved by the Holy Ghost, and were "in the Spirit," in his power and under his influence, which penetrated, stirred and guided the whole powers of the writer. If this is Bibliolatry, *venia sit verbo*, the Master

and the servants were Bibliolaters alike. If this was narrow Judaic superstition, mechanical inspiration, theological pharasaism, let us be content to share the reproach with Machtspruch, and the Lord and His disciples. There are two reasons why inspiration extends to the words, if it is in any respect plenary and sufficient to render the Scripture a rule to man. In the first place, in man's present state the *λόγος* of speech stands over against the *λόγος* of reason, and the suggestion of the thought brings also the word which expresses it, and the one is thus married to the other. And then, in practice, we find in a single word, oft-times, volumes of precious truth, which in our meditations we never exhaust, which would be wanting if the word was wanting, or different from what it is. This is an argument for verbal inspiration, and for closeness of translation, when translation is resorted to for popular use. If recourse may be had to rationalistic interpretation in matters of fact, so also in matters of doctrine, and "the precious things of Scripture" fade out before this destructive process.

The reason expressly given by Josephus why the Jewish writings subsequent to Artaxerxes were no part of the Canon, was, that they were uninspired, and that the succession of prophets had ceased. This was the common view of his nation, who were appointed by God as the receivers and conservators of the documents of our faith, till the time should come when they should pass over from one tribe of the family of Shem, to the tents of Ham and the dwellings of Japheth. We may take our station where we will in the Old Testament history, in the times subsequent to Moses, and the Codex of the Thora is already in existence. It regulates the worship, controls the customs, is the basis of all judicial decisions, sends its influence over social and domestic life, and is expected to control all parties, from the king on the throne to the slave that toils in the field or bears the sandals of his master. It is referred to, as to its substance, from Malachi to the times

of the Judges, and the division of Canaan itself was made by Joshua, his immediate successor, in accordance with predictions found recorded in Genesis. In the references to the Mosaic Law in this post-Mosaic literature, the expression often is shaped according to the words we now find written. In all the legislation found in these books there is nothing post-Mosaic, the brief expressions which indicate a later hand are, with the exception of Deut. xxxiv., unimportant, and are added for explanation, and added previous to the time when inspiration had ceased. The number of them, too, is diminished by a just interpretation, which rescues them from the hands of an unbelieving criticism, that dictates and will not learn, that prescribes what must be, and receives not what is. When you approach the writings of the Scriptures in a different direction, Genesis is the root of the tree of Revelation, "the anticipation," says Delitzsch, "of The Law, the Law the anticipation of the Old Testament, the Old Testament of the religion of redemption, redemption of the world of the present and its history—upon the pillars of this Book rests the edifice of our salvation, which reaches upward and forward into eternity." A meet and fitting outline and adumbration is it of the good things to come, a needed introduction to the whole system of divine revelation, without which the rest would be scarcely understood. It solves the greatest questions which lie at the foundation of all religion and all human history, and if we had it not, there would be a great chasm felt in all human knowledge. The future history of the Church and man would be like a river without a spring-head, a castle hung in the sky, without a foundation.

Whether the writer of Genesis was the first to reduce to writing the primeval history, and the story of the creation, and was informed of these things by a species of supernatural intuition akin to the prophetic, yet looking backward, or found in existence more ancient records from

patriarchal pens, is a matter not of prime importance as to the authority of this Book. It is necessary, absolutely, to this authority that the writer who penned it in the form we have it, should be inspired, not by an ordinary indwelling of the Spirit, but by that extraordinary guidance ascribed in the Scriptures to Apostles and prophets, and which operated in its highest power on the human mind of the man of Nazareth, who was also the divine author of our salvation.

Bunsen is another, added to the numerous class of German scholars, who have handled these topics of sacred history substantially in the same form. To the *document hypothesis*, broached by Ilgen in 1798, has succeeded the *fragment hypothesis* of Valer, in 1805, the *supplement hypothesis* of Tuch, in 1838, advocated also by Knobel, and to which Delitzsch, more lately, in a different spirit, and with high views of inspiration, has given a modified assent; and the *christalization hypothesis* of Ewald, as Delitzsch calls it, which supposes four authors, whose works have been incorporated by a fifth, into their present form. To these has succeeded that of Vaihinger, proposed in Herzog's *Cyclopedia*, with his three sources, the *Præ Elohist*, the *Elohist*, and the *Jehovist*, each supplementing the other.

Our space will not permit us to dwell longer on these points. An ingenious man can propound theories which it would require volumes to overthrow. If proposed with the ability and learning of a Tuch and an Ewald, they will have weight with many who will give heed to the most inconsistent fables. Learning can be lavished on theories the most baseless. It was in a book replete with knowledge that Lord Mouboddo, no mean lawyer and judge, extolled the blessings of savage over civilized life, and put forth his notion that man is only a monkey bereft of his tail.

Bunsen appears to have been a man of a genial nature,
VOL. XIV., NO. I.—17

and of generous impulses, and to have numbered many Christian men among his friends. It is the more to be regretted that his unsafe speculations, his arbitrary reasoning and his dogmatism should shake the confidence in his soundness and ingenuousness of those who revered him while living. He was social, accessible, cheerful and enthusiastic, and won the good will of many with whom he came in contact. But more and more, as the labors of his life have approached their termination, has it been perceived how far he was overstepping the boundaries of truth, and on what inadequate and fanciful grounds he was willing to confound all the records of the past. In proportion to the grief of these friends, has been the triumph of skeptical and latitudinarian men, who have solaced themselves with the accession of this new name, as they have supposed, to their own ranks. His friend, Pressensé, who acknowledges the unhappy direction his speculations have taken, says, in his defence, that "he traversed the great theological crisis of the times, and was affected by it in many of his opinions. His only desire was, as he often said, to throw a bridge between contemporary thought, tormented with many doubts, and Christianity. It mattered little to him whether the bridge stood or was broken, provided a safe passage was effected to the other bank." But there will always be those who will need to pass over, and broken bridges are in the way, and give no relief. He has, we fear, been a most unfortunate architect. The bridge of Languages has failed; the bridge of Mythologies has broken down; the bridge of the Antediluvian Generations has been found unsound; the bridge of the Manethonic Dynasties has given signs of dissolution, and is condemned by wise master-builders; the bridge of the Historical Epos is floating off; and there remains but the cloud-phantom of an inspiration, in which nothing is communicated, and nothing rendered sure, but the whole

record is blurred with harmful blots, marred with human weakness, and divested of all that was thought divine. So far as he shall be instrumental in conveying to the minds of the common people these unbelieving thoughts respecting the Word of God, his life of labor will bear evil fruit, "the grapes of Sodom and the clusters of Gomorrah."

Yet, as we have ever been reluctant to say how much ignorance in the lowly may yet be compatible with salvation, so we are afraid to say how much mistake and error and vain speculation may exist in the intelligent and exalted, and God yet own them as his. There have been some words of controversy respecting the death-bed scenes of this distinguished man. Some have been unable to understand how such error of the head could coexist with such apparent piety of the heart. Some have considered that to the aspiring philosopher there might be two realms of thought, one the region of speculation, the other of emotion, and that the heart may be true when the intellect goes far astray. Others are unwilling to allow this *dichotomy* of our moral nature, and suppose that by the grace of God he was raised in his last days out of the trammels of his system, restored to the simple faith in which he was reared in childhood, and brought to exercise a humble trust in Christ as a Saviour. A more unfriendly opinion than either has also been entertained. As we have said so much in condemnation, we will, as an act of justice, permit his friend, who seems to be clothed with authority to do so, to speak of the closing hours of his long life.

M. Pressensé describes the charm of Bunsen's conversation on his last visit to Paris: "So rich, so intellectual, and so cordial, all penetrated with that religious salt whose pungent savor none can imitate," and his whole person "so full of moral youth under his crown of white hair." He speaks, also, with much tenderness of his last hours: "M. de Bunsen desired the prolongation of his existence

till he should terminate the labors he had commenced. One night he perceived that such was not the will of God, and he lifted himself from his chair, crying 'O God, I commit my spirit into thy hands.' He then caused all his family to approach, and said to them, 'A great change has taken place in my thoughts, not as to my immortal soul, nor as to Christ, my only Saviour, but in regard to my body.' Having blessed his children, and expressed his grateful affection for the faithful companion of his life, in the most touching terms, saying that he had loved in her that which is eternal, (*In dir liebte ich das Ewige,*) 'O God!' he cried, 'be pleased to bless my friends! May my country be blessed, and Italy and her liberty! May Prussia, Germany, England, the entire world, be blessed! I desire every benediction to the Prince and Princess of Prussia! Gratitude for Niebuhr.'" Niebuhr had introduced M. de Bunsen into the career which he so worthily filled. After he had thanked his domestic with the truest affection, with a heavenly expression on his countenance, he thus resumed: "In spite of all my weaknesses and my sufferings, I have desired, I have sought, that which is noble here below! But my most delightful experience is to have known Jesus Christ. I quit this world without hatred to any person—no, not hatred, hate is accursed! Oh, how good to contemplate this exalted life! We know now what an obscure existence we have led on the earth. Above! Above! It is dark no longer, but brighter and brighter always! I am now in the kingdom of God. Till now it was but a foretaste. O, my God, how lovely are thy tabernacles!"

The 29th of October, as they pointed out to him the radiant sunset—"Yes," said he, in English, "it is beautiful, the love of God is in every thing." "May God bless you for ever," said he, in French. "Let us part in Christ Jesus. God is life, is love, the love which wills, the will that loves,

(*Wollendes Lieben, liebendes Wollen*). *Christus recognoscitur victor, Christus est, Christus est victor*. For him to be is to conquer. There is no death with God. I see Christ and I see God through Christ." * * * * "All the rest is nothing. Christ is the Son of God, and we are the children of God only when the spirit of love which was in Christ is in us."

"Such," says Pressensé, "was the last word of this long and brilliant life. To love God in Christ is every thing, the rest is nothing. Behold the theology of the death-bed, behold the science of the Christian's last agony!"

May we trust that his spirit has now gone where there is no darkness at all; where the errors, and the ambitious, trifling, and unfruitful studies of earth are laid aside; where nothing exists but light, truth and love? "His funeral obsequies were affecting and appropriate. His coffin was borne first by his sons, then by the students of the University of Bonn, covered with garlands of flowers, after the German custom, and accompanied by all the town, with the solemn sounds of those songs of his nation, which he had loved so well. The pastor, who had administered the communion to him some days before, pronounced over his open grave the words of eternal life, and they retired, saying that Germany had lost a great citizen, science one of its most eminent representatives, and the Church a fervent Christian, who died confessing his faith in Christ." Such is the touching narrative of his last hours, given by Pressensé in the *Revue Chrétienne* of December last.

ARTICLE VI.

A VINDICATION OF SECESSION AND THE SOUTH.

Discourse delivered by REV. DR. R. J. BRECKINRIDGE, on the day of National Humiliation, January 4th, 1861, at Lexington, Ky.

Our Country: its Peril, and its Deliverance. From advance sheets of the Danville Quarterly Review for March, 1861. By the REV. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Danville Theological Seminary.

Perhaps no writer in the Presbyterian Church is more entitled to a respectful hearing upon the questions which now agitate and divide the country, than the author of the two pamphlets whose titles are given above. The studies and pursuits of his early manhood were precisely such as to acquaint him with the subjects involved; while his great intellect, which has never faltered in any investigation, is fully competent to grasp the nature of parties, to expound the principles upon which they are formed, and to depict the results to which they naturally tend. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Danville Quarterly should signalize its advent into the circle of periodical literature by an elaborate political essay from the pen of its most distinguished editor, nor that this production should be selected and sent forth as an *avant courier* to herald its approach. When, too, the newspaper press announced the topics through which the discussion would range, public expectation was raised on tiptoe, prepared for a disquisition very far above the ordinary level of political harangues. Under an arrangement of subjects at once philosophical and exhaustive, such a thinker as Dr. Breckinridge might, if any

one could, offer a solution of existing political problems. Considering, further, the position of Kentucky in the struggle now pending, one could not but be curious to see the middle ground which Danville should occupy between Princeton and Columbia; between the defence of Black Republicanism, on the one hand, and the advocacy of Secession on the other. It would be unjust to say that these anticipations have been wholly disappointed; for upon every page the characteristics of the author's mind are clearly impressed. Of no living writer can it be said with more emphasis, in the language of Milton, that his books "preserve as in a vial the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them." Yet, after all, we are constrained to say that, viewing it as a whole, we have laid this pamphlet down, after a third perusal, with a feeling of disappointment raised to the third degree. As a great State paper, explaining either the way by which the country has become involved in its present entanglements, or solving the method of its extrication, it falls immeasurably below what might have been expected from the source whence it is derived. Aside from the glittering generalities in which it abounds, and uncovered of the dogmatism in which it is enveloped, it simply revives, in its boldest and most offensive form, the doctrine of a consolidated nationality held by the old Federalists; and proceeds, upon this view, to counsel the Government at Washington, temperately, but with parental firmness, to chasten into submission seven refractory sovereignties! We can imagine the smile stealing over the visage of some experienced statesman at the temerity with which this exploded political heresy is revived; and at the coolness with which the opposite theory is ignored, which, nevertheless, has generally prevailed through the history of American legislation to the present time. When so fertile a mind as that of this eminent Divine can suggest nothing to meet the exigencies of the

Union but what is contained in this pamphlet, it is fair to conclude the bottom of the argument on that side to be reached. And if a decisive proof is required to show the necessity of the great revolution which has taken place at the South, it is furnished in this final argument, which constructs for the whole country a despotism as overwhelming and hopeless as any which has bowed down and broken the spirit of man in any age or portion of the world.

We shall endeavor to make these positions good in the following pages. Dr. Breckinridge is too old a polemic to hope, in a time of deep agitation, like the present, that any *ex cathedra* pronouncement of his opinions can shield them from scrutiny. He may rest assured, however, that no expression shall consciously fall from this pen, inconsistent with that profound respect in which his genius and reputation have been held by the writer for more than twenty years.

In order that the reader may be able to judge of the fairness and sufficiency of this rejoinder, it will be necessary to present an analysis of the pamphlet under review. Like a true philosopher, Dr. Breckinridge begins with the beginning. In tracing the perils of the country, he can of course rise no higher than to the "spirit of anarchy," of which they are all begotten; which is accordingly made the *first* of his five divisions. This spirit of anarchy commenced with the Abolition party; existing only as a fanaticism, from which it speedily rose to the dignity of a State principle, in the liberty bills which were afterwards enacted—mounting at length to the highest national importance, by dividing the whole nation into two opposite parties—and, finally, upon Mr. Lincoln's election, reaching its consummation in the secession of seven States from the Federal Union. Amidst this chaos, the author proceeds, in his *second* leading division, to consider whether there remains

any ground for hope and effort. From a number of facts rapidly grouped together, such as that a large minority in the North is thoroughly opposed to the distinctive principles of the Republican party, that many who voted for Mr. Lincoln, are far more Whigs and Americans than Republicans, that many Republicans themselves are patriotic men, who, upon any clear issue, will not hesitate to sacrifice their party to their country; from these facts, he infers a speedy and certain revolution in the Northern mind, which will sweep from power the anarchists who have brought the country to the verge of ruin. In like manner, assuming that the secession of the Cotton States has not been, as to the popular masses, either spontaneous or cordial, but the result of an organized conspiracy, which has hurried those States along by a sudden and irresistible current of opinion, he predicts a corresponding reaction at the South; so that if the border slave States shall remain steadfast in their loyalty to the Union, "the secession movement must prove a failure, both as to its avowed and as to any concealed object." To guard against the defection of these, certain "immense considerations" are presented; in the statement of which we have a very distinct enunciation of the author's Federal creed. This argument is enforced by the two additional considerations, that "this blind and fierce spirit of anarchy" is "in frightful antagonism to the total civilization of the age," as well as to "the dominion and purpose of God over and concerning our country," which is neither, on the one hand, that slavery should be extinguished, nor, on the other, that it should be perpetuated. So endeth the second lesson.

The question of negro slavery being the occasion, at least, if not the cause, of these commotions, it becomes necessary, in the *third* chapter, to consider whether any view of it can be presented, upon which the whole country should harmonize. "It may be discussed in the light

of divine revelation, or in the light of the law of nature, or in the light of the political and municipal institutions of the countries where it exists." In this last aspect, the author affirms "there ought to be no dispute concerning it," it being strictly a domestic institution, with which no State nor the General Government may interfere in any wise—every plea to the contrary being immoral in itself, and revolutionary in its tendency.

As regards the law of nature, the grand difficulty occurs of interpreting its utterances, as made by the *human reason*, by the *common impulses of the human soul*, by the *common opinion and belief of the race*, and by the *actual execution of the law*, in the common state of that race in all ages. But "human reason," the author concludes, "lands the problem very nearly in a paradox." The common impulse of the soul towards freedom "is no evidence that restraint is wrong," and "fails of proving that they who cherish it would do aught but mischief," if it were universally gratified. If, again, "it was the common belief of the race, that servitude was contrary to the nature of man, then the race had before it always, in the actual condition of a larger part, the clearest proof that the belief was absurd." And finally, the testimony from the actual execution of the law is frightful and universal, to wit: that "all, every where, have felt themselves to be naturally impelled to reduce each other into a condition of subjection." From these confused and perhaps "contradictory utterances," it only remains to turn to "the Word of God, where this great problem is completely solved." In the light of this Book, Dr. Breckinridge considers "human servitude, in all its forms, as one of the badges of the fallen condition of the human race," and incident to man in a state of probationary discipline as a sinner. Like war and sickness, and sorrow and poverty, and pain and affliction, which are evils incident to man's fallen state, and often sanctified and

converted into blessings, so servitude exists "because our condition is just what it is, a condition of sin and misery in a state of probation," and "utterly incapable of being permanently and universally abolished, while this state of sin and misery continues attended with probation." "Throughout the total revelation which God has made to man, under the dispensations of Abraham, of Moses, and of Christ, embracing human servitude as it is, Abrahamic, Jewish, Christian and heathen—and the heathen aspect of it presented in every nation of antiquity, Asiatic, African and European; in not a single instance is it represented as a thing good in itself, or as a thing sinful in itself, but always as a thing actually existing, always to be expected, allowed by God, considered and treated in His law, regulated by His providence, wholly indifferent as concerning His grace, and to enter into our final account with Him, both as we may be masters and as we may be servants." The final inference is, that God's Word, being the only source from which a positive and safe judgment can be formed, "condemns all the pretexts concerning negro slavery, whether at the North or the South, upon which the public mind has been lashed into madness."

Plainly, if these conclusions shall be universally accepted, there is no reason why the question of slavery should destroy the integrity of the country. The way is then open for the author, in his *fourth* section, to submit a project for an *amicable settlement*.

Believing the Federal Constitution to recognize property in slaves, and to provide for the return of such as escape from service, and firmly persuaded of the equality of the States in the Union, and especially as that bears upon the question of slavery in the Territories, these two points offer a clear basis for this settlement. In what practicable form this common right to a common property shall be recognized, is rather intimated than formally expressed.

But as all the Territories can not be made wholly free, nor wholly slave, without a dissolution of the Union, no alternative remains but an equitable division of the common domain, founded upon the recognition of a common inheritance.

As, however, the concession of both these points must be made by the North, which has the numerical majority, what hope is there of inducing her to consent to the same in the face of the Personal Liberty Bills passed in many of the States, and in opposition to the dogma upon which Mr. Lincoln comes into power, the repression of slavery within the Territories? The considerations which Dr. Breckinridge urges to induce the acceptance of these terms, are as follows: "That with the North the whole affair is a sentiment, an opinion—that she has not one dollar of estate at stake—not one dollar of income directly dependent on slavery; with her, slavery has no necessary bearing upon the social, economical, personal or political condition of any State or individual; and, finally, as this nation was once composed exclusively of slave States, every consideration of decency and good faith obliges her to be more, instead of less, observant of the duties she owes to those who remain in the condition once common to all." On these points the contrast is so great between her position and that of the South, that "the whole feeling of loyalty to the Union in the South, is connected with an abiding confidence that the North will act as becomes her in this emergency." He plainly intimates that only by such concessions can "the secession pestilence" be arrested, and that "upon these two points public opinion in the slave States which have not seceded, is struggling at this moment." Such, then, is the balance in which this amicable settlement is now suspended.

Nothing remains for the author to discuss, under his *fifth* head, but the duty of the Government at Washington in

relation to secession. Having assumed that this is a consolidated nation, secession comes to be denounced as sedition, anarchy and rebellion, which must be crushed by the central authority. "By the express terms, as well by the very nature of the Federal Constitution, a secession ordinance in the South is as totally void as a personal liberty law in the North can possibly be." "There was no more legal necessity, nor any more logical consistency, in diatribes about lack of power to *coerce a State*, in one case than in the other." The doctrine that the people of a State are citizens of the United States only through its own Constitution and Government, is pronounced a political falsehood, and the power is declared complete to execute the laws of the United States upon *every citizen of the United States*, where ever found. He declares it "sheer folly to weaken the posture of the General Government towards the secession movement;" and is accordingly very severe upon those at the North who have united in protests against coercion, as all this but tends to "avert the coming reaction which may save the country." His deliberate counsel, therefore, is, in this great emergency, that the General Government shall steadily but temperately enforce the laws, postal, revenue, and every other, in all the seceding States, in utter disregard of all the ordinances these latter may have enacted, avoiding armed collision, except in repelling force by force. By this policy, to which he denies the term coercion, the voice that has not yet been heard, and the hand that has not yet been lifted—even the voice and the hand of this *great nation*—will be raised to restore the old Union to its former integrity.

We have thus presented a fair but condensed summary of the pamphlet under review. Without following the ramifications of the argument, or taking up many valuable side thoughts, by which it is enforced—which, with so terse and suggestive a writer, would require the transcription of

the entire essay—we have faithfully followed the main track of thought from beginning to end. As the reader may have perceived, there is not a single new suggestion—not a single principle—which, however ably put by the writer, has not been presented fifty times before. Indeed, his argument has no value except as addressed to the border States, dissuading them from being drawn into the vortex of secession, or as an irenicum addressed to the North, stemming the tide of abolition sentiment, and securing the guarantees necessary to satisfy Southern feeling in Kentucky and elsewhere. It was mainly with these objects in view, we suppose the argument to have been constructed. Had Dr. Breckinridge been content to restrain his discussion within that range, we should not have considered it necessary to offer a reply. Desirable as it may be, for many reasons, that all the slave States should unite in forming a homogeneous Confederacy, yet this is a matter which must be remitted to the sovereign discretion of each. We, at least, have no desire to dictate the course which others should pursue; and Dr. Breckinridge, as a loyal son of Kentucky, might, without a word of dissent from us, assist in moulding the local policy of his own State. So, again, we can not but wish that the fanatical North may be dispossessed of him whose “name is Legion,” and be found at last “clothed and in their right mind,” prepared to fulfil their sworn obligations to the Constitution, to which they have so long been recreant. The views presented to this end, in the third section of the pamphlet before us, we substantially endorse. They are precisely such, for the most part, as have been held by Christian men throughout the South for many years; and are considerably in advance of what we had supposed Dr. Breckinridge could conscientiously defend. We congratulate him on the satisfactory progress he has made since 1849, when he could advocate prospective emancipation in Kentucky, distinctly upon the grounds

that hereditary slavery was "contrary to the natural rights of mankind," "opposed to the fundamental principles of free government," "inconsistent with a state of sound morality," and "hostile to the prosperity of the Commonwealth." * We do not charge this as an inconsistency, but note it as a sign of progress. It gives us hope that, if Kentucky shall see fit to repudiate his principles in 1861 as unequivocally as she did in 1849, he may yet find his way even to defend secession itself, as not repugnant to the principles of sound republicanism. However this may be, we have no strictures to make upon his present exposition of negro slavery, as condemned neither by the clear teachings of revelation, on the one hand, nor by the confused utterances of the law of nature on the other. We sincerely hope his pregnant suggestions upon this subject may be kindly accepted by his neighbors north of the Ohio.

But the limits within which he might have written and reigned with undisturbed supremacy have been transcended.

"No pent up Utica confines his powers,
The whole boundless Continent is his."

No government will fill the eye of his ambition, which does not span the breadth of a hemisphere, and bathe its feet at once in the waters of the Gulf and of the Lakes. The silver trumpet is taken from the wall to break the slumber of an enchanted nation, which must rise and shake itself for an imperial career. The spectre of disunion must hie back to its grave among the buried seditions of the past. Whole States, stripped of their sovereignty, stand shivering before his buffeting and scorn, to be sent, like whipped children of the nursery, whimpering and supperless to bed. In short, Dr. Breckinridge has spoiled a fine part by over-acting. Had he been content to advise Kentucky, without abusing South Carolina—had he been satisfied with sooth-

* *Biblical Repertory*, October, 1849, vol. 21.

ing the factious North, without crying the dogs of war upon the hunted South—this rejoinder would never have been evoked. The cloak of the philosopher has been too scant to hide the burly form of the partisan. He pours forth his defamatory charges upon the seceding States with a wealth of expression only at the command of this great master of the English tongue. Anarchy, disloyalty, revolt, revolution, rebellion, fanaticism, sedition, form the alphabet of an almost exhaustless invective, which, by endless transposition and iteration, make up a description so hideous that its very deformity should prove it a caricature. His caustic denunciation can only expend itself in superlatives specially constructed by coupling together the fiercest phrases. Secession is not simply secession, but it is “the secession pestilence,” or it is “the explosion of human passions,” or “a revolution accomplished by terror, under the guidance of irresistible fanaticism.” It is not only anarchy, but “anarchy fierce and blind,” in “frightful antagonism to the total civilization of the age.” It not only springs from hatred of the Union, but a hatred that is “chronic” and “frantic.” It is “a movement in revolting disregard towards God’s dealings,” and “proclaims shocking conceptions of our mission.” The people have always been “precipitated into revolution,” and “lashed into madness.” And this, too, in a document which, in its opening paragraph, purports to be a manifesto to posterity; an appeal to the collective and impartial opinion of mankind is the verdict of history, whose judicial sentence is only less terrible than that of the last day. We will obey his summons before the dread tribunal, and purge ourselves of the calumny which has been heaped upon our good name.

Even this is not all; having proscribed and put us under the ban of eternal infamy, he would kindle with his eloquence the present resentment of an entire nation, that we may perish in its flame. He translates the Constitution, that great charter of civil freedom, into a grant of absolute

dominion to an imperial despot; and, having consolidated all power at Washington, he would consolidate all opinion, from the Tennessee to the St. Lawrence, to become the minister of summary vengeance. Stone is laid upon stone in the solid masonry of his argument; but as the huge pyramid rises before us, it is only to become the sepulchre where the last hope of American liberty is to be laid at rest for ever. We must tell him the day has not yet come for these sad obsequies to be performed. Seven States love republican institutions too well to surrender without a struggle the sacred inheritance; and, while he is shouting for an empire, we will contend for a republic. Assuredly, whatever else this secession movement may or may not accomplish, it has sounded the knell of despotism on this continent, and rendered possible the hope of transmitting the principles of republican government, which our patriot fathers toiled and bled to achieve. These sentences will, perhaps, sufficiently indicate the general tenor of this reply, as partly apologetic—partly expository.

Dr. Breckinridge prefers the charge of anarchy with equal vehemence against the Abolitionism of the North, and the Secessionism of the South, a couple generally lashed together in his unsparing invectives. As to the former, we abandon it to his tender mercies. May his eye not pity, nor his hand spare! Under his scorching anathema, may it wither to its deepest root! But the application of this term to the South is against the testimony of stubborn and flagrant facts. He does not indeed trouble himself much to define the terms which he bandies about so profusely, and only by inference can we gather what he precisely intends by this opprobrious epithet. On page four, he describes it as “working unto the disintegration, the morselment of all things;” and on page five, somewhat more rhetorically, as “the spirit which tramples under foot those institutions which every where have been esteemed most sacred, and every where despises the most venerable

and the most cherished traditions of our country and of our race." Nothing of all this is true of the seceding States. In the exercise of a prerogative which has always been claimed, and for what they deem sufficient cause, they have simply withdrawn from the old Confederacy and established a government of their own. We do not discuss at this moment the nature of that right, or the sufficiency of that cause; it is enough to say that their right to secede was no new pretension, advanced under the pressure of an emergency, but was always claimed as a prerogative of sovereignty. In this aspect of the case, the mere fact of secession does not, even *prima facie*, sustain the charge of lawlessness. Whether justifiable or not, the step was taken, not against law, but in accordance with a law which was deemed by the parties both fundamental and organic.

If we consider, further, the *manner* in which secession was accomplished, not a sign of anarchy appears; every step was in conformity with constitutional requirements, both in letter and in spirit. The people in each State were assembled in solemn Convention, called in due form, and with due deliberation. The election of delegates was free and untrammelled, without the machinery of caucuses, or the intervention of wire-working politicians. Ordinances of secession were duly framed, debated, adopted and signed, with almost a religious solemnity. Chosen delegates convened, after the manner of our fathers, with authenticated commissions, in a united Congress. A provisional government is immediately formed, adopting, almost without change, the old Constitution of the Union. With reasonable dispatch a permanent Constitution is framed, still upon the model of the old, with only such modifications as were necessary to adjudicate the principles lying at the bottom of this controversy, and to purge, as far as practicable, the intolerable abuses and corruptions which, under the old *regime*, had crept in through a per-

verted and subtle interpretation of that venerable instrument. This new Constitution is remanded to the respective States; and at this moment is being submitted to the ratification of the sovereign people in those States, in such manner as they themselves shall determine. Where in all this is "the morcelment of all things," that has been spoken of? If there be disintegration, it is not through the separation of the atoms in the mass, but by simple cleavage between adjacent laminae. The law of cohesion still obtains between the people which make up an entire sovereignty, and these entire sovereignties separate for the express purpose of reintegrating in a new and happier union. Dr. Breckinridge is mistaken in supposing this political change to be "the disintegration of every healthful force of society." It is rather the recuperative power of indwelling life, throwing off disease, and resuming health—it is but the moulting of the eagle, putting on a brighter plumage, and springing upward from its eyrie to a bolder flight.

Since secession has taken place, what sign of anarchy has appeared in those States which have adventured its perils? With completely organized State governments, each has moved steadily forward, and life, honor and property have been as safe as under the broad shield of the Union. All lines of business have been pursued as before, scarcely a jar being felt in the transition. Notwithstanding the letters with which the country has been flooded, from mythical correspondents, describing the depreciation of property, the ruinous extent of taxation, and a general reign of terror, we venture to affirm there has been more repose in the seven Cotton States than in all the rest of the country beside. With the exception of more than usual military stir, in evidence of preparation to bide the worst that might come, and with the exception of a certain amount of financial embarrassment, arising from the political confusion of the country, there has been nothing to

distinguish this period from the calmest moments of the past.

During the long anterior conflict which has terminated in secession, what manifestation has the South made of the spirit which "tramples upon sacred institutions, and despises cherished traditions?" Through forty years she has been loyal to the Constitution, earnestly contending for rights which were in that bond, and battling against usurpations which were not there. Never, in a single instance, trespassing upon the rights of others, she has only succeeded in maintaining her own, through a vigilance which has never been permitted to slumber. Her contentment with the Constitution, and complacency in its provisions, are illustrated in her cordial readoption of it, and the reverence with which, under the new Government, she has placed it again within the ark of testimony. Nay, the very changes which have been introduced into that sacred document move in a direction precisely the reverse of anarchy. The extension of the Presidential term—the ineligibility to a second term—the removal from office of subordinates only for certain specified causes—the reference of these to the Senate—the liberty given to members of the Cabinet to discuss their measures upon the floor of either house, for ever dispensing with party organs—the practical provision for convening the States when necessary, without resorting to revolution to obtain redress—we discuss none of these points, but simply state they betray any thing else but a tendency to anarchy, if there be any definite meaning attached to that word. So that, whether we look at the secession movement in the *act*, or in the *manner*, whether in the *history subsequent*, or in the *history antecedent* to it, the charge of lawlessness can not be sustained, until a new dictionary of the English language shall be framed. The sole foundation of this charge lies in his conception of the American people as fused into one solid, granulated mass, which now appears to be crumbling

into atoms. We may not anticipate here the discussion of that point. His idolatry of the empire—that great image of Nebuchadnezzar, set up on the plain of Dura—is disturbed; shadows are passing over the old glory of the past; and he can see no wisdom in arrangements that are not stereotyped in the world of that past. Anarchy, with him, is simply change, a departure from the existing order. But all change is not anarchy; nor is every uprising of an indignant people in defence of chartered rights to be denounced as insurrection. This can be maintained only upon principles which would have made him, in 1776, a tyrant in England and a Tory in America.

Dr. Breckinridge is in grievous error upon other points besides this of anarchy. We allude to his account of the origin and spread of secession, the objects at which it aims, and the motives by which it has been prompted. His statement, gleaned from different parts of the pamphlet, is, that it took its rise in the “chronic hatred of South Carolina to the National Union”—(p. 9)—that it “was propagated from her by concerted action through an organized party, which succeeded in precipitating State after State into secession; while the masses of the people, stunned by the suddenness and vehemence and thorough organization of the movement, were borne along by it”—(p. 23). His conviction of this is so firm that he warns the country not to accept “this exaggerated and disloyal opinion of the extreme South, as irrevocably fixed”—(p. 40)—and builds the hope of future reconstruction upon the reaction which is certain to ensue—(p. 11). He further charges upon secession that it has ulterior designs to accomplish, beyond those which are avowed—(pp. 7, 9). He more than intimates that the design of the South to make slavery universal is as strong as that of the North to banish it entirely; this being “the shocking conception” they have formed as to the mission of the American people—(pp. 12, 34, 36). He further charges that the lust of power is the controlling motive of

the seceding States; "power to be diminished by remaining in the Union, and to be incalculably increased by leaving it; and that this idea, far more than disgust that the North has condemned slavery, or any apprehension that slavery will be disturbed, has precipitated them into revolution"—(p. 14). Finally, he denounces the seizure of the forts, public arms, the mint, and other national property, as plunder and robbery—(pp. 37, 39). This is a heavy indictment, and the specifications are minute. We propose to substitute authentic facts for these fictions, which are the coinage of a fertile brain, or else have been received with a credulity unworthy of a philosopher.

We deny that South Carolina has ever been actuated by so base a sentiment as "hatred of the Union;" especially, a hatred that is "chronic." Her statesmen and her people did, indeed, despair of the Republic sooner than others. With that penetration into the working of secret and potential causes which seems intuitive, Mr. Calhoun long since announced the catastrophe that has occurred, with a precision which now looks like the inspiration of prophecy. But that she has ever been disloyal to the Constitution, is historically untrue. During the Revolutionary struggle, overlaid by the British forces, she passed through unparalleled sufferings; and contributed her full proportion of blood and treasure to the common cause, as the numerous battle-fields which dot her soil abundantly show. From that day to this, in all her country's battles her sons have stood nearest to the flashing of the guns, always prodigal of life, whether amid the hammocks of Florida, or upon the plains of Mexico. In the more quiet walks of civil life, she has taken her share in the public councils, and borne her fair proportion of the public burdens, however oppressively distributed. Even in the memorable conflict of Nullification, for which she has endured long reproach, she was battling for the Constitution, and for the equal rights of which it was the bond. Upon that Constitution she

stood then—upon that Constitution she stands still—and in her departure from a faithless Union she bears it into a new sanctuary, the Palladium of liberty. But, when all hope of safety had died within her, she stood calmly under the shadow of the Capitol, before the clock which silently told the Nation's hours, and which would ere long sound the knell of its destiny. No sooner was this heard in the shout of Black Republican success, than she leaped, feeble and alone, into the deadly breach. History has nowhere upon her records a more sublime example of moral heroism. Ignorant whether she would be supported, even by her sister across the Savannah, relying on nothing save the righteousness of her cause and the power of God, she took upon her shield and spear as desperate and as sacred a conflict as ever made a State immortal. It is just this heroic devotion to principle, this faith in the right and the true, this singleness of heart in the presence of duty, and this abiding trust in the power and righteousness of God, that render her capable of a thousand martyrdoms, and incapable of political bondage. It is just this combination of attributes, crowning her with such moral dignity, that draws to her worn hill-sides and barren pines the "untrav-elled hearts" of her sons; who, in all their wanderings, from the tropics to the pole, breathe no more fervent prayer than in death to sleep upon her faithful bosom until the awful day. Her accusers prejudge their own cause, when it is alleged that such a State can hate the Union. If it were true, it is only because that Union had become the synonyme of tyranny. But the breath of slander will pass over her fame as upon a burnished mirror—a moment dim—then brighter than before. The Genius of history has already wreathed the garland with which her brow shall be decked. Long may she live, the mother of heroes who shall be worthy of their birth!

The allegation, too, that the policy of secession has been "dictated" by South Carolina to the other six States, is

simply preposterous. If it were a matter of policy at all, she has enjoyed no such prestige as a political leader as to make it safe for her to venture upon its "dictation;" and the prejudice entertained against her, as "the irrepressible little State," would, under ordinary circumstances, have been a weight upon the movement. The fact is, it has not been a question of calculation and simple prudence in any one of the States—but of stern and absolute necessity—a conflict for life, "to be, or not to be." It is unstatesmanlike in the last degree to refer an agitation so deep and widespread to the superficial causes hinted in this pamphlet. It is no transient storm upon the sea from the blowing of an east wind, but it is the deep ground-swell of the ocean, heaving its waters upon the main. If ever there was a movement "spontaneous and cordial among the popular masses," this was one. We are not in the counsels of the Democratic party, to know whether its disruption at Charleston was (as Dr. Breckinridge takes on him to assert) "an act of deep intention, designed to produce exactly what has followed"—(p. 23)—but we do know that, if it were, then have their most sanguine expectations been surpassed. We do know that, after this disruption, the popular masses embarked with all their usual interest in the Presidential canvass, each voter hoping to save the Union by the election of a conservative ticket—that upon the sixth of November these masses went to bed as firmly attached to the Union as they had ever been, and awoke on the seventh, after Mr. Lincoln's election, just as determined upon resistance to his rule. The revolution in public opinion was far too sudden, too universal, and too radical, to be occasioned by the craft and jugglery of politicians. It was not their wire-dancing upon party platforms which thus instantaneously broke up the deep foundations of the popular will, and produced this spontaneous uprising of the people in the majesty of their supremacy; casting party hacks

aside, who shall have no control over a movement not having its genesis in their machinations.

The division of opinion at the South between coöperation and secession is greatly over-estimated, when vaticinations are based upon it of a speedy and certain reaction. It was simply a difference of opinion upon subordinate and collateral points; nothing more. It has never shaped itself into parties, and even as an opinion, the distinction is now almost entirely cancelled. The Coöperationists from the beginning averred—and their subsequent acts sustain the declaration—that secession was with them, as with others, the ultimate remedy. But they preferred to reach this great conclusion by successive steps. They preferred to justify the South at the bar of history, by offering to the North an ultimatum, which yet they did not expect to be accepted. They desired all the slave States, as they were involved in a common peril, after mutual conference, to move together in unbroken phalanx; both as a precaution against the contingency of civil war, and as a method of securing consideration to the new Confederacy. We shall certainly not discuss the wisdom of these suggestions. That is now a perfectly dead issue, and the disclosures which have since been made, alike in the deliberations of the Peace Conference, and in the Federal Congress at Washington, have probably more than satisfied them in acquiescing in the course which was actually pursued. If proof was needed that this difference of opinion related only to immaterial issues, it is the heartiness of this acquiescence. Certain it is, that no sooner were the Ordinances of Secession actually passed than Coöperationists stood shoulder to shoulder with extreme Secessionists, and have proved the most unflinching advocates of the new Government. The evidence is absolutely overwhelming, that, since its inauguration, the secession movement has been drawing deeper every day, and public opinion has drifted rapidly against the possibility, or even desirableness, of a

reconstruction. If there be a predestinated reaction—which Dr. Breckinridge seems to decree—he must sit longer on the mount of observation than did the prophet of old, before he shall see the sign of its coming.

The charge of “ulterior and concealed designs” is handled with a delicacy that altogether surprises us. Dr. Breckinridge is rarely satisfied to puncture with an inuendo. He always employs the genuine weapons of war, and would not be suspected of a resort to the stiletto. Why, then, does he take up this allegation so gingerly upon his fingers, as though it had thorns to prick him? In his Fast-Day Discourse—which, though the briefer, is far the abler document of the two—he significantly asks the people of Kentucky, “Do you want the slave trade reopened? Do you want some millions more of African cannibals thrown amongst you, broadcast throughout the whole slave States?” This, then, on the fourth of January, was one of the “ulterior designs” of secession. Was it the recollection of this splendid prophecy, unexpectedly spoiled by the Congress of “the Cotton Confederacy,” in the interdict of this traffic by an organic law, that renders him now suddenly prudent—contenting himself with generalities that can not presently be falsified? In that same discourse, he continues his interrogatories to the people of Kentucky: “Do you want to begin a war which shall end when you shall have taken possession of the whole Southern part of this Continent, down to the Isthmus of Darien?” Perhaps this is the bugbear now haunting his prophetic dreams. Well, there may be some thing here, for we see the wise men at Washington proposing to the powers of Europe a gracious protectorate over Mexico against the ambitious schemes of the Infant Republic; and benevolently hinting to Spain our very dangerous proximity to Cuba, a sugar-plum that Louisiana especially would like to swallow, in better security of her own great staple. Who knows but there may be in the midst of us military adventurers, as there

are in all lands, who are ambitious of making history a little prematurely? We know not how to quiet these nervous forebodings, but by suggesting that the South has notoriously been content to walk in historic paths. In all the long battle about slavery, we have planted ourselves upon history, as well as upon revelation. We have implored the North to look upon the whole subject as a question of history, and to leave it to history for solution. We have not the prescience of the prophet to forecast the distant future. We are content to deal with present realities, and leave the future to posterity, when it shall become their present. This has always been our position—nothing more, nothing less. Of all nations upon earth, we are the last to go poaching upon the inheritance of our neighbors. With the motto "*noli me tangere*," inscribed upon the banner of our defence, every instinct of self-preservation, as well as every sentiment of public decency, restrains us from military oppression; and the world may rest satisfied that in our waters, at least, the buccaneer can not find his sheltering cove. If we desire territory, we will not, with school-boy greed, pluck the apple when it is green, but will wait upon history till the time of ripeness, when it shall fall into the lap. But insinuations admit no reply. Our author is lawyer enough to know that no indictment crouched in generalities can lie in any court.

The transition is easy to his pathetic lamentation over the pious degeneracy which makes the universal extension of slavery the mission of the American people—(pp. 12, 34, 36). Was a purer fiction ever coined before? Where, in all the productions of Southern writers, political or religious, will Dr. Breckinridge find this thesis defended? Has it not always been admitted, by writers on both sides of the line, that, if African slavery exists at all, its limits must be determined by climate and soil—that precisely where it ceases to be profitable, there it will inevitably cease to exist? It is alone for this we have been contend-

ing—that, in the language of Mr. Webster, slavery may be left to be determined by nature and God. The simple statement out of which this great story of the three black crows has grown, is this, that slavery having come, in God's providence, to be the inheritance of the South, thoroughly interwoven with every fibre of society, and giving the very complexion and form of our civilization—and the historic moment having arrived, at the close of more than a Peloponnesian war, for concluding the conflict for ever—it is therefore the duty of the South, in the discharge of a great historic trust, to conserve and transmit the same. She must bravely rebuke the presumption which undertakes by legislative enactment to restrict that which can only be determined by God Himself, in the out-working of His providential purposes; and she must set over against it a claim of right to go wherever the providence of God shall choose to have it go. We have never said that it was the mission of the whole American people to extend it any where. We have never said that it was the mission of the South to do nothing but labor for that extension; but simply that, in the great impending crisis, the South would be recreant to every obligation of duty, and to every principle of honor, and to every instinct of interest, if she did not effectively contradict and rebuke the insufferable arrogance of those who assume into their hands the prerogatives of Divine legislation. If this offends the pious sensibilities of our brethren all over the land, we take occasion to say it will require some thing more to overthrow it than a holy exclamation.

With real pain we read the next specification against the South, of being actuated by the lust of power. In a penny paper, this would not have surprised us; but we expect generosity from the brave. It betrays a want of statesmanship to overlook the real causes of a great popular movement, and to base a political remedy upon motives which are purely fanciful. Why will not Kentucky and

the world believe the constant averment of the seceding South, that she has acted under the conviction of an amazing peril, and from a sense of compelling justice? Through nearly a half a century a party has been struggling for political rule, in sworn hostility to that institution upon which the life and being of the South depend. It has grown through all opposition, until it has imbued the public mind of the North with a kindred, though somewhat restrained, abhorrence of slavery. It has laid hold upon all parties as instruments of its will; and now at length, subordinating the Republicans as its pliant tool, it has throned itself upon the chair of State, and speaks with the authority of law. We need not go through all the details of a long and too familiar story, and recite the utterances and disclose the platforms of the dominant party now represented in the occupancy of the White House. What was the South to do? Submission at this stage would have been submission for ever; and since this was impossible without the surrender of all that a people can hold dear—liberty, honor, and safety—she simply, and, as we think, with great dignity, withdrew from the disgraceful and destructive association. Yet, while struggling thus for life itself, she is stigmatized by such a man as Dr. Breckinridge, with a base lust of power, or peevishly resenting the loss of a political control which she can not hope to recover.

It is certainly strange that a motive sufficiently strong to unite seven States in the solemn act of secession from the Union should never have combined them whilst in that Union; for it is notorious, upon all questions of public policy, the South has ever been found divided into parties, and arrayed often against herself. How does this fact—true up to the very date of secession—comport with this grasping ambition, which suddenly relinquishes all the traditions and advantages of the Federal Union, that she may vent her spleen for the loss of dominion? How does this allegation further consist with the exemplary patience with

which she has endured a system of revenue legislation, flagrantly and systematically discriminating against her, and in favor of the North? But the abundant fertility of her soil has enabled her to grow rich, even whilst contributing two-thirds to the revenue of the Government. Not for causes like these did she care to rupture the bonds of association which linked the whole country together. There is just so much truth as this in the charge now tabled against her. The South has looked with increasing alarm at the great increase of power at the North, by the addition of new free States; well knowing this power was destined to be wielded to her destruction. This she had reason to dread, and if, amongst the possible contingencies of the future, the question of reconstruction should be opened to debate, the South, unless she be given over to judicial blindness, will enter into no union in which the balance of power is not in some way preserved between the two sections. She will scarcely again hazard her all by trusting to a paper Constitution, without an effective provision, whether by a dual Executive, or by a perpetual equilibrium in the Senate, or by some other expedient, against the lawless will of an unscrupulous majority. She has preferred the better way of secession, and of a separate Government. Having long borne the burden of unequal taxation, it was proposed she should sustain that of political subjection also. The time had not come for her to accept the lot of Issachar, that "of a strong ass crouching between two burdens."

The truth of history must be vindicated, touching the seizure of forts and other national property, alleged against us as acts of spoliation and robbery. Let it be remembered that nothing of this sort was initiated until Major Anderson, under cover of night, spiked the cannon of Fort Moultrie, and threw himself into the impregnable fortress opposite to it in the harbor of Charleston. We have nothing to say of this as a piece of military strategy,

except that it changed at once the status of the two parties in this controversy. We have no anathemas to hurl against this gallant officer; for, his act being endorsed by the Cabinet, all censure is transferred from the subaltern to the principal. But the significance of this movement could not be mistaken. It meant coercion. The intolerable outrage was meditated of turning the batteries, which had been erected for the defence of the harbor against a foreign foe, upon the very people on whose soil they had been built. Instantly, upon the electric wires the conviction flashed throughout the South, that they were dealing with an imbecile and treacherous Government, which could not be trusted on its own parole. As a matter of simple self-defence, forts were seized, with all the public arms to be found within their domain. But at this very time of seizure, it was proclaimed by State authority that the proprietorship of the United States was distinctly recognized, that the seizure was intended only to prevent an unlawful and monstrous perversion of these munitions of war to their destruction, and that in final negotiations with the other party, the whole should be accounted for as the property of the entire country.

Precisely so with the mint at New Orleans. Money is the sinew of war; and Louisiana resolved the Federal Government should not draw from these coffers the means of her own subjugation. What then? She first takes a faithful inventory of all the mint contained, places the same on file, and publishes it to all the world. She then passes a special ordinance, through her Convention, by which the seal of the State is impressed upon this as a sacred deposit, held in trust, to be accounted for even to the uttermost farthing, in the final reckoning. We have private knowledge of the fact, that of this money, she has already paid out large sums upon drafts of the Government at Washington, to meet their public contracts. Under this exposition, what becomes of the charge of gross immorality

preferred against the seceding States? We smile in sadness over the recklessness of party zeal which draws a good and great man under the censure—“*honi soit qui mal y pense.*”

But enough of apology. Having disposed of these allegations, the severer part of our task remains, in the discussion of the theory which Dr. Breckinridge advances concerning the nature of our Government. The fundamental fallacy pervading his entire argument is the misconception that it is a consolidated popular Government, instead of being a Congress of Republics. It is this which gives point to his charge of anarchy—it is this that enables him to define secession as sedition and rebellion—it is this view of the case that drives him, in logical consistency, and against the better impulses of his heart, to advise a coercive policy, tempered with as much forbearance as may consist with a due enforcement of the supreme law. Here, then, is the *πρωτον ψευδος* of the pamphlet: and our defence of the South is incomplete, if we spare the refutation it demands. We are well aware that the controversy is as old as the Constitution itself, and has at various periods enlisted the ablest minds of the country, who have canvassed the subject both in popular speeches and in the calmer productions of the closet. But the pressure of this grave crisis, and the nature of the assaults made upon us, compel the reopening of a discussion which might well be thought closed up and sealed for ever. In proof that we do not misrepresent our author's position, consider the emphasis with which he speaks of this “great nation,” and dwells upon the unity of its life—(pp. 11, 12). “We constitute,” says he, “one nation, whose people, however, are divided into many sovereign States”—(p. 31). “It is a political falsehood that the people of a State are citizens of the United States only through the Constitution and Government of that State”—(p. 38). This is brought out still more articulately in his Fast-Day Discourse, which in a

note is assumed as a part of the argument of the essay in the Review. "No State," writes he, "in this Union ever had any sovereignty at all, independent of, and except as they were *United States*. When they speak of recovering their sovereignty—when they speak of returning to their condition as sovereigns, in which they were before they were members of the Confederacy, called at first the United Colonies, and then the United States—they speak of a thing that has no existence; they speak of a thing that is historically without foundation." Again: "as United Colonies they were born States." "So born that each State is equally and for ever, by force of its very existence, and the manner thereof, both a part of this American nation, and also a sovereign State of itself." "The people, therefore, can no more legally throw off their national allegiance, than they can legally throw off their State allegiance; either attempt, considered in any legal, in any constitutional, in any historical light, is pure madness."—(Discourse, p. 8.) From these quotations it is evident Dr. Breckinridge does not use the term nation in a loose popular sense, to signify a body of people, inhabiting the same country, speaking the same language, deduced from the same origin, and recognizing substantially the same laws; but in the fixed political sense of a people fused into one common and solid mass, who are merely distributed into States, for the convenience of local government. His conception, therefore, of the nation, is primary; that of States, secondary and derived. The relation of the people to the central authority is immediate, and not as they are the people of the separate States. While, in a sense which it would be difficult to define, sovereignty is ascribed to the latter, it is not original and independent, but only as they are born in and under the Union; out of connection with which, they would have none. Consequently, separation from the Union is simply *felo de se*. We do not remember ever to have seen a more complete inversion of the facts of history

to sustain an *a priori* theory. The discussion narrows itself down to a single point. There is no dispute upon the fact that sovereignty, the *jus summi imperii* resides in the people. But the dispute is, whether this sovereignty resides in the people as they are, merged into the mass, one undivided whole; or in the people as they were originally formed into colonies, and afterwards into States, combining together for purposes distinctly set forth in their instruments of Union. Dr. Breckinridge maintains the former thesis; we defend the latter; and in the whole controversy upon the legal right of secession this is the "*cardo causæ*."

What, then, is the testimony of history? We find the first Continental Congress, at New York, in 1765, called at the suggestion of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, and composed of deputies from all the Colonial Assemblies represented therein. We find, in 1773, at the instance of the Virginia House of Burgesses, the different Colonial Assemblies appointing Standing Committees of Correspondence, through whom a confidential communication was kept up between the Colonies. We find the votes in the Continental Congress of 1774, at Philadelphia, cast by Colonies, each being restricted to one only. We find in the celebrated Declaration of Independence, in 1776, "the Representatives of the United States, in general Congress assembled," publishing and declaring "in the name and by the authority of the people in these Colonies." We find the Articles of Confederation, matured in 1777, remanded to the local Legislatures, and ratified by the several States—by Maryland, not until 1781. The circular in which this form of confederation was submitted, requests the States "to authorize their delegates in Congress to subscribe the same in behalf of the State," and solicits the dispassionate attention of the Legislatures of the respective States, under a sense of the difficulty of combining in one general system the various sentiments and interests of a Continent divided into so many sovereign and indepen-

dent communities." * We recite these familiar facts to show that during the first period of our history, embracing the revolutionary struggle, the people were accustomed to act, not as an organic whole, but as constituting separate States, and combining for common and specified ends. Indeed, it could not be otherwise. Upon throwing off their allegiance to the British crown, and the sovereignty reverting to themselves, they were not destitute of a political organization through which to act. They had existed as organized, though not independent, communities before. What more natural, in their transition to new political relations, than to stand forth the communities they actually were? As separate Colonies they had been dependencies of the British Crown: when that dependence was thrown aside, in whom could the original sovereignty reside, but in the people, who were now no longer Colonies, but States—in which form of existence the people are first presented to our view. The fact that they combined against a common foe, and to secure their independence together, does not impeach their inherent sovereignty. It remains perfectly discretionary with them—that is, with the people, as States—to determine how much of this sovereignty they will retain, and how much they will surrender, in the arrangements afterwards made. In the language of Chief Justice Jay, quoted by Mr. Story, "thirteen sovereignties were considered as emerging from the principles of the Revolution, combined by local convenience and considerations—though they continued to manage their national concerns as *'one people.'*" We accordingly reverse Dr. Breckinridge's proposition; we are not "one Nation divided into many States," but we are many States uniting to form one Nation.

But let us see how the matter stands from the period of the old Confederation to the adoption of the present Con-

* Story's His. of the Confederation.

stitution, in 1787. When the former was found to be breaking down from its own imbecility, and the necessity of a more perfect union was becoming apparent, it is curious to see how the pathway was opened through the almost accidental action of State Legislatures. In 1785, commissioners were appointed by the States of Virginia and Maryland to form a scheme for promoting the navigation of the River Potomac and the Chesapeake Bay. As they felt the need of more enlarged powers to provide a local naval force, and a tariff of duties upon imports, this grew into an invitation from Virginia to the other States to hold a Convention for the purpose of establishing a general system of commercial relations—and this, at length, at the instance of New York, was enlarged, so as to provide for the revision and reform of the articles of the old Federal compact. Thus grew up, by successive steps, the Convention which met at Philadelphia in 1787, by which the present Constitution was drafted, submitted to Congress, as the common organ of all the States, and by it referred for ratification to these States respectively. Here we have the same great principle of the sovereignty of the people, as they are States, clearly recognized. The tentative efforts towards improving the interior commercial relations of the country, are initiated by two State Legislatures; by a third, a Convention of Delegates from all the States is suggested; and the new Constitution is finally debated and ratified by separate Conventions of the people in each—North Carolina withholding her assent till 1789, and Rhode Island till 1790. This historical review seems, to us, conclusive of the point in hand. The people—not as one, but as thirteen—revolt from the English yoke; because only as thirteen, and not as one, did they ever owe allegiance. The people—not as one, but as thirteen—unite to carry on a defensive and successful war; granting to the Continental Congress just the powers they saw fit—neither more nor less—as their common agent. The people—not

as one, but as thirteen—prepare and adopt Articles of Confederation, under which they manage their common concerns for seven years. And finally—not as one, but again as thirteen—they frame and adopt a permanent Constitution; under which they have lived for seventy years, and have grown from thirteen to thirty-four. But suppose the two dilatory States, which withheld their assent to the Constitution for two and three years, had withheld it altogether—What then? Why, says Dr. Breckinridge, “they would have passed by common consent into a new condition, and have become, for the first time, separate sovereign States.”—(Disc., p. 8.) Yes, truly, if by “*separate*” he only means isolated; but not separate in the sense of being *distinct*. But he has denied sovereignty to any State, “except as they are *United States*.” How, then, shall these two States, who, by supposition, refused to be united, become sovereign? “By common consent,” says Dr. Breckinridge, “they will pass into that condition.” But on what is this common consent to be based? Why not coerce them into Union, if the people is one Nation, and these States are fractions of that unit? Certainly it is just because their refusal to concur would be an exercise of sovereignty, and it must needs be recognized as such. Yet, if the *refusal* to concur would be an act of sovereignty, then, by equality of reason, was their *agreement* to concur an act of sovereignty. In either case, the people of these two States—and so of all the others—were antecedently and distinctively sovereign; and hence, could not owe their sovereignty to the Union which they themselves created. It is reasoning in a circle, to say that the States are sovereign only as they are *United States*, when by the force of the term, as well as by the express testimony of history, they are united only by a Union which is created in the exercise of that sovereignty. We commend this fact to the attention of Consolidationists; that two States did, for the term of three years, delay to come into the

Union under the Constitution, although they were previously in it under the Confederation. It clearly proves that the people formed the Constitution as States, and not as a consolidated Nation: and that these States were not merely election districts, into which the one Nation was conveniently distributed—but were organized communities, invested with the highest attributes of sovereignty, which they exercised again and again, by and through their supreme Conventions. If as States they could legally refuse to come into the Union, why may they not as legally withdraw from it? Upon the law maxim, "*expressio unius est exclusio alterius*," this attribute of sovereignty remains, unless in the instrument it can be shown to be explicitly resigned.

It is plain, then, that before and at the adoption of the Constitution, the States were independent and sovereign. Have they ceased to be such by their assent to that instrument? Or, is the Federal Union simply a covenant between the people of these States for mutual benefits, and under conditions that are distinctly entered into the bond? Let us see. Much stress is laid upon the use of the words, "the people," in the preamble of the Constitution—conveying, it is alleged, the idea of an undivided nationality. It is, however, a plain canon of interpretation, that particular terms are to be explained by the context in which they occur. This preamble further states, that "we the people," are "the people of the United States;" a title evidently intended to embody the history of the formation of the Union as a *Congressus* of States, which, by aggregation, make up one People. In proof of this, it is a title simply transferred from the old Confederation, when no one denies that the States were separate and independent. This fact is conclusive. As the Nation is formed by the confluence of States, a periphrastic title is given, which defines the character of this nationality, as not being consolidated, but federative. It is not a little

remarkable, that no other title is employed throughout the Constitution, but this of "United States;" the composition of which, historically, describes confederation, and discriminates against consolidation. How does it happen, if the idea of a nation, as composed of individuals, simply districted into States, is the fundamental idea, not only that a baptismal name was withheld which should embody that conception, but that, on the contrary, a composite title was given, which marks precisely the opposite?

Let us now pass from the vestibule, and examine the frame-work of the Constitution itself. The first section of Article I. vests the Legislative power in a Congress, consisting of two Chambers, a Senate and House of Representatives. In the latter, population is represented. But what population? the people of the Nation as a unit, or the people of the States? Unquestionably, the latter: for Section 4 provides that "the time, places, and manner of holding the election shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof." Should a vacancy occur, "writs of election are to be issued by the executive authority of each State." Thus the States, individually, direct the election, and count and declare the vote. Plainly, this is done by the States, either as mere election districts, or else as organized communities, in the exercise of a supreme right. In addition to what has already been urged, the fact of apportioning these Representatives to the States respectively, according to the population of each, concludes against the theory that the people are fused into the mass, and determines for the idea that, under the Constitution, as before its adoption, the people represented are the people of the States in Congress assembled. In the Senate, the case is still clearer, for these States are represented as such, all being placed upon the same footing, the largest having no more power than the least. If we turn to the Executive branch of the Government, the President and Vice President are chosen by the people, indeed, but still

by the people as constituting States. The electors must equal in number the representation which the State enjoys in Congress; and they must be chosen in such manner as each State, through its Legislature, shall determine.—(Con. Art. II.) Should the election fail with the people, it must go into the Congressional House of Representatives, with the remarkable provision, that the “vote is there to be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote.” Why so? if not to forestall the possibility, through the inequality of the States in that Chamber, of a President being chosen by a numerical majority merely, without being chosen by a concurrent majority of the States? We submit to the candor of the reader, if these constitutional provisions are not framed upon the conception that the people are contemplated as States, and not as condensed into a Nation. If this latter were the fundamental idea, could arrangements be made more effectively to conceal or to cancel it?

But it is urged that, in the adoption of the Constitution, the States have remitted, in great part, their sovereignty; and have clothed the General Government with supreme authority in the powers they have conferred. “Congress shall have power,” says the Constitution (Sec. 8, Art. I.), “to levy and collect taxes, to regulate commerce, to coin money, to declare war, to negotiate peace,” and the like; all which, it is alleged, are the acts of a sovereign. Precisely so: Congress shall have the *executive power*; but the Constitution does not say the *inherent right*. The distinction between these two goes to the bottom of the case, and will clear up much prevalent misconception. The people of the States have not parted with one jot or tittle of their original sovereignty. According to primitive republicanism, it is impossible they should do so. It exists unimpaired, just where it always resided, in the People constituting States. But these States, sustaining many relations to each other and to foreign nations, concur to manage those

external matters in common. In their confederation for this purpose, they create an organ common to them all. To that agent they confide certain trusts, which are particularly enumerated; and that it may be competent to discharge the same, they invest it with certain powers, which are carefully defined. They consent to put a limitation upon the exercise of their individual sovereignty, so far as to abstain from the functions assigned to this common agent. They come under a mutual pledge to recognize and to sustain this established Constitution, *quoad* its purposes, as the paramount law. But all this by no means implies the delegation of their sovereignty to the General Government. Power is often conferred upon municipal corporations to perform certain functions pertaining to sovereignty—as, for example, the power of taxation. But who ever dreamed that these corporations became thus *ipso facto* sovereigns; or that the State, in conferring such charters, remitted any portion of its supremacy? In like manner, the several States, in granting these powers to Congress, granted them in trust, for purposes purely executive: retaining the right inherent in themselves to revoke these powers, and to cancel at will the instrument by which they are conveyed. We confess our inability to understand this doctrine of a double sovereignty: a sovereignty which, while it is delegated to the General Government, is nevertheless supreme; and a sovereignty which, while it is retained by the States as a part of their original inheritance, is nevertheless subordinate. The very terms of either proposition appear to be solecisms. Sovereignty, however limited it may be in actual exercise, is simple, and incapable of distribution. It is a still greater contradiction to speak of a sovereign who is under subjection to a superior authority. We can very well understand how several sovereignties shall unite upon schemes which can only be executed by a restraint voluntarily imposed; but not how they shall create a power that is superior to them all. Ac-

cordingly, we find the Constitution providing in its very last article for "the establishment of this Constitution"—not *over*, but "*between*—the States ratifying the same." The distinction between these two propositions is not metaphysical, but immensely practical and substantive. The first would establish the government of a superior over subjects who obey; the second establishes a common law between equals who recognize and sustain. Still more emphatic is the tenth amendment to the Constitution, which specifies that "all powers not delegated to the United States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." This betrays the jealousy which watched over the formation of the Union; showing the grant to the General Government to be a grant of specified and executive powers; while all the rest remains, by inherent right, with the States in their local and permanent organization, or with the people of those States in their primal and inalienable sovereignty.

This exposition of the relation of the States to the Federal Union, is confirmed by the debates in the Convention which formed the Constitution, in 1787. Aware of the weakness of the existing Confederation, it is not strange that a party arose desirous of strengthening the central power. It was urged against the new Constitution, that no tribunal was erected to determine controversies which might arise between the States and the Nation. The Supreme Court was restricted in its jurisdiction to causes in law and equity, and could not adjudicate political differences. The proposition was, therefore, submitted to extend its powers, so as to make it the arbiter of all issues that might arise. It did not, however, prevail so as to be articulated into the Constitution. Of course, the States were thrown back upon the great principle of international law, that every sovereign must decide for himself in controverted issues, under a sense of responsibility to the opinion of mankind, and the verdict of impartial history.

To show still further the relation of the States to the Union, we will cite another fact. Three resolutions were introduced into the Convention, the first declaring "that a Union of the States *merely federal* will not accomplish the objects proposed by the Articles of Confederation;" the second, "that no treaty or treaties between the States, as sovereign, will secure the common defence;" the third, "that a *national* government ought to be established,"* etc. The first two resolutions were immediately tabled; the third was adopted; but afterwards, in the course of debate, undue stress being laid upon the word "national," it was changed into "the government of the United States."†

Another method was proposed, to provide for the danger of collision between the Federal and State authorities. The sixth of Gov. Randolph's famous fifteen resolutions, empowered "the Federal Executive to call forth the force of the Union against *any member of the Union*, failing to fulfil his duties under the articles thereof."‡ This suggestion utterly failed to secure the assent of the Convention, and the resolution was abridged as to this feature of it. The strongest Centralists in the body, as Mr. Madison and Mr. Hamilton, repudiated the principle, as tantamount to a declaration of war and a dissolution of the Union, and utterly repugnant to the genius and spirit of this Government. We can not burthen this article with the citation of authorities. These general facts are sufficient to show the view taken by the framers of the Constitution, as to the relations between the States and the central authority. They are of no little significance, at a time like this, when so many are clamoring for the coercion of the South, whether it be a *coercion of laws* or a *coercion of arms*. The puerile distinction had not occurred to these wise men of a past age, between coercing a State and the coercion of its citizens alone: a distinction perfectly legitimate, when

* Elliott's Debates, Vol. I., p. 391.

† *Ibid.*, p. 427.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

a State professes to recognize the authority of the Union, and unlawful combinations of individuals exist to resist the same ; but a distinction utterly impertinent, when the State asserts her sovereign jurisdiction over her citizens, and disclaims any longer participation in the Federal Union. Manifestly, if a State, while in the Union, may not be coerced by federal power, without its " being tantamount to a declaration of war;" then, *ex fortiori*, she may not be coerced, when by her sovereign act the bonds have been sundered by which she was held under the compact, and she stands wholly without the pale of the Union.

The longest argument must have an end. We advert, finally, to the notorious fact, that in the very act of ratifying this Constitution, three States asserted their sovereign right to resume the powers they had delegated. New York declared " that the powers of government may be reassumed by the people whenever it shall become necessary to their happiness:" * and further indicates what people she means, by speaking, in the same connection, of the residuary power and jurisdiction in the people of the State, not granted to the General Government. The delegates from Virginia " declare and make known, in the name and in the behalf of the people of Virginia, that the powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the people of the United States, may be resumed by them, whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury and oppression." † In like manner, Rhode Island protests against the remission of her right of resumption. And while the language is not so explicit as that of New York, the meaning is precisely the same ; for, as the original grantor of these powers was the people of the States, and not the collective people of the country at large, the former alone had the right to reassume. The other States made no such declarations. Indeed, as the right lay in the very nature and history of

* Elliott's Debates, Vol. I., p. 327.

† *Ibid.*

the federation, they could be made by these three only in the way of superabundant caution. This right, so solemnly asserted seventy years ago, has been sleeping upon the records of the country. It is now brought into exercise by seven States, and the issue can no longer be blinked. If the insane advice gratuitously tendered in this pamphlet should be followed by the Federal authorities, the war that ensues will be a war of principle as well as of passion: and the South will know that she is contending against tyranny in theory, as well as tyranny in practice.

It would thus appear the doctrine of withdrawal from the Union is not so novel as it has been supposed by those who scout it as monstrous. Let us see if it has not made its appearance more than once in the history of the country. When Mr. Jefferson was made Secretary of State, after his return from France, he was warmly importuned by Mr. Hamilton to throw his influence in favor of the assumption of the State debts, in order to save the Union from threatened dissolution. "He," says Mr. Jefferson, "painted pathetically the temper into which the legislature had been wrought; the disgust of those who were called the creditor States; the danger of the *secession* of their members, and the separation of the States;"* which was only averted by bringing over two of the Virginia delegation (White and Lee) to support the measure. At a later period, the passage of the Embargo Act, it is well known, inflamed the New England States to the highest degree; so that on the floor of Congress it was declared, "they were repining for a secession from the Union." In the Hartford Convention, at which five of the Eastern States were represented, the report which was adopted uses the following language: "Whenever it shall appear that these causes are radical and permanent, a separation by equitable arrangement will be preferable to an alliance by constraint among nominal

* Irving's Life of Washington, Vol. V., p. 61.

friends, but real enemies, inflamed by mutual hatred and jealousy," etc. Again: "In cases of deliberate, dangerous and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of a State and the liberties of the people, it is not only the right, but the duty, of such a State to interpose its authority for their protection, in the manner best calculated to secure that end. When emergencies occur which are beyond the reach of the judicial tribunals, or too pressing to admit of the delay incident to their forms, States, which have no common umpire, must be their own judges, and execute their own decisions." It is a little curious that these avowals of the right of secession should come from the very section which is most chargeable with begetting the present schism: and that the very people now most ready to arm themselves for the coercion of the South could plead for an equitable and peaceful separation, so long as it was meditated by themselves. The infamy attaching to the Hartford Convention springs not from their exposition of political doctrine, but from the insufficiency of the cause impelling them to a breach of compact, and from the want of patriotism which could meditate such a step when the country was in the midst of a war with a foreign enemy.

We have thus argued the legal right of secession, without touching upon its moral aspect. Regarding the Union in the light of a compact, it is not lightly to be broken. Framed for such purposes, and under such circumstances, it was a covenant peculiarly sacred, which could not be set aside without guilt somewhere. In this regard, the seceding South is prepared to carry her cause before the world, and before God. When the Union had failed in all the ends for which it was instituted—neither "establishing justice, ensuring domestic tranquillity, promoting the general welfare, nor securing the blessings of liberty;" when these delegated powers were perverted into powers of oppression and injury; when the compact had flagrantly, and with

impunity, been broken by the other parties to it; then it became the South to assert her last right, that of a peaceful withdrawal from the partnership. If to her other wrongs this last and most atrocious of them all, an attempt at her forcible subjugation, is to be added, then will her defence be as complete as an injured people ever carried over to the judgment of posterity. On this, however, we will not enlarge. It will be seen that, upon the legal aspects of the question, we are at antipodes with the writer, whose essay we have reviewed. He affirms the people to be one, divided into many: we, that they are many, united into one. He ascribes sovereignty to the Union: we, to the States. He regards the Constitution as creating a government which is *over* the States: we regard it as a common law established *between* the States. In his view, "any attempt to throw off this national allegiance, in any legal, in any constitutional, in any historical light, is pure madness:" in our view, in every legal, constitutional, or historical light, there is no allegiance to be thrown off, and consequently there is no madness in the case. He affirms secession to be rebellion, which must be suppressed at every hazard: we, that it is an inherent right of sovereignty, which can not be disallowed without an international war. Let the reader put the two into his own scales, and decide for himself.

We rise from this discussion under the profound conviction that the separation of this country into two governments was inevitable: simply because, from the beginning, two nations have with us been in the womb—and the birth, however long delayed, must come at length. From its very formation, two antagonistic interpretations of the Constitution have prevailed, which have just been presented in contrast. The final issue would naturally be deferred, as this and the other struggled for the ascendancy. But whenever, through the expansion of territory, and the consequent increase of patronage, the political prizes should

become too great for the virtue of our people; and whenever sectional jealousies should arise, springing from different forms of society, and opposite systems of labor, the time has arrived for deciding whether the Federal Executive is a *servant* or a *sovereign*. Had the former view prevailed, the Union might have been perpetual. Had the Constitution been regarded as a compact whose bonds were mutual honor and good faith, the apprehension of a rupture would have been the surest guarantee of its observance. The very feebleness of the bond would have been its strength, as the exquisite sensibility of the eye constitutes the greatest protection of that organ. The predominance of the opposite theory has wrought the existing anarchy of which our author so loudly complains. Just because the States have been regarded as provinces, which, if rebellious, could be dragooned into submission, the North has been tempted, through its numerical majority, to sectional aggression; from which, under the other view, it would have been restrained by every consideration of honor and interest. Dr. Breckinridge, in his zeal against anarchy, has not preserved us from despotism, towards which this country has already made fearfully rapid strides. We have always admired the gigantic scale upon which his shadow has ever been cast. It has been no mean proof of his transcendent genius, that in the display of even the smallest weaknesses of our nature, he has ever succeeded in redeeming them from contempt, and of lifting them almost into the sublime. So now, when he would provide for the final destruction of this Republic, it is upon a scale of grandeur that would make her fall only second to that of ancient Rome. We will not recall to his memory the steps by which that grand Republic slipped into an Empire; nor how the legions of Gaul, or of the East, or the Pretorian Guards at home, elevated successively their puppets—until the distant barriers were swept over by barbarian hordes, burying all civilization beneath the flood. But we will

remind him that one Rome is enough for one World. With her instructive history before him, let him not push this Republic forth upon the same career, first of imperial grandeur, and then of a disintegration that will prove universal and frightful. We are not anarchists upon a scale like that. We are conservative enough to reef the sails of our ship before she drives upon the rock, and founders in the sea, with the loss of her treasures. We will put out the long-boat, and separate in time to save and perpetuate those republican principles which are dear to our hearts.

We wish the reader to observe that, whenever the question comes up for decision, whether this is to be a Republic or an Empire, this country is obliged to split in two parts. This question happens to have mixed itself up with that of slavery, the issue upon which a sectional party has succeeded in carrying the Government by assault. But if there had not been an African on this continent, this political difference must sooner or later have worked out the result which has occurred. Dr. Breckinridge is to all intents an imperialist. He has gone off upon the old notions of former ages, which doom this Republic to be a failure—and a failure the more stupendous the longer it should happen to last. If there be no other bonds holding these States together but those of central force and coercion, then, with all our boasting, we have solved no problem in politics, and made no contribution to history. But our conviction is, that the American problem is being worked out for good, and not for evil. The future historian will look back upon this movement of secession as the movement which rescued the whole country just as it was slipping into an empire—an empire to be shattered at last, after the manner of all the empires of the earth—and least of all to be endured upon this continent, where it is an utter apostacy from the political faith of our fathers.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

In consequence of the crowded state of our pages, and the delay which has already occurred, we are compelled to postpone all notices of books until our next issue.

ARTICLE VII.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

I. AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEWS.—CONTENTS.

- I. *Danville Quarterly Review*, March, 1861; Explanatory Note. Article I. The Relative Doctrinal Tendencies of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism in America. II. The Relation which Reason and Philosophy sustain to the Theology of Revelation. III. The Mystery of Iniquity. IV. Our Country—Its Peril—Its Deliverance. V. Immortality of the Soul. VI. Ulphilas. The Goths and their Language. VII. Nature and Revelation in Relation to the Origin of our Conception of a God. VIII. Divine Sovereignty manifested in Divine Predestination—the only Security for the Use and Success of Means. IX. Critical Notices.
- II. *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, January, 1861. Edited by Charles Hodge, D. D. Article I. The State of the Country. II. Antiquity of the Book of Genesis. III. The New Oxford School; or Broad Church Liberalism. IV. The Fulfilment of Prophecy. V. Liverpool Missionary Conference of 1860; or, Results of Missionary Experience. VI. The Alexandrine and Sinaitic Manuscripts. Short Notices.
- III. *New Englander*, January, 1861. Article I. China and the West. II. The Maronites and the Druzes. III. Solar Phenomena. IV. The Design and Nature of Punishment under the Divine Government. V. Does Science Tend to Materialism? VI. Latin Pronunciation. VII. Puritan History. VIII. The Pulpit and the Crisis. IX. Notices of Books.
- IV. *DeBow's Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Mr. Clements' "The Rivals"—Burr and Hamilton. II. Growth and Decay of Nations. III. Cuba—The March of Empire and the Course of Trade. IV. National Characteristics—The Issues of the Day. V. Table Talk—Sydney Smith—Coleridge—Luther. VI. The Non-Slaveholders of the South. VII. Chotank, Alexandria—A Dive into Herculaneum. VIII. The Secession of the Cotton States. IX. Southern Patronage to Southern Imports and Domestic Industry. X. A Plan of Present Pacification; or, a Basis for Reconstruction of the Union, if it be Dissolved. Department of Commerce. Department of Miscellany. Editorial Miscellany.

- V. *DeBow's Review*, March, 1861. Article I. The Pioneers, Preachers, and People of the Mississippi Valley. II. Eikon Basilike—Now as Then. III. French Revolutionary History. IV. What is a Constitution? V. One Idea. VI. School Life and Its History. VII. The Dead Languages. VIII. Density of Population. IX. The English Language. X. The Grape—Its Culture and Manufacture at the South. XI. The Southern Confederacy. XII. Practical Geology of Louisiana. Department of Commerce. Department of Internal Improvements. Department of Manufactures and Mining. Department of Agriculture. Department of Miscellany. Editorial Miscellany.
- VI. *United Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, January, 1861. Edited by David R. Kerr. Article I. Philosophical Theology. II. Forbearance. III. The Ruling Elder. IV. Tractarianism Traced to its Sources. V. The Theology of Art. VI. The Settlement of the Reformed Churches in Western Pennsylvania. VII. Individual Effort. VIII. The Second Assembly. IX. Short Notices.
- VII. *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Paganism a Demon Worship. II. Laurentius Valla. III. The Inward Light. IV. The Hebrew Language and Literature. V. Evangelism of the Eighteenth Century. VI. Literary and Theological Intelligence. VII. Notices of New Books.
- VIII. *Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, January, 1861. Article I. Education for the Ministry. II. Recent Anglican Philology. III. Philosophic Import and Value of the First Chapter of Genesis in its applications to Organic Nature. IV. Cleveland's Text Books. V. Philosophy of Representation. VI. Introduction of Children into the Church. VII. Apparitions of the Dead. VIII. The Rev. Littleton Fowler. IX. Brief Reviews.
- IX. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, January, 1861. Edited by D. D. Whedon, D. D. Article I. Methodism after Wesley's Death. II. Annihilation. III. Another New Hymn Book. IV. The Prayer of Habakkuk. V. Dean Swift. VI. The Use and Abuse of Eyesight. VII. Godwin's History of France. VIII. Foreign Religious Intelligence. IX. Foreign Literary Intelligence. X. Synopsis of the Quarterlies. XI. Quarterly Book Table.
- X. *Christian Review*, January, 1861. E. G. Robinson, Editor. Article I. Macaulay's Essays. II. Infant Baptism: its origin traceable to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. III. The Sensibilities. IV. The Inspiration of the Apostles. V. Conant's Matthew. VI. Roman Orthodoxy. VII. Study of International Law. VIII. Notices of Recent Publications. IX. Theological and Literary Intelligence.
- XI. *Mercersburg Review*, January, 1861. Edited by Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., and Rev. P. Schaff, D. D. Article I. The Epistle to the Galatians Translated and Explained. II. The Marvellous in Modern Times. III. English Versions of the Heidelberg Catechism. IV. Our Alumni Association. V. Recent Publications.
- XII. *Evangelical Review*, January, 1861. Edited by C. P. Krauth, D. D., and others. Article I. The Laborer, the Artisan, and the Artist. II. Chiliasm critically examined, etc. III. The Ministerium. IV. Baccalaureate Address. V. The Master's Call to His Church. VI. Notices of New Publications.
- XIII. *Theological and Literary Journal*, January, 1861. Edited by David N. Lord. Article I. Mr. Gascoyne's Theory of the Apocalypse. II. Dr. Barth's Travels and Discoveries in Africa. III. Reply to the Errors and Misrepresentations of J. R. Blake. IV. The Golden Image, Daniel iii. Nebuchadnezzar's Vision of the Tree, Daniel iv. V. Designation and Exposition of the Figures in Isaiah, chapters lxi., lxii., and lxiii. VI. Literary and Critical Notices.

- XIV. *Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy*, January, 1861. Article I. Interesting and Successful Experiments in the Treatment of Convicts. II. The Application of the Principles of Reformatories to the Treatment of Adult Criminals. III. The "New York Times" on Prison Discipline. IV. Enormous Abuse of the Power of Committing Magistrates. Brief Notices.
- XV. *Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository*, January, 1861. Edited by E. A. Park and S. H. Taylor. Article I. Theodore Parker. II. The Theology of Sophocles. III. The Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, and its recent Theological Applications. IV. The Christian Law of Self-Sacrifice. V. Review of Palfrey's History of New England. VI. Notices of New Publications.
- XVI. *Home Circle*, March, 1861. L. D. Huston, Editor. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. General Articles. Poetry. Editorial Department.
- XVII. *Southern Episcopalian*, March, 1861. Edited by Rev. C. P. Gadsden and Rev. J. H. Elliott. Miscellaneous. Poetry. Editorial and Critical. Religious Intelligence. Obituary Notices.
- XVIII. *Historical Magazine*, March, 1861. General Department. Societies and their Proceedings. Notes and Queries. Notes on Books. Miscellany.
- XIX. *Pacific Expositor*, March, 1861. Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., Editor. Thé Presbyterian on the Expositor; Our Boys in their "teens"; The Aged Pastor; Education in California; Dr. Scott's Address at the opening of the City College; Opening of the City College, from the *Alta*; Condemned Criminals; "Milking the Goat"; Princeton Review on the Country; Rev. Charles Russell Clarke; Afflictions Sanctified; Chaplains in the Legislature; A Prayer for the Times; California Bible Society; Rev. W. C. Mosher—Rev. J. Woods; Natural and Apostolic Intolerance; City College and its Prospects; Thanksgiving Sermons; Vice and Virtue; The National Fast; Literary Record.

II. BRITISH PERIODICALS.

- I. *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision. II. Japan and the Japanese. III. The Victoria Bridge. IV. Political Ballads of England and Scotland. V. Ocean Telegraphy. VI. Autobiography of Dr. A. Carlyle. VII. Motley's History of the United Netherlands. VIII. Forbes and Tyndall on the Alps and their Glaciers. IX. The Kingdom of Italy. X. Naval Organization.
- II. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, January, 1861. Article I. The Political Year. II. The Purist Prayer Book. III. Uncivilized Man. IV. English Embassies to China. V. Horror: a True Tale. VI. What's a Grilse? VII. Norman Sinclair: An Autobiography.—Part XII. VIII. A Merry Christmas! IX. The Indian Civil Service—Its Rise and Fall.
- III. *Westminster Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Ancient Danish Ballads. II. Alcohol: What becomes of it in the Living Body. III. Canada. IV. Bible Infallibility: "Evangelical Defenders of the Faith." V. The Neapolitan and Roman Questions. VI. American Slavery: the Impending Crisis. VII. Cavour and Garibaldi. VIII. Dante and his English Translators. IX. Contemporary Literature.
- IV. *London Quarterly Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Canada and the North-West. II. The Welsh and their Literature. III. The United Netherlands. IV. The Iron Manufacture. V. Italy. VI. The Dogs of History and Romance. VII. The Income-Tax and Its Rivals. VIII. Essays and Reviews.

V. *North British Review*, February, 1861. Article I. India Convalescent. II. Shelley and his Recent Biographers. III. Large Farms and the Peasantry of the Scottish Lowlands. IV. Lord Dundonald. V. Modern Necromancy. VI. Engineering and Engineers. VII. The Political Press—French, British, and German. VIII. Home Ballads and Poems. IX. Hesse's Bampton Lecture. X. Dr. Carlyle's Autobiography. XI. Lord Palmerston and our Foreign Policy.

III. FRENCH AND GERMAN PERIODICALS.

- I. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Janvier 1861: Paris. I.—Le Roi Louis-Philippe et l'empereur Nicolas (1841-1848), par M. Guizot. II.—Les Mineurs du Harz, Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans l'Allemagne du Nord, par M. Auguste Laugel. III.—De la Statistique en France et des Progrès de la Richesse Publique, par M. Charles Lavollée. IV.—Conquête de la Mer, par M. J. Michelet, de l'Institut. V.—L'Esclavage aux États-Unis.—II.—Les Planteurs et les Abolitionistes, par M. Élisée Reclus. VI.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'espèce Humaine.—II.—L'Espèce, la Variété et la Race, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VII.—Deux Jours de Sport à Java, Scènes de la vie Indo-Hollandaise, par M. Fridolin. VIII.—Des Derniers Budgets de la France et de l'Accroissement des Dépenses, par M. Victor Bonnet. IX.—Chronique de la Quinzaine. Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X. Essais et Notices.—Le Comte Téléki. XI.—Revue des Théâtres, par M. É. Montégut. XII.—Bulletin Bibliographique.
- II. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Janvier 1861. I.—La Comtesse d'Albany. I.—Louise de Stolberg et Charles Édouard, par M. Saint-René Taillandier. II.—L'Empoisonnement des eaux Douces.—Les Poissons Sédentaires et les Poissons Voyageurs, Mœurs, Production, Elève et Acclimatation des Diverses Espèces, par M. J.-J. Baude, de l'Institut. III.—Le Général Sir Robert Wilson au Camp Russe en 1812. Souvenirs de Guerre et de Diplomatie, par M. E.-D. Forgues. IV.—Leibniz et Bossuet d'après leur correspondance inédite, par M. Charles de Rémusat, de l'Académie Française. V.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—III.—Races Végétales et Animales, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VI.—Deux Épisodes Diplomatiques.—I.—Dernières Négociations de l'Empire, Ouvertures de Francfort et Conférences de Chatillon, par M. O. d'Haussonville. VII.—Les Voyageurs en Orient.—VI.—De la Moralité des Finances Turques, par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Académie Française. VIII.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX.—Essais et Notices.—Lettre de Chine. X.—Des Récens Progrès de l'Agriculture Anglaise, par M. L. de Lavergne, de l'Institut. XI.—Bulletin Bibliographique.
- III. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Février 1861: Paris. I.—L'Italie depuis Villafranca.—II.—Le Roi François II et la Révolution de Naples, par M. Charles de Mazade. II.—Joseph de Maistre et Lamennais.—Les Tendances Communes et les Résultats Définitifs de leur Philosophie, par M. Louis Binaut. III.—La Comtesse d'Albany.—II.—La Reine d'Angleterre et Victor Alfieri, par M. Saint-René Taillandier. IV.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—IV.—Des Variations dans les Êtres Organisés, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. V.—Les Finances de l'Empire, par M. Casimir Perier, ancien député. VI.—La Fauvette Bleue, Récit des Bords de la Loire, par M. Th. Pavie. VII.—Les Fantaisies d'Histoire Naturelle de M. Michelet, par M. Emile Montégut. VIII.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX.—Revue Musicale.—Un Ballo in Maschera, etc., par M. P. Scudo. X.—Théâtres.—Les Pièces Nouvelles. XI.—Bulletin Bibliographique.

- IV. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Février 1861 : Paris. I.—La Comtesse d'Albany.—III.—L'Amie d'Alferi et la Société Européenne, par M. Saint-René Taillandier. II.—Hegel et l'Hégélianisme d'après les Derniers Travaux Publiés en Allemagne, par M. Edmond Scherer. III.—La Nationalité Bretonne dans l'Unité Française, par M. L. de Carné. IV.—La Télégraphie Électrique en France.—De la Réforme du Service Électrique et de l'Abaissement des Tarifs, par M. Auguste Laugel. V.—Les Voyageurs en Orient.—VII.—De la Situation des Chrétiens en Turquie d'après une Enquête du Gouvernement Anglais, Première Partie, par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Académie Française. VI.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—V.—Origine des Variétés et Formation des Races dans les Êtres Organisés, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VII.—Des Origines de la Gravure.—l'Archéologie et la Critique dans l'Art, par M. Henri Delaborde. VIII.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX.—Revue Musicale.—La Circassienne, de M. Auber, par M. P. Seudo. X.—Essais et Notices. XI.—Bulletin Bibliographique.
- V. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Mars 1861 : Paris. I.—Trois Ministres de l'Empire Romain sous les fils de Théodose.—II.—L'Eunuque Eutrope, Première Partie, par M. Amédée Thierry, de l'Institut. II.—Philosophie Anglaise Contemporaine.—John Stuart Mill et son Système de Logique, par M. H. Taine. III.—Statistique Morale.—Le Salaire et le Travail des Femmes.—IV.—L'Assistance et les Institutions de Prévoyance, Dernière Partie, par M. Jules Simon. IV.—El Cachupin, Scènes et Récit de la Louisiane, par M. Théodore Pavie. V.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—VI.—Du Croisement dans les Êtres Organisés, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VI.—La Nemesis Divina, Manuscrit Inédit de Linné, par M. A. Geffroy. VII.—La Question du Coton en Angleterre depuis la Crise Américaine, par M. John Ninet. VIII.—Portraits Poétiques.—Maurice de Guérin, par M. Émile Montégut. IX.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X.—Essais et Notices. XI.—Bulletin Bibliographique.
- VI. *Revue Germanique*, par MM. Ch. Dollfus & A. Nefftzer, 15 Janvier 1861 : Paris. Sommaire : I.—L'Âme de la Plante (deuxième et dernier article), par M. A. Boscowitz. II.—Le Saule, nouvelle, par M. Ch. Dollfus. III.—La Corse, traduit de l'allemand de M. Ferdinand Gregorovius. IV.—Un Mois de Séjour à Vienne, par M. A. Widal. V.—Les Travaux de F. C. Baur : Idée générale des origines et des premiers développements du Christianisme, par M. A. Nefftzer. VI.—Bulletin Bibliographique et Critique. VII.—Courrier Scientifique et Littéraire. VII.—Chronique Parisienne.
- VII. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Décembre 1860 : Paris. Sommaire : La Tragédie fataliste en Allemagne, A. Monnard. Félix Neff, Martin. Saint Jean Chrysostome, A. Eschenauer. Une mission en Chine et au Japon, Ernest Lemaitre. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois, E. de Pressensé.
- VIII. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Janvier 1861 : Paris. Sommaire : Les Moines et le Christianisme, E. de Pressensé. Milton, sa vie et ses Écrits, E.-H. de Guerle. Un nouveau plan d'éducation, Gauthey. Etude sur le Cantique des Cantiques, Godet. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois, Eug. Bersier.
- IX. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Février 1861 : Paris. Sommaire : Ce qu'il faut à la France, Rosseeuw St-Hilaire. M. de Tocqueville et l'Académie Française, E. de Pressensé. De la Prédication Catholique.—Le P. Larcordaire, E.-H. de Guerle. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois, E. de Pressensé.

X. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Jahrgang 1861 erstes Heft. Abhandlungen. 1. Hupfeld: noch ein Wort über den Begriff der sogenannten biblischen Einleitung. 2. Weiss: zur Entstehungsgeschichte der drei synoptischen Evangelien. Gedanken und Bemerkungen. 1. Ritschel; über die im Briefe des Judas characterisirten Antinomisten. 2. Kamphausen; Bemerkungen über einige Stellen des vierten Capitels der Genesis. Recensionen. 1. Lücke, Commentar über die Briefe des Evangelisten Johannes; rec. von Wieseler. 2. Gass, Geschichte der protestant. Dogmatik; rec. von Kling. Miscellen: Programm der teyler'schen theologischen Gesellschaft für das Jahr. 1860. Zweites Heft. Abhandlungen. 1. Bleek, Erklärung von Jesaja, 52, 13–53, 12. 2. Richter, die Kindertaufe, ihr Wesen und Recht. Gedanken und Bemerkungen. 1. Steitz, der classische und der johanneische Gebrauch von *ἐκείνος*. 2. Gurlitt, kleine Beiträge zur Erklärung des Evangeliums Matthäi. Recensionen. 1. Pressel, Ambrosius Blaurer's Leben und Schriften; rec. von Ullmann. 2. Maier, Commentar über den ersten Brief Pauli an die Korinther; rec. von Holtzmann. Kirchliches. Mühlhäuser, die Unionskatechismen. Miscellen: Programm der Haager Gesellschaft zur Vertheidigung der christlichen Religion auf das Jahr 1860.

ERRATA.

The reader is requested to correct the following errors of the press, (in Article V.,) which happened during the author's absence from town:

On page 129, line 14th, for *Valer*, read *Vater*. In line 18th, for *christalization*, read *crystalization*. In line 22d, for *Præ Elohist*, read *Præ-Elohist*. In line 5th from bottom, for *Mouboddo*, read *Monboddo*.

On page 132, line 11th, for *Ervoqe*, read *Ewige*.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 2.

JULY, MDCCCLXI.

ARTICLE I.

NATURAL HISTORY AS A BRANCH OF SCHOOL EDUCATION; AND THE SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE, AND THE UNIVERSITY, IN RELATION TO ONE ANOTHER AND TO ACTIVE LIFE.

In our article on the Principles of a Liberal Education, (Vol. XII., p. 310,) as also in an Inaugural Address delivered by us, we endeavored to show the importance of *organic science* as a means of mental culture. In our article on Morphology, (Vol. XII., p. 83,) we undertook to point out the philosophic connection of that branch of organic science with fine art. Finally, in our article on the Relation of Organic Science to Sociology, (Vol. XIII., p. 39,) we attempted to explain the philosophic connection of the same science with the most important concerns of life. If there is any truth in any of these views, (and we are perfectly confident there is,) the great importance of a full introduction of organic science into our courses of liberal education becomes evident at once. Our college curriculum, therefore, requires modification in this respect. It is in vain to contend that other equally or more

VOL. XIV., NO. II.—24

important departments would have to be partially displaced. If the object of liberal education is symmetrical culture, and if the different departments have correlative functions, and are, therefore, essentially complementary to one another, as we have attempted to show in the article on the Principles of Education, before alluded to, then it is of the utmost importance that the various departments should be *all* introduced, and properly adjusted. Profound, accurate and special knowledge of any department, however important in a practical point of view, is far less important in a liberal education than a good fundamental knowledge of all.

It is true that mathematics and classics, as the basis of the whole scientific and art course, may be considered the most important departments in a general culture, but it is not necessarily true that importance, in the sense of *indispensableness* should be the measure either of prominence or of dignity. A course of education is an *organized* system. It may be, therefore, compared with other *organisms*, and is subject to their laws. Now, the functions of the animal body may be divided into two great classes, viz: those which are the *means*, the necessary *condition* of animal life, and those which are the *end* and *object* of animal life, and give dignity to it. To the first class belong digestion, respiration, circulation, nutrition, and all the so-called vegetative functions; to the second belong the distinctive animal functions, such as locomotion, and the exercise of the higher senses. Now, which of these two classes is the most important? Evidently, the first, since upon it depends the very life of the animal, and, therefore, the existence, of the second class. But which is the noblest? Evidently, the second, since these functions constitute the true end and object of animal life, and, therefore, the first class exist only for them. The various pursuits of men may be similarly considered as functions of the social body, and may, therefore, be similarly classified. There are those which are the necessary means and condition of social life—the vege-

tative functions of the social body—*e. g.*, the trades, commerce, and all the so-called useful pursuits of men. There are others, which are directly connected, not with the existence, but with the end and object, of social life, and without which social life will have utterly failed of its true mission, viz: the spiritual elevation of man. These are all pursuits which have for their object the attainment of Truth, Virtue, Beauty. Of the tree of social life these are the flower and fruit, as the first are its trunk and roots. Of the temple of society these are the capitals and pinnacles, as the others are the firm foundation and the solid walls. Of these two classes, again, evidently the first is the most important, but the second the noblest. In proportion as society advances, the first becomes subordinate to the second.

Now, each subordinate course of the college curriculum is or ought to be an organized system, and, therefore, subject to the laws of other organisms. The several departments may be, therefore, classified in a somewhat similar manner, though the classification is by no means so obvious, because the organism is less perfect. Mathematics forms the basis and necessary condition of scientific culture, as organic, and especially social, science does of its true end and object. In the art course, classics bear the same relation to literature and the fine arts. If each lower department had no other significance than as a basis for the next higher—in other words, if the organism was complete—then it is evident that, in a general culture, so much and no more mathematics would be required as is necessary to form a solid foundation for physics and chemistry; so much physics and chemistry as is necessary for a clear apprehension of organic science, and so much organic science as is necessary to a thorough knowledge of social science and psychology. In an ideally perfect condition of human philosophy, such would, indeed, be the ideal of general culture. But in the present very imperfect condition of human

knowledge, particularly in these higher departments, each lower department must be not only a means, but an end, in itself, of culture; and until now their function as an *end* is even more important, perhaps, than as a *means*. In proportion, however, as the higher departments are more developed—in proportion as the sum of human knowledge becomes more perfectly organized—in the same proportion must the educational course become more perfectly organized, and, therefore, the lower and simpler departments assume the position of a foundation and the function of a *means* of culture. They must decrease as the others increase. Now, it seems to me that the development of our educational systems have by no means kept pace with the organization of knowledge—that in the lower departments much is insisted on which is not absolutely necessary in a *general* culture—an amount of minute knowledge, and, therefore, an amount of time, is required, which was well enough when no other formal or organized culture was possible, but now belongs rather to a *special* than a *general* culture.

If, then, the recent rapid advance and great importance of the higher departments be admitted, there can be no doubt that our curriculums of education should be modified to suit these new conditions. Organic science, especially, should be more largely introduced into our college curriculums. But there are difficulties in the way of the successful introduction of this department, which in the present state of our educational systems are absolutely insuperable—difficulties which only increase in proportion to the conscientiousness of the teacher, and his appreciation of the nature of true culture. Perhaps many will think that the subject is as yet unadapted to systematic teaching; but a little reflection will suffice to show that the chief difficulty lies not in the nature of the subject—which is eminently adapted to excite the interest, to kindle the enthusiasm and expand the mind—nor in the unorganized condition of the science

itself, but in the faulty and unorganized condition of our educational systems.

In order to show the true nature of this difficulty, let us compare organic science with some one of the simpler and more perfect departments of science. In the present state of our educational systems, perhaps, of all departments of science, natural philosophy is capable of most completely successful teaching, and organic science is cumbered with most difficulty. The reason of this difference is easily explained. In teaching natural philosophy, the facts and phenomena—the things about which the science treats—are *already familiar* to the pupil. Uniform, accelerated and retarded motion, falling bodies, centre of gravity, levers, pulleys, wedges, screws, inclined planes, winds, rains, dew and frost, clouds and storm, thunder and lightning, the more obvious phenomena of light and sound, as reflection, refraction, dispersion, etc.—all these have been forced upon his attention during childhood, as the necessary result of the simple exercise of his senses. If there are a few phenomena which are still unfamiliar—such as those of electricity and magnetism—these may be easily given in a very few and simple experiments. Thus the *things* about which we are to reason are already familiar, and the reasoning, and the study of *principles* and *laws* may commence at once, and be carried on with entire success.

In astronomy there is more difficulty. Already there are a number of unfamiliar facts which must be learned, (such as the motions of the heavenly bodies,) before the study of laws, or the science proper, can be commenced. These, however, may be learned without much loss of time. In chemistry we first enter a field in which the facts and phenomena, and even the things about which we are to reason together, are utterly unfamiliar to the pupil. We are about to learn a language the alphabet of which is not yet known. Oxygen, hydrogen, chlorine, nitrogen, as well as almost all the substances spoken of by chemistry, are new things—

their properties entirely unknown until the pupil enters the chemical lecture-room. Hence, a very large amount of time is necessarily consumed in becoming acquainted with the mere *raw material* of science, before that material can be woven into the *fabric* of science. Hence, to teach the science of chemistry with thoroughness and success, requires an amount of time much greater than can be spared from other and equally important departments in the college curriculum. Already the difficulty is beginning to press heavily. But when we come to organic science and geology, the difficulty reaches its acmé. In these sciences the number of facts, most of them unfamiliar, is so enormous—even the objects concerning which we are to reason are so entirely new, and so infinite in number and variety—that much more than the whole time which can be well spared from the curriculum would be required to master them, and no time at all is left for the science proper. Thus, only one of two alternatives is left open to the teacher: Either to attempt to teach the laws and principles with an exceedingly slender and imperfect knowledge of the objects and phenomena upon which these laws and principles are based, or else to consume the whole time in an attempt to master the details, and never ascend to laws and principles at all; either to attempt to interest the mind and exercise the reason, by explaining the significance of things yet too imperfectly known, or else to stuff the memory, “against the stomach of the sense,” with the dry detail of facts which have no significance; either to call up a mere *skeleton* of facts, and then try to “create a soul under the ribs of death,” or else to make a *body* out of the dust of the earth, and breathe into it no breath of life; in a word, either to teach a science without a natural history, which must precede it, or else to stop with natural history, and never ascend to science at all. In the one case we imitate the folly of him who built his house upon sand; in the other, of him who laid deep the foundation, and built nothing thereon. The

effect of the one is to unsettle the mind by unsatisfactory and unsubstantial knowledge; of the other, to disgust the pupil, and degrade the noble science of organisms, by crowding the mind with details when it should be occupied with principles—exercising the memory only, when we should exercise the reason also—stuffing the memory with the husks of *facts*, when we should be nourishing the mind with the invigorating aliment of *truth*.

Such being the difficulty, how is it to be removed? We are sure it has already suggested itself to the reader's mind. The only difference between the simpler and the more complex sciences, in respect to success in teaching, consists, as we have seen, in the fact that in the one the things and phenomena are already learned in childhood, while in the other they are not. Evidently, then, organic science can never be successfully taught in college, unless a large number of facts in this department be first mastered in childhood. And as these will not be spontaneously acquired, they must be *taught* in our common schools. In a word, *before organic science and geology can be taught in our colleges with a thoroughness and success at all commensurate with their importance, natural history must be largely introduced into our preparatory schools.*

Thus it has happened, that, by reflecting on the great importance of organic science, and yet the difficulties attending its successful introduction into our college curriculum, we have been led to reflect upon the philosophic relation of school education to college education, and thence upon the relation of both to university education, and all to active life—through a train of thought connected with a particular department, to a question of general interest—from a question in a special philosophy to a question in general philosophy. We hope in the sequel to show the significance of this fact.

There is a growing, and, we believe, a thoroughly rational tendency at the present day to look upon all artificial clas-

sifications and systems as essentially vicious, and to make nature, rightly interpreted, the true basis of every system. A course of education, therefore, in order to be successful, must be a reflection of the course of development of the human mind—a true expression of the order of development of the human faculties. It would be difficult, and perhaps useless, for our present purpose, to trace this order in all its details; but there are great groups of faculties or departments of the mind, which unmistakably culminate and decline successively. This fact we have attempted, in our article on the Relation of Organic Science to Sociology, to generalize, under a law which we have called the law of “cyclical evolution.” For illustrations of this great law of all development, we would simply refer to that article; suffice it for the present to say, that in childhood the perceptive faculties and memory take their rise, culminate and gradually decline; in youth culminate the impulses, the passions, the emotions, and the imaginative faculty; at the same time takes its rise, and in manhood culminates, the rational faculty, or formal reason, or, as it might otherwise be called, the scientific faculty, or faculty of *organizing* knowledge. Or the relation between these three stages of development may be otherwise expressed, thus: childhood is the period of culmination of the perceptive faculties, as manhood is of the rational faculty. With the decline of the one, the other takes its rise, thus forming two arches, the chasm between being spanned, and the continuity of development maintained, by the imagination and æsthetic faculty. Thus, youth is the *transition stage* between childhood and manhood, as the imagination forms the connecting link between the strictly perceptive and the purely rational faculty.

This, then, being the order in which the faculties of the mind *naturally unfold*, it must be the only order in which they can be successfully *cultivated*. The best human education is not that which forces the faculties into unnatural

and premature growth, but that which cultivates to the fullest extent the several faculties as they naturally and successively arise—*i. e.*, the perceptive faculties and memory first, and the rational faculties afterwards. We have all of us observed instances of the disastrous results of a contrary course. We have all observed that, as a general rule, the too prematurely *thoughtful* child is not most likely to make the most eminent and useful man; that, on the contrary, the boy in whom the characteristic *childish* faculties are most strongly developed—the boy fullest of life and keen interest in the external world—of the keenest eye, the quickest ear and the readiest mother-wit—in a word, the boy who is more boyish than other boys, is most likely to make a man more manly than other men. There is a *tide* in the developement of the mental faculties, which, taken at the flood, leads on to the highest culture, and to greatness. Childhood is the flood time of the perceptive faculties and the memory—the golden opportunity for gathering rich stores of detail-knowledge of things through the senses, and retaining them by the memory—an opportunity which never occurs but once. Youth and early manhood is the rise and flood time of the reasoning faculties. We must seize this opportunity of cultivating these to the full: if we seize it not, it is gone for ever. Alas! for those who neglect this only opportunity. The careless, thoughtless joyousness of childhood, opening its young eyes upon a beautiful world, as it were, fresh from the hands of God; the warm emotions and glowing imagination of youth, through which, as through a prism, the world seems so variously and gorgeously colored—alas! these must decline; it is the inexorable law of developement. If we go not forwards, we go, inevitably, backwards. If the culmination of the higher intellectual and moral faculties do not succeed to these, the whole nature, both physical and mental, degenerates—the beauty, the freedom, the splendor, of youth sinks into the coarseness of manhood—glorious

hopes and noble aspirations are exchanged for selfish worldliness. Ah! who has not seen this melancholy process of retrogradation going on constantly? There is some thing always touching, engaging, beautiful, in childhood and youth, even without culture. But without intellectual and moral culture, there is neither interest nor dignity, nor even physical beauty, in manhood. But, alas! in woman, how much sadder is often the change, unless culture takes the place of the free joyousness of youth! Who has not seen and mourned over the sad change which marriage often makes in the characters of women who neglect culture? Instead of the charming maiden expanding into the noble matron, she sinks into the querulous household drudge, or the heartless devotee of fashion. Where, now, are all her tremulous hopes, her tender longings, her ardent aspirations after the ideal? Gone for ever! All these sweet swelling buds, just ready to burst into bloom, to fill the air with fragrance, and rise as grateful incense to Heaven, withered and shrivelled beneath the icy touch of the hard realities of life, and only the scentless calyx leaves remain—all the glorious promise of spring sinking suddenly into an untimely winter sleep. “Some times, when a long buried idol of her once devout heart, or a strain of melancholy music, throws upon this winter sleep of her heart a warm sunbeam, she starts and looks around, and says, ‘Formerly was it different with me, but it is long, long since, and I believe at that time I might have erred’—and she sleeps again.”

But to return. If childhood is the flood time of the perceptive faculties and the memory—the golden opportunity for gathering stores of material—how important that this omnivorous, indiscriminate appetite for knowledge—this immense capacity for gathering and retaining material—should be turned in the right direction. We have said above that natural history belongs to the school, and organic science to the college. We now generalize this fact into the

proposition that there is *in every department a corresponding division, with similar educational functions*. In every department there is a part which corresponds to natural history, and a part which corresponds to natural science. The one is occupied with the details of facts and phenomena, the other with laws and principles; the one with things, the other with ideas; *the one exercises preëminently the perceptive faculties and memory, the other preëminently the formal reason*. There is no general name by which these two divisions are designated, for the plain reason that they have been imperfectly recognized. In default of a better, I shall call them natural history and natural science, or simply History and Science. We have already indicated the two in natural philosophy, astronomy, chemistry and organic science. In geography, they are—1st. Ordinary geography, both political and physical, as taught in the schools—*i. e.*, the detail-knowledge of the features of the earth's surface; and, 2d. Geographical science, or the laws and causes of these features. The first is the anatomy of the earth; the second, the morphology and physiology of the earth. In history they are—1st. History as ordinarily understood—*i. e.*, the details of history; 2d. The philosophy of history—political economy and social science. In the language department they are—1st. Knowledge of *formal rules* of grammar—of lexicon, and practice in translation; 2d. The science of language, *the laws* of grammar, and the study of the literature of the ancients. In art they are—1st. Manual dexterity and knowledge of technical details and rules; 2d. *Æsthetics*. Now, the great and fundamental difference between the school and college curriculum consists in the fact that *history* belongs to the *school*, and *science* to the *college*, using both terms in the general sense previously indicated. Thus, the school and the college do not, or ought not to, differ in the *subjects* taught, but only in the *kind* of knowledge imparted in each department. In every subject there is a part which belongs to the school and a part to the college.

Every subject should be learned twice over, once in the school and once in the college. In the one we store the memory with words and things, in the other we exercise the higher faculties of the mind, in reasoning about the things previously acquired. Thus, celestial geography and the phenomena of celestial motion, belong legitimately to school, while astronomical science belongs to college. Chemistry, so far as it refers to a knowledge of the properties of bodies, belongs properly to school, but chemical science, or the body of laws and principles founded upon these properties, belong to college. Natural history of organisms belongs to school, the science of organisms to college. Geognosy belongs to school, geology to college. Geography belongs to school, geographical science to college. History belongs to school, philosophy of history and sociology to college. The knowledge of lexicon—the formal rules of grammar, and practice in translation—belong to school, philology to college. Formal rules and technicalities of art, and acquirement of manual dexterity, belong to school, cultivation of taste—enthusiasm for art, and the study of æsthetics—belong to college. Even in mathematics the division, though less marked, is still visible. The formal *rules* of arithmetic and algebra, and the acquirement of facility and dexterity in arithmetical and algebraic *operations*, belong to the school, while the higher mathematics, and even the rational comprehension of these rules and operations, belong legitimately to college. Thus, if it were possible, it would be well if, on every subject, there were two series of text-books, one for schools and the other for colleges; and thus that every subject in the course of education were passed over twice. In fact, all that we have said on this subject is but an illustration of the general and indisputable law, that the mind passes always from the *concrete* to the *abstract*—from sensation and perception, to thought—from things to ideas. Now, the proposition is,

that *concrete* knowledge belongs essentially to *school*, and *abstract* knowledge to *college*.

Having thus defined in general terms the true nature of school education, as contrasted with college education, and shown that if organic science is ever to be successfully introduced into college, the natural history of organisms must first be introduced into our schools, we will now attempt further to show that the *natural history* of organisms is *peculiarly adapted* to the *cultivation of the childish faculties*, and, therefore, *peculiarly important as a department of the school curriculum*.

One of the greatest faults of our systems of school-education, from time immemorial, has been the over-crowding the memory of the pupil with dry, uninteresting detail—the over-taxing the memory, without relieving it by connection with the other faculties of the mind—thus often creating a disgust for learning which is never eradicated. This difficulty has long been felt. The tendency of the age has been to relieve this tax upon the memory, by connecting it with the formal reason. Now, in so far as this has counteracted the disastrous effects of cultivating the mere memory—so far as this connection has succeeded in giving life and interest to otherwise dry detail—it has done immense good. We can not but think, however, that it may be carried too far, and thus result in unnatural and premature development—development of faculties which belong to youth rather than childhood; or else that it will, in many instances, fail from a want of conformity to the laws of natural development. It is rather by its connection with the perceptive faculties, or *intuitive* reason, and the exercise of the senses, that the memory is to be relieved in childhood. It is in youth that the connection of memory with the formal reason is most advantageous. A mere mass of unconnected facts, we all know, can not be retained in the memory, or, if retained, is but a heap of useless rubbish. Knowledge, to be of any use, must be more or less organized. In child-

hood it must be roughly and provisionally organized by the *perceptive faculties*; in youth and manhood it must be more perfectly and permanently organized by the *formal reason*. Who does not know that it is impossible to over-crowd the memory if it is stored through the senses, and the materials organized by the perceptive faculties? Now, this is just the effect of natural history in all departments of science, but particularly of the natural history of organisms. It teaches the child to see and hear, to observe and compare, and to store the memory by means of observation and comparison. The habit of seeing and hearing truly, of observing and comparing accurately—does not daily experience prove that these are among the rarest, and yet the most important, of mental gifts? In all the departments of exact science, our knowledge may be brought completely under the dominion of formal reason—may be subjected to regular rules and strict methods—and thus completely organized. But in the higher and more complex departments of knowledge, this is no longer possible. In our dealings with men, and even with nature in its most complex phenomena, the processes of the mind are far too subtle to be reducible to regular methods. The problems of exact science may be *completely solved* by the *formal reason* and the use of regular rules; but the problems of the more inexact, because more complex, departments of knowledge, can only be more or less accurately *guessed at*, by the *intuitive reason* acting through methods which can not be reduced to rule. In these departments conclusions must be reached by a process of combination so rapid and subtle, so various and complex in its successive steps, as to baffle all our attempts at analysis. This rapid intuitive perception of truth, by processes which we can not analyze, is, in fact, what is called *common sense*, or *judgment*; and in its highest development, as in great statesmen and warriors, is genius. It is closely allied to what I have called the perceptive faculty—it is, in fact, but a higher development of the same

thing. Now, the great value of natural history, as well as of ancient language, consists in the fact that it *preëminently cultivates this indispensable faculty of comparison and rapid combination—this noble faculty of judgment and common sense*. The mental process by which the naturalist pursues, through numberless comparisons, and finally detects, the unvarying amid the ever varying; by which he determines species, and then groups them into genera and families: eludes, by its subtlety, our powers of definition, and baffles our attempts to reduce to formal rule. The capacity may be *imbibed* by personal contact and familiar association, but can not be *formally imparted* by the teacher—the process may be learned by practice, under direction, but can not be taught by rule. Where formal reason fails, we are often compelled to *judge of organisms* by their habits, their general port, their physiognomy: as we judge of men by their faces and their actions. Thus natural history cultivates the power of observing and comparing—of rapidly combining and accurately judging—of arriving at truth which transcends the power of formal methods—and thus admirably prepares us for those still more complex and difficult problems of human actions which are daily presented to us in practical life.

If, then, this faculty of observing and comparing, of combining and judging, is so useful in practical life, how important is it that it should be not only freely exercised, but carefully trained. Exercise it will be, at any rate, since the perceptive are the predominant faculties of childhood, and, therefore, in constant use; but an untrained faculty is often worse than its entire absence—undisciplined strength is often worse than mere weakness. The latter may be harmless, the former always dangerous. The one leaves us in ignorance, the other leads us into error. We feel confident, therefore, that as a means of mental culture, no department of the school curriculum can at all compare with natural history of organisms, except the ancient languages. In this department we have the same connection of memory

with the perceptive powers, though not so much with the senses—the same exercise of comparison, though not of observation. These two, therefore, of all departments, are most eminently adapted to cultivate the characteristic faculties of childhood. Ancient language has, perhaps, the advantage of requiring severer labor, and thus cultivating the habit of patient perseverance in toil, so indispensable to the student; and, in common with the whole art course, of cultivating the faculty of expression, so indispensable to every cultivated man; but natural history has the advantage of exciting more interest, of stimulating the spirit of inquiry, kindling the enthusiasm, and feeding the flame of the love of truth.

A complete confirmation of the views above presented, as to the importance of these two departments, is to be found in observing the *method of nature*—*i. e.*, in watching the manner in which, and the means by which, the mind of the child unconsciously cultivates itself. There are two, and only two, kinds of culture to which the human mind is subjected by nature from the very first, and which, in imitation of nature, should be continued by art throughout life, or least until maturity, as coördinate branches of education. They are *object-culture* and *language-culture*. From the time the child opens its eyes upon the world, these two kinds of education commence. Who has not watched with intense interest the gradual but joyous, free, and healthy, development of the mind under the influence of these two sources of knowledge and culture—the gradual acquisition of the *knowledge* of properties, phenomena and things, by the *action* of the external world upon the mind through the *senses*, and the gradual acquisition of *power* by the *reaction* of the mind, through the bodily organs, upon the external world—the gradually increasing influence of other minds upon that of the child, through language, and the gradual attempt, through the same means, to react upon and influence others? The two great natural educators are external

nature and our fellow-men—the one acting through the senses, the other through language—the one is object-education, the other language-education. From time immemorial, we have directed and improved by art this language-education. Shall we not perfect by art the object-education also?

These two, then, viz: object-culture and language-culture, are the *natural* coördinate branches of the education of childhood. To these, however, must be added, by art, mathematics. This department must be added at this time, not so much with a view to present as to *future culture*. As the necessary basis of the whole scientific course in college, it can not and must not be neglected. Still, as a means of cultivating the minds of children, I think it will be admitted by all that mathematics more often fails than any other department. The reason of this is not any special difficulty in the department itself; but because, as usually taught, it is introduced, with an eye to a future course, out of the natural order of mental development. The mind passes always with much difficulty, and by slow degrees, from the *concrete* to the *abstract*—from *things* to *ideas*. But here we commence at once with the most abstract propositions. If the mind is prepared for these, either by nature or by previous training, it grasps them at once, and the whole mathematical course becomes extremely easy; but if not, the whole course becomes a dead waste, without a single green spot—a blank tablet, covered with curious but unintelligible symbols. Thus, mathematics is either *more* perfectly or *less* perfectly understood than any other department. There is no half-knowledge possible. It is the most uncompromising dispenser of its gifts—it either nourishes bountifully or altogether starves the mind. To him that hath five talents it gives five talents more, but from him that hath but one talent, it takes away even that which he hath. It will not yield an inch, nor stoop in the slightest degree, but requires every one to help himself.

External nature and language, on the contrary, are adapted to the capacity of every mind. They have some thing for every kind and degree of intelligence; they have their milk for babes, and their strong meats for strong men; they kindly stoop and take the feeble ones by the hand, and gently and tenderly help them onward and upward. We climb the hill of mathematics by a series of steps cut in solid rock. If the pupil's legs are too short to reach the first step, he is left behind. If in any subsequent part of the course—through carelessness or inadvertence—he misses one step, the train sweeps onward in its magnificent march, and leaves him struggling behind, unpitied, and perhaps disheartened and broken-spirited. In object-culture and language-culture, on the other hand, we ascend a hill equally lofty, but more accessible to feeble limbs; not by granite steps, but on natural soil—rugged and steep, true, but here and there a blue gentian or a moss-covered resting-place. We are not compelled to proceed "*cum æquo pede*," by inexorable steps ready cut; but at the rate and with the steps which suit our strength, our gentle mother, Nature, the while leading us by the hand.

We have thus attempted to show the characteristics of school, as contrasted with college education. It must not be supposed, however, that it is either possible or desirable that the two courses should be trenchantly divided. We have shown the *distinctive* characteristics of each course, but they really run by insensible gradations into one another. They are, indeed, but one course, the college being but a natural developement of the school course. There are no trenchant lines of distinction in nature, especially in a course of natural developement. We speak of the distinctive characteristics of childhood, youth, and manhood; but these three stages pass by insensible gradations into one another. The proper basis of a scheme of education, is the law of developement of the human mind; and therefore, also, the several stages of a course of education must equally grad-

uate insensibly into one another. As all the faculties of the mind exist at every stage of development, and the distinctive character of each stage consists in the relative strength of these faculties, so, also, all the faculties of the mind must be cultivated at all periods; the distinctive character of the different stages of education consisting in the predominance of one or another species of culture. The human mind is in fact an unit—the separate faculties are so indissolubly bound together that they can not be cultivated, except in connection with one another. Thus, the rational faculty is to some extent cultivated in every department of school education, but especially in the mathematics, which may, therefore, be looked upon as the representative of that faculty in the school course: While, on the other hand, the memory, the perceptive faculty, and the power of expression, is cultivated to some extent in every department of the college course, but especially in the language-art course, which may, therefore, be looked upon as their representative in the college course. The school, therefore, graduates insensibly into the college course in all departments, but especially is this true of the language and art course. In fact, it is, we think, one distinctive function of the language-art course thus to connect firmly together the school and college curriculum. We have already said that the imagination, the faculty of expression, and the æsthetic faculty, stand midway between the perceptive and the reflective, partaking of the nature of both, and binding all together into one organic whole. So, also, the art-course, which is the representative of these in the curriculum, must run through and firmly connect the school and college courses. Thus, of the three coördinate departments of the school, viz: nature, mathematics and language-art, the first, nature, is distinctly differentiated between the school and the college into *natural history* and *science*; mathematics runs throughout, but is cultivated in school principally with reference to practice in mathematical operations, and in

college, to the exercise of the formal reason; the language-art course also runs throughout, but in school cultivates principally the perceptive faculty and the memory, and in college the æsthetic faculty and the reason. Thus, the mathematical and language-courses both run throughout the whole educational course, but there is this great distinction between them, viz: that while the language-course *remains as a distinct course throughout*, mathematics, which is distinct in school, *is merged into the scientific course in college*. Nature and mathematics have no connection in school, but become *one* in college. This simplification, by the union of what was before distinct, is a law of development of human knowledge, particularly conspicuous in the department of science, as we have attempted to show in our Inaugural, as also in our lecture on Morphology, and in that on the Principles of a Liberal Education. Here, we observe, it finds its embodiment in a course of education; but only distinctly marked in the scientific department, because only this department is completely organized. The metaphysical or philosophical course belongs, of course, exclusively to college. Thus, there are three coördinate departments, both in school and in college. Mathematics and natural history, which are distinct in school, uniting, in college, to form one, viz: science, the philosophic course being added, and the language course continuing.

We come now to the university course. The *distinctive end and object of this course is, undoubtedly, a direct preparation for active life*—a direct apprenticeship to the various pursuits of actual life. The college course looks only to the *individual* to be cultivated, without direct reference to the particular wants of *society*. It cultivates strength, symmetry of proportion, and universal efficiency. It prepares for the whole sphere of man, without reference to the particular fragment of that sphere which the necessities of material existence may hereafter compel him to choose. It is a thoroughly *human* education, and not an education for

society in its present phase. The university course, on the other hand, is a direct preparation for society in its present phase of development—as now constituted of various classes and pursuits. It is a preparation for activity in that particular subdivision of man's sphere which the necessities of our material nature and the wants of society compel us to choose.

But it will be asked, is the university, then, a mere school of specialities? Is the object of culture purely utilitarian? Shall not the general culture, commenced in college, be completed here? Is not one object of the university to make the finished scholar? Yes, it is true that one of the main objects of the university course is to complete the general culture, and thus make the perfect scholar; but it is only as a member of *society*, as a member of one *class*, and that the highest, in a well-organized society, and as influencing society for good, that the scholar assumes his true significance and his real dignity. One of the main objects of the university is a preparation for the scholar-class—an apprenticeship to the profession of letters. The main object of the university is, certainly, the completion of a general culture; but this general culture has in the university a *special* significance which it has not in the college. It is only from this point of view that the university course assumes its true significance, not as a system of self-culture, but preparation for the noblest field of activity; only so does the scholar assume his true dignity, not as an *object*, but as an *agent*—not as a *work of art*, but as a *worker* in the field of thought—one actuated not by selfishness, even though it be the most refined, but by duty to God and his fellow-men. In fact, it is only through activity, as a member of society, by connecting the intellectual with the *moral* faculties, the *intellect* with the *will*, that the highest culture, even of the pure intellect, is attained.

There is no difference of opinion, then, as to the fact that the university should make the complete scholar. The

real difference of opinion, as to the university course, is connected with a difference of idea as to the nature of the scholar. The common idea of the scholar is either the man of learning, or else the man of polite culture—either the man of immense erudition, or else the man of general, brilliant, but superficial culture—the one has come down to us from an age servile in its admiration and imitation of antiquity, the other from a frivolous age, fond of glitter and pomp and display. But in this earnest, hard-working age, when labor in some field is the only passport to respect and the only badge of dignity, the idea of the scholar must be changed. The true scholar is the *productive worker* in the field of thought, either as *extending its bounds* or as *increasing its distribution*—either as the investigator or as the teacher. In speaking of the scholar, therefore, I speak not of him who has merely passed through and mastered the *curriculum*, but of him who has imbibed the true *spirit* of knowledge; not of him who has the form or shadow only, but of him who has grasped the substance also; not of him who has laid up in the treasure-house of his memory the thoughts of other men—whose memory is the charnel-house of dead thoughts, embalmed, it may be, in the royal ceremonies of noble language, yet still, to him, dead—but of him whose life is a real, living activity in the world of thought; not of him whose mind is a museum in which elegant extracts and striking thoughts, gathered hither and thither, like glittering gems, from the field of literature, are regularly arranged and carefully labelled, ready to be paraded on fitting occasion to astonish the uninitiated, but of him who has eaten of the thoughts of great men as of flesh, and imbibed of their spirit as of blood, until these have been incorporated into his very mental constitution, to reappear as a living, active principle in his thoughts, his words, his actions; not of him who dwells for ever in the outer world of appearances, but of him who has entered the inner sanctuary of knowledge, who has laid hold of the di-

vine idea of the universe—the divine which underlies all appearances—even though it be but the extreme skirts of her garment, and has said: “I will not let thee go until thou bless me.”

Now, I am satisfied that the *best means of attaining this true scholarship is through exhaustive study of special departments*, and in proportion as knowledge becomes more and more perfectly organized does this attainment of a general philosophy through a special philosophy become more and more easy. The sum of possible human knowledge—the knowable—may be likened to a sphere. If we wish to attain a general philosophy, in proportion as culture is superficial, must its area be extensive. So long as we crawl upon the surface, our knowledge, however various, extensive and minute, must be fragmentary—our *learning* may be profound, but our *knowledge* will be superficial. But if we penetrate to the centre, *in any direction*, we are then in position to study the forces and causes which give shape to the whole mass. So, if through any special department, we penetrate to the inner sanctuary of knowledge, we will catch at least glimpses of the divine idea which animates the whole. Or, to use another illustration: Divine truth, descending from the throne of God, ramifies in its way earthward, dividing first into great branches, these into smaller, until the extreme rootlets are fixed in our sensuous nature. To him who dwells in this lower, sensuous plane alone, no connection between these various branches is visible—all knowledge is isolated and fragmentary. But in proportion as we ascend along any one branch, the union of some, the approximation of all, and their ultimate convergence to one centre of all truth, becomes more and more clear.

These four, then, the *primary school*, the *college*, the *university*, and the *world*, are the successive schools through which the human mind must pass in order to insure its full and perfect developement. The education in these may be

called, respectively, *primary* education, *liberal* education, *practical* education, and *activity*. Of these, the first is a direct preparation for the second, and these two together constitute the *pure* educational course, as contrasted with active life. They constitute essentially one course, having one object, viz: simple culture, but divisible into two parts, the distinctive character and mutual relations of which we have already fully considered. Again: the third is a preparation for the fourth, although the connection is not so intimate. If, therefore, we divide human life primarily into two—educational life and active life, or education and activity—the object of the one being *culture*, and the object of the other *influence*, or the imposition of that culture upon others—then the school and college are the field of the pure educational life, the world is the field of the pure active life, and the university is the transition, or *bridge*, between the two. Thus we have, again, a threefold aspect of human life, consisting of two complementary, and apparently antagonistic, halves, bound together by a third, and together constituting an organic whole. Let us show, further, the extent of this antagonism, and the nature of this connection.

Active life is also divisible into two parts. One is the action and reaction of *rational* beings, through their spiritual nature—through mutual sympathy and moral influence; the other is the mutual action of beings *material* as well as rational, upon one another, through their material nature and material wants. The one may be called *spiritual life*; the other, *business life*. The one is social life from the spiritual point of view, the other is social life from the material point of view. The one is the free activity of our spiritual nature, unconditioned, except by its own imperfections; the other is the activity of the same nature, conditioned also by time and sense—by external nature and a material body. The one has its basis in that common humanity which underlies all the fleeting forms and phases

of society; the other has its basis in those very fleeting forms and phases. Now, the educational life—*i. e.*, general culture, or liberal education—is a direct preparation for the first, but has no connection with the second, but, on the contrary, may be said to be antagonistic to it. The too great absorption of the mind of the present age in the second, or business-life, is the true ground of the hue and cry against liberal education, as unpractical, and unfitting for active life. Now, it is the great end and object of liberal education to prevent this absorption of the mind in the business-life. This it does by cultivating that common humanity which underlies and is independent of all forms of social organization—by preparation for activity in the spiritual life. The tendency of business-life, while it strengthens the material bonds, is, as we all know from sad experience, to loosen the spiritual bonds, and thus to separate the classes of society from one another. The tendency of the spiritual life, on the other hand, is to bind them together by mutual sympathy. This mutual sympathy is strengthened by liberal education, and thus society is bound more closely together into one common brotherhood.

But there is, nevertheless, a real ground of justice in the protest of the utilitarian spirit of the age against liberal education—*i. e.*, of culture for culture' sake. It is certainly true that education, in many cases, unfits for active life. It is certainly true that, in too many cases, the student, by constant living in the world of books, and having to do with at least the *forms* of ideas, gradually loses his firm hold upon the world of solid reality, and yet has failed to lay hold of the divine idea. Thenceforward he lives neither in the world of thought nor in the world of reality; but in a world of *forms* and *shadows*—the world of opinion and appearance. Thus, the more he cultivates himself, the more impenetrably does he become incrustèd with dead formulæ, and, therefore, the more impermeable to the rays of truth. Thus, in too many cases, culture be-

comes an injury, instead of a blessing, to the individual. But is this peculiar to culture? Is it not so with every thing good in this world—it blesses the few and curses the many. Is not wealth a curse to most men? Does not increasing vice often come with increasing civilization? Does not increasing knowledge engender increasing skepticism? Does not the glorious Gospel itself, while it blesses unspeakably the few, harden the many? Are we to conclude, therefore, that these intended blessings have all proved curses to our race; and must we find happiness only in Rousseau's "State of Nature?" Ah, no! The few chosen in each case are the "salt of the earth." Through them the world is blessed, society improves, civilization progresses, and even those who are individually injured in one way are blessed in another, by their connection with society and with civilization—even those who become impermeable to *direct* light, may be affected by that which is *reflected* from society—even those who have not the living principle of truth itself, may be incrustated with the *form* of truth: and this incrustation of dead forms, even though it resists growth and development, at least preserves from *decay*. Thus, each successive phase of truth is, as it were, "buried in a napkin" until the return of the Lord—embalmed until the day of its resurrection into living activity. Now this is, perhaps, in many cases, the necessary result under any system of education; but its extreme commonness is, we are sure, the result of a wrong conception of university education, and, therefore, of the nature of the true scholar. There seems to be, among cultivated men, a general impression, rather felt than expressed, that the principal object of the university is to complete the culture, for culture' sake, commenced in the college—that making the university a practical school, in any sense, degrades it—that university education is, *par excellence*, the liberal education. But we are convinced that this idea has been disastrous to the cause of true culture, and still more to the

influence of cultivated men. Such an idea only increases the antagonism between the educational and the active life, and thus removes the scholar still farther from the actual practical world. Not only so, but it can only make the pedant or the superficially cultivated—the learned or the accomplished man—but not the man of living power, or the true scholar. The fact is, we can not and must not ignore the material wants of man and the existing constitution of society in our schemes of education. The antagonism between the educational and the active life must not be carried too far; on the contrary, the antagonism must be removed, and they must be reconciled. This must be done in the university, and is, indeed, the distinctive significance of the university course, particularly of the special practical schools. It is true, also, but not to the same extent, of the university course, considered as a general culture—as an introduction into a complete philosophy—as a course intended to make the perfect scholar, or *worker* in the field of thought. We say, not to the same extent, because the scholar may be said to stand as a connecting link between the material and the spiritual man. His activity is principally displayed in the spiritual world, but only becomes efficient through his connection with an *organized* society, and as a member of a class in that society. Thus, the university course is, in every sense, a connecting link between the educational and the business-life. It is so, first, through its special practical schools, which directly prepare for the professions and pursuits of life; and, second, by preparing for the profession of letters, or, more properly, the profession of *thinking and teaching*, which is itself a connecting link between the spiritual and the business world.

We have thus far investigated the relation of the *educational* to the *active life*, from the *objective* point of view; but their subjective relation—their mutual relation as a means of the highest individual culture—is not less remarkable. The field of educational life is essentially the *abstract*

world—the world of *thought* and *idea*; while the field of active life is the *actual* world—the world of *action*. Thus, the one cultivates primarily the pure *intellect*, the other primarily the *will*; *truth* is the object of the one, *influence* the object of the other. It is the intellect which discovers truth: it is the power of the *will* which controls men. Thus, the educational and the active life are, in this respect, the complements of each other, and only by their union produce the most perfect culture of our whole nature, and the highest usefulness to our fellow-men. The man of mere thought, without power of will, can not maintain, in the actual world, the position to which his intellect entitles him; the man of strong will, without thought, only leads the community astray. Yet, not only in cultivating the *will* is active life important, but also as cultivating the pure intellect. The faculties and powers of our nature are so indissolubly connected together, that they are all best cultivated in connection. It is only by connecting the intellect with the moral nature, that the highest intellectual culture is attainable. As a motive for exertion, we must exchange the principle of *self-culture* for the principle of *duty to others*. The highest culture, like happiness, can only be attained by going out of *self* for a motive of exertion and an end of life. We have said elsewhere that this external motive must be *love of truth*. This is strictly true for the pure educational life; but if we take the whole human life, both educational and active, as a school of human culture, then we must add another, also, viz: *the good of our fellow-men*. Thus, the motive in culture, as in religion, becomes two-fold. As in religion, the motive of exertion is not primarily our own happiness, but love to God and our fellow-men, so in culture, the motive must not be self-culture, but the attainment of the True and the Good. Solomon, because he prayed not for happiness, nor riches, nor power, nor even wisdom only, but *wisdom* “*to judge the people,*” received not only wisdom, but also riches and power and happiness: So, also, we, if

we desire first, and strive earnestly after, not self-culture, nor even truth alone, but *truth for the sake of good* to others, shall receive not only the answer to our prayers, and the reward of our strivings, but the highest culture of which our nature is capable will be added also.

But again: there are most important complementary relations between the *general culture* of liberal education and the *special culture* of the university, showing the absolute necessity of combining them if we would attain either a *perfect culture* or a *complete philosophy*.

First, then, in the attainment of a *perfect culture*, the complementary relation of these two is very evident. General culture alone produces comprehensiveness, but, at the same time, dimness and indefiniteness of view, while special culture alone produces clearness and definiteness, certainly, but narrowness of view. The one cultivates breadth, the other profundity. General culture alone is too apt to beget, if not superficiality, at least inaccuracy, and, therefore, a want of practicalness of mind, and a want of earnestness of character; special culture alone produces, it is true, microscopic clearness and accuracy, but also, too often, microscopic narrowness of view. Like all microscopic vision, it magnifies the importance of even the most insignificant details, and thus comes narrowness of mind, bigotry of character, and uncharitableness of feeling. The student gazes through his microscope of special culture, and imagines his field of view the whole world. All that lies outside of this field is nothing to him. It is only, then, by combining general with special culture that the most perfect culture of mind and character is attained.

Equally important to the individual, and still more important to the race, and far more interesting in a philosophic point of view, is the complementary relation of a special to a general culture, in the formation of a *complete philosophy*. However much the student may cultivate himself in a general course, there necessarily comes a time when, if he

would be useful to his fellow-men—if he would add any thing to the common stock of knowledge—if he would contribute any thing to the advance of society—he must exchange the general for a special course, either in the university or in the world. The field of knowledge is now so vast, that it is utterly vain for any one man to attempt to grasp it in all its details. For the advance of knowledge, therefore, it becomes absolutely necessary that the field of knowledge, like the field of industry, should be divided and subdivided, until the human mind can exhaust what is already known in each department. The extent to which the subdivision must be carried for this purpose is almost incredible. The science of chemistry alone, already constitutes at least ten sciences, each of which is sufficient to exhaust the energies and occupy the life of any one man. Physics is subdivided to at least an equal, and organic science to a much greater, extent. In the higher departments of knowledge the subdivision is not so great; but this is only because these departments are less mature. As knowledge becomes more perfect, the same subdivision must take place in all. Science is the simplest, and, therefore, the most mature, of all branches of human knowledge, and therefore, also, most clearly exhibits in its progress the law of development of knowledge. This law, as deduced from the study of scientific philosophy, is that of gradually increasing differentiation and specialization. This is, in fact, a fundamental law of development of all kinds and under all circumstances.* All branches of knowledge must eventually come under it. Now, this division and subdivision of labor in the field of *thought*, like subdivision of labor in the field of *industry*, with all its immense advantages to the RACE, must be, to some extent, disastrous to the *individual*. As civilization advances, and the absolute sphere of human

* *Vide* our article on Organic Science in relation to Sociology, S. P. R., Vol. XIII., p. 44.

knowledge becomes greater, division and subdivision goes on at the same rate—the field of each man's thought becomes a smaller and smaller fragment of the whole, and increasing narrowness and incompleteness of view would seem to be the necessary result. Thus, the *collective* humanity increases constantly in *strength* and *symmetry*—in *power* to subordinate nature to his uses, and *beauty*, as an object of contemplation; but, alas! for the *individual*: he becomes more and more distorted and fragmentary—more and more a mere tool in the hands of society; he, to some extent, at least, offers up himself a living sacrifice on the altar of the social impulse; or, even worse, he sacrifices the health and beauty of his spiritual nature for daily bread—he sells his divine birthright for a paltry mess of pottage. Thus, while the strength and beauty of the collective humanity increases, that of the individual humanity decreases; while the collective humanity expands, the individual contracts; in proportion as society grows larger, stronger, more beautiful and complete, the tendency is that the individual grows smaller, weaker, more distorted, and fragmentary. Alas! alas! when shall the world see again such examples of completeness and strength—of symmetry of proportion combined with gigantic power—as the grand old statesmen, philosophers and artists of Greece! Is there, then, no hope for humanity? Can philosophy only gain in perfection by losing in completeness? Is the advance of society incompatible with the completeness of the individual? Is the tide of social life to be swelled only by pouring into its veins our own hearts' blood? Is society, indeed, such a huge, remorseless, devouring dragon? Not so. This is but one side of the picture. There is yet hope. Philosophy will yet vindicate her divine origin, by attaining symmetry of form as well as perfection in detail. The apparent antagonism between the individual and the collective humanity will yet be reconciled; *completely in philosophy*, and with *ever-increasing approximation* to completeness in reality.

Let us, then, very briefly attempt to show *how*, under the law of development, a complete philosophy is both *objectively*, and, through education, *subjectively*, possible.

We have said that the universal law of development is gradually increasing differentiation. This is a true, but only a partial, statement of the law. There is a *limit* to this differentiation in *philosophy*, though none in purely *material industry*. Beyond this limit, there is a reverse process of *integration* commencing and continuing. The lines of progress branch and diverge, *apparently ad infinitum*, but not so *actually*. At a certain point they begin again to converge, and approximate unity. The true expression of the law of development, therefore, is, first, *simple unity*, or *homogeneity*, then infinite *diversity*, and finally, the coördination of this diversity into *organic unity*. We may illustrate this law in various ways, and in every department—in the development of the earth, in the development of the human race, in the development of the human mind, and in the development of knowledge, both generally and in all its departments. In the geological history of the earth we find *connecting types*, differentiated into an infinite number of distinct families, genera and species, and these all pointing to, and coördinated in, *man*. In the history of the human race, we find first a primeval simplicity and unity, then a confusion of tongues and scattering abroad, by which diversity of national character and forms of civilization was effected, and finally, even now, these diverse civilizations and nationalities are being coördinated into a general civilization, under the guidance of Christianity. In the history of the *individual*, the same law is illustrated in many ways. First, we have the simplicity, the unity, the harmony, of blind, child-like *faith in authority*; then comes reason, overthrowing faith and introducing doubt, discord, and anarchy—destroying the harmony, the innocence, the peace of mind; and, lastly, philosophy, or, still better, religion, solves these doubts, changes this discord into harmony and peace,

restores again faith, which is now no longer *blind*, but *rational*. The philosopher, like the Christian, must return to the simplicity of childhood. To take another illustration. First, in childhood, we have harmony, because the passions are not yet developed—peace, because the enemy is asleep; then, in youth, the fiery conflict of volcanic *passion* with *reason*, in which conflict, reason is often overthrown, and the man ruined; but at last, with the growing power of reason, these fiery enemies are subdued and subordinated into useful servants—the man stands now victor over himself—the intellect is now strong enough to assert its rule against the utmost efforts of the passions and emotions—“the whole man stands in an iron glow, white hot, perhaps, but still strong, and in no wise evaporating—melting, perhaps, but losing none of his weight.”

Now, the same law is traceable in the developement of philosophy. First, we have an universal philosophy, but imperfect and temporary; then, an infinitely subdivided philosophy, more perfect in its details, but less complete in its whole—in fact, many partial philosophies, impossible to coördinate into one; lastly, as we hope, again, an universal and much more complete philosophy, formed by the coördination of these perfectly finished details. First: popular notions, opinions, intuitions (the intuitions seem peculiarly clear and true in the early periods of the history of the race, as of the individual,) are gathered and systematized by *reason* into an universal, and tolerably consistent, philosophy: then comes scientific observation, with its accurate methods, scrutinizes every fact anew and verifies every result, extends its search far beyond the limit of popular knowledge; as the field increases, dividing and subdividing into departments, determined, above all things, upon perfect accuracy and completeness of detail as the only possible foundation of a complete and permanent philosophy; from time to time coördinating the details in each department into partial philosophies, until the field of de-

tail-knowledge is well-nigh exhausted, and the circle of sciences complete: last comes the coördination of these perfect, but partial, philosophies into one universal and permanent philosophy. Man is placed in the world of sense and matter, to conquer and reduce it to rational method—to attain, by Reason, a complete knowledge of Deity, as revealed in the Book of Nature—in a word, to construct a complete philosophy. But in attempting to do so, the human mind finds itself in this strange dilemma: a perfect theory, or rational philosophy, is impossible without scientifically observed facts; and, on the other hand, it is equally impossible to make truly scientific observations without a previous theory or philosophy as a guide. How, then, does the human mind extricate itself from this dilemma? In the only way in which it is possible to do so. Upon the basis of mere *popular* observations and intuitions, it hastily constructs a *provisional* philosophy: under the guidance of this philosophy, it then proceeds to make scientific observations; and finally, upon these, more slowly and carefully, to build a permanent philosophy. This is true, not only of general philosophy, but of each subdivision of philosophy. First, we have an *hypothesis*, or provisional theory, founded upon imperfectly observed facts; under the guidance of this, scientific observation becomes possible, and is, therefore, accomplished; upon these scientifically observed facts, a true and perfect theory is formed. The one is what Bacon calls the “*anticipation of nature*;” the other, the “*interpretation of nature*;” the one is a guess—some times a happy, noble guess, indicating wonderful genius—like a gleam of light casting a vivid but *uncertain* splendor upon the surrounding darkness and chaos; the other, a sober certainty, like the steady light of full day, revealing objects in definite outline and true proportion. In the first, the proud human reason, scornful to become the patient pupil, attempts to *impose his own* philosophy upon Nature; in the second, reason is content

to sit at the feet of Nature, and humbly *accept* the philosophy which *she* teaches. Illustrations of this law, not only from the general history of philosophy, but from the history of each department, and even the subdivisions of each department, are abundant and obvious. In general philosophy, the stages are not yet all completed. The Greek philosophy, of which the Aristotelian is the type, represents the *provisional*; the permanent we are only now approximating, under the guidance of the Baconian method. In astronomy, we have the Ptolemaic system as the *provisional*, and the Copernican and Newtonian as the permanent theory. In botany, we have the Linnæan classification as the temporary, and the *Natural* classification as the permanent. In the same manner, if time allowed, we might trace the same law in the theories of chemistry, in the theories of light and heat, and even in the theories of individual natural phenomena, as of geyser eruptions, of atoll reefs, of glacier motion, etc.

The case of botany, however, is so admirable an illustration, both of the law and of its necessity, that we must dwell a little more fully. In botany, the problem presented to the human mind is, to acquire rational knowledge of the forms of the vegetable kingdom. But the number of these forms is so great, and their variety so infinite, that it is utterly impossible to commence without classification—the materials are utterly unmanageable without systematic arrangement of some sort. But a perfect classification presupposes a perfect knowledge. Under the pressure of this dilemma, we make, first, an arbitrary, or *artificial*, classification, founded upon some obvious fact. Under the guidance of this artificial classification, thousands of observers, in every part of the world, work in concert. The scientifically observed facts thus laboriously accumulated, become now a solid basis for a thoroughly natural, and, therefore, *rational*, classification. We see that in this case (and the same is true in all others) the very significance of the first

classification or *theory* is different from that of the second. The first is the necessary *condition* of rational knowledge; the second is the compendious expression and natural embodiment of rational knowledge. The first is complete, because artificial—but, for the same reason, transitory; the second never complete, because natural—but, for the same reason, also, eternal, ever growing, ever approaching completeness.

We have selected the case of botany because, on account of the great genius and authority of Linnæus, and the great beauty, and, to some extent, truth of his artificial system, this system maintained its sway until we were entirely ready for the *natural* system, which then took its place. Thus, the two stages are very distinct, and their significance obvious. In the other cases, there are, some times, many provisional theories gradually approximating and gradually merging into the permanent theory. In such cases the law is less obvious, but none the less true.

But this law, as we have already said, is not confined to the progress of knowledge, but governs progress in every direction. We will, therefore, take one other illustration, and from an entirely different quarter, viz: from the progress of social organization. Man is urged, by the social impulse, and as the only means of attaining civilization, to organize into communities; but a perfect and permanent social organization can only be the result of much experience, combined with the highest culture, moral and intellectual, and this, again, can only be attained through perfect social organization. Hence we have, first, a social organization founded upon some arbitrary and obvious principle, perhaps upon violence and injustice, or even upon accident—the human race is classified upon the obvious distinctions of birth, or wealth, or power; in a word, we have an *artificial* classification—a provisional organization, as the necessary condition of civilization. Under the fostering influence of this organization, civilization becomes

possible, and, therefore, advances. Finally, however, the classification of the human race must have a thoroughly *natural* basis—human society must be organized upon a thoroughly rational principle—must take on a thoroughly *natural* form, permanent in its outlines, though constantly improving, which is no longer only the necessary condition of progress, but also the natural expression—the material embodiment—of a perfected humanity, which is never attained. Without the first, civilization would be impossible; without the second, civilization would be arrested at a certain point. Almost all revolution is the result of the non-recognition of this law.

Perhaps the law may be placed in a still clearer point of view, by comparing the construction of a perfect philosophy, or a perfect civilization, to the construction of an edifice. Man is placed upon the earth houseless and naked. But he can not continue to live in this condition, at least in his present fallen state—he must have a house to protect him, and wherein to worship God. But how shall he, without much time, build an house worthy of himself and of God, to whom he will dedicate it? an house which shall be eternal, like God and his own soul? Under the pressure of this dilemma, he rapidly constructs a temporary edifice, sufficient for present purposes, in which he continues to live and worship while the laborers are scattered abroad, slowly gathering materials for a more glorious and permanent edifice. Now, philosophy is, at present, in this second, or transition state, though approximating the third. The laborers are scattered abroad over the whole face of the earth, gathering materials, or finishing details. Under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, some are laying the foundation, or building the solid walls; some are shaping a column, or constructing an arch; some are finishing a capital, or carving delicate tracery; some chosen ones, with washed hands, shoes removed, and pure hearts, are silently engaged upon the holiest of holies, the

innermost sanctuary, and the altar-piece. But, does any one understand the great work upon which all are engaged? Has any one a clear and perfect conception of the magnificence of the structure? Alas, no! Perhaps, in moments of ecstatic, holy enthusiasm—in moments of Divine inspiration—some noble soul may catch faint glimpses of the glorious edifice: in dim, shadowy outline, as in a vision, he may see it all standing before him in the majesty and beauty of its noble proportions—its solid walls, its glorious columns, its towering spires, stretching upward and passing out of sight, in their way heavenward—and even hear the solemn music of its deep-toned bell calling the nations to worship: in broken accents, and almost unintelligible words, he may strive, in such moments, to tell of his holy vision; but no consistent, clear and permanent conception of the whole is possible to the human mind. God alone is the Master Builder; under His direction we work, if we are indeed true workers. Some imperfect, general conception, there must be in the minds of the chief workers, for man is a co-worker with God; but He alone can fitly frame all these parts into one perfect whole. Thus, in comparing Greek philosophy with modern, we may say that the temple of their philosophy and civilization was lower in type, but more complete; ours higher in type, but still lying scattered in fragments; they lived and worshipped in a *temple* which they *enjoyed*, looking for no better; we live in shanties and *work-houses*, looking forward, in *hope* of a more glorious edifice—theirs was a purely earthly house, contrived entirely by human minds, and, therefore, clearly seen and understood, as being present to the *sense*; ours, contrived by the Divine Spirit, connects earth with heaven; while we, the workers, absorbed in petty details, can only partly apprehend it, through *faith*. We see, then, why it is that the earlier philosophers were, in many respects, viz: in completeness, symmetrical proportions, and comprehensiveness, superior to the workers of the present day. We are

apt, in comparing ancient with modern times, in respect to extent and diffusion of knowledge, to take much complacency and gratulation to ourselves; we are apt to speak of that period, compared with our own, as a *night*. Yes, it it was a night; but a night whose firmament was glorious with brilliant stars. The day has dawned, the stars are fled, but, alas! the sun has not yet risen.

Thus have we attempted to show that philosophy passes from simplicity, through complexity, again to simplicity—from unity, through infinite diversity, again to unity. Thus philosophy, like religion, must return again to its pristine simplicity and unity—but a simplicity and unity of a far higher order. The first is the simplicity of childhood; the second, the simplicity of wisdom. As might have been expected, the different departments of knowledge, in their present condition, perfectly represent these different stages of development. The simpler departments of science, as mechanical philosophy and astronomy, have already, in great measure, passed through the first two, and reached the third; hence their simplicity, their completeness, their certainty, their definiteness of outline, and permanence of form, and the ease with which they may be grasped in their totality. In chemistry and organic science, the subdivision is, just now, greatest, because these have fairly reached the second, and only now, as we believe, commencing to approach the third. Metaphysical philosophy, psychology, and sociology, are yet in the first stage, though approaching the second. The want of subdivision in these departments is the result of *immaturity*—their unity is the unity of childhood. But their unity is not complete. They have reached the stage of *diversity of opinion*, though not of *division of labor*. It is childhood, but childhood expanding into youth—they are yet in the first stage, but painfully struggling towards the second; for *doubt* always precedes *scientific inquiry*, and the use of right method—*diversity of opinion* always precedes *division of labor* and productive work in

the field of thought. But, while different departments represent different stages, yet philosophy, as a whole, may be said to be now in the second stage, though approaching the third. The difficulty of acquiring a general philosophy has already, probably, reached its acmé, and will, from this time, become less. This law of differentiation and integration, which may be so clearly traced in the lower departments of science, is the law of development of all philosophy. Philosophy must henceforward become simpler, and easier to grasp.

Looking, then, upon philosophy *objectively*, as the gradual development of the divine idea in the human reason, we see how special philosophies are related to a complete general philosophy; we see that the law of development may be expressed as a progress, from an imperfect, (and, therefore, *provisional*,) general philosophy, through *special* philosophies, to a perfect and *permanent* general philosophy. Now, this law of development of general philosophy is epitomized, as we have already seen, in the development of the individual, and, therefore, must be, also, *in a rational course of education*. As, in the one case, we have popular intuitions, systematized by reason into an imperfect general philosophy, then scientific observations and partial philosophies, coördinated into a more perfect general philosophy; so, in the other, we have, first, perceptions and intuitions of childhood, systematized by cultivation of reason into an *imperfect* general culture; then special courses, laying the foundation of a *more perfect* general culture. As, in the one case, we have *imperfect* general philosophy, founded upon intuitions, passing through special philosophies into a *more perfect* general philosophy, so, in the other, we have imperfect general culture, founded upon the perceptive and intuitive faculties, passing through special culture into a perfect general culture. It is *only through special culture, after a previous general culture*, that the highest general culture is attainable—it is only through a

special philosophy, or study in a *special department*, coming after a previous general study in all departments, that the most perfect general philosophy is attainable by the individual.

But how, it may be asked, can a special philosophy contribute to a general philosophy, or a special culture to a general culture, *in the individual*? The collective humanity, or race, cultivates *many* special philosophies, which are finally coördinated into a general philosophy; but the *individual* can not cultivate perfectly but *one* special department. How can the perfect knowledge of this *one* department lead to a more perfect general philosophy, in which *all* departments are embraced? The case of the individual is evidently somewhat different from that of the race—that of philosophy *objectively* considered, from that of philosophy *subjectively* considered. The answer to this question is found in the *absolute unity* of philosophy, and this, again, in the absolute unity of nature, and this, of course, in the unity of Deity. The general idea of philosophy is epitomized, with modifying conditions, in the philosophy of each department. Thus, every special philosophy contains some thing which is general and some thing which is special. It may be difficult, and often impossible, in the present state of philosophy, to distinguish these two with precision, in consciousness; but they are both necessarily involved in the idea of organic unity. If we have once grasped the general, though but imperfectly, by general culture, we may then study more perfectly *the general through the special*—this comprehension of general through the special becoming more and more possible, in proportion as philosophy approaches organic unity. If we study the general alone, our philosophy will be dim, shadowy, inaccurate in detail, incomplete, and, therefore, unproductive, *through indefiniteness*: if we study the special alone, we mistake the modifying conditions for the general law—we erect our special philosophy into a general philosophy—and our philosophy

is, therefore, incomplete, *through narrowness*. But the profound study of *one* department, after general instruction in *all*, not only gives us a perfect philosophy in that department, but, through the unity of philosophy, gives us, also, clearer insight into general philosophy—not only illumines the area of the chosen department with intense brilliancy, but sends its beams in every direction, even to the extremest verge of the circle of human knowledge. To recur again to the illustration of the building. The unity of the noble structure is so complete, that the general idea of the whole is repeated in every, even the minutest, part. Every column, every pinnacle, every arch, every door and window, every leaf or flower in the most delicate tracery, all, all tell the same tale, each in its own way—all point in the same direction—upward. Thus, after we have taken a rapid survey of all knowledge, and attained a general, though imperfect, conception of philosophy—if inspired by this general conception, we now, in honesty of purpose and humility of spirit, concentrate our energies upon a special department, this general conception will grow steadily brighter and clearer. Thus, if, standing at a distance, with becoming reverence and holy fear, we gaze and worship, until the Divine Idea of the noble structure has penetrated our minds and fired our souls—we now approach, not only as *worshippers*, but also as *workers*; not only rapturously to *gaze*, but also manfully to *do*—then the Spirit of the Master will enter and dwell within our hearts, and He, the great Master Builder Himself, will kindly reveal to us so much of His plan as we, in our weakness, are able to understand.

ARTICLE II.

THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE
OF THE SCRIPTURES.

V.—The three divine persons in the Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—proved not to be three Gods, and, therefore, one God.

We are now led, as a fifth link in our chain of argument in proof of the Scriptural character of the doctrine of the Trinity, to conclude that the existence of one infinite divine essence, or Godhead, and of three coequal persons in that Godhead, does not imply the existence of three Gods.

Though these three divine persons are distinguished from each other by proper and personal characteristics, attributes, offices, and works, yet all that is essential to the nature of the Godhead is common to them all, so that the Son is not a different God from the Father, nor the Spirit a different God from the Father and the Son. They are not three separate Gods. The Godhead—that which constitutes each person God—is one and the same. They are all three but one, and all three necessary to the full conception of the one God. The Godhead, or essence, is not multiplied so as to make three Godheads. The Word was God, but not another God. The Holy Ghost is not man, but God, and yet not another God. Neither is there a divine nature, essence, or Godhead, which is distinct and different from that common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. There is no other divine nature but that which is common to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and by virtue of which they are each “God over all, and blessed for ever.”

Neither are we to imagine that this Godhead first existed, and that then a trinity of persons was formed out of it, but we are to conceive the existence of three modes, or per-

sons—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—in one common Godhead, as being essential to the very nature of that Godhead, and as being as necessary as its existence. The whole divine nature is in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost constitute that nature. They are not different either in nature, attributes or perfections. But yet they are not the same in their mode of personal subsistence, or in their relations to each other, or in their relations and functions towards creatures, in the various dispensations of providence and grace. These persons in the Godhead, therefore, can neither be divided nor destroyed. They are one in nature. They are equal in power, attributes, and glory. They are different and distinct in mode of subsistence, in person, relation, and offices. Every one of these three persons has—not a *part*—but the *whole* Godhead in himself, so that each is “the living,” and “the only living and true God.” And yet, in this one Godhead each person is in such a way distinct, as to be capable of distinct relations, offices, and worship. Another observation, important to be borne in mind, is, that while in worshipping the Son, we “honor Him even as we honor the Father,” and while in worshipping and seeking the grace of the Spirit, we honor Him even as we honor the Son, and while we must, in every case, approach God only in the way of His own appointment, yet, when we do so, our worship of the Spirit and of the Son is equally the worship of the Father, and equally acceptable to Him, since in honoring one person in the Trinity we honor all. And hence, in baptism, we are devoted, not to the one undivided essence and Godhead of the Deity—not to the Father, merely—but to each of the distinct persons of the Godhead separately and severally, because this is the way in which God in Christ has manifested Himself to us—the way in which He works out redemption for us—and the way in which that redemption is to be sought and obtained from Him.

The Christian system can be stated, explained, supported, defended, and made practically efficacious, in no other way. The whole economy of man's salvation is based upon the fact, that while there is but one Godhead, there is in this Godhead a three-fold distinction, not in name or character, but a real, personal distinction. To each of these persons is attributed distinct offices in the work of redemption—in its origination, its completion, its application, and its consummation—while, at the same time, to each is ascribed all and every thing that is attributed to this one Godhead. Each person is thus declared to possess the common Godhead. There are, therefore, three persons in one Godhead.

The same Divine Works—Creation, Resurrection—attributed absolutely to Each Person, and to God alone.

This will appear, further, from the fact that, while each person has His peculiar relations and offices assigned to Him, yet, as if it was *designed* to prove that there are three distinct persons, and yet only one Godhead, we find that the same divine power and operation is attributed, equally and undividedly, to each of these persons, as God, and THE God by whom they are possessed and accomplished.

As this is a very essential point, we will illustrate it by two instances—which have been already presented, to prove the personal diversity of the Father, Son, and Spirit—that we may now prove by them the unity of their Godhead.

The first illustration is the work of creation.

It is the express and uniform teaching of Scripture, that God "is the maker of all things, by HIMSELF ALONE."*

Here, then, God claims that work of creation which is the most essential, and in itself the absolute demonstration of an almighty, infinite and personal God, as His work, and as *exclusively* His, and *His alone*.

* Acts 14: 15; Gen. 1: 1; Is. 44: 24; Ps. 33: 6. See the Jewish Commentators in Gill, Allix, Jameson. John 1: 1-3.

And yet God, in His own Word, and in words inspired by Himself, represents each of the "three persons as all connected with, and coöperating in, creation. With the honors of a work usually ascribed to the Father, Paul crowns the Son. Mark what he says of the Son: 'By *Him* were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, whether they be thrones or diminions, or principalities, or powers.' And, speaking elsewhere of God, he says: 'He, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake to our fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds.' Now, as to the third person, or Holy Spirit, we discover indications of His existence even in the Mosaic record of creation. He appears in the earliest epochs of time, and amid those sublime and magnificent spectacles with which the Bible opens."

"The curtain rises upon the first act of creating power, and, through the enveloping shroud of darkness, we see the earth—a shapeless mass, crude and chaotic. It is a world in embryo. 'The earth was without form and void.' Yet at this early period, when there was neither golden cloud nor blue sky, nor green land, nor silver sea; when no waves broke upon the shore, and there were no shores for waves to break on; when no mountains rose to greet the morning sun, and there was no sun to shine on them; when no wing of bird was cleaving the silent air, nor fin of fish the waters; when—like the rude and various materials from which an architect intends to rear the fabric he has designed—the elements of fire, air, earth, and water, lay mingled in strange confusion, through the darkness that lies on the face of the deep, we discover some mighty Presence. He is moving and at work. It is the Spirit of God. He presides at the birth of time. He is evoking order from confusion, forming the world in the womb of eternity, and preparing a theatre for scenes and events of surpassing grandeur. Concerning that early period of creation, Moses

has recorded this important fact: 'The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters.' In this glorious creation, therefore—in this beautiful world, and the starry skies that rose over it—we behold the mighty monuments of His presence and power. He sprung the arch of this crystal dome, and studded it over with those gems of light. Listen to the magnificent hymn of the Patriarch: 'He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing. He holdeth back the face of His throne, and spreadeth His cloud upon it; He hath compassed the waters with bounds, and divideth the sea with His power. By His *Spirit* he hath garnished the heavens.' In the temple of nature, therefore, as in that of grace, we adore a Godhead—the Three in One; and see Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the presiding and coequal authors of a first creation."

What, then, must be our inference from these several declarations of God respecting the highest exercise of God-like power? What can it be but that the three persons—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—are alike uncreated, since they were each of them the author of creation; and, secondly, that as there is and can be but one Creator, because there is but one God, these three persons are and must be one God? In the ancient language of the Church: "The Father is uncreate; the Son is uncreate; the Holy Ghost uncreate: and yet there are not three uncreated, but one uncreated." *

The same conclusion may be deduced from what Scripture declares concerning another creating work, that of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead.

Reject the doctrine of the Trinity, and the statements of Scripture on this subject can not be reconciled. Admit it, and all is clear.

* See, also, Westminster Conf. of Faith, ch. iv., § 1.

In Gal. 1 : 1, it is said : "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God THE FATHER, who raised Him (*i. e.*, Christ) from the dead." Again : in John 11 : 19, our Lord, speaking of His resurrection, says : "Destroy this temple," (meaning his body,) "and in three days I will raise it up again." And 10 : 17 : "I lay down my life, that I might take it again. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."

From this, it is plain that our Lord assumes to Himself the act of raising His own body from the dead, so that here the resurrection is attributed to *the Son*.

Thirdly : 1 Peter 3 : 18, we read : "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit."

Once more, then, we see that Christ is said to be *quickened*, or brought to life, by *the Holy Ghost*.

Lastly : Peter and the other Apostles, when they are brought before the Council, in Acts 5, say, at verse 30, "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus."

Now, compare all these passages together. In the first place, observe we all admit that God raised Jesus from the dead. Next we read, that the Father raised Him up, therefore, the *Father is God*. Again we read, that Christ the Son raised Himself up; therefore, the *Son is God*. Thirdly, we find that the Holy Ghost raised Jesus from the dead; therefore, the *Holy Ghost is God*. And yet, they are not three Gods, but one God; for Peter says: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus." And how does Moses describe this God of their fathers? "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is ONE Lord." If, now, from a candid comparison of these Scriptures, the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity must not of necessity be believed, we would ask, What, then, do these passages mean? Is it at all probable that the writers of the New Testament would use such unguarded language as this is, if they did not mean us to believe the divinity of

each of the three persons of the Trinity? Certainly not. No writer of common prudence could have done so, much less one writing by the direction of the spirit of wisdom and truth. How such a union can exist we are *unable*, and, therefore, not required, to understand. But that it *does* exist—that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are each of them a *distinct person*—each of them God, and yet but one God, we *are* required to believe—to believe it on the peril of our souls; “for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”

Nor are these exceptional cases. They are only illustrations of the general tenor of Scripture. Thus we find that the work of Providence, or the preservation of all things, is ascribed equally to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. “Jehovah is the preserver of man and beast, and the eyes of all wait upon Him.” In like manner, Christ “upholdeth all things by His own power.” And so, also, when the Holy Spirit is withdrawn, “they die and return again to their dust,” but “Thou sendest forth Thy SPIRIT, they are created, and Thou renewest the face of the earth.”*

Again: spiritual and divine operations are attributed equally to the Father, to the Son, and to the Spirit. “It is the same God which worketh all in all.” Christ is “all in all.” “But all these worketh that one and self-same Spirit.”† “Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world.”‡ “Every one that doeth righteousness is born of Him,”§ that is, of Christ. “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God.” Believers are sanctified by God the Father.|| Paul, in his prayer for the Thessalonians, prays that the very God of

* Neh. 9 : 16; Ps. 145 : 15; Col. 1 : 16; Heb. 1 : 3; Ps. 104 : 29, 30.

† 1 Cor. xii. : 6; Col. iii. : 11; 1 Cor. xii. : 11.

‡ 1 John v. : 4.

§ 1 John ii. : 29.

|| Jude, ver. 1.

peace would sanctify them wholly.* But the same Apostle, ascribes this divine work to Jesus Christ, when he says: "He that sanctifieth (that is, Christ) and they who are sanctified, are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren."† And yet this divine operation is also ascribed to the Holy Ghost, by whom Christians are often declared to be sanctified."‡ We might show, further, that a commission to the work of the ministry—the judging of the world, the raising of the dead, and many other divine and omnipotent works, are ascribed in Scripture equally to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

Interchangeable use of the name of God.

As, however, the proofs of these points are given in almost every work on the Trinity, § we proceed to remark that a still further and very striking proof of the identity of all that is essential to the Godhead, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is found in the indiscriminate and interchangeable application to each of the names of God.

The term God is employed to denote the absolute Deity, in all that is comprehended in His nature, essence, and attributes, and is, therefore, synonymous with our words Deity and Godhead. Now, this term is applied to each of the three persons, in the following, among other passages: "The Lord our God," "The Word was God," "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." When used alone, therefore, the word God appears to import the absolute Deity, apart from any consideration of unity or trinity. To the English word *God* corresponds the term *Elohim* in Hebrew, and *θεος* (*Theos*) in Greek,|| which is used by the Apostles

* 1 Thess. v. : 23.

† Heb. ii. : 11.

‡ Rom. xv. 16.

§ See the proofs given in Jones on Trinity, ch. iv., and in West's and Eadie's Concordances to the Bible.

|| See Hävernicks, in Kitto's Cyclopædia, art. God.

always in the singular, as it is in other languages, because they want the grace and propriety of the Hebrew, and are not adapted to convey, as it does, the primitive revelation of a God whose plurality in unity is conveyed by His Hebrew titles, Elohim and others.

The Monarchy of the Godhead, and the personal relations and subordination of the Son and Spirit.

It is when thus spoken of in his absolute Godhead, simply as God, that God is declared to be invisible, unrevealed, unknown, and incomprehensible. Jehovah is the Elohim revealed, the manifested, only perfect and holy One, our Redeemer the God of Israel, the angel of the covenant, He who was to come, who is come, who is the *ερχομενος*, he who is yet to come.* As thus revealed and manifested, God is made known in three distinct modes of subsistence, having mutual relations to each other, and yet having one essence or Godhead common to each. This mode of subsistence constitutes the personality, and this, together with the distinct relation in which each of these stands to the others, constitutes the persons. Upon this revealed nature of the Godhead is founded the conception of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and of their relations to each other, and of all the duties of creatures towards them.

In point of authority and order, the Father is first, the Son second, and the Holy Spirit third. In point of office, the Father is supreme, the Son subordinate to the Father, and the Holy Spirit subordinate to both. The Father is the everlasting fountain of the other persons, by whom, in an eternal generation, the Son is begotten, and from whom, in eternal procession, the Spirit proceeds. In order of nature, rank, office, and prerogative, the Father is supreme,

* See Hävernicks, *Introductio ad Veteris Testamenti*, p. 56, *seq.*

and the Son and Spirit ministrative, and officially subordinate.*

“This relation of the persons of the Trinity is carefully preserved in all Scripture representations of the economy of redemption. The Father appoints, the Son executes, and the Holy Ghost applies. The Father, in a more particular manner, sustains the character of the offended Deity, and asserts the honors of divine government, for which reason He is more frequently called God than the other adorable persons. The Son appears as mediator, assuming the place of men, yet invested with the rights of the Godhead; and the Holy Ghost represents both the Father and His Son Jesus Christ, supplying the absence of the latter. We need not wonder, therefore, that the name of God, which is common to all the persons of the most holy and glorious Trinity, should be more frequently given to the Father, who sustains the divine character in a very particular manner in the wonderful economy of redemption.”

But while this is true, and while this explains, and makes even necessary, all the language which implies inferiority, subjection, obedience, and ministration, in the Son and Spirit, yet we are abundantly taught that this is a distinction only of order, office, and relation, and not of dignity, derivation, or essential perfection. For, as has been seen, this order of naming the persons is not invariably observed in Scripture.† The term Father is not always used to designate that distinction in the Godhead which we commonly describe by the term *the first person*, but, also, in some cases, as a general title of divine nature.‡ In the same manner

* See Horsley's Tracts, Letter XV., p. 29; Newman's Hist. of Arianism, p. 180, etc.; Bull's Def., IV., 2, § 1, and especially Bishop's Bull's Three Treatises, and Waterland's Works.

† Mat. 28 : 19; John 5 : 7; Eph. 4 : 4-6, and 2 : 18; 2 Cor. 13 : 14; Rev. 1 : 4, 5.

‡ Deut. 82 : 6; Isa. 63 : 16; 64 : 8; Mat. 5 : 16, 48; 6 : 4; 7 : 11; John 8 : 41.

the title Lord, or Jehovah, is applied often to Christ in particular, and to God as a general appellation; and that the titles Spirit, Spirit of God, and Holy Spirit, are also employed as a general designation of the entire Godhead, is admitted by all parties.

So perfect is the union between the Father and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that, in respect of their essential glories, what is asserted of the one, is to be understood of the other. Jesus, therefore, does not only say, "I and the Father are one;" He also affirms, "He who honors the Son, honors the Father also." And again, he says: "ALL that the Father hath is mine. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father also." Again, it is said, "The things of God knoweth no one, but the Spirit of God." We are plainly taught by such expressions that such is the infinite union and communion of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son, that they are only known and comprehensible by each other, and that all that is spoken of one may be said of each and all.

There is not, therefore, one glory of the Father, and another glory of the Son, and another glory of the Holy Ghost. The glory of the Father is the glory of the Son, and the glory of the Holy Ghost. There is but one divine glory which God will not, and can not, give to another; and as this pertains equally to each person, the Father is called "the Father of glory"—Eph. 1 : 17; the Son, "the Lord of glory"—1 Cor. 2 : 8; and the Holy Spirit, "the Spirit of glory"—1 Pet. 4 : 14. They are thus all equally glorious, and all gloriously equal in that glory which they had with each other from before the foundation of the world.

Our object only to state Revealed Facts, and not to explain Inexplicable Mysteries.

We have ventured on these remarks, not, we again repeat, with any intention of explaining or of removing the mys-

tery of the Trinity. To do so would be absurd. The mystery remains, and must ever remain, in all that relates to the divine nature or attributes. Our only design has been to state clearly all that has been revealed, and all that is expressed, in the doctrine of the Trinity. On the one hand, the Son and Spirit are represented to us as ministering to God, and therefore are personally subordinate to Him; and, on the other hand, in spite of this official relative inequality in the offices thus ascribed by Scripture to the Son and Spirit, nevertheless the Son and Spirit are represented as being partakers of the fullness of the Father, and as being equal to Him in *nature*, and in their claims upon our faith and obedience, as is sufficiently proved by the form of baptism and the forms of doxology and benediction.

● The fact that God is one, and yet that the Father, Son, and Spirit, while each partaking of this one essence, are capable of subsisting in such a manner, and of holding such relations to each other and to us, as to devise, execute, and carry on the scheme of man's redemption, is, therefore, essential to the truth of the Christian system, and to all that is vital to the hopes and happiness of man—to his proper and acceptable worship of the true God—to his reconciliation to Him, confidence towards Him, obedience to His will, conformity to His image, and to a fit preparation for the enjoyment of Him in a blessed immortality.

Of these facts we may be satisfactorily and experimentally convinced, without pretending to assign a reason for, or so much as being able to conceive, the nature of these distinctions in the Godhead, or of the manner of their operations. All attempts to explain what is inexplicable, and to render intelligible what is infinitely above and beyond the reach of our intelligence, only darken counsel by words without knowledge, create differences among those who hold the truth as it is in Scripture, and give occasion to the enemy to blaspheme.

How, then, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost subsist in the one divine nature we can not tell, and may willingly remain ignorant, since God has not thought it best, if it were even possible, to discover it to us. The Scriptures nowhere tell us, either in what manner the Son is begotten of the Father, or in what manner the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and Son. And how, then, can we pretend to say how these three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, subsist in one? Surely, it does not become us to determine the way and manner of God's subsistence, when He in His Word is silent concerning it. It may, and it should, be enough for us, that the facts of God's unity in a trinity of persons, of the relations in which we stand to these persons, and our duties and hopes founded upon them, are clearly revealed.

Summary, and Conclusion of the Argument.

Believing, then, that in nature—that is, in all that is essential to Him as God—God is and can be only and absolutely one, so that there can not possibly be more Gods than one; believing that, according to the uniform and constant language of Scripture, there are, and must be, distinctions in this divine unity; believing that these distinctions are real and personal, and not nominal nor figurative; believing that each of these persons is, by every form of expression that could convey the fact, most certainly declared by God to be God, and to possess and to do all God possesses and does, and to be equal with God in power, in glory, in worship and works; and believing, nevertheless, these three persons are one God over all, and blessed for ever; believing, we say, these things, is to believe only **THE FACTS** which are presented to our faith by God himself in His own Word, which was given by inspiration through holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and which Word was given for the very purpose of revealing God to us, His own nature, and will, and-

mercy, so far as was necessary for our present duty and consolation.

Without this revelation we are in the condition of ancient philosophers, as described by Lucretius :

“ Stretching unfathomably at boundless thought,
 Intensest visions were before him brought,
 Unreal shadows ; yet his spirit stern
 Did still unconscious for that Presence yearn
 Which clothes itself with circumambient day,
 Swifter than solar beams or lightning ray.
 Grasping infinity, he nothing found,
 Then from the vacuum shrunk that yawn'd around ;
 Spread like the blind his hands, therein to clasp
 Annihilation in his feeble grasp ;
 As if some fiend that mock'd him in its place
 Left but a shadow in his void embrace.
 And thus he fail'd that mystery to scan,
 The greatness and the littleness of man.”

To the law and testimony, therefore, be our appeal, and to it let us render “the obedience of faith.” Reason requires us to come to it with implicit deference, knowing that it must contain things too high for us, things else unimaginable and always mysterious, and that it must be heard in reverent docility and teachableness, not according to any private interpretation, but in the plain teaching of the Holy Ghost.

And as the question before us is the doctrine of Scripture, no forced construction can give us that doctrine. And hence the unavoidable tendency of the Unitarian views to destroy the authority and inspiration of Scripture, is palpable proof that its witness, which is true, is destructive of that system ; while the presumptive argument leading us to anticipate in Scripture the doctrine of the Trinity, is in itself a proof, that in teaching, as it does, the doctrine of the Trinity, it is what it claims to be, the Word and the Wisdom of God.

What saith the Scriptures is, therefore, the only rational controversy. For if the premises are taught in Scripture, then to reject the conclusions is to be wiser than God. It is to call God a liar. It is to affirm and to deny when ignorance is complete, and the subject is infinite, and the speaker is divine. It is to say a trinity of persons contradicts a unity of essence in the ever-blessed God, when both the nature of the essence and the nature of the personality are infinitely incomprehensible.

Yea, the heathen themselves will rise up in judgment against such presumption, and condemn it, seeing that Plato and others were led to regard the doctrine of a Trinity as agreeable to, and in no way contrary to, reason, and never suspected that it was liable to the charge of nonsense, contradiction and absurdity, and seeing that this was reserved for such atheists and sceptics as Porphyry, and Lucian, and Celsus, and Plotinus, and Proclus.*

* "In the opinions of the Pagan Platonists we have, in some degree, an experimental proof that this abstruse doctrine can not be the absurdity which it seems to those who misunderstand it. Would Plato, would Porphyry, would even Plotinus, have believed the miracles of Mahomet, or the doctrine of transubstantiation? But they all believed a doctrine which so far, at least, resembles the Nicene, as to be loaded with the same or greater objections."

After showing that Plato's doctrine was referred by the Fathers to his knowledge of Moses, Stillingfleet remarks: "They never suspected it to be liable to the charge of nonsense and contradictions, as our modern Unitarians charge the Trinity with; although their notion, as represented by Porphyry, be as liable to it. How came these men of wit and sense to hit upon, and be so fond of, such absurd principles, which lead to the belief of mysterious nonsense and impossibilities, if these men may be trusted?" "That this hypostasis did maintain its reputation long in the world. For we find it continued to the time of Macrobius, who mentions it as a reasonable notion, viz: of one Supreme Being, Father of all, and a mind proceeding from it, and soul from mind. Some have thought that the Platonists made two created beings to be two of the divine hypostases; but this is contrary to what Plotinus and Porphyry affirm concerning it, and it is hard

Without controversy, great is the mystery of Godliness. Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out.

Testimony of the Primitive Church to the Monarchy in the Trinity.

The views of some of the earliest Fathers will appropriately close and complete this article.

The following quotation from Dionysius Romanus (A. D. 260) defines the catholic doctrine of the Trinity with as much precision as Athanasius himself could have used :

“It would be right,” says Dionysius, “for me to address myself next to those who divide and separate and destroy the holiest doctrine of the Church of God—the Unity—into three essences and divided existences, and three Godheads. For I hear that there are some among your teachers and preachers of the Word, who countenance this notion ; who are opposed, as I may say, diametrically, to the opinion of Sabellius. For the blasphemy of the latter consists in saying, that the Son is Himself the Father, and *vice versa* ; but these others preach in a manner THREE GODS, dividing the holy Unity into three existences, foreign from each other, and altogether separate : whereas, the divine Word must be united with the God of the universe ; and the Holy Ghost must reciprocally pass into, and dwell in, God ; in short, the divine Trinity must be summed up and brought together into one, as a head, I mean the almighty God of the universe.” After condemning the heresy of Marcion, and the notion of Christ being a creature, he continues : “We must, therefore, neither divide the wonderful and divine Unity into three Godheads ; nor destroy the dignity

to give an account how they should, then, be essentially different from creatures, and be hypostases in the divine essence.” See Stillingfleet on the Trinity, pp. 214, 217 ; Horsley's Tracts, pp. 75, 82.

and exceeding greatness of the Lord, by making him a creature; but we must believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus his Son, and in the Holy Ghost; and that the Word is united with the God of the universe: for 'I,' says he, 'and the Father are one,' (John x. : 30,) and 'I am in the Father, and the Father in me,' (xiv. : 10,)—for thus both the divine Trinity, and the holy doctrine of the Unity, will be preserved."*

Tertullian (A. D. 200) says of Praxeas: "He thinks that we can not believe in one God in any other way, than if we say that the very same person is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; as if *one* might not be *all*, (if *all* proceed from *one*,) by unity of substance, and still the mystery of the divine economy be preserved, which divides the Unity into a Trinity, pointing out three, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost: but three, not in condition, but in order; not in substance, but in form; not in power, but in species; but of one substance, and of one condition, and of one power. These persons assume the number and arrangement of the Trinity to be a division of the Unity; whereas, the Unity, which derives a Trinity from itself, is not destroyed by it, but has its different offices performed. They, therefore, boast, that two and three Gods are preached by us, but that they themselves are worshippers of one God; as if the unity, when improperly contracted, did not create heresy; and a trinity, when properly considered, did not constitute truth." †

Again, he says: "Thus, the union of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Comforter, makes three beings united one to the other; which three are one thing (*unum*), not one person (*unus*); as it is written, 'I and the Father

* Decret. Syn. Nic., c. 26, p. 281, *et apud*. Routh Relig. Sacr., Vol. III., p. 179. Burton's Test. of Fathers, pp. 128, 129.

† Burton's Test. of Fathers, p. 68.

are one,' (John x. : 30,) with respect to the unity of substance, not to numerical individuality."*

"It is impossible," Origen says, "to compare God the Father, in the generation of his only begotten Son, and in his mode of existence, to any man or other animal who begets; but there must necessarily be some thing special, and suited to God, for which no comparison of any kind can be found, not only in existing things, but not even in thought and idea, so as for human thought to comprehend how the unbegotten God is made the Father of an only begotten Son. For the generation is eternal and everlasting, in the same manner as effulgence is generated from light. For he does not become a Son from without, by spiritual adoption, but is a Son by nature." Origen proceeds to confirm this by passages of Scripture, such as Heb. i. : 3; but he dwells particularly on Col. i. : 15, where the Son is called "the image of the invisible God." He considers in what sense the term *image* can be applied to the Son of God; and having observed that every son may be called the image of the father who begat him, he says, that in this sense the Son of God may be *the image of God*; "which image contains the unity of nature and substance, of Father and Son."†

Irenæus (A. D. 185) says: "And thus there is shown to be one God the Father 'who is above all, and through all, and in all things.' The Father is *above all things*, and He is the head of Christ; the Word is *through all things*, and He is the head of the Church; the Spirit is *in all of us*, and He is the living water which the Lord supplies to those who believe rightly in Him, and love Him, and know that *there is one Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.*" Again, he says: "That the Word, that is, the Son, was always with the Father, I have proved at much

* Burton's Test. of Fathers, p. 80.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 88, 89.

length; but that Wisdom, also, which is the Spirit, was with Him before all creation, he says in the words of Solomon (Prov. iii. : 19, 20; viii. : 22-27.)*

Clemens Alexandrinus, (A. D. 194,) says: "Nothing, therefore, is hated by God, nor yet by the Word, for both are one, God; for He says: 'In the beginning the Word was in God, and the Word was God.'" This same idea, of *both being one*, is found still more strongly expressed at the end of this treatise, where Clemens addresses a prayer to the Logos, and begins it with these words, which it is difficult to translate: "Be merciful, Instructor, to Thy children, O Father, the Director of Israel, Son and Father, both one, Lord."† Again: Clemens asks leave to "offer praise and thanksgiving to the only One, to the Father and Son, Son and Father, to the Son, who is Instructor and Teacher, together with the Holy Ghost, in all things one, in whom are all things, through whom all things are one, through whom is eternity." There may be parts of this sentence which are difficult to be comprehended; but it is unquestionable, that the Son and Holy Ghost are united with the Father as objects of praise, and the Greek words can hardly admit any other construction than that which declares the three persons to be one.‡

* Burton's Test. of Fathers, pp. 49, 50.

† *Ibid.*, p. 56.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

ARTICLE III.

GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE.

The subject to which we invoke our readers' attention has been much debated. But our purpose is not to weary them with a repetition of those discussions concerning a Pre-Adamite earth, the length of the creative days, or the best way to reconcile geology with Moses, which have often been conducted within a few years past; with deficient knowledge and temper in some cases, and often with slight utility. In the progress of natural science, relations between it and theology become apparent from time to time; and frequently in very unexpected ways. Both parties are usually at fault in defining those relations in the beginning; and thus there occurs a season of somewhat confused contest, arising from the oversight of the proper "metes and bounds" of the two sciences. As the discussion proceeds, the facts are at length set forth, which enable all reasonable men to adjust the relations satisfactorily, and to appropriate to each its legitimate field of authority. All will agree that it is time such an adjustment were, if possible, begun, between the geologist and the divine. Our humble attempt will be to make such a beginning. We have no geologic theory to advance or to impugn, and no particular facts to advance, either new or old. But, looking back over the general course of the discussion on the structure of our globe, only as those may profess to do who keep up with general literature, without assuming to be professional geologists, we would endeavor to fix some principles of discussion, by which the application of natural science and its inferences, may be defined, and limited to their proper territory, and the claims of theology established along the points of contact. It would, perhaps, have been better for the divines if they had confined their efforts to these defen-

sive views, instead of entering, without being always adequately prepared, into the technical discussions of geology.

1. But, while making this admission at the outset, we would firmly protest against the arrogant and offensive spirit in which geologists have often, we may almost say, usually, met clerical criticisms of their reasonings. To the objections advanced by theologians, the answer has usually been a contemptuous assertion that they were incompetent to sit in judgment, or to object, when geology was in question, because they were not professional masters of the science. Their reasonings have been pronounced foolish, ignorant, mistaken: and slightly dismissed or rejected without fair examination, because they came from "parsons." Now, we freely grant, that it is a very naughty thing for a parson, or a geologist, to profess to know what he does not know, as well as a very foolish: that some of the "*genus irritabile vatum*" have doubtless been betrayed into this folly by their zeal against infidel science (as they supposed it), and that geologists have not been at all behind them (as some instances will show before we have done), in the mortifying displays of ignorance and sophistry they have made, in their attempts to use the weapons of the theologian and expositor. But, we would remark, while the specialities on which inductions are founded, in any particular branch of natural science, are, of course, better known to the professor of the speciality, the man of general intelligence may judge the deductions made from the general facts just as well as the other. Any inductive logic is the same in principle with all other inductive logic, and all deductive logic also is similar. Yea, conclusions from facts may some times be drawn more correctly by the man of general science than by the plodding collector of them; because the former applies to them the appropriate logic with a more correct and expansive view, and, perhaps, with less of the prejudice of hypothesis. The man who defined the inductive logic was not a naturalist by special

profession—was not practically skilled in any one department of natural history—but was a great philosopher and logician.

If, then, after geologists have described and generalized their facts, and have explained their conclusions therefrom, a class so well educated as the clergy must be pronounced unfitted to form an opinion upon them, the fault must be in the geologist or his science. If demonstration is there, it ought surely to be visible to the intelligent eye. How absurd is it for the advocates of the science to recalcitrate against the opinions of an educated class of *men*, when they virtually offer their systems to the comprehension of *boys*, by making them a subject of collegiate instruction; and one (who has, perhaps, more scornfully than any other, derided the criticisms of clerical opponents,) to popular assemblages of clerks and mechanics? Surely, if Mr. Hugh Miller thought that he could convince a crowd of London mechanics intelligently, in one night's lecture, of his theory of the seven geologic ages, it is absurd to claim that the science is too recondite for the unholy inspection of parsons' eyes.

There must always be a peculiar reason for the meddling of theologians in this subject. It is, that it is virtually a theory of cosmogony; and cosmogony is intimately connected with the doctrine of creation, which is one of the modes by which God reveals himself to man, and one of the prime articles of every theology. The inevitable connection of the two might be inferred from this fact, that all the cosmogonies of the Ancients were natural theologies: there is no philosopher of whom we know any thing, among the Greeks and Romans, who has treated the one without treating the other. It must, therefore, be always expected that theologians will claim an interest in geologic speculations, and will require them to be conformed to sound principles of logic and exposition.

2. On the other hand, the attitude and temper of many of the eager defenders of inspiration, towards the new science, have been most unwise. By many, a jealousy and uneasiness have been displayed, which were really derogatory to the dignity of our cause. The Bible is so firmly established upon its impregnable evidences, it has passed safely through so many assaults, has witnessed the saucy advance of so many pretended demonstrations of its errors, which were afterwards covered with ridicule by the learned, that its friends can well afford to be calm, patient, and dignified. They should be neither too eager to repel and denounce, nor too ready to recede from established expositions of the text at the supposed demand of scientific discoveries. They should assume the calm assurance, which regards all true science, and every genuine discovery, as destined inevitably to become the handmaids, instead of the assailants, of revelation. Especially to be deprecated is that shallow and fickle policy, which has been so often seen among the professed defenders of the Bible, in hastily adopting some newly coined exposition of its words, made to suit some supposed exigency of new scientific discovery, and as hastily abandoning it for some still newer meaning. They have not even waited to ascertain whether the supposed necessity for relinquishing the old exposition has been really created by a well-established discovery; but, as prurient and shallow in science as in theology, they have adopted on half evidence some new-fangled hypothesis of scientific facts, and then invented, on grounds equally insecure, some new-fangled explanations to twist God's Word into seeming agreement with the hypothesis. It would be well for us to ascertain whether our position is really stormed, before we retreat to search for another. But, several times within a generation, the world has seen a certain class of theologians saying, that the old popular understanding of the Bible upon a given subject must be relinquished; that science had proved it untenable, but that

they had at last found the true and undoubted one. And this they proceeded to sustain with marvellous ingenuity and zeal. But, after a few years, the natural philosophers relinquish, of their own accord, the hypothesis which had put these expositors to so much trouble, and introduce with great confidence a different one. And now, the divines tell us, they were mistaken a second time as to what the Bible intended to teach about it: but they are certain they have it right at last. So a third exposition is advanced. It has been this short-sighted folly, more than any real collision between the Bible and science, which has caused thinking men to doubt the authority of inspiration, and to despise its professed expounders. If they are to be believed, then the Word of God is but a sort of clay, which may be moulded into any shape required by the purposes of priest-craft. Clergymen ought to know enough of the history of human knowledge to be aware that true science advances slowly and cautiously, that great and revolutionizing discoveries in physical laws are not established every day; that a multitude of hypotheses have been mistaken, before our times, for demonstrations, and afterwards relinquished; and that even true inductions are always, to a certain extent, tentative, and require to be partially corrected after the science has been pushed to farther advances, from which fuller light is reflected back upon them. It will be time enough, therefore, for us, as professional expositors of the Mosaic history, to settle and proclaim a plan for expounding it in harmony with geology, when geology has settled itself. Our wisdom would be to commit the credit and authority of God's Word to no theory except such as is absolutely established by the laws of sound exegesis; and when we have thus taken a well considered position, to maintain it firmly against all mere appearances.

3. It should, in the third place, be clearly decided what is the degree of authority which we are to claim for the Bible upon those questions of physics which lie along the

path of its topics. Many claim for geology a license here, which comes very near to the deceitful distinction of the Schoolmen, between the philosophical and theological truth. When their daring speculations clearly contravened the teachings of Scripture, they said that these opinions were true in philosophy, though false in theology. In a somewhat similar spirit, it is now pleaded for geology, that it has its domain in a different field of investigation and evidence from that of the Bible. Each kind of evidence is valid in its own sphere, it is said; and, therefore, the teachings of each science are to be held true, independently of each other. But all truths are harmonious *inter se*. If one proposition contradicts another, no matter from what field of human knowledge it may be brought, manifestly, both can not be true. If, then, the Bible, properly understood, affirms what geology denies, the difference is irreconcilable; it can not be evaded by any easy expedient like that described above; it can only be composed by the overthrow of the authority of one or the other of the parties.

To determine how the Bible should be understood in its allusions to physical facts, we must bear in mind the object of God in giving it. His purpose was not to teach us philosophical knowledge, but theological. Nothing seems plainer than that God acts on the scheme of leaving men to find out, by their own researches, all those facts and laws of nature, the knowledge of which may minister to curiosity or to material well-being; while He limits Himself to giving us those divine facts and laws which man's research could not discover, or could not adequately establish, necessary for our attaining our proper theological end. Philosophy is our teacher for the body and for time; revelation, for the soul and for eternity. When revelation says any thing concerning material nature, it is only what is made necessary to the comprehension of some theological fact or doctrine. And in its observance of this distinction the Bible is eminently a practical book, saying nothing

whatever for mere curiosity, and stopping at just what is essential to religious truth. Hence, we ought to understand that when the Scriptures use popular language to describe physical occurrences or facts, all they mean is, to state the apparent phenomena, as they would seem to the popular eye to occur. They never intended to give us the non-apparent, scientific mechanism of those facts or occurrences; for this is not essential to their practical object, and is left to the philosopher. Hence, when natural science comes, and teaches us that the true *rationale* of apparent phenomena is different from that which seems to be suggested by the terms of the Scripture, and of popular language, there is no real contradiction between science and the Bible, or between science and the popular phraseology. For instance, the exposition of such passages, which led the doctors of Salamanca to condemn Columbus' geography as unscriptural, and the Inquisition and Turretin to argue against the astronomy of Galileo, as infidel, was mistaken. The former argued against Columbus, that the Psalms speak of the heavens as spread out like a canopy, and the earth as immovable and extended. Turretin argues most methodically that the Copernican scheme of the heavens can not be true, because the Scriptures speak of the earth as "established that it can not be moved;" of the sun as "going forth to his circuit in the heavens;" and of sun and moon as "setting," "rising," "standing still" at Joshua's command. We now clearly see that all this was an exegetical folly. And, now that we know it is the earth that moves, and not the sun, we no more dream of charging the Bible with error of language, than we do the astronomer himself, when he says, perhaps on the very pages of his almanac, "sun rises," "sun sets," "sun enters Capricorn," etc. For such really are the apparent motions of those bodies, and had the Bible departed from the established popular phraseology in mentioning them, to use terms of scientific accuracy, it would have been gratuitous

pedantry, aggravated by the fact that it would have been unintelligible and absurd to all nations which had not yet developed the Copernican astronomy.

Now, so far as the demands of modern geology upon our understanding of the Mosaic record are analagous to the concessions made above, we cheerfully yield them. It was with a view to the illustration of this new application that the familiar principle was again stated by us. And we find this principle, which we thus concede, claimed by the Christian geologists, as Hugh Miller, to cover all possible liberties which they find it convenient to take with the sacred text. This, then, is another point which requires careful adjustment. When Moses seems to say that God brought our world out of nothing into an organized state, about six thousand years ago, and in the space of six days, are his words to be classed along with those passages which denote physical occurrences according to their popular appearance, and which are to be interpreted, as we do the popular language about them, in obedience to the discoveries of natural science? Or, does this class of passages belong to a different category? We are compelled to take the latter answer as the proper affirmative. In the first place, the reference to physical facts in the record of creation is not merely subsidiary to the narrative or statement of some theological truth, but is introduced for its own sake. For, creation is not only a physical fact; it is a theological doctrine. The statement of it is fundamental to the unfolding of the whole doctrine of the creature's relation to his Creator. It is not one of those things which revelation treats as being intrinsically outside its scope, and which it, therefore, only introduces allusively. It is the first of those "things of God," which it was the proper and direct object of revelation to teach authoritatively. Second: the fact of creation had no apparent phase, different from its true scientific one, like the seeming dome of the skies, the rising sun, the stable earth; for the simple reason, that it had no

human spectators. Hence, there could be no popular mode of representation, different from the true scientific *rationale*, as there was no people to observe the apparent phenomena and describe them. But we have seen that the popular language of the Bible about the rising sun, and such like apparent phenomena, receives its explanation purely from the fact that it is conformed to the apparent and obvious occurrences, and to the established popular language founded thereon. Instead, therefore, of requiring these passages to stand waiting until they receive their proper construction from the hand of natural science, they are to be construed, like the remainder of the doctrinal teachings of the Scriptures, according to their own independent laws of exegesis, honestly applied.

Farther: when the proper rights of revelation, as related to natural science, are defined, it is most important that we assert their independence of it. Most geologists speak as though, on any subject which the researches of human science may happen to touch, the Bible must say only what their deductions permit it to say. The position to which they consign God's Word is that of a handmaid, dependent, for the validity of the construction to be put upon its words, upon their permission. Now this, we boldly assert, is intrinsic rationalism; it is the very same principle of baptized infidelity which reappears from so many different points of view, from Socinianism, Neologism, Abolitionism, exalting the conclusions of the human understanding over the sure word of prophecy. Let us fully concede that the Bible has been often misinterpreted, and thus its infallibility has been cited to sustain what God never meant it to sustain; that its correct exposition may, especially in certain parts of it, require great patience, caution, and modesty; and that it is wrong to claim its teachings as authoritative on any point, unless we have ascertained the true meaning of the text, beyond a peradventure, by the just application of its own laws of exposition. But still, the

Bible must be held to have its own ascertainable and valid laws of exposition; and its teachings, when duly ascertained, must be absolutely authoritative in all their parts, without waiting on or deferring to any conclusions of human science whatsoever: otherwise, it is practically no Bible; it is no "rule of faith" for a human soul. For, to say nothing of the uncertainties and fallibility of human reasonings, of the numerous mistakes of science once held to be demonstrated, how preposterous is the idea that our Bible held out to all the generations of men before Cuvier what professed to be an infallible cosmogony, while they had no possible means (the science which was to interpret it being undeveloped) to attain the true meaning, or to discover, by the laws of exposition of the language itself, their misunderstanding of it? Such a revelation would be a mere trap. But, worse than this; just as all our forefathers, when reading the first chapter of Genesis, supposed they were reading a plain story, which they were invited and permitted to comprehend, but were, all the while, deceived; so we may now be unconsciously accepting a number of Bible propositions as authoritative, and staking our souls upon them, which are destined to receive, several hundred years hence, a totally different interpretation—an interpretation impossible for us to attain—from the light of some science as yet undeveloped, either geological, or astronomical, or ethical, or ethnological. And who can guess in what part of the Bible these quick-sands are? All seems like solid ground to us now: but so did Genesis seem to our honest forefathers. We repeat, if they sinned against the Bible's own independent laws of exegesis, in venturing to put a sense on the first of Genesis, if there was any thing in those laws of exegesis themselves which, properly observed, would have sufficed to warn them off from their unwarranted interpretations, they were wholly to blame for their mistake. But if not, if the Bible was dependent for a fair understanding on a science as yet wholly undevel-

oped, then in those places it really means nothing in itself; and in seeming to mean some thing it is a mere trap for honest people. And so, we repeat, until human science shall have made its last advance in every circle of knowledge which can ever inosculate with theology, we must remain in suspense, whether there are not other hollow places in this Bible, which are betraying us. Obviously, such a book is not authoritative to a rational soul. And obviously, he who holds the authority of the Bible only in the sense described, is but a rationalist in spirit, whatever may be his Christian or his clerical profession. But, it may be objected: "Does not every enlightened Christian hold that it is the glory of the Bible to receive illustration from every light of human science?" We reply: It is its glory to have all human science ancillary to it, not dominant over it; to have its meaning illustrated, *but not created*, by all the discoveries of true science.

4. An equally important adjustment is to be made, as to the party which is bound to assume the burden of proof in this discussion between the Mosaic and the Geologic records. We consider that the theologian, who asserts the infallibility of the Bible, and the independency and sufficiency of its own laws of interpretation, is entitled to the preliminary presumption; and, therefore, the burden of proof rests upon the geologist, who asserts a hostile hypothesis. The authority of the Bible, as our rule of faith, is demonstrated by its own separate and independent evidences, literary, historical, moral, internal, prophetic. It is found by the geologist in possession of the field, and he must assume the aggressive, and positively dislodge it from its position. The defender of the Bible need only stand on the defensive. That is, the geologist may not content himself with saying that his hypothesis (which is opposed to Bible teachings) is plausible, that it can not be scientifically refuted, that it may adequately satisfy the requirements of all the physical phenomena to be accounted

for. All this is naught, as a successful assault on us. We are not bound to retreat until he has constructed an absolutely exclusive demonstration of his hypothesis; until he has shown, by strict scientific proofs, not only that his hypothesis *may be* the true one, but that *it alone can be* the true one; that it is impossible any other can exclude it. And we, in order to retain our position, are not at all bound to construct any physical argument to demonstrate geologically that Moses' statement of the case is the true one; for, if the Bible is true, what it teaches on this subject is proved true by the biblical evidences, in the absence of all geologic proof. Nor are we under any forensic obligation to refute the opposing hypothesis of the geologist by geologic arguments, farther than this; that we shall show geologically that his argument is not a perfect and exclusive demonstration. If we merely show, by any flaw in his conclusion, by the citation of any phenomenon irreducible to the terms of his hypothesis, that his demonstration is incomplete, we have successfully maintained the defensive: we hold the victory.

Now, have geologists always remembered this? Nay, is it not notoriously otherwise? It would seem as though this interesting young science had a sort of fatality for infecting its votaries with a forgetfulness of these logical responsibilities. Perhaps this would be found equally true of every other physical science of wide extent, of complex phenomena, and of fascinating character, while in its forming state. But every acute reader of the deductions of geologists perceives numerous instances where they quietly substitute the "may be" for the "must be," and step unconsciously from the undisputed probability of an hypothesis to its undisputed certainty. And one's observation of nature need proceed but a small way, to light upon instances in which phenomena exist which would receive a given solution just as plausibly as certain others; while the geologists imagine a reason for withholding that solu-

tion in the cases which would thus spoil their hypothesis. That they can not yet claim that exclusive and perfect demonstration of their hypothesis which is required of their position, as holding the aggressive, seems very plain from familiar facts. One is, the radical differences of hypothesis to which leading geologists are committed, up to this very day. Sir Charles Lyell makes it almost the key-note of his system, that all geologic changes were produced by such causes as are now at work, and operating, in the main, with no greater speed than they now exhibit. Hugh Miller, and others, are equally sure that those changes were produced by successive convulsions and earth-tempests, revolutionizing in a short time the state of ages. Some reconcile the "stony record" with that of Moses, upon the scheme advocated by Dr. Chalmers, which pushes back all the mighty changes to that interval ending, in Gen. 1 : 2, when "the earth was without form, and void." Others, with Miller, and Professor Tayler Lewis, adopt the very different theory of the six creative days extending to vast periods of time. Mr. Miller is certain that the fossil *flora* and *fauna* indicate just the order, in the main, as to the succession which their chief developments had in the geologic ages, which is set down in Genesis as the work of the several days. Many others, equally great, declare just the opposite.

A reasonable mistrust of the perfectness of geological demonstrations is excited, again, by instances of obvious haste and inconclusiveness in their inferences from supposed facts. Of this, one or two illustrations must suffice. Few of their writers rank higher than Sir Charles Lyell. In the London edition of his "Principles of Geology," 1850, page 205, we have an attempt to make an estimate of the age of the earth's present crust, from the character of the deep gorge, or great rocky gully, in which the Niagara river flows from the falls towards Lake Ontario. The deep part of this channel is said to be about seven miles

long. The author first satisfies himself, on grounds which might, perhaps, amount to probability, that this whole gorge may have been excavated by the torrent itself. This is the first element of the calculation. Through the rest of the argument this probability is tacitly turned into a certainty. The next element to be ascertained is, the rate at which the river now digs out its channel, and the edge of the cataract recedes. A previous intelligent inquirer concluded, upon the best testimony he could collect upon the spot, that the falls receded a yard each year; but Sir Charles assumes an average of a foot per year as the more correct rate, on grounds which he does not state. This second source of uncertainty is, also, quietly ignored. Then it is calculated that the Niagara has been flowing thirty-five thousand years. While the author does not venture to vouch for this positively, he concludes by indicating to his reader that his private opinion is, the time was more likely longer than shorter. Now, even the unscientific visitor of Niagara can not fail to observe, what Sir Charles himself correctly states, that the perpendicular face of the gorge, of the cataract, and of the lower edge of Goat Island, reveals this structure:—on the top there is a vast layer or stratum of hard grey limestone, nearly horizontal, and, at the falls, nearly ninety feet thick; while all below it, to the bottom of the precipice, is a soft shale. The real obstruction to the very rapid cutting away of the precipice by the tremendous torrent, is the solidity of the limestone layer, whose surface forms the bottom of the river above the falls. When that once gives way, the rest is speedily removed. Any person can easily understand that the permanency with which this limestone layer withstands the water depends chiefly on its thickness, and also on its dip, or inclination, and on the frequent occurrence or absence of fissures or seams, destroying the cohesion of its masses to each other. Now, will not the reader be surprised to learn that, even in the two miles which ex-

tend from the cataract down to the Suspension Bridge, this all-important stratum of limestone is diminished more than half in its thickness, the soft and yielding shale forming the remainder of the cliffs? So that, to say nothing of the high probability of the occurrence of the two other causes within the seven miles, we have here a cause for the recession of the cataract greatly more rapid than that which now obtains. Sir Charles Lyell concludes with these words: "At some points it may have receded much faster than at present, but its general progress was probably slower, because the cataract, when it began to recede, must have had nearly twice its present height." Did not the waters then have more than twice their present momentum? So that common sense would say that if there was more earth to be worn and dug away, there was far more power to do it. Surely, such reasoning as the above does not make an exclusive and perfect demonstration!

Another instance shall be taken from the same author. On page 219 he presents us with an argument for the great age of the world, from the length of time the Mississippi has been employed in forming its alluvial delta. The elements of the calculation are, of course, the area and depth of the alluvial deposit, giving the whole number of cubic yards composing it, the quantity of water passed down the stream in one year, and the per-centage of solid matter contained in the water in its average state of muddiness. The *data* upon which the depth of the alluvium is fixed are only two, the average depth of the Gulf of Mexico, and a well or shaft sunk near lake Pontchartrain. Are either of these sufficient? Is it not customary for strata to dip towards seas and oceans? If the spot at which the well was dug happened to be one of those sunk far below the usual level by earthquake agencies (and Sir Charles himself saw that such agencies had produced just such results in the region of this same river, near New Madrid), would it not come, in the course of a few hundred years, to receive far

more than the average thickness of alluvial deposits? But let us come to the other element, the percentage of sediment in the water. From the observations of Dr. Riddell he learns that it is one three-thousandth part, in bulk, of the water. Two other observers, Messrs. Brown and Dickson, make it one five hundred and twenty-eighth part, and they make the volume of water one-third more! Sir Charles concedes that "so great a discrepancy shows the need of a new series of experiments." Did either of the observers take pains to ascertain whether the larger part of the sediment does not gravitate towards the bottom of the water, while flowing, and to go down any part of the one hundred and sixty-eight feet, which measures the depth of the river at New Orleans, to procure the water which they examined? We are not informed. The observations on the annual volume of water were made at New Orleans. Was any allowance made for the waters which flow off in such vast quantities through the delta, by the *bayous*, and during the gigantic freshets, leaving the main channel above New Orleans? We are not informed. Again, the total volume of the water passing New Orleans in a year depends on its velocity. Now, experienced pilots and boatmen of the Mississippi are generally of opinion that the lower strata of water in its channel run with far more velocity than the surface. Hence the calculators, in gauging the surface velocity, were probably entirely at fault as to the real volume of water. Last: it is universally known that the Mississippi is nearly twice as muddy, on the average, at the head of the delta as at New Orleans! How much is this notable calculation worth after all these deductions? But, for all that, he *chooses* to assume Dr. Riddell's estimate for his basis, and thus proves (!) that the Mississippi has been running one hundred thousand years.

Now, let the reader note, that we do not advance the inconclusiveness of these two calculations as sufficient proof, by itself, that the world *is not* thirty-five thousand, or

one hundred thousand years old. But we advance it upon the principle expressed in the adage, "*Ex pede Herculem.*" The detection of such hasty and shallow reasoning gives sufficient ground of mistrust as to their general conclusions.

Another specimen shall be drawn from Hugh Miller, ludicrous enough to relieve the tedium of this discussion. In the "Testimony of the Rocks," (Boston: 1857, p. 259,) he is arguing that the fossil animals were produced by natural law, vast ages ago, because they exhibit marks of creative design similar to those we now find in the living works of nature. One of his evidences is a little coral, the "*Smithia Pengellyi*," which constructed its bony cells such that the fracture of them presented a surface remarkably similar to a certain calico pattern, which had proved extremely popular among the ladies. The conclusion is, that as this calico must have been very pretty—(as though the better part of creation had never been known to exhibit their sweet caprices by admiring things for their very ugliness)—the Creator undoubtedly caused these coral insects to construct their cells in this way for their prettiness! To us duller mortals it is not apparent that the "final cause" of coral insects was to be ready to have their stony buildings cracked open by geologists' hammers; we thought they had been made for an existence where, in the main, no human eye could see them; especially as the species was Pre-Adamite by myriads of years. Mr. Miller's notion of the design of creation seems to be very much akin to that of the old Scotch crone, who, whenever she beheld a beautiful young girl, had no other appreciation of her graces than to conceive "what a lovely corpse she would make."

Once more: while the currently received theory of the cosmogony is ingenious, it is at least doubtful whether the adjustment of all the phenomena of so complex a case to the hypothesis, has been, or can be, accurately carried out.

But until this is done, it is not demonstrated. If that scheme is true, then all the material substances which make up the chemist's list of simple substances, must have been derived from the elements of the atmosphere, of water, and of the primitive rocks. For, if we go back to the beginning, we find, according to the current hypothesis of the geologists, nothing in existence, except a heated atmosphere, watery vapor, and a fluid globe of melted granite, basalt, etc. All the rest, secondary, tertiary, alluvial, is the result of cooling, crusting, depressions and upheavals of this crust, disintegration, and sedimentary deposits. But, is it certain that air, pure water, and primitive rocks, contain all the chemical substances? And a still harder question is this: Has it ever been ascertained whether the chemical conditions and combinations, in which the elements exist in the primary rocks, and then in those called secondary and tertiary, are such as are consistent with this hypothesis? Has it been ascertained that the small per-centage of silicate of lime found in some of the granites (only some) and other primitive rocks, within such a distance from their surface as could, by any possibility, be subjected to disintegration, can account for all the vast masses of *carbonate* of lime (no longer silicate) in all the limestones, marbles, chalks, coral, and calcareous clays of the newer strata? But the world is entitled to have these questions answered, before the geologists claim a demonstration of their hypothesis.

Recent events furnish us with another doubt. One of the main arguments by which the fossil animals of all but the most recent species are shown to be Pre-Adamite, as it is claimed, is, that no fossil human remains, or marks of human handiwork, have been found among them. And geologists have admitted (as they must) that the well-attested discovery of such remains among the earlier strata would demand a surrender and reconstruction of their theory. But lately the scientific world has been agitated by the report that, near *Amiens*, in France, arrow heads of

flint, and other works of human industry, have been found unquestionably in a *stratum*, and along with fossils, uniformly assigned by geologists to a Pre-Adamite period. And now, it is stated that a scholar of high qualifications, Rawlinson, has visited the spot, and is satisfied of the correctness of the assertion.

For these and many other reasons, we consider the geological hypothesis as not yet a demonstration; and, hence, we claim the right to stand upon the defensive, upon the impregnable bulwarks of Scripture evidences, until we are positively dislodged. We deny that any logical obligation rests upon us to present any scientific argument, or to establish any hypothesis, on the subject. We are not bound to show, by natural science, what is the true *rationale* of the earth's creation. Our defence is thoroughly accomplished when we show that any adverse theory is not yet exclusively demonstrated.

5. The most vital point in the relations between theology and geology, we have reserved for the last. It is one which has been summarily disposed of by geologists, without condescending to weigh its vast import. How far must the logical value of the inferences of natural science from natural appearances, be modified by the admitted fact of a *creation*? The character of these inferences is the following: "We see a given natural law produce a given structure: We find the remains of a similar structure which has been some how produced in the past: We infer that it must have been produced by a similar natural law." The just application of this kind of reasoning, within its proper limits, is fully admitted: it has been the main lever in the discoveries of natural science. But now, we ask, how far should its application be limited by the knowledge of the truth, that *some where* in the past some omnipotent creative act must have intervened? This is the question.

Unless geologists are willing candidly to take an atheistic view of cosmogony, the fact of an absolute act of creation

must be admitted some where in the past. We will not insult the intelligence and piety of our readers by supposing it necessary to recite the arguments which disprove an Atheistic origin of the present order of things, or the emphatic admissions of all the greatest teachers of natural science, that nature obviously discloses her own origin in the creative will of an eternal Intelligence. The short-lived theory of *development* has been already crushed beneath the combined arguments and ridicule of scientific geologists themselves. There is, however, one fact, peculiarly german to this point, that the Christian geologists of Great Britain and America claim it as the peculiar glory of their science, that it presents an invincible and original argument for a creation. It is this: the stony records of successive *genera* of fossil plants and animals show that prior *genera* perished wholly, and *genera* entirely new appear on the stage of life. Now, as the development theory is repudiated, the entrance of each new *genus* evinces, beyond a doubt, a new and separate creative act. Let us grant this for argument's sake. It is agreed, then, that terrestrial structures began, some where in the past, in God's creative act.

But now, it is most obvious, that if a scientific observer had been present, just after that creative act, to observe the structures produced by it, any observations or inferences he might have drawn from the *seeming* marks of the working of natural laws upon them, would have been worthless to prove that those specimens originated in natural laws. We repeat: once admit that a creative act has intervened *any where* in the past, and we should have had there, if we had been present, one case, in which all deductions and inferences of the natural origin of things from their natural appearances, would have been worthless. Such analogical arguments would have been cut across and superseded utterly by the creative act. This is indisputable. We may illustrate it by the instances usually pre-

sented by the sound old writers of the class of Dick (instances which have far more significance than has usually been admitted). Suppose, for illustration's sake, that the popular apprehension of the Bible account of the creation of Adam's body, and of the trees of Paradise, is true. But now a naturalist of our modern school investigates affairs. He finds towering oaks with acorns on them! Acorns do not form by nature in a day—some species of oaks require two summers to mature them. But, worse than this. He has ascertained by natural history that one summer's growth forms only one of the concentric rings in the grain of the tree's stock. He cuts down one of the spreading monarchs of the garden, and discovers that it has a hundred rings. So he coolly rejects the story that this garden began last week, and insists on it that Adam has told a monstrous fib in saying so; that it is not less than a hundred years old. Yet Adam was right; for the creative act explained all. But let us suppose another naturalist returning after some nine or ten centuries. He visits the venerable tomb of the father of all the living, and learns from his heir, Seth, how that his father sprang, at the bidding of God, out of the dust, a full-formed, adult man. The naturalist takes up a leg-bone of Adam's skeleton: he remarks: "The person to whom this bone belonged at death was evidently an adult; for its length, size, solidity and density show this." He saws off a section, polishes it down to a translucent film of bone, and subjects it to his microscope and his chemical solvents. He remarks: "Here is the cellular structure of gelatinous matter, which once formed the incipient bone of the *fetus*; and these cells I now find filled with the deposit of *proto-phosphate of lime*, giving it its stony strength and hardness. But I know that the introduction of this earth into the cells of the soft bone of the infant is just the process by which nature now forms the bones of adults, by gradual growth. Whence I learn that this individual, like his children, grew, during

the space of twenty-one years, from a *fœtus* to an adult; and the myth of his son Seth, concerning his instantaneous creation, is an attempt to impose on my credulity. This attempt I, as a philosopher, shall repudiate with contempt." Yet Seth was right, and the philosopher wrong. For, not to rely on the inspired testimony alone, this natural argument would prove that Adam was once an infant, and, therefore, had a father. The same argument, applied to the body of Adam's father, would equally prove that he, also, was once an infant, and had a father. And it would prove equally well an infinite series of finite human fathers, extending back to all eternity. But such a series, philosophy herself shows, is impossible!

But, second—and the remark is of prime importance—any creative act of God, producing a structure which was intended to subsist under the working of natural laws, must produce one presenting some of the *seeming* traces of the operation of such laws. We confidently challenge geologists who admit that there has ever been any creation at all, to imagine a product of it which could be different. For, note, all these Theistic geologists repudiate the theory of development of *genera* from different and lower *genera*. Whence it follows, that the first specimen of God's immediate handiwork, the very first moment it left his hand, must have stood forth *as truly natural* as any of its progeny which were destined to proceed from it by natural law. And the same thing must have been true, to some extent, of all inorganic structures. If they had no traits of the natural, as they came from God's hand, then they were incapable of becoming, thenceforth, the subjects of natural law.

Hence, third, it follows that, if once a creative act is admitted to have occurred some where in the past, it may have occurred any where in the past, so far as the deductions of natural science from the marks of natural law upon its products go. In other words, the value of all

these analogical inferences as to the date at which, and the mode by which, these objects of nature came into being, are worthless just so soon as they attempt to pass back of the earliest historical testimony. For the creative act, wherever it has intervened (and who can tell, when testimony fails, where it may not have intervened?) has utterly superseded and cut across all such inferences. Nor can these natural analogies prove that the creative act has not thus intervened at a given place in the past, because the whole validity of the analogies depends on the supposed absence of the creative act. Hence, all the reasonings of geologists seem to us utterly vitiated in their very source, when they attempt to fix, from natural analogies, the age and mode of production of the earth's structures.

This objection is usually dismissed by geologists with a sort of summary contempt, or with a grand outcry of opposition. It does, indeed, cut deep into the pride and pretence of their science; at one blow it sweeps off that whole domain of its pretended 'discoveries—the region of the infinite past prior to all history—in which the pride, conceit, and curiosity of man's fallen intellect must crave to expatiate. But let us see whether it is possible to impugn the simple premises on which our conclusion rests, or the inevitable result from them. Is there a single answer which can be presented, that is even of any scientific weight?

It is urged, in substance, by Hitchcock, that if the validity of their analogical reasonings from natural laws is denied in this case, the very foundations of all natural science are overthrown. But what is this, more than an appeal to our fears and prejudices? It is as though one said, when we refuse to accept a given species of evidence outside its proper range, that we thereby invalidate the force of all evidence. The question is: What is the proper domain of these inferences from the analogies of natural law? Within their own domain, true science accepts them as

valid; outside of it, true science herself will concur with theology in arresting them. Let these premises be granted, viz: Given the sufficient evidence that supernatural causes are all absent in a certain class of effects; and given the fact that just such effects have usually resulted from a certain natural law: Then the inference may be very valid, that these effects did result from the operation of this law. But this inference can not help us to determine the first premise, whether all supernatural causes were truly absent; for the very reason that it depends on that premise in part. This would be to reason in a circle, with a vengeance. The application of these inferences, upon which Hitchcock and the other geologists insist, is, in fact, precisely a case of that induction, from mere uniformity of antecedent and consequent, as far as observed, which Bacon condemned under the term "*Inductio per enumerationem simplicem*," and which it was one of his chief tasks to explode, as utterly worthless. He proves that it can never raise more than a meager probability of the correctness of its conclusions, where it is not supported by some better canon of induction. To explain: The shallow observer says—"I find that, so far as my observation has been enabled to test the matter, a given consequent phenomenon, named B, has always been preceded by a given antecedent, named A. Hence, I conclude that, in every other case where B appears, A was its cause." The obvious vice of this is, that it is wholly unproved that some other cause capable of producing B was not present, besides A, in the last cases. The induction is worthless until that is proved beyond a peradventure. To apply this: Our modern geologists argue, for instance, that wherever they have been able to examine the actual process by which the formation of *stratified rocks* takes place, the cause is *sedimentary action*. Therefore, wherever any other stratified rocks are seen, their producing cause must have been *sedimentary action*. Here we have precisely the worthless induction *per enumerationem*

simplicem; for, the possible presence of some other cause capable of producing stratified rocks, has not been excluded. And every one but the Atheist admits that another such cause may have been present, in the shape of *creative power*. Until the presence of that cause is excluded by some other evidence, the conclusion is not proved. The vice of argument is just like that in the famous sophism of Hume against miracles—it is only worthy of a Humist. And we conceive that there is no uncharitableness in declaring that the covert tendencies of all such philosophizings are to Hume's Atheism. Such reasonings can not be complete for such a result in all cases, unless the supernatural be wholly excluded; and the secret tendency to do so (which is virtual Atheism) is the true spring of all such reasonings in science. But it may be retorted: Are we, then, to surrender all dependence on inferences from natural law, as certain evidence, throughout the whole extent of natural sciences? We reply: No; wherever the inquirer into nature is certain that the facts he investigates are truly under the dominion of natural law, so far such reasonings are valid. As to the origin and history of nature in the past, they are valid no farther back than we can be assured of the absence of the supernatural; and we know not how such assurance can be gained by us, save by the testimony of human experience and history, or of inspiration. This conclusion does, indeed, curb the arrogance of human science, but it does not affect in the least any part of its legitimate dominions, or of its practical value to mankind. It does, indeed, disable us from determining the age, date, and origin of the structures nature presents us, but it does not prevent our discovering the laws of those structures; and the latter is the discovery to which the whole utility of science belongs.

Again: why should the Theistic philosopher desire to push back the creative act of God to the remotest possible age, and to reduce His agency to the smallest possible *mini-*

mum, as is continually done by these speculations? What is gained by it? Instead of granting that God created a world, a *κοσμος*, they continually strive to show that he only created the rude germs of a world, attributing the actual origin of the fewest possible elements to God's almighty act, and supposing the most possible to be the result of subsequent development under natural law. We repeat the question: What is truly gained by this, if once the lingerings of covert Atheism be expelled? Admit in good faith the facts of an actual Creator, an almighty and omniscient agent, and of an actual creation, any where in the past, and it will appear just as reasonable that God should have created the whole finished result as a part. To His infinite faculties there is nothing hard, as opposed to easy, nothing intricate, as opposed to simple, nothing great, as contrasted with the simple. It was just as easy for Him to speak into existence a finished universe, with all its beautiful order, "by the word of His power," as to produce the incipient elements out of which "laws of nature" were slowly and laboriously to evolve the result.

For, what are those laws of nature, and what their source? Do they not originate, after all, in the mere will and immediate power of God? None but the Atheist disputes this. And, although we cordially grant that the properties of bodies, by which they are constituted *forces* in the great system of causation under natural law, are actual properties, and not mere seeming blinds or *simulacra* of properties; though we grant that they are truly intrinsic in bodies, as constituted by God's creative will; yet who, except the Atheist, denies that their operation is sustained and regulated by the ever-present, special providence of God? Hence, if we say *natural law* does this or that, as opposed to supernatural creation, we have not in the least simplified, or relieved, the perpetual miracle of God's working. There is still a manifold and countless operation of infinite power and wisdom.

But, if the natural philosophers still persist in claiming the universal application of their principle, that wherever there is an analogy to the results of natural law, there we must conclude natural law alone has wrought, we can clearly evince that their position is utterly untenable and inconsistent, save for the thorough Atheist. For, as already intimated, push back the supernatural creative intervention as far as we may, it is impossible for us to conceive how it could produce any structure adapted to the subsequent dominion of natural law, without giving it the properties which such law gives to its similar products. To give the most complete proof of the justice of this remark, let us take that theory of the solar system which the unbelieving *La Place* is said to have doubtfully suggested as a possible one, and which our nominally Christian philosophers have so incontinently adopted, without demonstration, as demonstratively the true one. Suppose that the natural historian, coming from some older system, had begun his investigation of ours (on the principles of these philosophers) at that stage when nothing existed but a *nebula* of incandescent compound vapor, rotating from west to east around an axis of motion. (This is the stage, we understand, at which it is now most popular to suppose cooling, liquefying, and solidifying processes began, resulting in a sun and planets; when the only shadow of truly scientific evidence on which *La Place* grounded his doubtful surmise, has been dissipated by Lord Rosse, resolving the *nebulae* into clusters of well-defined stars.) How would this scientific observer have speculated on what was presented at that primitive stage? Had he used the confident logic of our geologists, he must have said to himself: "Motion in matter is always the result of impact; therefore, this rotary motion which I now behold must be the result of some mechanical force, developed by natural action, either mechanical or chemical. And again: *vapor* implies *evaporation*, and sensible heat suggests latent heat, rendered

sensible by chemical action. There must, therefore, have been a previous and different condition of this matter, now volatilized, heated, and moving. These conditions are the results of the working of natural laws; and that implies a previous material, in a different condition, to be the subject of that working." Now, this reasoning would be precisely as good as that of geologists. But what would it prove? It would make matter and the organism thereof eternal; for, after ascending by such reasonings one stage higher, we should be equally impelled to ascend still another, and another. Thus it would exclude a Creator totally from creation. Hence, it appears that the principles we have criticised are unsound and inconsistent, in any hands except those of the Atheist. Once admit a Creator and a creation, and the validity of all inferences from the seeming analogies of nature, as to origin of things, is vitiated the moment we pass back of the authentic light of historical testimony. Once admit a Creator and a creation, and nothing is gained, in logic, by attempting to push back the creative act.

In fine, if that account which theology gives of the origin of the universe is to be accepted at all, it appears to us that the most philosophical conception of a creation would be the following: That God, in producing a world which His purposes required should pass immediately under the dominion of natural laws, would produce it with just the properties which those laws were to develop. Thus God, intending to have trees perpetuated by a law of germination and growth, would most naturally create the first tree of the *genus* just such as germination and growth would produce. And so, the whole structure of His world would be made, at first, with an adaptation to the laws which were intended subsequently to regulate and modify it. And just here theology inosculates with cosmogony, and gives us a consideration which will strike every just mind with no little force, while it is one of that kind which

the man of narrow specialities is almost incompetent to estimate. What was God's true end in the creation of a material world? Reason and Scripture answer: It was to furnish a stage for the existence and action of reasonable moral beings. The world was made for MAN to inhabit. Without the presence of this its rational occupant and earthly master, all the manifestations of intelligent design and moral attributes, given in the order of nature, would be an aimless and senseless work. For, as light would be no light were there no *eye* in the universe, so God's declarative glory in the wisdom and goodness of His works is no glory till there is a *mind* to comprehend it. Now, such being God's end, it seems far more rational to suppose that God would produce at once the world which was needed for His purpose, rather than spend hundreds of thousands of years in growing it.

But, bearing in mind the object for which God created a world, we shall see that it becomes the most reasonable supposition that He should have made it, from the first, with some of those traits which geologists suppose have all resulted from the working of natural laws. For instance: God's purposes, as at present revealed, prompted Him to subject the surface of our globe to that class of agencies which are continually adding to its sedimentary *strata* of rocks and earths. Well, it is the most reasonable, the most philosophic, supposition that the same purposes prompted Him to create a globe which had, from the first, some *strata* of the same sort. That the surface of the globe should be from the first stratified was necessary, for instance, to produce springs and veins of water, and that whole economy of irrigation, which makes it a tenable home for sentient creatures.

If, therefore, there is any authentic testimony that God did, from the first, create such an earth, no sound inference drawn from natural analogies is of any force to rebut that testimony.

ARTICLE IV.

“*The Art of Extempore Speaking: Hints for the Pulpit, the Senate, and the Bar.* By M. BAUTAIN, Professor at the Sorbonne,” etc.

M. Bautain is himself one of the most brilliant extempore orators in France, a country abounding in masters of the art of ready eloquence. He has, therefore, a certain right to call the ear of mankind to the great subject of public speaking, seeing that he is a practical and successful exemplifier of its principles. For those who, by popular speech, would influence their fellow-men, he authoritatively lays down rules, which have all been tested in his own rich experience. They are not abstractions. They are not the results of *a priori* reasoning, based upon the nature of the human mind, or wire-drawn from the philosophy of rhetoric. They do not come to us perched upon Blair's brittle stilts of ice, with nothing human about them. They have passed through the mill of actual experiment. The entire book has this to say: What is here described, *has been done*; try the receipt, O fellow-orators, for yourselves! It is not surprising that this masterly essay upon a most difficult, and even recondite, subject—this fresh, vigorous, limpid outpouring of an elocutionary expert—should have met with the favor which has greeted it in our own country; for among a free people the cultivation of effective oratory is recommended by the very character of their institutions. Moreover, it is a book the very graces of whose composition would themselves give it currency with all who love vivid writing, original illustration, and enthusiasm.

It is not our purpose to review this entertaining and instructive volume, but to make it the starting-point for

some observations touching the bearing of its subject upon the oratory of the pulpit.

We can readily imagine the delight with which such a treatise might be hailed on the part of those who believe that the time has fully come for imparting to our pulpits the impulse of a new energy, and who think that this energy resides in the art of extemporaneous address, in contradistinction from written homilies. A numerous class of judicious Christians are convinced that the introduction of a freer style of public speaking into the sacred desk will be vastly promotive of ministerial efficiency. Many newspaper and periodical writers have, within a few years, been greatly exercised with respect to what they regard the comparative unfruitfulness of the *Presbyterian* Church, particularly, in the instrumental work of human salvation. In accounting for this alleged barrenness, these reformers immediately arraign the pulpit at the bar of public opinion, and denounce it as the prime hinderer of that work, by its inapt and lifeless mode of presenting truth to the conscience. They say: Give us a living pulpit, and we will show you a living Church; give us the breath of excited oratory, and we will show you the kindling of excited emotion; give us an unreading ministry, and we will show you an unsleeping auditory: as if these propositions were all identical. These persons would, in their zeal, send a copy of Bautain's work to each theological student, and to every young preacher, and to the hundreds of dull prosers who have passed their pupilage, and are no longer young, with the request that they study at the feet of this master, acquire his art of free extemporization, and learn to thunder at the people with the artillery of his off-hand eloquence. This would usher in the millenium!

We think that those who thus feel—for feeling it is, rather than sober thought—are in a great degree mistaken; pulpit oratory may be just as effective when its power is wielded by the “manuscript” preacher, as when it is exem-

plified by the "extempore" speaker. The secret of inefficient preaching does not lie here at all, in our humble judgment, but far elsewhere. We do, indeed, readily grant that no preaching is worthy of the name which does not possess a certain power, considered as an instrumental human agency, by which the mind of the preacher can impress its own convictions of truth upon the mass of mind which waits upon it for instruction from time to time. There are sympathies to be awakened between speaker and hearer. There are arts to be employed for winning confidence, for enlisting attention, for awakening thought, and for persuading to action. This is all well understood. But the question is: Does extemporaneous preaching alone meet all the demands of the case? We embrace the negative. In its discussion we will, as briefly as possible, consider the three points which seem to constitute the kernel of this controversy: 1. The standard of extemporization which is ordinarily raised for the preacher's imitation. 2. The only kind of this mode of public address which is deserving of emulation by the pulpit orator, but which will be found impracticable in the main. 3. The nature of preaching, and what essential popular qualities it seems to demand, but which will be found to appertain to the judicious use of the manuscript as surely as to the opposite mode of presenting or enforcing divine truth.

I.

It is well known to every one who has read the literature belonging to this subject, or who has listened to occasional conversations relating to it, that the regret is commonly expressed, to the effect that the style of pulpit oratory does not more resemble the declamation of the lawyer and the politician. This comparison between the rostrum and the sacred desk is almost spontaneously resorted to by every individual who wishes to convince the preacher and the people whom he addresses that all *jejune* sermonizing

owes its origin to a lack of those popular elements which characterize the bar and the "stump." The court-room and the hustings—or, at any rate, the halls of legislation—present the true standard of effective speaking. Now, it is difficult to meet this mode of argumentation, because of its vagueness. We are disposed to believe that, whenever it is employed, the mind of the pulpit-censor is fixing his thoughts, not upon the "common run" of lawyers, etc., but only upon some master-spirit of their number, who stands out prominent before them all, and who may be one of those commanding geniuses, whose eminent abilities enable him to adorn and exalt his class—upon some Webster, or some Preston, or some Stephens, the native strength of whose minds, and the graces of whose rhetoric, and the marvels of whose elocution, in connection with whose legal and other attainments, make them the objects of a general and an enthusiastic admiration. They say: Fill the pulpits of the land with the sanctified oratorical abilities of *such* men, and you will move the world towards Christ with an irresistible impulse. Before we get through, we will see reason to doubt even this conclusion, and to believe that *God's* plan, which makes exceptional instances of greatness like this so rare in the Church, is the best plan.

But, surely, if our opponents mean, after all, to point us for our exemplars to the second, third, or still lower rates of speakers who crowd the courts, or bawl from the stump, or prose in the legislatures, we tell them that they are very wide of the mark. We are compelled to say that, while upon the arena of the law there is quite often a fine, perhaps brilliant, display of forensic power—while we have frequently found occasion to admire the off-hand readiness with which great pleaders hurled their telling points upon electrified juries—yet very few of our innumerable legal advocates *ever* make a very creditable display of themselves or their causes, with all their supposed cultivation of *unstudied* address!

We do not hesitate to declare, what every man of taste well knows, that, as a common thing, the haranguing of the bar belongs to a very low order of oratory: it is only now and then relieved by the magnificent speech of some deservedly eminent barrister. Of all the slipshod rhetoric to which we have ever listened—of all the common-place fustian with which the ear of cultivation was ever disgusted—of all the tedious tautologies with which language has been watered and weakened—of all the ungrammatical blundering with which the poor English tongue has ever been disgraced, on the part of those who ought to know better—some of the worst specimens are any day to be found in those pleadings of the bar to which preaching is exhorted to listen for instruction in the art of successful extempore address! Turn all of our preachers into the department of the law, and turn all of your lawyers into the department of the Gospel, and we hazard nothing in saying that the pulpit would be the worse for the ill-advised exchange, whilst the bar would be vastly elevated by the (to it) advantageous transfer. It is mainly because the lawyer deals with facts of present material interest to a number of persons among his audience—with principles so affecting the life and property of all his hearers as to make every case in court personal to each individual in the community—it is because he is addressing a jury or a court whose responsibility is always pressing—it is more because of matters entirely extraneous from himself than on account of the intrinsic excellencies of his oratory, that he obtains the hearing and wins the applause which he does so often secure. Bid not the preacher go, therefore, to the place where eloquence is in itself so seldom winning, if you would have him learn the best mode of declaring the counsel of God. Nor, when you translate the lawyer from the court-house to the political meeting, does the matter become any better. If noise, if ranting, if rambling incoherency, if the employment of gross epithetic abuse, if the

glib recitation of stale maxims, if voluble caricaturing of national history—if all this, relieved now and then by an occasional flash of unoriginal wit, can indicate the possession of the elements of genuine oratory, then is your stump-speaker a rival of Demosthenes! And how easy would it be to introduce such speaking into the sacred desk, for the entertainment of the Sabbath-day assemblies! Aye, how often has it been done! The most complete exemplification of the politician's catching arts of special pleading is found in the anti-Gospel stump-oratory of H. W. Beecher, wherein extemporaneous anathemas are hurled with pleasing effect upon the devoted substance of every good thing in heaven and on earth! This madman has many imitators, who have degraded the inspiration of extempore genius infinitely below the point of their master's example, and who have proved themselves well qualified to take oratorical grade with the rank and file of the inferior orders of political ranters! God save the pulpit generally from the ability to pour out their favorite streams of much-relished waters of strife! Ignorance has always, in the pulpit and out of it, laid hold of this mode of gaining the ears of men—this method of raw improvising—this flaunting *dishabille* of undressed thought—this storming of the mind by a mob of undrilled words—for the purpose of exciting easily captivated feeling and of deadening judgment. Need I point the reader to hundreds of instances where the peculiarities of the lawyer and the politician have been transferred to the pulpit, in the persons of preachers who care more to gain sectaries than to win souls to Christ in God's appointed way? Is not the Church already too full of extemporaneous speakers, whose noisy platitudes possess interest mainly to the *denomination* whose favorite doctrines or forms they uphold by stress of voice, by occasional "hits," and by ministering to prejudice, but which have no great influence in promoting the permanent welfare of mankind, and in placing immovable stones in the uprising temple of grace?

Their inspiration lies in warmth of blood, in mechanically strung nerves, and in a boldness of official dogmatism, which nothing can ever put to the blush.

II.

But it will be said that no sane man pleads for the introduction of such pure and such dangerous extemporality into the pulpit—that what is needed is the *finished* art of unhampered eloquence, implying qualities of mind and breadth of learning far beyond what is ordinarily witnessed at the bar, or amongst the confused crowd of ignorant declaimers in certain denominations. We even wish for some thing better and nobler than the products of legislative elocution. Yes; no doubt every thinking man must shrink from that portraiture of the sacred desk, which might be drawn were the oratory of any but first-rate lawyers and eminent statesmen to characterize it. Let us take for granted, therefore, that the popular demand is unreasonable and foolish which asks for a repetition of the common style of court-room palaver in the history of sacred oration. Let us turn from the picture we have presented, to some thing more attractive. Speaking after the manner of men, and apart from the mind of God in the premises, let us see what *is* required of the preacher, if his public efforts would, upon ordinary principles, equal the demands of the great end which is proposed to him.

Any one will think that he can discover, at a glance, that the preacher who is eminently *skilled* in the noble art of free extemporization possesses certain capital advantages. Look at them. He can command his audience with the speaking eye. He can excite attention by gesticulatory action. He can carry conviction by a species of boldness which at once commands the will. The passion of the speaker, involuntarily aroused, may burst forth of a sudden in some sublime strain of feeling which must needs tell upon a sympathizing auditory. Vivid emotion and

VOL. XIV., NO. II.—86

energetic expression are often the pure product of extempore speaking. A brilliancy sometimes sparkles in the words, a majesty sometimes clothes the thoughts, a kind of inspiration sometimes opens up to view the similitude of the soul to divinity, which no other order or style of speech can reach. Even greater force and decision may thus be brought sometimes to bear upon the subject in hand. Words will often be warm and fresh beyond what they could be if chosen in the study. There is frequently a spring and a vigor attending the excitement of free oratory, which makes the argument of the harangue tell upon the convictions as nothing but the energy of instantaneous effort or the concentrated power of a sudden burst can. The very necessity of unpremeditated production is calculated to give stimulus to thought, and command to manner, and vitality to style of expression. The orator may even go beyond himself, and seem to be under the guidance of a mind superior to the one of which, in his ordinary moments, he is conscious; enjoying those moments of indescribable luxury when, throwing the reins upon the neck of his cloud-climbing steed, he seems to have no command over it any longer, but is hurried into hitherto unknown regions of blissful emotion or glorious thought:

“Fertur equis auriga, neque audit currus habenas.”

And this spontaneous flight is always upon wings which are able to bear along the surprised and captivated audience. But, leaving out of view these exceptional flashes of unexpectedly aroused genius, the extempore orator is, more commonly, enabled to leave the track of his discourse and delight his auditory, by kindling many a little blaze of illustration upon some side path in the general region of his discourse, which never could have occurred to him amid the chills and labors of pen-and-ink thought. And, what is better than all, he can, upon occasion, be familiar in his phraseology, and converse with his hearers as

if alone with them, each by himself. If, moreover, his speech threaten to prove weary, he can readily ward off the approaching tedium by changing the current of his remarks, and conducting them, for a time at least, into more taking channels of instruction. In truth, the skilled master of the art of off-hand speaking is a temporary monarch, whose will is law, and whose sway is almost absolute.

It is no wonder, therefore, that there are men, zealous for the glory of God, who would gladly introduce this royal gift of oratory into all our pulpits. Having in their mind's eye many illustrations of its power in other departments of influence—nay, looking over the history of the Church, and having their vision glowing with high scenes of successful elocution, in which a Masillon, a Bourdaloue, a Bossuet, a Hall, have carried whither they would their overwhelmed and subjugated congregations—they have naturally imagined that, if all the pulpits in the land were filled with such unfettered spokesmen of the Gospel, the cause of Christ would rapidly hasten on to its consummation in the latter-day glory! And, truly, regarding the matter from a mere earthly point of contemplation, these reformers of clerical oratory would seem to be right. So far as we can see, it might contribute immensely to the success of preaching if *angels* should come down—or, at least, reëmbodied saints—and preach to the world in such flaming speech as heaven could lend them. Or, it would be well, were the apostles to return to earth, accompanied by the long line of ancient prophets, and give forth arousing volumes of inspired breath, to kindle the world into a blaze of sudden Godliness. Indeed, the advocates of extemporaneous preaching are accustomed to go back to the early days of the Church, and sigh over the lost oratory of *Noah*, as he stood warning mankind upon the completing deck of his ark; of *Nathan*, as he hurled truth with lightning directness upon the conscience of his king; of *Ezra*, as he expounded the word from hour to hour in Jerusalem; of

Peter, as he proclaimed the merits of Christ on the day of Pentecost; of *Paul*, as he astounded philosophy from the sublime pulpit of Mar's Hill; of *Apollos*, who, from deep fountains of Gospel-truth, watered the Churches. Or, if these enthusiastic admirers of the unfettered preacher do not go back so far, and gather up such inappropriate instances of *inspired* eloquence with which to startle the consciences of modern sermonizers, they at least stand with admiring wonder before the image of a Luther, extemporizing at Worms; of the Scottish Reformers, improvising discourses full of consolation amid the caves of persecution; of Whitefield, that child of Reformation, pouring over a dead establishment the fiery floods of God's forgotten truth; of the Blairs and Tennants, especially called of heaven to lay the foundation-stones of our American Zion. Would to God such men could be given to the Church in every generation, and continued to her down to the last moment of time! But they are exceptional cases: we believe designedly exceptional. The Head of the Church has not seen fit to repeat, often, those heroes who fought so valiantly "upon the high places of the field."

But, then, when our friends on the other side of this controversy are driven from the argument which is founded upon these picked cases of inimitable pulpit-greatness, they fall back upon the well-knowing saying of Quintilian, "*fiunt oratores, nascuntur poetæ*," and affirm that the best oratorical talent can be *acquired*. It is, therefore, they urge, within the reach of all who are not too old to learn. They, of course, insist upon our preachers possessing the *best* oratorical talent. For it surely requires this, according to their views, to enable the Gospel-herald to blow full and clear and arousing blasts through his trumpet. Their opposition is to *dull* preaching, of whatever style; and intolerably dull is a prosy or a frothy extemporizer. The mere fact of his having no manuscript before him does not carry him up to the height where the demanded men of off-hand

effort are to stand for Christ. No; they must be *orators*, in the proper sense of that word. Now, have our opponents ever seriously reflected upon the historic truth, that there never have been *many* orators in the world? Or, if they please to put it otherwise, there have been in no age of the world many masters of the extempore style of speaking. And why? Because excellence in this mode of public address imperatively demands *genius*, requires high cultivation, and must possess the most favorable opportunities for practice, to say nothing about many subordinate qualities of person, of mind, of manners. A great orator is the growth of a century. A great pulpit orator is the wonder of an age. A man who can compel the same people to listen to the stale truths of revelation year in and year out, by the force of an oratory which has around it none of the appearances of study, but whose never-repeated images of truth always appear to issue spontaneously from the exhaustless depths of a great soul—such a semi-inspired genius God grants to mankind as rarely as He does a poet who might take rank with Milton, or a scientific discoverer who may rival Newton, or a brilliant historian who can compare with Macaulay. They are marvels.

But, O Reformer, you say that you do not look for such marvels. But you *do*: perhaps without knowing it. You set up such a standard of perfection, and plead for its attainment in every pulpit. If you do not, all your sighing, and regretting, and pleading, are to no purpose—mere empty breath. We will, however, accommodate ourselves to your wishes upon a somewhat lower ground. We will describe to you BAUTAIN'S extemporizer, of which he thinks there may be numerous samples among his professional readers. We will show you the mark towards which he thinks every one should aim who has any hope of becoming the influential man he might be; and in the light of this showing, we will ask you if we are wrong in saying that such a standard can never be reached, save by a fa-

vored few, and that, if reaching it be essential to success as a preacher, nineteen twentieths of the existing ministry must be swept from the field they are disgracing.

Bautain's enumeration of the qualities which an extempore orator, who can reasonably expect enduring success in his profession, presents a list perfectly appalling. He says that nature must have implanted within the candidate for popular favor, in this line of influence, a lively sensibility, a penetrating intelligence, a sound reason, a prompt imagination, a firm and decisive will, an inborn necessity compelling him to expand his subject when once touched, and a certain instinct, which urges a man to speak as a bird to sing. How many men are there who possess such an array of shining qualities as the generous gifts of all-lavishing nature? And, then, this is only the sub-stratum—this assemblage of great parts constitutes merely the foundation on which to build. This rich furniture for the basis of extempore oratory must be supplemented by such a fund of ideas, such a treasury of learning, such a mastery of logic, such an acquaintance with the difficult and concealed art of thinking, such a command of words, such a familiarity with all the possible turns of speech, to say nothing of the voice, the articulation, the oratorical action!—why, where shall the enumeration stop? But we must go on a little further. It is certain, as Bautain teaches us, that no one can be a first-rate speaker unless he has long been in the habit of taking thought to pieces and again putting it together, is familiar with the art of writing correctly, clearly and elegantly, is conscious of a capacity for the handling of language at will, and without effort, has ability to construct sentences suddenly, without stoppages or faults, enjoys the power of ready and intelligent declamation, possesses a neat, distinct and emphatic utterance, knows how to maintain a good carriage of body, can wield an easy expression and graceful gesticulation, and is able to crown all with manners that distinguish the per-

son by a certain air not characterizing ordinary mortals! What an array of qualifications, to be sure! Who has them all? How many have the *most* of them, in a respectable degree? Alas, for the Church, if she has to wait for her millennial garments at the hands of extempore preachers who must be born in a pattern of excellence so exquisitely moulded!

We do know, indeed, that, when our pulpit-reformers would revolutionize the oratorical manners of so many excellent men, they are not in the habit of distinctly bringing up before their view such an exhibition of the extempore speaker as we have presented. But it is only in such a way that we can show them what they themselves want, and illustrate the utter unreasonableness of their expectations. They mean to elevate the "readers" whom they denounce into orators whom they can praise, or they mean nothing. But, can they praise any but *good* orators? And where will they find these good orators? In those denominations whose public sentiment frowns the manuscript out of sight? Surely, they look *there* in vain, except as their eyes may fasten upon one and another rare example of occasional excellence in the style of oratory. Do they direct us to the arena of the law, and to the field of politics? We have already seen that their direction thitherward is marked with thoughtlessness. Do they, therefore, say that, although no where will you discover the ideal for which the pleading is made, yet this ideal may yet be realized, by introducing a proper system of instruction into your schools, academies, and colleges? Well, it may be so. We will not discuss such a may-be. We prefer to deal with facts. And we, moreover, think there is a solution of the question in the inquiry: What is *God's* standard of pulpit acquirements? We may be sure that *His* is the best. Let us examine this, our last point, a little.

III.

The Scriptures abundantly teach the doctrine that no one is entitled to preach the Gospel who is not divinely called to the sacred office. A "call" to the ministry is, of course, not arbitrary, nor is it miraculous. It presupposes, in the man who believes that it is made to him, the possession of certain qualifications, natural, gracious, and acquired, with which, as so much evidence of his fitness, he is enabled to ascertain the fact of his "call," in the exercise of his reason and his conscience. He must have a good intellectual capacity—he ought to possess a fund of common sense—and his mind should enjoy the vigor which sound bodily health can alone impart to its energies. These are among his natural qualifications for a place among the authorized messengers of God. Crowning his mental life with its highest excellency, and penetrating it through and through with the power of an all-directing mastery, the ministerial aspirant or incumbent must possess a living, active, consistent, augmenting piety. This is the innermost kernel of his qualifications, bestowed upon him by the hand of grace. This is the indispensable jewel in that casket of treasures with which he is to enrich his hearers with salvation, as he discourses to them in the name of Jehovah. But, over and above—or, rather, along with—these natural and gracious gifts, he must have certain acquisitions, without which his pious efforts for the conversion of men can not be made to the best advantage, if they can be made at all, in his ministerial capacity. He must acquire habits of self-control, of diligence in study, and of easy knowledge-gaining. He must know how to rouse his intellect to action, to pursue the investigation of truth with successful ardor, to intensify thought upon a given point of inquiry. He must be a pains-taking gatherer of information from every field of learning within his reach, for various and fresh illustrations of the Word of

God. In one word, he must either become a practical *student*, or a—failure, in the long run. Men, moulded in such a pattern as we have thus hastily outlined, are those to whom God seems ordinarily to give the assurance of a ministerial “call,” provided they are animated with the underlying desire to preach, as *their* best mode of doing good. This desire and these qualifications put the harness fairly upon them, other and minor things, easily suggesting themselves to the reader, being equal.

But why have we mentioned these qualifications? In order to make the inquiry: Wherein, among them, comes in the required *oratorical* status of the pulpited herald of the Cross? Doubtless, he ought to cultivate his voice, free his manner from defects, and make the best possible presentation of his great cause which nature and grace and culture will allow. But ought he to be an *extemporizer*? Is this the only *right* method of preaching, every other being only tolerated through expediency or necessity? The answer is found in the simple fact that the Holy Ghost has “called” to the ministry of His Word multitudes of men who could no more “extemporize” to edification, during a protracted term of preaching service in any given community, than they could fly. All men of moderate capacity, and of middling attainments, and of a share of boldness, can talk, can “spout,” (to use an expressive vulgarity,) without cessation, can even say many good things in taking tones of voice—but we have already seen what it is to “extemporize” intelligently and well; and we ask, how many men are to be found, in the present ranks of the ministry, who are able to expound the Scriptures, in a manner either instructive or pleasing, without an amount and a concentration of studious effort which implies the use of the manuscript, or an equivalent writing down of daily thoughts upon the memory? At any rate, however this may be, certain it is that God has placed His clearest “call” in the hands of a large and an

influential class of preachers, who not only employ the manuscript mode of preparation for the pulpit, but whose minds are so constituted that this manner of influencing their fellow-men in offering to them the Gospel, was the only one left open to them from the first. This proposition, who can deny? But, if granted, what is the conclusion? Surely this, that *God's* estimate of preaching is not akin to that of our reformers, who so stoutly contend for the exclusive extempore method. It is evident that *He* does not regard the ability to preach without the "hampering use of notes," as *essential* to the saving power of the pulpit—that this is quite subordinate to other and higher qualifications—that the potency of that living voice, which gives efficacy to the presentation of truth, lies deeper than, and remote from, the gift of ready elocution; and that the success of the sermonized Gospel is more entirely under the will of a sovereign God than it can ever be dependent upon external forms of publication. It is certainly true, by the testimony of experience, that where there is piety, sense, knowledge, and single-eyed devotion to the cause of Christ, *there* is ministerial qualification in its *essence*; and that the presence or absence of oratorical gifts constitutes one of those circumstances which may assist, indeed, or retard the Word of God on certain occasions, but which belong rather to the shell than to the kernel of the matter. Who does not know that men of the most awkward address in the pulpit, of the clumsiest oratory, of the least attractive style of public speech, in its every phase, have been among the most successful in winning souls and in building up Churches? Examples will occur to any reader. But, are these classed among the exceptions? If so, why? It must be because these preachers had other and better and more vital qualifications than those which might have thrown a grace around their pulpit deliverances, and such as render this grace unimportant in the production of the effect. Well, this is all that

we are at present contending for: the truth that God does call men to preach who are not, and can not be, orators, in the ordinary sense of that abused word, and that He does, thereby, mean to teach us that preaching should strive to understand itself as a power, not after the manner of men, but altogether *sui generis*, and after the manner of the Lord.

What, then, is *true* pulpit oratory? The obvious answer is, That which best accomplishes the *appointed* ends of preaching. What are these? Mainly, two: The edification of the Church, and the conversion of sinners. The aim of the pulpit is instruction and persuasion. The man of God wishes, in Christ's name, to state clearly, and enforce strongly, the various points of saving truth which are intended to engage the understandings and enlist the hearts of his hearers. He imparts light, and desires to accompany it with heat. The real efficiency of the ordinance of preaching is undoubtedly wielded, instrumentally, by him who can open *God's Word* to the mind and conscience, in a manner the best calculated to serve the design of the Spirit in organizing this high department of moral effort; or who, in other words, becomes the Spirit's channel of communication with His people and the world. The truth which the Bible contains is itself the grand medium of salvation, and the expounder thereof is simply to bring it out and present it, so that what was theretofore concealed from the hearer may, by the accompanying power of grace, become efficacious to salvation. In proportion, therefore, to the fidelity with which the inspired volume is illuminated by means of the private studies and the public expositions of the preacher, in that proportion may he expect his labors to reach their end in sanctification and conversion. The herald of the Gospel must understand that, behind *him*, is another and more powerful herald, even the Holy Ghost. The *Spirit* is the *real* orator in the case. He is the true preacher; so entirely so, that

to Himself alone belongs all the praise of pulpit success. The sermonizer is not a mere public speaker, the accomplishment of whose ends is due altogether to the triumphs of his oratory. There is an end to be gained by the preacher which no human power—which no efforts of the rarest genius—can ever hope to reach. And, inasmuch as this principal end is gained purely through the agency of the Holy Ghost, it comes to be true that preaching is, as we have said, simply the official channel wherein that truth is to flow as freely as possible, and as untainted as possible. The whole duty of the pulpit, then, we again urge, is to set forth, in a manner as winning as its incumbent is able to employ, and by every art of faithful representation, the whole counsel of God pertaining to Christ and His proffered salvation. Now, it is as obvious that this may be done in a great variety of styles of thought, and of composition, and of delivery, as it is certain that the Almighty has laid His hand upon thousands of individuals, of all temperaments, of all tastes, of all peculiarities of manner, of all degrees of native talent, of all measures of learning, of all types of true piety, and bade them, each in his own best way, do the work of the ministry. It was so in His choice of those whom He designed as the channels of His original communication to mankind, through the revelation which He inspired them to deliver. All these organs of the Spirit were not moulded in the same pattern. Isaiah differed from Malachi, and John from Paul, yet all proclaimed the same great doctrines, while each did so in his own peculiar and self-distinguishing style. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." Look at the modern pulpit. One preacher *extemporizes* his discourses emphatically, and his loose, rambling sentences strike some minds with force, while his warmth of zeal stirs up kindred emotions in some hearts. Another has prepared his "heads," and, trusting to the inspiration of the occasion, fills in as he rushes along, or as he spasmodically

leaps from point to point, with such matter as lies conveniently to hand; this man often producing impressive thoughts, sometimes suggesting satisfactory explanations of important texts, now and then surpassing what he could do by the most careful study; and, notwithstanding his oft-repeated platitudes, and his ever-recurring pet phrases, is listened to with interest and profit by a large class of hearers. A third, resolving to have nothing to do with manuscripts, commits his sermons to memory, and, with steady countenance, and more or less unimpassioned manner, recites to half-sympathetic audiences his measured sentences. A fourth, committing his thoughts only to memory, launches out upon a bottomless sea of words, where wonder and piety follow him with edifying amazement. A fifth writes and reads his discourses—sometimes reads them slavishly; again, with freedom of manner akin to the declaimer; and again, with a mixture of the various styles of delivery, which afford a succession of pleasing changes. All these are successful, to a degree that is surprising, in winning souls and improving the graces of God's people. They are all employed by the Spirit in the one, but many-sided, work of salvation. They are, each in his own way, *pulpit orators*—*i. e.*, they are messengers sent of God to preach the Gospel—with a success proportioned, not to their adherence to this or that method of presenting truth, but to their holy zeal, to the nearness of access which their souls have had to the throne of grace, and to their determination to know only “Christ and Him crucified.”

The fact is—every one knows it, because every one has felt it—that the one great, shining characteristic of preaching, as it is the organ of the Holy Ghost, is *earnestness*. Earnestness is eloquence in the pulpit. Nothing will atone for the absence of this quality, and its presence covers a multitude of faults. Does any one object to manuscript preaching, that *it* must necessarily lack this all-important element? The most truly earnest preachers we have ever

heard, delivered their discourses from written pages. The most earnest preachers ever heard in modern times—Chalmers, Davis, Edwards, and a host of others—were those who did not venture “to talk nonsense in the name of the Lord” by extemporaneous haranguing. The case of Edwards is a fine illustration of what seems to constitute real pulpit oratory. His was made up of two things, which, where they are united in the same discourse, will *always* produce a powerful effect—*solid Scriptural thought, and holy unction*. In the degree in which these are present, will the sermon be effective, whether read or delivered, by an Edwards or any body else. Indeed, we venture to say that it is particularly the latter quality—the indescribable unction which is obtained in prayer, in profound meditation upon divine truth, in a deep realization of the importance of eternal things to one’s self and the world at large—it is *this* which gives its best and truest power to the pulpit. It is *not* manner. It is *not* grace of attitude. It is *not* richness of voice. It is *not* the glance of excitement from a blazing eye. It is not even fullness of matter. It is not one, nor all of these combined, which gives potency and efficiency to the preached Word. Let men of God take hold of the stupendous realities of the plain Gospel—let them deal with their fellow-men as with candidates for eternity—and whether they read their discourses or declaim them, their efforts will not be “in vain in the Lord.” Give them the ineffable anointing of the Spirit, together with an honest love for immortal souls, and they will at once be placed in that proper sympathy with the truth they utter, and with the persons to whom they utter it, which will assure them of a hearing full of attention, and most promising in assurances of profit. “After all,” says Secker, “every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, another after that; let each cultivate his own, and no one censure or despise the other.” This is true, but it would have been more true had Secker added, that it mattered little what a

man's style of utterance might be, provided he only spake, in earnest, the faithful words of an earnest Saviour, in a manner not offensive to the ear nor repugnant to the common taste.

Our article is already too long. We had intended to say much more. We had specially desired to direct the reader to consider the fact, that the most important Churches in the land are under the ministry of "readers" in the pulpit—that these readers have always been among the most useful and honored of God's servants—and that converts have multiplied where *they* have dealt out the Word, to a degree not often exemplified in the history of "extempore" preaching.

But we forbear. Every minister must consult his own capabilities, and must suit the character of his public performances to his own peculiarities of mind and temperament, being careful only to be always "in earnest." For our own part, we fully and freely endorse the sentiments contained in the following pleasing piece of poetry :

" Your sermons write
 From end to end ; and every thought invest
 With full expression, such as best may suit
 Its nature and its use ; and then pronounce
 As much as your remembrance can retain.
 Rather read every sentence, word for word,
 Than wander in a desultory strain—
 A chaos, dark, irregular, and wild—
 Where the same thought and language oft revolve
 And re-revolve, to tire sagacious minds.
 But never to your notes be so enslaved
 As to suppress some instantaneous thought
 That may like lightning dart upon the soul,
 And blaze in strength and majesty divine."

God takes men as they are, and pours His grace into the "earthen vessels" of their minds—bids them cultivate holiness—commands them to be studious—makes it their duty to make the most of their native powers—and then

carries them, in His providence, to the pulpit, and promises them an unction from the Holy One to give success to those efforts of their preaching which may be the best that *they* can make. This is our judgment, in one sentence.

ARTICLE V.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1861.

We still acknowledge ourselves to be, in one sense, members of the body which is called the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. This title is now, indeed, *a misnomer*, for the United States of America have ceased to be United, and have become two distinct, separate, and, alas! hostile governments. The Presbyterian Church, Old School, is, of course, in fact, no longer one Church, but two. And yet the separation will not, we suppose, be formally made until the regular fall sessions of our Presbyteries and Synods. Our readers will, no doubt, acquiesce in our decision to occupy some few pages with our usual Annual Review of the proceedings of the General Assembly—or, rather, of such of its proceedings as will be of any interest to Southern Presbyterians.

I. ORGANIZATION.

After the opening sermon, by the respected Moderator of the last Assembly, Rev. Dr. YEOMANS, from John xviii : 36—"My kingdom is not of this world"—the Assembly was organized, and the Rev. Dr. J. C. BACKUS, of the Presbytery of Baltimore, was elected Moderator, and Rev. D. J. WALLER, of the Presbytery of Northumberland, Temporary Clerk. There were present two hundred and sixty Commissioners, against three hundred and twenty-

nine at the preceding Assembly. From the Synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Arkansas, there were no Commissioners present. From the Synod of Virginia there were two; from that of Nashville, three; from Mississippi, seven; from Memphis, two; from Texas, two—in all, sixteen Commissioners from Synods in the Confederate States, against ninety Commissioners from those Synods in the last Assembly.

This general absence of Southern Commissioners seems to have been misapprehended by the Assembly. Dr. Hodge said “one-third of the Commissioners were absent through the force of circumstances they could not control.” Also, in his paper offered as a substitute for Dr. Spring’s, he says: “Owing to providential hindrances, nearly one-third of our Presbyteries are not represented;” and he refers to the absent Commissioners as such, “most of them, we believe, by no fault of their own.” Evidently, the Assembly in general ascribed this absence to a fear of the consequences which might overtake the Commissioners at their homes, and not to the patriotic feelings, either of our Presbyteries or of the Commissioners themselves. Thus, the people of the North will, on all occasions, it seems, lay the flattering unction to their souls that the South is divided into friends and foes of the so-called United States Government. Let the North sleep on. Time will put an end to their delusion and their dreams. It must be some mighty interest, however, which does so blind them to the real nature of this contest. It must be their not being willing to be convinced, which makes it so hard to convince them that we are both united and in earnest. It would seem as though, did they once appeal to their own hearts, they would find out how the South really feels, and why the Southern Commissioners generally would not go and sit down in council with the enemies of their country seeking her utter ruin and overthrow.

But what did our sixteen Commissioners present mean by the course which they pursued? On this point, as on others, we fear some of them very much misrepresented the South; unless, indeed, they have themselves been misrepresented in the newspapers, from which we have derived our accounts of the Assembly. Dr. WILLIS LORD, of Chicago, urging the adoption of Dr. Spring's resolutions, "honored these brethren for coming to this Assembly, and only wished that all the Commissioners from the South had been here. . . . But why are they not here? He had a letter from a distinguished source in the South, in which he was informed that some of the Presbyteries would not appoint Commissioners—and why? Because of the difficulty of travel? No; but because of their sympathies with the rebellion."

"Mr. McInnis (of New Orleans) and Mr. Baker (of Texas) besought Dr. Lord not to make the impression that such was the general state of things. That letter was a misrepresentation of the Southern Presbyteries, if true of any; and one of the gentlemen (the reporter could not see which one spoke) deprecated the harshness of the term 'rebellion.'"

We will not trust ourselves to make any comments upon the conduct of these brethren, as thus described by *The Presbyterian*. We hope that *The Presbyterian's* reporter did them injustice.

II. PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Several places were put in nomination—amongst them Springfield, Illinois; Washington, D. C.; and Columbus, Ohio. The first named was soon dropped, the nomination, of course, having been only a compliment to Mr. Lincoln, as the Presbyterian interest is but small in that place. But it was seriously and urgently endeavored, by many in the Assembly, to choose Washington City, and no other place but that odious seat of a despotism abhorred by one-third

part of the Church, for the next place of meeting. At last, however, Columbus was victorious. The final vote stood, one hundred and seven for Washington, and one hundred and thirty for Columbus.

III. THE BOARDS.

Upon the subject of two of these institutions there was protracted and earnest discussion, viz: the Board of Publication and the Board of Domestic Missions.

Respecting the former, the Secretary, Rev. Dr. Schenck, made, on the whole, an encouraging statement, notwithstanding the difficulties of the times.

The Board's publications were received every where with growing favor. *The Sabbath School Visitor's* circulation had increased. The number of Colporteurs was greater, by forty, than ever. And the number of Churches contributing to this Board was larger than ever before, by more than one hundred.

Dr. EDWARDS, of Philadelphia, objected to the resolution which endorsed the Board's economy and efficiency. We are not sufficiently informed in regard to the business of the Board, and can not find out what is its capital, its assets, its net profits, nor its expenses. The Board tell us of their *benevolent* operations, but not of their business transactions. He objected to the cost of management. He alleged that \$41,000 worth of business had cost \$3,000 for Secretaries only, besides a Treasurer at \$1,000, and a book-keeper at nearly as much more. He acknowledged the improvement made in *The Sabbath School Visitor*, but he characterized *The Home and Foreign Record* as an eminently dull and stupid paper, sent every where, to the number of fifteen thousand, but never read, and only lumbering up ministers' studies and the reading-rooms of theological seminaries. All that was worth reading in it was soon copied into the papers, and it were better given up, and the cost saved. He charged that the Board gave all their printing to one publishing house, whereas, competition would cheapen work. And, finally, he complained that the Board was too intimate with *The Presbyterian* newspaper. Too many men belonging to that one establishment were in positions of influence in the Board.

Dr. SCHENCK repudiated any wish or intention, on the part of the Board, to practice any concealment. The minutes of the Board and Executive Committee, the vouchers, the accounts, all are here, and a balance-sheet has always been presented to the Assembly. The Board think it would be inexpedient to spread these statements over the whole land; but if the Assembly so direct, it shall be done, notwith-

standing it would place the Board at a business disadvantage, as in competition with our houses in the same trade.

As to the charge of extravagance in the colportage department—to get the forty thousand required much work. It was not a compact capital, all in a lump, and ready to be used, but the *collection*, as well as the *disbursement*, of it demanded labor and expence. A Superintendent of Colportage was necessary, and also a Corresponding Secretary, and the two offices could not be united in one man. A book-keeper was, also, indispensable, and his pay moderate. And, then, as the Treasurer had to give bonds, it was necessary to pay him, also, a salary.

A MEMBER asked what was the amount of capital of this Board?

Dr. SCHENCK replied that the papers, balance-sheet, and all the details were here, on the table, and could be read or examined at pleasure. He could not, without referring to them, state with accuracy. He then denied, explicitly, the charge of the Board's being tied to one printing establishment. The printing was given out by contract, and to those who would do the best job. As to the charge of intimacy with *The Presbyterian*, it was an extraordinary charge, and he knew not how to meet it. When the Board was established, that paper was here, and had always been the friend of the Board. The intimacy complained of was very natural and proper and profitable. It was, however, only official, and he had never known that any advantage to themselves was sought or obtained from it by those gentlemen, and he was sure no such thing had occurred.

Dr. MUSGRAVE claimed it as his right to demand, for the information of the Assembly, what the capital of this Board was. Without this, no man could judge intelligently of the economy practiced. He was surprised that the Secretary had not promptly answered the questions asked on this point. He could conceive of the propriety of their withholding many details, but not the amount of their capital. The General Assembly had authorized them to add six per cent. annually to the capital. He wanted to know how much the increase now amounted to. When he was Secretary, he estimated their net profits at \$10,000 annually. He supposed their capital might soon be a quarter of a million. He thought it was not safe for so few men to control so large a capital.

As to the economy exhibited by the Board, Dr. Musgrave remarked that the entire sales of the Board, for the last year, were about ninety-one thousand dollars, and the expenses of conducting this business about seventeen thousand dollars—more than nineteen per cent—and that exclusive of rent, which was worth four or five thousand dollars more. He trusted his remarks would not be considered personal. Alas! that it should be so. But has it come to this, that a man may not call in question the propriety of any action of any of our Boards, without having his motives suspected, and being considered personal? He then proceeded to object to the salary of the Corresponding Secretary (\$2,500), as being too high; to the Treasurer's office, as a mere

sinicure; to the price paid for the printing, as higher than other printing establishments would ask; and to the undue connection between *The Presbyterian* and the Board. It was a nice little family affair. Two editors of that paper, the brother of one of them recently removed by death, and a brother-in-law, also, all were in the Committee. Why should such a nice little family circle object to any bills that might be handed in for printing at the office of *The Presbyterian*? He would advise those gentlemen to retire from the Board and the Committee, that confidence might be restored to its management. He doubted not that some fifteen cents a token could be saved in the printing. Another subject he would just hint at. If men do not agree with that paper's views of ecclesiastical management, their opinions are misrepresented, their motives are assailed, and they are held up as hostile to the Boards of the Church. No man could have fair play who dissented from the positions of *The Presbyterian*.

Dr. LEYBURN, (Stated Clerk, and editor of *The Presbyterian*, here interposed, although not entitled to the floor,) Moderator, such assaults ought not to be made upon an officer of this Assembly, without an opportunity to defend himself.

Dr. MUSGRAVE called the Clerk to order. He proceeded to the subject of colportage. Would any other publishing house give salaries to agents to sell books, and allow a per centage, too? It was argued that these men were missionaries, but he doubted whether, as a general thing, they did any thing but sell books. It was folly to employ book agents on such principles. Human nature is human nature. The Board should conduct their business on the business principles usually recognized amongst business men.

Mr. T. C. HENRY (Ruling Elder) moved to refer this matter to the Committee, and that Dr. Musgrave and Dr. Edwards be directed to appear before that Committee and substantiate these charges. It was easy to bring indefinite charges.

Dr. EDWARDS was surprised at Mr. Henry's motion. A member rises in his place and asks for explanation, and up gets another member and moves that the inquirer be required to go before a Committee and substantiate charges!

Dr. MCPHAIL (Chairman of the Committee on the Publication Board's Report) said the work proposed in the motion to recommit would require eight or ten days to perform it. Such an investigation could not be had in less time. Besides, is this the business of a Standing Committee? If so, is not the Board itself a farce? In regard to the charge that the Board is a family affair, he saw no justice in it.

Dr. SCHENCK, being again allowed the floor, said he regretted to be called upon to meet the venerable father who had made this assault. An assault of the Secretary of one Board upon another Board, he hardly knew how to meet. From one who had been for one year a Secretary of this very Board; who had often made earnest appeals for it, from the pulpit and with the pen; and who, in one of his own an-

nual reports, written as Secretary, had contradicted the very statements which he had himself made here to-day—from such an one he was surprised to hear what had now been uttered.

The history of the capital stock was as follows: It was first gathered by collections which the Assembly had ordered, during the period from 1839 to 1842, and thus rose to about \$43,000. It was ordered then by the Assembly that the profits, at the rate of six per cent., be added to the capital. It now amounts to about \$242,000. As for the house in Chestnut street, it is now worth no such sum to us as \$75,000. The house cost \$37,000. It gives us shelter for our business. He denied that books of the Board cost more than those of other publishers, and he presented various specimens to prove what he said. He insisted that the per centage of expenses in the Board was only 12¼ per cent. instead of 19 per cent. He compared the per centage of his Board with that of other like establishments, which were in one case 27 per cent., and in another case 28 per cent.; upon salaries alone the per centage in one of them was 10½, and another 14, while in the Board of Publication it was only 11 per cent. In regard to that nice little family circle, it is indeed a nice and orderly circle. True, that venerable father can not, perhaps, appreciate the family circle as well as if he sustained certain relations in life; but more is the pity. If he was more familiar with such family scenes he would, perhaps, not envy us our great enjoyment. But he is mistaken in supposing that there are in that family circle any collusions to the injury of this Board. Dr Engles and Dr. Leyburn are as often on opposite sides as any other members, and if Dr. Musgrave would insinuate that private ends are subserved by our counsels, the imputation is unworthy.

This debate, so little creditable to the Presbyterians of the North and North-West, occurred on the fifth day of the Assembly. On the sixth day, the Report of the Committee on the Board of Domestic Missions came before the body. The chief item was the Committee's recommendation that the office of Coördinate Secretary be discontinued, and that in filling the office of the one Secretary, both the present incumbents be passed by, and some new man appointed.

There was a minority report, proposing to employ one Secretary only, but leaving the Board free to choose whom they would.

Dr. KENNEDY, for the minority, urged that the Assembly had given to the Board the power of filling these offices, and could not take it back, without violating the compact it had made with the

Board. This Board was composed of the best men in the Presbyterian Church. To resume the powers once delegated, seems a bold and a far stretch of power on the part of the Assembly. The members of the Board, if they had any self-respect, would no longer serve in a Board whose powers were thus trifled with.

The proposal to remove both Secretaries really had reference to but one. The Senior Secretary had resigned—the Junior only was to be the victim. And who was this Junior Secretary? A man who has been serving for seventeen years, and never accepted a cent of his salary whilst a single missionary was lacking his—a man who has given his time, his toil, his property, to this Church and this Board.

Dr. DONALDSON, for the majority, urged that the Assembly had never created these offices, and had as much right to abolish a Secretary as a Secretaryship. It was a mistake, that one man only was affected; for, although the Senior Secretary had proposed to resign, his resignation had not yet been accepted. But neither of the two could secure the coöperation of the whole Church, and he would not sacrifice the great interests of this Board to the official claims of any one or two men.

THE MODERATOR then observed that it was usual to hear the Secretaries of the Board after receiving the report of the Committee. The Senior Secretary, Dr MUSGRAVE, then came forward and expressed embarrassment, after having on another subject occupied so much time. His brother (Dr. Schenck) had applied rather a venerable title to him—"venerable father"—and seemed to think him disqualified for appreciating the amenities of social life. The charge fell with a bad grace from one who had continued so long a *widower*, whilst the speaker was only a *bachelor*; still, he thought neither of them disqualified thereby for their duties to their respective Boards. He had been himself a friend to all these Boards—not of that youthful class of friends who did not know Joseph. He was an old soldier in the service. An effort had been made to institute, by *inuendo*, a comparison between him and another officer. But he would publicly ask the other Secretary if he had not received his salary up to the 1st March, and whether there was not due to the missionaries unpaid salaries to the amount of seven thousand five hundred dollars? He proceeded to charge the present embarrassments of the Board for money on their rash and undue expansion the preceding year. It was not due to the political difficulties and pecuniary crisis, for this Board was insolvent in August last; whereas, the election that produced the crisis did not take place till November. For this rash expansion he was not responsible. He warred against it. He had always favored a large working balance, so as to be prepared for such evils and revulsions as have now occurred. He then recounted the history of the abolition of the Associate Secretary's office (Dr. Happersett's), with which he declared he had nothing to do, and then the reëlection of Dr. Happersett, with himself, as two Coördinate Secretaries, which had caused him to tender his own resignation, though he

afterwards withdrew it, and also that decapitation of the heads of old and tried members of the Board, and the other particulars of *the revolution in the Board*, which had resulted in the establishment of the more liberal policy, with all its consequent present embarrassments. Three years ago he thought the then expenses (nine thousand dollars) too much, now they are fourteen thousand. The aggregate for salaries of Secretaries and Superintendents alone (including those at Louisville) are now nine thousand four hundred dollars. He urged that one Secretary was sufficient, for the Clerk had kept count of the letters each Secretary wrote, and he had himself, in 1859, written one hundred and nine more than his colleague. And how many do you suppose we each write in one day, leaving out Sabbaths? How many a day do you suppose?—a little less than ONE! Only one thing more would he revert to, and that by the order of his Presbytery. It was to the proscription in the membership of the Board of all who had voted to abolish the office of Associate Secretary. Almost every such man has been guillotined as his term of office expired—dropped from this Board and this Committee. Must matters in the Church be managed as they sometimes are in the State? If this thing goes on, your Boards will become corrupt.

Dr. HAPPERT (the Junior Secretary) would not speak two and a half hours. He had an instinctive horror of controversy—would rather suffer persecution. He complained that the Committee was composed of five out of seven who had prejudged the case, yet he knew the Moderator had no blame in the matter. He said a previous General Assembly itself had expressly ordained the establishment of the two Coördinate Secretaryships, and so they were not the creation of the Board. He met the statement that the Board was insolvent by referring to the balance then in the Treasury of three thousand dollars. He utterly denied that his own salary had been paid when the missionaries were lying out of their money. He had given his own note into bank, and had the missionaries all paid, before setting out for Louisville on the business of the Board, previous to the 4th of March. But he alleged that the Treasurer had been ordered by the other Secretary to pay no more missionaries until money enough had accumulated to pay his (Dr. Musgrave's) salary, which was paid on the 25th, five days before it was due. He himself had not received any of his salary this year. He detailed certain statements, showing that the more liberal policy of the Board had worked well. He explained why the Assembly at Indianapolis changed the *personnel* of the Board. It was because of a falling off that year both in missionaries and funds, and that was a year of great general prosperity. The missionaries were stinted in their salary while yet there was a balance lying in the Treasury of twenty-four thousand dollars. Was it any wonder that the Assembly should revolutionize the Board? He reviewed the history of the Associate Secretaryship and its abolition, and then the reaction which ensued, and he replied to the charges of proscription. As to the Senior Secretary's one letter a day, the fact is, that the Clerk

wrote the most of them, as the book itself shows, where they are signed G. W. Musgrave, per W. DeArmand, Clerk. But you will not be surprised that he wrote no more letters, when I tell you that I have kept a little book with a record of the precise time the gentleman has been in the office during the year. The average is but *fifty-five minutes a day*. The-e things I never would have mentioned, but for the extraordinary attacks upon myself. Dr. Happersett concluded by averring that he had simply defended himself, and that most reluctantly, against unfounded charges. He was now ready to retire, and to serve God in some other department, wherever Providence might call him.

After this discussion between the two Secretaries, a few of the other members of the Assembly expressed their views, chiefly to the effect that the harmony of the Church required that both these Secretaries be passed over. The previous question was called for, and the majority report adopted, which instructed the Board, in view, most especially, of the "severe pecuniary pressure of the times," to elect but one Secretary, and he a new man.

On the next day, the seventh, the discussion on the Board of Publication was resumed, and Mr. WALLER argued that the cost of managing the business was disproportionate to the amount of the business done. In the department of colportage alone, there was expended the sum of thirteen thousand dollars, in managing a business of twenty-eight thousand.

The discussion was interrupted at this point, and down to the night of the tenth day it was not resumed. Beyond the night session of that day, we have no particular accounts of the proceedings which refer at all to this matter.

Our readers are aware that we are not of those who have approved the principle of the Church's delegating her work to these Boards. We will not, however, charge the disgrace of the recent discussion, with its disagreeable and unbecoming personalities, to the principle or to the system of Boards. Were the system in the hands of *gentlemen* all round—that is, of none but refined, and fair and honorable men—such shameful results might never be brought

forth. But every Presbyterian Minister or Elder is not a refined and honorable man; and one coarse, selfish, imperious Secretary can run even a good piece of machinery into the ground. We are more than ever satisfied, however, from this very debate, that the machinery itself is liable to great objections, and must, in the long run, work evil to the Church, even in the best of hands. Look, for example, at what has now, we believe, for the first time, come to the knowledge of the Church generally, that the Board of Publication has a capital which, in twenty years, has grown from forty-three thousand to very nearly one-quarter of a million of dollars, and which is constantly increasing at the rate of six per cent. per annum. And recall the fact, which was alleged, and not contradicted, that, a good many years ago, the net annual profits of this Board were ten thousand dollars! Well might Dr. Musgrave say, (although it was, for him, of all men, a most inconsistent declaration,) that it was not safe for a few men to control so mighty an agency. And the remarkable part of the case is, that it has been generally supposed that the Board of Publication was an institution struggling hard to keep its head above the water. A few shrewd men have insisted that they ought to be able to make money out of the vast patronage which, as a publishing house, they get from the great Presbyterian Church, instead of needing collections all the time for their Colporteurs, etc. But still, the general impression has been that the institution needed help, or it could not stand.

Now human nature, even in the best of men, being what it is, who will deny that it is a dangerous thing to lodge so much influence with one of these organizations, outside of the regular Church courts? Does not the struggle for power in the other Board, which was so clearly brought to light in the late debate—does not that struggle show how much of chicanery and management may be covered up in

one of these societies which our Presbyterian Church has had fastened to her free-born limbs?

Or, look at the report, this year, of the Domestic Missionary Board. It has had seven hundred and seven Missionaries in commission. And all these Missionaries are beholden to Dr. Happersett for his kindness in putting his note into bank that they may get their salaries paid. Is this not a large body of Presbyterian Ministers to be dependent upon the kindness of one man, or even two men? This whole difficulty, which so disgraced the late Assembly's proceedings, has arisen out of an effort by the Church to obviate to herself the objection which she felt to suffering so large a one-man power as this. And now the Assembly, finding that the two men could not agree, has gone back to the former plan of intrusting it all to one individual. The difficulty is inherent. All these Boards are great centres of power. If we must have them, let us submit to the evils which they necessarily bring with them. But if Domestic Missions can be as well or better carried on directly by the Presbyteries, let us operate in that way.

The objections hitherto made to the system of the Boards have, for the most part, always come from a portion of the Southern Commissioners. But never did any part of the South urge any such assault as has been witnessed this year. Our objections have been to the principles, not to the men. It has not been the South that has ever arraigned the Boards before the Assembly upon charges of incompetency, maladministration, or unfaithfulness—such charges have always come from the North, and have also most signally marked and disgraced the very year which witnessed the gathering of an almost exclusively Northern Assembly. Even the charge of an extravagant *per-centage* of administrative expense is not a charge which we of the South have urged—that, also, is a Northern censure. We have always been aware that great enterprises must, in the nature of things, require great expenditures of money. Competent

salaries to competent officers the South has not objected to, nor to any amount of necessary outlay, if we could only get the great work efficiently done. We have had no sympathy with the trick of adding together several salaries of officers, or other like items of necessary expense, and holding up the sum they make to frighten the Church from a steadfast pursuit of her great ends. But, on the other hand, we have equally detested the narrow spirit which delighted to figure up the comparatively insignificant doings of the Church in any one of these great departments, and because the sum they constitute would be a large amount for one man to give away, or even to possess, therefore to represent it as a large sum for the whole Church to contribute. We have ever maintained that our Church operations of all kinds were really on a very inadequate scale, and that there was nothing done worthy of the annual huzzas which Red Tape had moved the Assembly to utter. Yet we always granted that, considering the kind of expedients adopted to draw out the Church's resources, what was done was as much as could, perhaps, be expected; and that, no doubt, the men appointed by the Church to employ these human expedients were as faithful and as successful as could any where be found. The argument of the Southern Commissioners, so far as concerns the point of efficiency, has always been to this effect: Take away all your inventions of men—your Yankee notions in Church machinery—your rags and tatters of Congregationalism, and give us the natural and simple operation of the ordinances of Christ. Let your Churches be taught the doctrine of the grace of giving by her pastors; and let your Church courts directly oversee the various parts of Christ's work committed to them. Then, by the blessing of her Head, you will see what the Church is both able and willing to do and to give.

It has, indeed, been, for the most part, Southern Commissioners who have gone beyond these views of the dan-

gerousness and the inefficiency of the system, and attacked the very principle of the Boards, as an unwarranted, and unpresbyterian, and unscriptural scheme. But the opponents of the scheme have ever been in the minority. Year after year, when the matter has been discussed, the Boards have been sustained by large majorities. The system has, therefore, been long and fairly tried. It has enjoyed the confidence and support of the large body of our Church for a great length of time. Now, at last, it happens to it to encounter internecine strife and contention. It begins to devour itself. It is one Board, or rather the Secretary of one Board, that leads the attack on another. It is the two Secretaries of another Board that assail each other. It is no other than our old friend, Dr. Musgrave, who now sounds the alarm about too much power in the hands of a few men—it is he that complains that a man may not call in question the policy of one of these institutions, without having his motives impugned—it is he that can not get fair play from *The Presbyterian*—and it is he, on the other hand, who is now accused of making indefinite charges against a Board. Thus does Providence appear to be against the Boards, and the Church is plagued until she will relinquish the use of this Altar of Damascus.

We have dwelt upon this subject at some length, because, of course, the question will come before the Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States, now to be organized, in due time, whether she will employ such outside institutions, or stand simply on the platform of Presbyterianism and the Bible. Will she delegate her powers to any such Societies, or will she do her own work through committees, directly responsible to her? Will she undertake to do the Ministerial Education work, or the Domestic Missionary work, of every particular settled Presbytery, through any agency of the General Assembly, or will she devolve both these works immediately upon the several Presbyteries themselves? Would she think it desirable, if it could possibly

be done, to transport Philadelphia southward? Or, this being, alas! impossible, will she try and make a copy—a *fac-simile*—as near as possible, of the comely original? Can she hope and expect to live and grow and thrive without the help of any such ecclesiastical metropolis, any such centre of Church power, and parties, and squabbles?

DR. SPRING'S RESOLUTIONS.

At first Dr. Spring's was but one resolution, to the effect that a committee be appointed to inquire whether it was wise and expedient for the Assembly to make any expression of attachment to the American Union, and to the Constitution and Government; and, if so, what expression should be given. This business came up on the third day of the meeting. It was discussed from time to time, and decided on the twelfth day.

When first proposed, Dr. Spring's resolution was laid on the table, upon the motion of Rev. Mr. Hoyte, of Nashville, Tennessee, by a vote of one hundred and twenty-two to one hundred and two. Dr. Spring called for the ayes and noes; but some maintained, rather strangely, that they could not be had if demanded, after a vote was actually taken. Then it was moved to take up the motion just laid on the table; but it was then rather strangely insisted, and that by Dr. Hodge, that to lay on the table was a final disposition of any subject. The rules generally followed clearly provide that it may be taken up whenever two-thirds of those present at the time consent. Even when indefinitely postponed, a subject may be called back again before the house, by consent of three-fourths of the members present at the time. But in either case, the motion to reconsider must be made and seconded by persons of the majority. This point caused a good deal of discussion, and the appeal was made to the generosity of some two of the majority, to move the reconsideration, but there was no response. It would thus seem that at that time a

majority of the body were for silence in the premises. It will be interesting to trace the causes and progress of the change wrought in their views.

The subject did not come up again until the sixth day. Dr. Spring then said: "The influence of the action of last week upon both the friends of revolt throughout the country, and the friends of the Government, was of the most unhappy kind, as he was well informed by advices received both from the North and the West." What the effects of the Assembly's action was in the North and the West, of course we can not judge. But as to the South, which is the seat of the "revolt," and where the greater part of "the friends of revolt throughout the country" are to be found, it is very certain that it has had no appreciable effect whatsoever. Dr. Spring shows old age. Last year, we remember that he deplored the discussion in the Assembly about Boards, for it endangered the Union, of which these were so many bonds! This year, he fancies that an accomplished revolution would go backwards or forwards, according as the Assembly should judge respecting its merits! In view, therefore, of the unhappy effects of what the Assembly had done, Dr. Spring offered for adoption the following preamble and resolutions:

Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God toward this favored land, and also recognizing our obligations to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopt the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, the fourth day of July next be hereby set apart as a day of prayer throughout our bounds, and that on this day ministers and people are called on humbly to confess and bewail our national sins; to offer our thanks to the Father of Lights for His abundant and undeserved goodness towards us as a nation; to seek His guidance and blessing upon our rulers and their counsels, as well as the then assembled Congress of the United States; and to implore Him, in the name of Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Christian profession, to turn away His anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of a safe and honorable peace.

Resolved, 2. That in the judgment of this Assembly, it is the duty of ministers and churches under its care to do all in their power to

promote and perpetuate the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government.

Afterwards, the fourth day of July was substituted by the first, and the second resolution was altered by Dr. Spring himself, with others, so as to read thus :

Resolved, 2. That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, as far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution, and to this Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty. And to avoid all misconception, the Assembly declares that by the term "Federal Government," as here used, is not meant any particular Administration, or the peculiar opinions of any political party, but that central Administration, which, being at any time appointed and inaugurated according to the terms prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, is the visible representative of our national existence.

There was some promiscuous conversation now had, and several motions were made, none of which appeared to be seconded. Dr. Hodge then moved that this subject be made the first order of the day for Friday morning, the eighth day of the Assembly.

On Friday the discussion was opened by Dr. THOMAS, of the Presbytery of Miami. He urged the right of free discussion against those who wished to shut his mouth. And he advocated the right of the Assembly to testify on behalf of the civil authority, when it was in extreme danger. The old Synod of New York and Philadelphia, then the supreme judicature of the Church, repeatedly did this during the old French war, and the pre-revolutionary difficulties, and also after Independence was declared. And the Synod of South Carolina had recently taken the initiative in the matter, and were committed thoroughly to the position that the Church ought in such cases to speak. If the Presbyterian Church *dare* to shrink from her duty in this crisis, she will be blown away like the foam from the crest of the billow by the tornado. Shall we *dare* to falter when our army and our Government need our encouragement? Are we Secessionists? Are we traitors? Have we forgotten our loyalty? Then, what right have we to sit here as a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of these United States?

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Tennessee, contended that the Church courts were not the proper place to express loyalty. He loved loyalty to government, and would express it at the proper place—at the ballot-box, or in the battle-field, but not in the Church court nor the pulpit. He would give his life to restore the country and the Union to what it was, but even for this he would not divide the Church.

Dr. HODGE differed not with brother Thomas in regard to the duty of the Church to testify on proper occasions. But he objected to the resolutions on other grounds.

1st. Because this action is unnecessary. Our people do not need to be roused. We can not, indeed, hold them back. So sublime, grand, wide-spread and irrepressible a rising was never heard of before. Who doubts the loyalty of Presbyterians?

2d. Such a pronouncement will be highly injurious to the Union, and the objects of the Federal Government. The Administration does not ask our interference—does not need it. It will do them harm, instead of good. A distinguished member of the Cabinet has said he wished the General Assembly would aim to preserve the unity of the Church, as a means of preserving the union of the country.

Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, here interposed, to state that the other members of the Cabinet had been telegraphed, to know if they desired the Assembly to take no action, and here is the answer, assuring us that they wish us to do nothing.

Dr. HODGE, resuming, urged that these resolutions tend to sever, rather than preserve, the Union. The best service we can render to Government is, to preserve the kind feeling of the Union-loving men of the South, so that when the time comes for them to assert their loyalty, they will be encouraged to do it. Our Church is the last link that holds this Union together.

A third objection to this paper is, that the Assembly is designed to represent the whole country. Had the Assembly met this year in a Southern city, and been composed chiefly of Southern men, would it have seemed to you fair and honorable for them to vote similar resolutions in favor of their Confederacy?

4th. The great consideration is, we are bound by our ordination vows to study the *unity of the Presbyterian Church*. What right have we to take a course that will drive away from us one-third of the General Assembly, and one-third of our Churches? The Church is the most influential and conservative agency for the preservation of our Union. He closed by begging not to be misunderstood—he was not pleading against the Government—but he was pleading for the preservation of the Church. He then moved the adoption of the following paper, as a substitute for Dr. Spring's:

“The unhappy contest in which the country is now involved has brought both the Church and the State face to face with questions of patriotism and of morals, which are without a parallel in this or any other land. True to their hereditary principles, the Ministers and Elders present in the Assembly have met the emergency by the most

decisive proof, in their respective social and civil relations, of their firm devotion to the Constitution and laws under which we live; and they are ready at all suitable times, and at whatever personal sacrifice, to testify their loyalty to that Constitution under which 'this goodly vine has sent out her boughs into the sea, and her branches into the river.'

"For the following reasons, the Assembly deem it impossible to put forth, at the present time, a more extended and emphatic deliverance upon the subject, to wit:

"1. The General Assembly is neither a Northern nor a Southern body; it comprehends the entire Presbyterian Church, irrespective of geographical lines or political opinions, and had it met this year, as it does with marked uniformity one-half of the time, in some Southern city, no one, he believed, would have presumed to ask of it a fuller declaration of its views upon this subject, than it has embodied in this minute.

"2. Owing to providential hindrances, nearly one-third of our Presbyteries are not represented at our present meeting; they feel that not only Christian courtesy, but common justice, requires that we should refrain, except in the presence of some stringent necessity, from adopting measures to bind the consciences of our brethren who are absent, most of them, we believe, by no fault of their own.

"3. Such has been the course of events, that all the other evangelical denominations have been rent asunder. We alone retain, this day, the proportions of a national Church. We are, happily, united among ourselves in all questions of doctrine and discipline. The dismemberment of our Church, while fraught with disaster to all our spiritual interests, could not fail to envenom the political animosities of the country, and to augment the sorrows which already oppress us. We are not willing to sever this last bond which holds the North and South together in the fellowship of the Gospel. Should an all-wise Providence hereafter exact this sacrifice, we shall be resigned to it. But for the present, both religion and patriotism require us to cherish a Union which, by God's blessing, may be the means of reuniting our land."

Dr. ANDERSON, of California, said there was danger of other losses than of the South. There are threats of disunion of the Church from the West, which have come since last week. You have to choose where the Unity is to be preserved. He replied to the argument that this action is unnecessary. The subject is before us, and it must be met. Many had kindred in arms—he himself had many dear friends—he wanted to encourage them. It was useless to try and drown the Assembly with such milk-and-water sophistry as that of the substitute. It was entirely too weak—one gallon of milk to about five barrels of water. (Great laughter, and applause in the galleries.) He heard much talk about the Unity of the Church—it was like tying two Mississippi steamboats together with a piece of silk thread, and bidding them not break apart when starting in different

directions. How long would the Church remain one, if we have two confederacies? Not a moment, although Dr. Hodge endeavored to make us believe the contrary, in the last number of the *Princeton Review*.

Dr. SPRING said the paper he had presented was not in the course he had originally proposed. It might have led to some such document as the substitute now offered. But it had been treated with discourtesy, and unceremoniously laid on the table. He believed the measure now proposed by him was right. Talk about the Unity of the Church! It is broken. Like the *debris* of the rock, it is crumbling, and no timid measures could prevent it. The only present hope of unity was on this side of the line. As for the voice from Washington, he would like to know by what measures it had been *procured*—he would like to see it, and find out what more it contained than had been quoted here. And for whom is your sympathy now evoked? For REBELS. Pass Dr. Hodge's substitute, and he would not like to say how many of the Synod of New York would again meet with the General Assembly. He wanted his last utterance to be for that glorious Union, for which his father had fought, and for which he had never ceased, and never should cease, while alive, to labor and to pray.

Judge RYERSON, of New Jersey, proceeded to recite the evidence, which convinced him that it had long been the design of South Carolina to break up this Union. He did not consider the usurpation of the South entitled to any respect. It had none of the claims of a Government. It was a sheer conspiracy, and a wanton and inexcusable rebellion. Was it possible to preserve the unity of the Church after the nation is rent in fragments? Is it supposed that we will consent to attend the General Assembly, when we can travel to it only under a system of passports? It was folly to think of it. Americans would never submit to it.

Mr. GILLESPIE, interposing, asked if China, India, and Africa were not now represented on our floor, and what was to hinder the South from coming in as they?

Judge RYERSON. The only way to keep the Church one, is to keep the country one. We have the constitutional right to make the deliverance proposed in Dr. Spring's paper—let us not be afraid to do it.

The Rev. Mr. HASTINGS spoke of the sudden birth of an intense spirit of patriotism, and of the danger of resisting that giant. He spoke of a letter he had received at noon, and which he held up in his hand, in which a very prominent citizen expressed astonishment that the Assembly should have laid Dr. Spring's first paper on the table.

Rev. Mr. HOYTE (of Tennessee) urged that the Assembly had no right to make the deliverance proposed. It was unconstitutional, for the Assembly could interfere with such matters only by humble petition, or when invited thereto by the civil authorities. The action proposed would divide us. It was also unfair to take such action in the absence

of so many of the Southern Commissioners. Why should you take advantage of our feebleness amongst you to force us into circumstances of distress and danger? Who asks you to touch this thing? Not the Cabinet—not the officers of your army—not the men who take broadest views of the interests of the nation—not the Union men of the South. The Government at Washington would not thank you for any such deliverance; and, while it can not increase the unanimity which appears to prevail at the North, its effect at the South would be to drive to despair those who had done nothing to bring about this deplorable state of things, and who had done what they could to avert it.

Dr. MUSGRAVE denounced secession as a monstrous immorality. The Assembly ought to say so, and encourage their public men in crushing out at once and for ever this ruinous error. We ought to aid in sweeping it from the country and from the earth. He would do it for our own sakes—he would do it for the encouragement of all loyal hearts in the South. He pointed to Maryland and Baltimore, as now rejoicing in the protection of the General Government, and he hoped that other States would soon receive the same protection. He hoped the paper of Dr. Spring would pass, not only by an overwhelming majority, but by an unanimous vote.

On the next day, the Rev. Dr. Wines, of St. Louis, informed the Assembly that he was in a sense the representative of the Hon. Edward Bates, the distinguished member of the Cabinet referred to yesterday. Whereupon, he read the telegraphic correspondence which had passed between them, and then proceeded to define his own position, and to offer a substitute for both the papers before the house. He was for no action—for it might be that the mission of our Church in this solemn crisis is to assist in the readjustment of our relations to the seceded States.

Rev. Dr. MATHEWS, of Kentucky, said his affections and interests were on both sides—North and South. The State from which he came, he was happy to announce, had unfurled and kept waving the banner of the stars and stripes. (Applause, with a few *cat-calls*, both which the Moderator checked.) Dr. Mathews expressed regret that he had said any thing to elicit such an expression. He had only said so to show that what he had to say he said as a Union man. He went on to deplore the straits into which the proposed action of the Assembly was about to bring the Union men of the South. Two things he wished to add before he sat down. 1st. There are brethren in the South who wished to secede—a minority, he believed—but they want a pretext. O! give them no such pretext. 2d. There are men in the South who labor night and day to heal these divisions. Let those men be cherished and upheld. The last thing he had to say was, let this Assembly legislate in the spirit of great charity. What if there has been wrong at the South? What if on the records of the Synod of South Carolina there are things we regret? Ought we not to exercise charity in judgments? What did the Master say to her

who stood accused before Him? "Go, sin no more: neither do I condemn you."

The Rev. Mr. WALLER urged the adoption of Dr. Spring's paper, because of the very conviction Southern Christian men were said to have, that it was wrong to obey the Government at Washington. For this very reason we ought to pronounce, and do it distinctly. Such a conviction he considered in decided opposition to the Bible and our Confession. It was such a conviction as this that ruined our race, and blighted Paradise. It was an allurements to withdraw her allegiance from the rightful government under which she was placed, that was the temptation of our first mother. It was a withdrawal of their loyalty from their lawful sovereign and His government, that constituted the sin, and produced the ruin, of our first parents. They claimed the right to do it, but had no right. A similar temptation had beset our brethren, and we should warn them of it.

On Monday morning, Mr. Waller still having the floor, Dr. WINES, by his leave, offered a modification of his paper.

Dr. SPRING presented a modification of his second resolution.

Dr. BERGEN offered a substitute of his own.

Dr. STOCKTON proposed a substitute for Dr. Spring's second resolution.

Judge RYERSON offered a paper, proposing a committee of nine, with Dr. Spring as chairman.

Dr. MCPHAIL offered a substitute for all.

Mr. MILLER (Ruling Elder), of New York, offered sundry preambles and resolutions.

Dr. MONFORT also offered a paper.

Rev. Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, offered a paper.

Rev. Mr. STRYKER presented one.

Rev. Mr. REASER asked if this thing was not becoming ridiculous.

The MODERATOR answered that it was not.

Rev. Mr. MURPHY also offered a paper.

Mr. WALLER confessed bewilderment amongst all these papers. He feared the very delay occasioned was breeding timidity. He feared the disposition to stand still would do mischief. He felt inclined to stick to the boat in which he had first embarked, viz: Dr. Spring's paper. He deprecated a false issue—that we were to save the Church

from division. Territorial division did not necessarily involve spiritual division. Separation in form may exist, and be compatible with spiritual union. He denied that we were making a new term of communion. He quoted the prophet Samuel: "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft," which latter crime was punishable with death, and therefore the former was likewise. If we had any doubt about the legitimacy of our Government, or the application of these Scriptures, then we might hesitate. But nobody doubted this, and nothing but an "obfuscation" of interests could admit such a doubt. Moreover, our brethren of the South have not set an example of hesitation and forbearance. He read from the Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina to show this. These resolutions of the Synod of South Carolina, urging secession, were passed before the State had seceded. Here was a Southern Synod urging rebellion against lawful authority in advance, and promising in advance to bless it with the prayers of the Church. Surely, these men can not complain if we lift our voice on the side of God and the country.

Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, urged the inexpediency of the proposed action. The administration wished the Church to hold together. On the other hand, the disunionists will hail the proposed action with joy. But it is said other bodies have spoken out, and so should we. If others have acted, impulsively yielding to the tide of the times, let us all the more move cautiously, and with our pristine, far-reaching wisdom and tide-resisting firmness.

Dr. YEOMANS was sorry a judicious committee had not been agreed to, that they might have embodied in a harmonious minute what might command the suffrages of a majority of both sides. He regretted extremely that such an opportunity had been lost by the tabling of Judge Ryerson's resolution. It was a solemn moment in the history of our Church. We stand on the brink of division. And there seems to have been a real preparation of mind for division. We have had an apology for it here this morning. From the beginning, it did seem that there were some who had ends to reach at this terrible sacrifice. Is it not time for us to pause and ponder our way? Moderator, if I could utter one word to delay this dreadful result—if I could make one utterance that might recall my brethren to a sober consideration of the real issue before us, it would be the sweetest word of my life, and one which, to my dying day, it would be most pleasant to remember. It is admitted that a division is likely, if this vote is pressed. Is there any good to be gained by this sad sacrifice? Can we afford the sacrifice? Can this Church's mission be accomplished if she be divided? He urged particularly the advantages the Church must lose for doing good to the slaves of the South.

It is one of the pretexts for this action (he used the word not in an invidious sense) that we are to uphold the Government. Is there a call for this? We have individually, and in various and decided ways, expressed our patriotism. Is it necessary that the same class of men repeat, in every possible relation they fill, their devotion to the

country? We have proof that the Government itself does not want, but rather deprecates, this support from us. We are asked to do over again, as a Church court, what we have already done as citizens. We are doing it at the sacrifice of the integrity of our Church organization. We not only do it, but we *understand* that we do it. But is it wise and right? He deprecated the inevitable consequences, and could see no compensating advantages. We defeat our Church enterprises—we defeat the very purpose of the action itself. We cut the last, strongest, tenderest bond that holds our country together. O! sir, let us hold on to our Southern brethren—they will do good and great service in times and efforts that yet belong to the future. One brother had reminded us that there is a North-West. Why, sir! that is the very thing that ought to be forgotten. Now is the time to ignore sections. O! sir, let us not destroy the conservative position of our Church in regard to the great question that is agitating the civilized world—the question of most difficult solution in our own beloved land. Let us not descend from our vantage ground. Let us not let go the cable that holds us, and us only, in available position for good in relation to that subject. It is small matter to speak of patriotism. It is cheap to do as he did the last Sabbath before he left home, viz: to tell his people that we were engaged in a great struggle, that must be fought through, once for all. He had urged them to do their duty to their country in this, the hour of their peril. This was a cheap utterance for us in the North to make. He appealed to the kind feelings of the body for the Southern members, in view of the sacrifices they had made to come to the Assembly. He hoped naught would be done to increase their difficulty and distress. He earnestly begged that the Southern men who had not spoken might be heard. He had heard of one of them who had stood face to face with the bold front of secession—with a mob of six hundred excited people—pleading for the Union, and who would like to do it here. Another, from the most distant seceded State, would be willing to say a few words. He hoped the house would be willing to hear them, and others, and give them a fair and candid hearing, and would gravely ponder what they had to say.

Dr. WILLIS LORD, of Chicago, eulogized the Government, to support which it was proposed to pledge ourselves. He spoke of its protection of us and of the Church, and of its beneficent influence on our country and the world. He urged the entire *constitutionality* of the action proposed, viz: the adopting of Dr. Spring's paper. This new doctrine of the unconstitutionality of Church utterances on such subjects, which has been much mooted for a few years, came from the same source from which our other troubles came. Its origin is identical with that of nullification and secession. It is designed to estop the Church from meeting her responsibilities and performing her full mission. He also urged the *expediency* of the course. You might as well give up your Missionary work in the great West if you falter on this subject. His third reason for this action was, its *necessity*. In

no other way can we show that we have been and are loyal. We must pass these resolutions, to meet the sad fact that one Synod had avowed disloyalty already. They had penned such action and sent it to the General Assembly. Some of the Ministers of that Synod were actually in the army of the rebels. His fourth reason was, that the course proposed was *right*. It had been said it was unfair to pass these resolutions in the absence of the Southern brethren. Why unfair? Is it right to presume, in their absence, that they would not approve of a measure so right and expedient in itself? He honored those Southern brethren who had come to the Assembly. He wished all the Southern Commissioners had been present. But why are they not? He had a letter from a distinguished source in the South, in which he was informed that some of the Presbyteries would not appoint Commissioners—and why? Because of the difficulty of travel? No; but because of their sympathy with the rebellion.

Here (says *The Presbyterian*) Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. BAKER besought Dr. Lord not to make the impression that such was the general state of things. That letter was a misrepresentation of the Southern Presbyteries generally, if true of any; and one of the gentlemen (the reporter could not see which) deprecated the *harshness* of the term “rebellion.”

Dr. Lord urged that our charter, and the protection of our Church property, was from the Government which we proposed to encourage. We owe it much. We ought to sustain it, for it has done much for us and for our Church. Our dearest interests are at stake, and if this United States Government is prostrated, every thing will be in jeopardy. He loved the Church—Christ’s cross and crown were above every thing, but his country next. And, in conclusion, he could not help saying:

“The star-spangled banner, O! long may it wave,
O’er the land of the free, and the home of the brave.”

Rev. W. M. BAKER, of Texas, said he feared he might say some thing unpleasant to his brethren, whom he shrank from offending. He feared he might not do justice to the cause in which he felt constrained to speak. Born in Washington, raised there, educated in reverence for the Government, he still loved it, and loved the whole country. The present state of things is one of the greatest griefs of his whole life. He was going to speak plainly, and say things which might endanger his life, both at the North and at the South. He was opposed to the proposed deliverance, which was neither a Christian nor a religious movement; for, 1st. It was by a *sudden* impulse of the venerable father who introduced it; 2d. It was military, it smelt of war. You are making a Church utterance under a military impulse. We from the South opposed secession, but were borne before the torrent. Now we find a thundergust raging at the North, and upon its wild and raging bosom is our Church to be borne away? Dr. Lord had shewed a profound ignorance of the South. Grant that you have

to choose between the going off of the North-West and that of the South. If the Church must divide, let it not divide along that accursed, fatal line—Mason's and Dixon's. He was against secession—but what can man do against the tide? When overpowered, what can we do but submit? And was it generous or just for this Assembly to put us in a position where we must either separate from our homes and fields of labor, or from this beloved Church of our fathers? If you pass this resolution, we must either leave our all, give up our charges to destitution, and leave our fields of labor, or separate from you. For, is it not duty to submit to the powers that be? Can we rightfully resist it where there is none other there for us to obey? We are told the popular excitement is such that the Assembly dare not be silent. It is just as impossible to resist the excitement there as here. He was Daniel Baker's son, and was glad that holy man was not alive to witness these troubles. Brethren say the Southern Confederacy is a usurpation. If you pass these resolutions, you compel us to be loyal to that Confederacy or leave it. You run up the secession flag over our heads. You can not do more to help Mr. Davis' Government than just to compel the Southern portion of the Church to take the position into which this action will force them. Your silence will send a thrill of joy to Washington. Your speaking will send it to Montgomery.

It was not because of secession that the Commissioners from the South were not here. He felt ashamed to tell the real truth; yet why should he? Crops had failed in many portions of the South, and many Presbyteries could not raise the means to send their Commissioners. We were in many instances too poor to come, and shall we be reproached with disloyalty, because we yield to providential necessity? Shall I tell you a secret? Do not any of this vast audience repeat it, for it might not do to tell every where. But he would tell it, and was consoled in venturing in the same way a member of a legislature was, in making a speech that he was afraid would displease his constituents—"Don't report that speech," said he, "but if you do, I don't care, for none of my constituents can read." He (Mr. Baker) could not just say that, for his constituents could read; but still, he would be safe, for the *mails were stopped*. He would tell the secret. He then, with a good deal of dramatic manner, described the way in which those who still loved the Union at the South spoke to each other in whispers; described the way in which he had been approached, with extreme caution, and inquiries made of his intention of coming to the Assembly; of his opinion of what would likely be done; and of the wishes of the Union men at the South that nothing might be done that might render adherence to the Assembly, on the part of the South, impossible.

Such is the report of Mr. Baker's speech in *The Presbyterian*. In other papers he is reported as saying that he

“hated secession ;” that he had “never made a prayer for the President of the Confederate States in his pulpit ;” also, as “eulogizing the patriotic uprising in the North.” At the same time, we find him represented in the *Cincinnati Weekly Gazette* as saying that “if the Southern Commissioners in the Assembly were to be cast off, they would return to their beautiful and glorious South, their fortunes linked with it, and their lives given to its defence.”

At the close of Mr. Baker’s speech, Dr. Hodge moved to lay the whole subject on the table. The yeas and nays were called for. There were seventy-four yeas to one hundred and thirty-nine nays. So the Assembly refused to lay the whole subject on the table.

On Tuesday, the eleventh day of the proceedings, absentees were allowed to record their votes on the question of laying on the table, so that the vote stood eighty-one yeas to one hundred and forty-six nays. The first order of the day was judicial case number two, but a motion was made to postpone it, so as to take up the unfinished business.

Mr. SMITH, of Ohio, was ready to vote on the loyalty resolutions now.

Dr. MUSGRAVE was, also, now ready to vote for Dr. Spring’s resolutions. He would vote for no resolutions that did not express those sentiments.

Dr. HALL, of Rochester, then said he wanted a special committee, so that he could offer the following resolution :

Resolved, That there is a voluntary rebellion in certain States against the constituted authorities of our Government, and that rebellion is a sin of such magnitude among members of the Presbyterian Church as to make them fit subjects for excommunication.

It was then decided, by a vote of one hundred and thirty to eighty-three, to appoint a committee to consider all the papers before the house on this subject. A committee of nine was appointed, viz: Drs. Musgrave, Hodge, Anderson, Wines, and Yeomans, and Judges Ryerson, Semple,

White, and Clark. In the afternoon, they brought in a report, by a majority of the committee (eight out of nine), endorsing the Government, yet softening the language of Dr. Spring's paper. Dr. Anderson read his report, as the minority of the committee, recommending the adoption of Dr. Spring's paper, as modified by the author himself and others, only making the first of July the day of prayer, instead of the fourth. He said, in his speech, that the report of the majority was intended to shirk the crisis and its responsibilities. Its aim was to prevent the Assembly from showing its hand, and coming manfully forward to the support of the country. It was full of weakness and prevarication. There was once a man tried for stealing a sheep. The defence set up was, that he had been an industrious laborer, and was good to his wife—but it said nothing about the sheep. So with the majority's report. They talked of functions, constitutions, etc., etc., but said nothing of the crisis, and its demands upon the Church and the ministry.

On Wednesday, the twelfth day, Dr. Yeomans supported the majority report, and moved that the vote be taken at twelve o'clock.

Rev. Mr. McINNIS, of New Orleans, said the Synod of Mississippi, had been striving to get the floor for the last four days. He gave notice, that if the motion to end the debate should pass, he would protest against the action of the Assembly, and withdraw from the body.

A MEMBER here said that the speaker had himself voted to lay the whole subject on the table. Mr. McInnis replied, that he was not there to give an account of his vote. Continuing, he said that his section of the country had been misrepresented, and would not submit to be gagged.

It was then voted to take the question at 6 o'clock, P. M.

Mr. McINNIS, of New Orleans, again took the platform. He said the Assembly had made up its mind, and that his words would not alter it; but, for all that, he had to make a statement, showing the position and opinions of the Church at the South. No statement from any seceded State had, so far, given the true idea of affairs in that region. The Southern Churches are, as he knew, being a native of the South, perfectly loyal to the Presbyterian Church, and they are loyal to Government. They have in the South a Government which

they are as much bound to obey as you in the North are bound to obey your Government. If Dr. Spring's resolutions are passed, they place us in rebellion to the Government *de facto* at home. The attempt thus to bind our consciences will sever the Presbyterian Church. It was not the province of this Assembly to break our allegiance. They could not say to which Government its members should be loyal. In the support of their Government, the people of the South are both *united* and *determined*. The conduct of the South had been compared to the sin of witchcraft—the same charge might have been made against our revolutionary fathers, contending for their rights. The speaker asked for neither pity nor sympathy for the South, but for her inherent constitutional rights. The speaker was opposed to both of the reports of the Committee. If you are going to force political views upon us, give us a creed that there can be no mistake about.

The speaker thought that the history of the Church and its constitution proved that it was always unsafe to legislate on such subjects. The Assembly is not a legislative body, and its decisions are not law. It is entirely a judicial body. The speaker here read from the "Form of Government" a section which he thought decided that the Assembly had no right to take any political action, except in the way of petition. In this latter form of action the speaker would join; he would sign a petition for peace, for a just and honorable settlement of this whole national difficulty. But if you place me at the mercy of a mere majority of this Assembly, then I say "Farewell!" to all that constitutes Presbyterianism. Is there no limit to the power of this Assembly? Have we no constitution?

Mr. McInnis here read further extracts from the "Form of Government," to show that the power of the Assembly was confined to matters of doctrine, of appeal, and of a judicial character. Errors of doctrine (not political, but theological,) and immorality in practice, can also be dealt with by the Assembly; but no power exists by which it can make a political deliverance. No right exists to force a political vote from a member.

The speaker asked if any Presbytery had sent up an overture on this question? On the contrary, the Presbyteries have ordered us to say nothing on this unhappy subject. At the opening of this Assembly, the body decided to say nothing on the question, and the speaker thought they were no better prepared to speak now. If you could hear the vote of all the Church, you would feel that they desire no utterance. It can not come before us constitutionally. The country does not desire any deliverance from us, nor would it justly appreciate the meaning of our words. Any deliverance we might make to-day we might be ashamed of in a week. Even the Southern Secessionists desire no deliverance from us.

The orator earnestly repeated that any action on this subject by the Assembly would drive off the South and close it for ever against the influence of our Church. The South needs the restraining influence of the North, and the North needs the South; but if we separate, there

can be no reconstruction of the Presbyterian Church, The speaker protested against the division in the name of the Saviour, in the name of the Church, and in the name of the country.

Mr. HARBESON, an Elder from Kentucky, arose about the conclusion of Rev. Mr. McInnis' remarks, and said he fully concurred in all of the speaker's views.

Rev. Mr. OGDEN, of Mississippi, stated that he was a native of New Jersey, a graduate of Princeton, but the last thirty-four years had given his life to the religious education of the slave. He was opposed to the Constitutional views of the previous speaker; but, like him, was opposed to both the majority and minority reports; yet, if compelled, would vote for the majority report. He was opposed to the minority report, because it committed the Church to the Administration of Abraham Lincoln, William H. Seward, and Salmon P. Chase. It perils the union of the Presbyterian Church, and consummates the disunion of these States. If passed, it will gratify every Abolitionist in the country—William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and the like.

He would not accuse Dr. Thomas and others of being Abolitionists, yet he would say, that if they were, they could not have done any thing better to serve the views of Abolitionists than by bringing in these resolutions. The resolutions finding favor with Northern members will commit all the Union men of the South to the Secessionists.

The Rev. Mr. FRAZER, of Kentucky, opened his argument historically, referring to the Church of Scotland, and its connection with the State; he then referred to the Missionary Churches of this body, and asked whether we required them to be loyal to the "United States?" He thought we could not decide the question whether "we have a Government" in this body. The Church could not decide it, but she could take a higher position, and act in her appropriate sphere. There is a sphere found for the civil power to legislate in for the Church, and limits in which the Church can legislate for the State. Neither of these authorities can legislate for each other.

From the days of Constantine, the State had nearly always preserved the unity of the Church. Now, is the Presbyterian Church going to act the tyrant to preserve the unity of the State? Such action would resemble the action of the Roman Catholic Church, which had made kings and emperors bow to it.

If Dr. Spring's resolutions were passed, every loyal Presbyterian in the South would be a traitor to the *de facto* Government, and would be hung on the nearest tree. He was very severe on the conduct of the North-Western brethren, who wish to make the Southern Presbyterians traitors, and earnestly maintained that the Assembly had no right to fix and pronounce upon any man's political allegiance.

Rev. Mr. MUTCHMORE, of Missouri, said it was a sad day for the Church of Jesus, when the Gospel herald must hoist the stars and stripes to be heard at all. The Church in the South, and four-fifths of its Ministers, had been true to the Union.

The Rev. Dr. Breckinridge, and the Rev. John Knox, and others, were cited by the speaker, to show that the Church was in a quandary, at one time, as to whether King James or his rival should be served. So with members of the Assembly now living in the South. The speaker proceeded, in strong terms, to *argue the right of revolution*. The Assembly, in his mind, had no business to take a stand for the constituted authorities, because revolution might be right, if not now, at some time to come.

The speaker was here interrupted by a gentleman, who stated that he would not remain in the Church to hear "treason" preached. The speaker had no right to argue the right of revolution, which was obnoxious to the loyal people of the Assembly and audience.

There were two means of revolution, the ballot-box and the sword. If the second resolution of Dr. Spring was passed, either the Church must be disobeyed, or half his congregation and Presbytery must be dismissed. A member of the speaker's Church might conscientiously oppose the Government, thinking it an engine of tyranny? Should he be dismissed for acting conscientiously? If the General Assembly took Dr. Spring's stand, he should endeavor to obey, but it would require revolvers to carry out the law.

In his State the Governor was a traitor, and a military bill had been passed, requiring the people of Missouri to take oath to support the laws of the State, as expounded by the Jackson Administration.

It were better that Forts Sumter, Pickens, Monroe, and all the rest, should fall, than that the Spring Union resolutions should be passed. In Missouri, the Methodists were the strongest Secessionists, because they had been long embittered with the radicals of the North. Controversy which would ensue upon the Spring resolutions would make the Presbyterians of the South the rankest Secessionists.

Dr. EDWARDS, of Philadelphia, said the Church could not stay its hand in this matter, even if it would. It must deliver an official and authoritative idea of its position. The Reverend Secessionists of South Carolina and Georgia had departed, in the first place, from spiritual discussion; yet, their political friends now raised the argument of non-interference. A missionary of the Old School Assembly was a Chaplain in the Secession ranks; eight Old School preachers were enrolling men, and thousands of Presbyters and members were in the ranks of treason.

In reference to the members of the Assembly present from India, etc., he would say, that the presence of such was no evidence of a world-broad Presbyterianism, for the native delegates of such missions would probably never be present. The Church must be geographically divided, and if so, the North and the North-West could not be lost. If the South must go, so let it be. (Applause in the galleries.)

When the armies of the North had achieved the integrity of the Union anew, the Church would be again reunited.

Dr. Edwards held in his hand a letter from a Philadelphia clergyman to Secretary Chase, asking him if the passage of the Union resolutions would do harm to the Union, even if some of the representatives in the Assembly should withdraw. The following reply was received from Secretary Chase :

"Can not properly advise, but see no valid objection to unequivocal expressions in favor of the Constitution, Union, and freedom.

"S. P. CHASE."

(Loud applause.)

Dr. DICKSON then took the floor, and made a statement relative to Judge Bates, reading a letter from that official.

He hoped, afterward, that three minutes would be allowed for meditation and silent prayer before voting.

Much confusion here ensued, as the hour for voting had arrived. Motions and counter-motions were made on every hand, and an effort was made upon the part of each wing to bring their respective report before the Assembly prior to the other.

An appeal from the decision of the Chair, to put the minority report first, with amendments, was lost. Efforts were made to adjourn until this morning, and avoid a vote. Loud cries of "vote," "vote," were made, and there was great confusion. The Assembly refused to adjourn.

The vote was then taken, first on the majority report, which was rejected; and then on the minority report, which was adopted, by a vote of one hundred and fifty-four to sixty-six. To this, Dr. Hodge and forty-five others offered the following protest :

We, the undersigned, respectfully protest against the action of the General Assembly, in adopting the minority report of the Committee on the State of the Country. We make this protest, not because we do not acknowledge loyalty to our country to be a moral and religious duty, according to the Word of God, which requires every one to be subject to the powers that be, nor because we deny the right of the Assembly to enjoy that and all other like duties on the Ministers and Churches under its care; but because we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what Government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due, and its right to make that decision a condition of membership in our Church. That the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, in our judgment, is undeniable. It not only asserts the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises, in the name of all the Churches and Ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to strengthen, uphold and encourage

the Federal Government. It is, however, a notorious fact, that many of our Ministers and members conscientiously believe that the allegiance of the citizens of this country is primarily due to the States to which they respectively belong; and, therefore, that when any State renounces its connection with the United States, and its allegiance to the Constitution, the citizens of that State are bound, by the laws of God, to continue loyal to their State, and obedient to its laws. The paper adopted by the Assembly virtually declares, on the other hand, that the allegiance of the citizens is due to the United States, any thing in the Constitution, ordinances or laws of the several States to the contrary notwithstanding. It is not the loyalty of the members constituting this Assembly, nor of our Churches and Ministers, in any one portion of our country, that is thus asserted, but the loyalty of the whole Presbyterian Church, North, South, East, West. Allegiance to the Federal Government is recognized or declared to be the duty of all the Churches and Ministers represented in this body. In adopting this paper, therefore, the Assembly does decide the great political question which agitates and divides the country—the question, whether is the allegiance of our citizens due primarily to the State or to the Union? However our own convictions of the correctness of this decision may be, or however deeply we may be impressed with its importance, yet it is not a question which this Assembly has the right to decide. A man may conscientiously believe that he owes allegiance to one Government or another, and yet possess all the qualifications which the Word of God or the standards of the Church authorize us to demand in our members or Ministers. As this General Assembly represents the whole Church, the acts and declarations of the Assembly become the acts and declarations of the Church. It is this consideration that gives to the action in this case all its importance, either in our own view or in the views of others. It is the allegiance of the Old School Presbyterian Church to the Constitution and the Federal Government, which this paper is intended to profess and proclaim. It does, therefore, of necessity, decide the political question which agitates the country. This is a matter clearly beyond the jurisdiction of this House.

That the action of the Assembly in the premises does not only decide the political question referred to, but makes that decision a term of membership in our Church, is no less clear. It is not analogous to the recommendation of a religious or benevolent institution, which our members may regard or not at pleasure, but it puts into the mouths of all represented in this body a declaration of loyalty and allegiance to the Union and to the Federal Government; but such declarations, made by the members of our Church residing in what is called the seceding States, is treasonable.

Presbyterians under the jurisdiction of those States, therefore, can not make that declaration. They are, consequently, forced to choose between allegiance to their State and allegiance to the Church.

The General Assembly, in thus deciding a political question, and in making that decision practically a condition of membership of the Church, has, in our judgment, violated the constitution of the Church, and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master.

We protest, secondly, against this action of the Assembly, because it is a departure from all its previous action. The General Assembly has always acted on the principle that the Church has no right to make any thing a condition of Christian or ministerial fellowship which is not enjoined or required in the Scriptures and the standards of the Church. We have, at one time, resisted the popular demand to make total abstinence from intoxicating liquors a term of membership; at another time, the holding of slaves. In firmly resisting these unscriptural demands, we have preserved the integrity and unity of the Church, and made it the great conservator of truth, moderation, and liberty of conscience in our country. The Assembly have now descended from this high position, in making a political opinion, a particular theory of the Constitution, however correct and important that theory may be, the condition of membership in our body, and thus, we fear, have endangered the unity of the Church.

In the third place, we protest, because we regard the action of the Assembly uncalled for. It was required neither to instruct nor to excite our brethren in the Northern States. It was not needed as a vindication of the loyalty of the North.

Old School Presbyterians every where, out of the so-called seceding States, have openly avowed, and most conspicuously displayed, their allegiance to the Constitution and the Government; and that, in many cases, at great cost and peril. Nor was such action required by our duty to our country. We are fully persuaded that we best promote the interest of the country by preserving the integrity and union of the Church. We regard this action of the Assembly, therefore, as a great national calamity, as well as the most disastrous to the interest of the Church, which has marked its history.

We protest, fourthly, because we regard the action of the Assembly as unjust and cruel in its bearing on our Southern brethren. It was, in our judgment, unfair to entertain and decide such a momentous question, when the great majority of our Southern Presbyteries were, from necessity, unrepresented in this body; and it is, in our judgment, a violation of the law of love to adopt an act which would expose most of our Southern brethren, should they remain connected with our Church, to suspicion, to the loss of property, to personal dangers, which tends to destroy their usefulness in their appointed fields of labor.

And, finally, we protest, because we believe the action of the Assembly will not only diminish the resources of the Church, but greatly weaken its power for good, and expose it to the danger of being carried away more and more from its true principles, by a wordly or fanatical spirit.

We have patiently labored through this long and absurd debate (most of which was as wicked as absurd), that we might here put on record the names of all these speakers, and the sentiments uttered by them. As reported by the weekly journals alone, the whole might possibly have perished, and been forgotten. We have probably secured for it immortality. In our pages it will no doubt live, in at least some few *bound up* copies, and descend to generations following, for their instruction and warning. The future Church historian will note the principles asserted by this body of Presbyterian Ministers and Ruling Elders—principles which are in violation of the constitution of the Church, and destructive of the crown-rights of the Church's Head. It will be seen hereafter, by the student of these times, how a new term of communion was invented and imposed. It will be seen how a majority sought to impose on a minority the necessity of committing treason, on pain of being cut off from Church privileges. It will be seen how the encouragement and support of a human government, and that an unrighteous one, was made the altar on which the unity and peace of the Church, which we have all sworn to study and to seek, was sacrificed. Presbyterian Assemblies have sometimes, before now, been servile in their adulation of royal persons—but hitherto, in this country, Presbyterian Assemblies have always sympathized with the defenders of regulated freedom. Our fathers of the old Synod, whenever it became necessary to speak about the duties of the citizen, always spoke for the country, and against the tyrant. Their patriotism was an intelligent thing; and they held it a sacred duty of British subjects to defend their rights as Britons. They believed that a free people might not justly nor legitimately be forced to submit to rulers not of their own choosing; and that the free sons of free sires were under a religious obligation to transmit, if possible, to their children, their sacred inheritance of constitutional liberty. But here sat an Assembly,

which made its chief business the passage of "the *loyalty resolutions*"—as if in this Republic loyalty were a thing due from the people to the officers of Government, and not, rather, from the officers of Government, high and low, military and civil, to the people and their Constitution. Alas! for the noble Church that has fallen the victim of an insidious, as well as cruel, fanaticism. Dr. Spring, in that body, was really the cat's-paw of Dr. McMaster. He it was, who, though not a member, yet, through Drs. Thomas and Monfort, and a few other Abolitionists, made himself the master-spirit of that feeble Assembly. The hitherto insignificant elements of positive Abolitionism amongst us rose to the agitated surface of things in that sycophantic body, and, with the hue and cry of patriotism on its lips, and with bitter malice against the South in its heart, triumphed over the timid, uncertain, demoralized opposition that encountered it. Where was Dr. Hodge? He was there, but he was not there as a leader any more. He was there, to be ridiculed, and opposed, and *snubbed*, and put down. Coolly did Dr. Monfort tell him (as we were privately informed) that the election of Professor Moffat to Princeton Seminary, over Mr. Shields (Dr. Hodge's candidate), was the punishment of his opposing the "loyalty resolutions," and was also to teach him that there is a North-West, which will drive him, next year, out of Princeton Seminary! Yes! Dr. Hodge was there, to have his protest answered by no other pen than that of Dr. Thomas, of Ohio—this Old School Presbyterian Assembly actually appointing such a man as that to represent her against Charles Hodge! He was there; but the South, against whose sacred cause he had so lately used all his influence, and upon whose devoted head he had helped to launch the terrors of this atrocious war, was not there, as always hitherto, to sustain him and the other conservatives, against the pressure that was upon

them, and so he and they, and the Old School Presbyterian Church of the North, went down together.

The debate on the state of the country was divided between three different classes of speakers. There was, first, the class led by Dr. Thomas—the man who *dared* the Assembly to shrink in this crisis, and “be blown away like the foam from the crest of the billow.” He was supported by Dr. Anderson, the man who had “dear friends in the army, and wanted to encourage them.” He it was who ridiculed Dr. Hodge’s paper as “milk-and-water sophistry.” Dr. Thomas was supported, also, by Judge Ryerson, who had long been aware of the wicked designs of little South Carolina upon the mighty Union, and who had no respect at all for the “sheer conspiracy” which Southern men call their Government. Then there was Mr. Hastings, who scared the Assembly with the danger of resisting the intense and giant patriotism that had been awakened. It was he that shook in their pale faces the letter “received at noon from a very prominent citizen.” There was, also, Dr. Musgrave, who saw in secession “a monstrous immorality—a ruinous error, that ought to be crushed out, at once and for ever—that ought to be swept from the face, not only of this country, but of the earth;” which terrible words he spake for the “encouragement of all loyal hearts in the South.” His tongue was loud and smooth on the subject of the Government’s gracious protection of Maryland, which he hoped “would soon be extended to some other States.” There was, also, Mr. Waller, drawing out the comparison in full, of secession from Mr. Lincoln’s Government with the apostacy of our first parents from God. He was the man to denounce, on Scripture authority, this “rebellion,” as being “like witchcraft, worthy of death;” and yet the confession came out of him, that, after all, the justice of the death he would inflict depended on the legitimacy of the Government, and that that legitimacy did admit of being doubted. And, finally, there was Dr. Lord, with like ser-

vile adulation of the Government, urging on the Assembly how much the Church owed to it, and how every interest of the Church was in jeopardy if the United States Government were prostrated! Well might he close his speech with an apostrophe to the star-spangled banner, under whose folds he had just put the Church! That eloquent apostrophe, so suitable to the time and the place, lacked only one additional touch, to have made the effect of it perfectly irresistible. Dr. Lord should have *sung the whole song from the platform*, and the Assembly should have joined in it, as we are informed has come to be a common practice in the Northern Churches. Alas! for the Church, when the banner of the Cross is thus displaced, and her Head and Saviour has His honor given to Cæsar! Along with all these speeches of flattery to the Government, put the fact that, once and again, the Cabinet must be asked, by telegrams, to direct the course of this Assembly, and that their wishes are referred to, over and over again, as authority for the action taken. It was a just remark of a writer in the *North Carolina Presbyterian*, that, toward the Government of the United States, the tone of this free-born General Assembly was as abject as that of the most servile English Parliament towards the fiercest of the Tudors, or that of the Roman Senate, in the worst days of imperial despotism, toward the most sanguinary of the Cæsars.

The second class of speakers in the Assembly was composed of Drs. Hodge, Yeomans, Backus, and, perhaps, one or two others. These were the only representatives of the conservative North. In our judgment, the ablest speech of the Assembly, from amongst the men of the North, was that of Dr. Yeomans, and that, we are sorry to add, since we respect Dr. Yeomans so highly, is not saying much. Dr. Hodge's speech had its strong points, too, and they were well put, but it was chiefly a mere appeal to considerations of expediency. Both Dr. Hodge and Dr. Yeomans acknowledged in full the righteousness of the war, and there

was, therefore, no power in them to withstand the demand for an expression of sympathy with the Government. The fierce and savage uprising of the North, to wage a war of invasion and of every horror against the South, simply because these free Southern States have claimed their independence, Dr. Hodge said, is more "sublime and grand than was ever heard of before." And Dr. Yeomans told his people, just before leaving them, that it is a great "struggle which must be fought through, once for all." With such utterances on their lips, how could they expect to keep back the Assembly from declaring *its* sympathy, also, with this "grand and sublime struggle?" Both of them were willing to make the unity of the Church subsidiary to the Union of the States, and Dr. Hodge, especially, urged the continuance of the former chiefly on that ground; thus making Christ's kingdom to be *of this world*; and yet, they both sanctioned the war which renders disunion, both in Church and in State, as permanent as complete.

The third class of speakers in the Assembly, was the small class of Southern Commissioners. We do not desire to intensify at all the feelings of disapprobation with which it is becoming evident that Southern Presbyterians have regarded the course of these brethren generally. We would treat them with all possible forbearance, on the ground of its not being at all certain that they have been justly represented by the reporters. One thing, however, we think is very certain. They put themselves into a false position by appearing at all in the Assembly. Previous to the opening of the Assembly, the war had commenced. Southern men, therefore, had no business at the North, nor in that house. To go to an enemy's country, and to stay there, and to meet in counsel with those enemies, and to take part in their debates—this was, all, or any part of it, bad enough. But to take such a part in these debates as has been ascribed to most of the Southern speakers, is worse than we can well express. We will not attempt to express it. We would

not say too much, lest we should be unjust to them; we would not say too little, lest we should be unjust to that dear and sacred cause which they appear to us to have so much damaged.

We have dwelt upon the sycophantic adulation of the Government by the Assembly; of the voting at the outset to meet next year at Springfield, Illinois, where Mr. Lincoln comes from, and at Washington, where he holds his court; and of the telegrams asking the Administration to direct the proceedings of the body. The reader also remembers how one great Doctor of Divinity held himself forth as the “*representative*” of Mr. Secretary Bates, and as the man who had actually held the correspondence, by telegraph, with that distinguished functionary. Before passing away to another topic, let us just allude to a significant little circumstance mentioned by the *Cincinnati Weekly Gazette*, in its account of the proceedings. It was, indeed, a *little* thing, every way, but it shows the character of the body. It evinces the calibre and the tone of the men who were so loud in hounding on the dogs of war upon the South. It declares how incapable was that Assembly of rising to the seriousness of the occasion and the case before them—how little in earnest they were—though met together in such sad and earnest times. The *Gazette* is speaking of the very afternoon when Dr. Spring’s resolutions were adopted. It says:

Prior to the commencement of the afternoon session, when the house was moderately filled, an artist photographed the scene, the prominent or forward members of the body taking standing positions in the pulpit. The scene may yet become historical with the Presbyterian Church.

With regard to the question of the right and duty of the General Assembly, or of the Synod, or of the Minister in his pulpit, to enjoin upon the people their duty to Government, we have no doubts whatever. We think in nothing was the weakness of the Southern Commissioners more

manifest than in their constant, but vain, efforts to disprove this right and duty. None have been more hostile than we to "political parsons," or to untimely intermeddling with civil affairs by bodies of Ministers. But there are, without doubt, *morals in politics*, which sometimes demand a testimony. There is duty to God in respect to country and to rulers, to ancestors and to posterity; and there is duty, also, directly to all these last. The second table of the law must be preached, as well as the first. And not only may a Church court, as we conceive, testify to the citizens, individually and separately, respecting their civil duties, but that court may sometimes be required to testify to the nation itself. The nation is a moral person. It can sin, and it will be punished if it do not repent. Wisdom, of course, is profitable to direct, when the occasion has come which demands the instruction of the Ministry and the testimony of the Church court respecting the affairs and the duties of the nation. But it does seem to us, that, if there ever was an occasion when Church teachers might legitimately have spoken, and were under obligations to speak, to the Church and to the country, about duty and about sin, that occasion was when the last Assembly met. Just think of the ground which those must take who deny the Assembly's right to speak: Here was, on the theory of the North, a sinful rebellion against the Government, gotten up in certain States where the Assembly had many Ministers and Churches; while, on the theory of the South, here was a wicked war of invasion waging by the Federal Government against free and sovereign States—that Federal Government being the agent of the North, where, also, the Assembly had many Ministers and Churches. The consequences of this struggle were to be dreadful in the highest degree and on the largest scale. Thousands of men were likely to be slaughtered at a time. Widows and orphans were to fill the land. Every species of wickedness was to increase and multiply in the train of the war, and,

in a word, inexpressible misery as well as guilt was involved on the one side, or on the other, or on both. Yet, while the moral sense of all the world is shocked at the idea of such a fratricidal war and its consequences, the General Assembly were to have no moral sense whatever on the subject! The very spectacle of it, the confused noise in their ears of the battle itself, and the warrior's garments rolled in blood before their very eyes, is not to call off their attention for a moment from their more important affairs of routine and red-tape! It seems to us to be the absurdest possible notion of our Church Government, that the Confession of Faith forbids the Church court from speaking out for justice, and right, and peace, in such a case as this. The very idea casts *ridicule*, yes, *reproach*, upon the Assembly, as a body of reverend recluses in white cravats and black coats, too sanctimoniously busy with their own holy or unholy pursuits—too much engrossed with the pious squabbles of the body—to turn an ear for one moment to the cry of a bleeding country. This preposterous conception of the Church's duty arises from simply failing to draw the very obvious distinction between mere politics and a great religious question. If a whole congregation were going out, immediately after service, to a murderous assault upon their innocent neighbors; or if, on the other hand, they were going out to rebel against lawful authority, and if their pastor knew it, ought he to preach not a word of warning against their sin? If the members of all our Churches were joining in this war, on the one side or on the other, and if the Assembly believed that one side was wicked aggression, and the other side rightful resistance, could they, ought they, to be silent, and not testify upon this moral and religious question? We know that an Assembly constituted like ours could hardly have one opinion on such a question, and that whatever it might say must be condemned either at the North or at the South. That only shows how impossible it would be for a body so con-

stituted to hold together in such circumstances—it does not disprove their duty to testify to whatever might seem to them to be right in the premises.

What, therefore, as it seems to us, the Southern Commissioners ought to have attacked, was not the Assembly's undertaking to enjoin the duty due to the Government, but the way in which they performed their undertaking. It ought to have been demonstrated that the Assembly was giving the wrong kind of testimony. There ought to have come forth from amongst the Southern Commissioners some adequate exhibition of the rights of the country from which they came—a country of eleven sovereign States—which had renounced the unfaithful and usurping central agency they joined in creating, and had set up a new Confederacy. What a glorious opportunity it was for some man in the Assembly, whether from the South or from the North, whether from the East or from the West, to have spoken strongly, clearly, fully, adequately, on behalf of the rights of these States; on behalf of regulated liberty—that precious gift of God to so few of the nations, but inherited, through His favor, by Britons, and still more fully by Americans; on behalf of the Constitution—that compact violated on one side, and, therefore, on all sides; on behalf of truth, and justice, and honesty, and fairness, and peace, between all the equal parties to that national compact. If there had been some Dr. Witherspoon there, how he would have stood up for the States against Abraham I., as he stood up for the Colonies against George III. Had the General Assembly but risen to the sublimity of the occasion, and, laying Dr. Spring's resolutions—not on the table, but under it—had they testified, before God, to their people that this is a wicked war which Mr. Lincoln is, without color of constitutional authority, waging against the Confederate States; and had they called on their people to exert themselves on behalf of justice and peace towards their brethren, who desire nothing from the North which

belongs to the North, asking only for their plain right to govern themselves; if the Assembly had spoken in some such sense as this, how becoming had been their action, and how beneficent their influence. We shall be told, of course, by the Southern Commissioners, that it had been altogether in vain for them to have attempted any such full and complete testimony as that, for it would not only not have had any good effect, but it would not have been listened to—that the Assembly would have silenced any such thorough and full defence of the South as treason. Then we say, this only shows that Southern men had no business to be in any such Assembly.

All that we have now said is quite in harmony with the views which we and others of the South have hitherto asserted, and which prevailed in the Assembly of 1860, respecting the unlawfulness of interference by the Assembly with *secular* affairs. This matter was *ecclesiastical*, and that in the highest sense, and for the strongest reasons. And the Assembly could not have innocently omitted to notice it. Their misfortune was, that they did not view it in the only right way—that they did not rebuke the unjust—yea, murderous spirit of Northern Ministers, and Churches, and people. We do not see how any gathering of Ministers and Christian men, in any part of the country, can neglect to speak, loudly and distinctly, their views of this war. It is their own responsibility if they speak on the wrong side. Speak they must, for it is the grandest drama of wickedness, on the one side or on the other, that the respective parties ever were engaged in. And let all sections of what was once the American people be aware of this. Let them look to the stand they are occupying, for it is full of responsibility. Let them do all things in this case in God's name, and in God's fear, for to Him, as Judge amongst the nations, they must give account.

The action of the Synod of South Carolina at its last meeting, often referred to in the Assembly, is altogether in

harmony with what we have always maintained, as well as with what we are now maintaining. It was moved in that Synod that we immediately separate from the Old School Presbyterian Church, because of the Act of 1818, which, with other circumstances, evinced her to be hostile to the South. The ground upon which this course was urged was, that fidelity to the South required it of the Synod. The motion was laid upon the table, by a vote of seventy-seven to twenty-one. A minute explaining this very significant disposal of a motion which had appealed, but in vain, to such a sacred principle, was then adopted, with but one dissenting voice. That minute declared truly that the General Assembly, in its annual meetings, had always accorded both justice and courtesy to the Southern members; and that the Act of 1818 had been adopted by the South of that day, as well as by the North, and virtually had been rescinded in the action of 1845. As to separation, it was said the Synod could not inaugurate it, because that was not the time for such a step, nor was the Synod the proper body to initiate such a movement. It was not for the Church to anticipate the State in dividing from the North; and it was not for the Synod, but for the Sessions and Presbyteries, to take the first steps, whenever the time should come. Then the Synod proceeded to say it was not for her to instruct the citizens in their ordinary political duties; but that the great and solemn question before the State, whether she would give up her inheritance of freedom, and her very being and life, had a religious bearing, and involved duty to God; to ancestors; to posterity; to our very slaves. The Synod doubted not that the State ought to make a stand for the precious rights which were the correlative of all these solemn duties. And she exhorted our Churches and people to go forward in the solemn path of their duty, putting their trust in God, and, also, assured them of her benediction and her prayers.

Of course, the so nearly unanimous adoption of that minute implied plainly that the members of the Synod had studied the question of the rights involved in the controversy between the South and the North—had studied the Constitution of the United States and of their own State, and were convinced that there was involved a precious and sacred inheritance of rights, which could not be surrendered without sin against God. And well had it been for the Assembly, in Philadelphia, had they, also, understood the question at issue, and been prepared to take a proper view of the relative rights and duties of the belligerents in this case. We cheerfully commit the action of the Synod of South Carolina, in comparison with that of the Assembly, to the judgment of impartial posterity.

The Presbyterian Church, Old School, is, therefore, of course, soon to be formally divided. It is now, in one sense, divided already, for there is no more union of feeling between the two parts. The Northern majority have so legislated against us, as to show that in their hearts they are not at one with us; and so legislated against us, as that we certainly can not be at one with them. Now, the question arises, what is it that both *will* soon, and *ought* soon, to divide this Church? Is it these mutual feelings of alienation? Do they, can they, justify actual separation, and the setting up of a new and distinct Presbyterian Church organization? We have no hesitation in answering, No! Such feelings as produce unjust and unkind legislation, and such feelings, too, as it produces, ought to be controlled and corrected. They form no justification of schism.

Is it, then, that the late Assembly has made a term of Church membership which we can not agree to? In ordinary circumstances, we would answer, with equal readiness, No! If the new term they have made were not so peculiar in its nature and bearing, that would undoubtedly be our answer. To make a new term of membership is extra-Constitutional action, and simply null and void. The Gen-

eral Assembly has no power or authority to do any such thing. It has only a judicial power of interpreting and declaring the laws of Christ. But whenever it gives a wrong interpretation of them, no man's conscience is bound thereby. Were it not, therefore, that the "loyalty resolutions" of the Assembly must necessarily affect our position towards our own Government, we would say, unhesitatingly, that they do not render necessary any division of the Church. And, notwithstanding this bearing of the Assembly's action, we are much inclined to the belief that those resolutions do not, of themselves, constitute any necessary or justifying ground of a separation. We might repudiate the resolutions—we might defy the Assembly, as violating the Constitution thereby—and we might still continue in the Church of our fathers. If there were no other and better reason for division, we conceive that this unconstitutional action would neither compel nor justify it. This is not the ground on which, of itself, we, for one, are willing to put our departure. Nor would the additional circumstance suffice, that the Assembly have really reënacted the Act of 1818. That, also, is simply the judgment of a fallible court, which judgment ought to be, and might be, subsequently reversed. All such offences by the Assembly against truth and right, as we have now been considering, do but require the Presbyteries to appear in the next Assembly, and, with the help of the conservative men of the North, if any there now be, endeavor to rectify all these errors. And, if defeated, then it would be our duty to renew the conflict, and hope for some future vindication of the truth to be successful. Just as, if the Assembly were to enact any other heresy, we would not think of therefore giving up our birthright and retiring, until, at least, we had fought some good fighting in its defence. We are satisfied of the entire justice of this position. If the Church had been at liberty to divide whenever any Council or Synod made any unjust or erroneous decree,

she would just have been dividing all the time, from the beginning until now. Synods and Councils have been prone to err. What is a General Assembly, but two or three hundred fallible men, acting for a constituency which may at any time reverse their decisions? Dr. Breckinridge once said, with characteristic point, that God had ordained that the General Assembly should every now and then decree itself *an ass*.

What is it, then, that *must*, and *ought* to divide the Presbyterian Church, Old School? It is the division of the country into two separate nations. No external Church organization of a spiritual Church can properly perform its spiritual functions within the limits of two distinct nations. And the more hostile they become, the more impossible will it be for one Church to work in the bounds of both. There is no need to spend much time in arguing this point. All Church history illustrates the truth of what we say. The Romish Church is no exception, because, in point of fact, she, also, is divided into many distinct national organizations, which are but indirectly connected together through the Pope. The Gallic Church, for example, never has been in any other but this indirect way connected with the Church in Spain or Italy. Each one is fully organized within, by a separate and independent organization, only they are all subject to the same Pope—except when it happens that there are two or three of these. We suppose, in the present case, the Romish dioceses of the North and those of the South will be organized into separate Archbishopsrics. But, whether they shall be so organized or not, the Romish Church is no exception to what we said above, because that Church can not be considered, in the full and high sense of that term, a *spiritual* Church. With her, on the contrary, all is material, mechanical, external. She is a purely visible society, having a visible head on the earth. The union between the members of that Church, the world over, is not spiritual, but external. It does not depend on

the bond of any internal, religious, or moral character. It depends simply on the profession of the same creed, the use of the same sacraments, and the acknowledgment of the same Pope. Within these few and wide limits, therefore, no obstacles to their unity arise from differences of ideas or opinions. The sphere of their Church is not the sphere of the life, or of thought or feeling. Every kind of moral notion may prevail amongst them, even the most opposite ones, and their outward Church union is not thereby disturbed. Quite different is the case with every spiritual Church, where each member is to be united to every other, as well as to an invisible Head, by a faith which appeals to the intellect and to the heart, and which always affects the character. Here there must be identity, in some good degree, of moral judgments, feelings, and sympathies, or the unity is broken. For here opinions are free. Here there is discussion, and here, owing to weakness on one or both sides, there arise prejudices, and these are obstacles to union, and to the accomplishment together of the Church's work. In the case of every such free Church, therefore, having the domain of the intellect and the heart for its sphere of operation and influence, the separation of national interests becomes an obstacle to union, which can not be disregarded. Differences of political organization, therefore, must divide such Churches. There were, in the beginning, the different Churches of Rome, Corinth, Galatia, and Ephesus, etc., etc. No one Church organization can operate successfully under two Governments. The necessity for separation is absolute. But the real unity of the Spirit is no more sacrificed in this case, than when the separation is produced by language, or by race, or by the ocean, or by the ages.

So, also, the case of our own Missionary Synods in India forms no exception. They are but exotics, submitting, of course, necessarily, for a time, to many untoward circumstances and influences. Wait till they take root in the soil,

and we shall see them organize the Presbyterian Church of the Indies.

But we have taken root already, and are no exotics. Our case is that of a Church extending into all parts of this broad land, and the country suddenly disrupted politically. And how can the old organization successfully operate in these two separate Confederacies? This question was settled for the Church, in our apprehension, on the same day which settled it for the country. And, just as it was the earnest wish of the Southern States, in their separation from the North, to take a peaceable departure from their late sisters, and to maintain with them always the most friendly relations, so did we fondly hope that the inevitable separation thus to be brought upon the Church would be a peaceable separation, and no schism. That pleasant dream of a secession for the States which should be peaceable, we confess that we ourselves did dream, and long did we refuse to be waked up from it. We can hardly yet believe that we are awake, and that we find war between the North and South an actual reality. Just so in reference to our dream for the Church. We have been waked up from it, to find ourselves virtually *cut off*, and practically *turned out*. We are in the condition of the Apostles when cast out of the Synagogue. Well, it is not the first exodus God's people ever made. Israel made an exodus from Egypt. It is not the first *Presbyterian exodus*, either. The Free Church of Scotland made an exodus from their National Church, Erastianized. And accepting, as, *in view of our divided nationality*, we all certainly shall accept, that exodus which many Southern Presbyterians consider to be, even otherwise, forced upon us by the Erastianized Church of the North, our humble, but earnest, hearty, and cheerful hope is, that, disowned by the servants, we are acknowledged by the Son and the Lord and Master. This is enough for us. We do not doubt that He has a work for us to do, and that He will enable us to perform it. Our hearts bound forward in the pathway of

this new Presbyterian exodus. We hasten to meet the new and glorious future which seems to rise up before us, and to beckon us onwards.

Our own impressions were, at first, favorable to no immediate action towards the formal separation. We preferred to have the Presbyteries take the needful action at their regular Fall meetings. But we are now convinced that the general and the clamorous call, from so many parts of the South, for a Convention to assemble, without unnecessary delay, and take the necessary steps for organizing a separate Southern Church, is the voice of God on the subject. It is the instinctive demand of the Church's feelings. And the instincts of Zion's heart are apt to be right. It does appear to us, that, having been put into a false position, both by the Assembly and by our own Commissioners, we must not delay at all to set ourselves right. We owe this to our Northern brethren, in so far as it may be possible to reach them by any declarations of ours. We owe it still more to our country—our country, the Confederate States. We must have opportunity to declare, immediately and loudly, with how much indignation we repel the attempt to coerce us to be traitors to her. And still more, if possible, do we owe it to ourselves—to our own convictions and our own feelings, which will not let us rest as the thing now stands—to repudiate, in the most formal and solemn manner possible, and as soon as possible, the attitude which they would have compelled us to assume.

It is a sad thing to have had such an end made of "the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." We think impartial history will testify that the South, in this case, as in the civil disruption, has not been the aggressor. We humbly trust such will be the Master's judgment, also. He is a gracious Lord. We are complete in Him. We again declare our confidence that He will not forsake nor disown us. He will condescend to use us and our poor labors. We have a glorious work to do in these

Confederate States, and in our share of the Foreign Missionary field. Let us gird up our loins for the vigorous discharge of these sacred and delightful obligations!

P. S.—Since the above was sent to press, accounts have reached us of the further and final proceedings of the Assembly.

REMOVAL OF BOARDS FROM PHILADELPHIA.

Dr. DICKSON moved to remove the Board of Education to Baltimore. The Corresponding Secretary was in favor of it.

Mr. WALLER moved to refer the subject to the next Assembly.

Mr. ROBERTSON moved a Committee to consider the propriety of removing the Boards of Education and of Domestic Missions to Pittsburgh, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, or other cities, and to report necessary changes.

After some discussion, in view of the lateness of the day, the whole subject was indefinitely postponed.

REPORT OF BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

Mr. WALLER continued his speech, on the want of economy and the expensiveness of the whole arrangements.

Dr. EDWARDS said, if the Boards had had trouble, they had brought it on themselves. There must be a clear showing; nothing kept under the hand.

Dr. SCHENCK replied, that nothing was hidden in the reports of the Board, save the capital, and this had not been called for in the Assembly till now.

Various efforts to procure a vote of some kind of censure of the Board, were then made by Drs. Edwards and Musgrave, but all failed, and a very favorable report was adopted.

MINUTES OF SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

The exceptions reported by the Committee were taken up *seriatim*.

The first was that "the book has not been sent up for three years."

Agreed to.

The second was "against the statement, by the Synod, that the act of 1818 had been virtually repealed." After some discussion, agreed to.

The third exception was "against the solemn counselling of a popular movement against the Government of the United States."

Dr. HALL moved to add to the exception the words: "Inasmuch as it is inexpedient for the judicatures of our Church to give political deliverances."

Mr. VAILL said he would propose, as an addition to that, these words: "Except in the case of the General Assembly."

Dr. HODGE moved, as a substitute for the third exception, as reported, the following: "In approving these minutes the Assembly is not to be understood as endorsing the action of the Synod in reference to the political course of the State of South Carolina." Adopted.

REVISED BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

Mr. CLARK offered a resolution, directing the Committee on the Revision of the Book of Discipline to meet in Pittsburg, on Tuesday, August 13, at 7, P. M., and that the members present be a quorum.

This resolution seems to have been adopted. It is a virtual displacing of all the Southern members of the Committee, the Chairman, Dr. Thornwell, included.

The following is the letter of Dr. Thornwell, as Chairman of the Committee, read to the Assembly. It is said to have produced very general indications of mingled surprise and derision in the Assembly, many of the members repeating over and over to themselves, in a whisper, its closing expression, "your country and mine."

DEAR BRETHREN: It becomes my duty, as Chairman of the Committee on the Revision of the Book of Discipline, to state the reasons why the orders of the last Assembly have not been complied with. The Committee have been able to have no meeting at all. During the whole of last summer I was absent from the country, and did not return until some time in October. I left immediately after the dissolution of the Assembly.

I intended to call the Committee together about Christmas, but the political troubles, which at that time began to thicken upon us, rendered it inexpedient, if not impracticable. At no time since has it been possible to have a meeting; and, even if the condition of the country had allowed, my health, since the middle of January, has been so poor that I have attempted no public duty of any kind.

I am persuaded, however, that the Church is put to no real inconvenience by not having a report from the Committee of Revision. The Assembly could not consider it. Other issues, much more pressing, and much more solemn, are upon us. This whole subject will have to lie over until more quiet times. Brethren, I invoke upon your deliberations the blessings of the Most High.

I sincerely pray that He may guide you, by the inspiration of His Spirit, into wise and holy measures; that He may save the Church

from every false step; that He may make her a messenger of peace in these troublous times; and that He may restore harmony and good will between your country and mine.

Most truly, yours,

J. H. THORNWELL.

ARTICLE VI.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Biblical Commentary on the Epistles of St. John, in Continuation of the Work of Olshausen. With an Appendix on the Catholic Epistles, and an Introductory Essay on the Life and Writings of St. John.* By Dr. JOHN H. A. EBRARD. Translated by Rev. W. B. POPE, Manchester. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1860; pp. 416, 8vo.

Dr. Ebrard is one of the most learned, earnest and zealous divines of Germany. A Bavarian by birth and education, and a Huguenot by descent, he unites to the impulsive energy of the French, the minute learning of the Germans. He is one of the leading advocates of the Reformed Church in his own country, adopting, as our own standards do, the Calvinistic view of the spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament, but approaching more nearly the Melancthonian than the higher Calvinistic type in his theology. Though in the prime of life, his works have already become numerous. Among the most considerable are his *Critical History of the Life of Christ*; his *Dogmatic Theology*; his *History of the Lord's Supper, from the Apostles down*; his *Collection of the Reformed Liturgies*; his *Lectures on Practical Theology*; his *Commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and on the Apocalypse*. Besides these, he has been a frequent contributor to the *Studien und Kritiken*, and to Herzog's *Encyclopedia*.

The commentary on the Epistles of John exhibits all the learning and heartiness which characterize the author. The first Epistle, which is without the usual salutation and inscription, he regards as a document written to accompany the Gospel, and, as it were, an epistle dedicatory. It is a concentrated and condensed summary of the Gospel of John, the same with it in subject, written at the commencement of the Apostle's exile, for the benefit of the Churches of Proconsular Asia, now deprived of his oral instructions and pastoral supervision. It was written in opposition to the lying doctrines of Cerinthus, a townsman of John at Ephesus, who made of Jesus a mere man, to whom the *Aeon Christ* became united at His baptism, and again separated from Him before His passion. Against Judaic heresies the Gospel of Luke was especially written, and Paul strenuously contended. The Gnostic element was now disturbing the Church, and John, whose mind was contemplative, rather than logical, and whose character was the complement of the other disciples, was reserved for this occasion, to give forth the complement of their exhibition of Christ and His doctrine.

The Commentary of Ebrard on the Epistles of John is, as we might anticipate, learned and thorough. His argumentative defence of his own interpretations against those of his contemporaries, Luecke, Düsterdieck, and Huther, are more minute, perhaps, than the American reader would desire. His doctrinal explanations are not always all we would wish. Still, the student will find this a valuable help to the critical study of the Epistles of John, "which reflect a mind penetrated through and through by the light of the Spirit of God," so that "the expositor, like the readers, hears the cry at the entrance: 'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.'"—Ebrard, p. 41.

2. *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, 1574-1660. Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office.* Edited by W. NOEL SAINSBURY, Esq., Honorary Member of the New England, New York, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina Historical Societies. Under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, and with the sanction of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonial Department. London: 1860; pp. 577, royal 8vo.

This is a publication of great importance in reference to the early history of the Anglo-American Colonies. It rehearses the main substance of the numerous papers touching the early colonization of North America, which are found in the Colonial Office, from Elizabeth to the restoration of Charles II. It embraces a large amount of information, sometimes curious and sometimes authentic. Certain fabulous accounts of the riches of this wilderness are found, such as that "in every cottage pearl is to be met with, in some houses a peck." That about the bar of "St. Maries" fire dragons are to be seen "which make the air very red as they fly." "The streets broader than London streets. Banqueting houses built of crystal, with pillars of massive silver, and sometimes of gold. Pieces of clear gold as big as a man's fist in the heads of some of the rivers. Great abundance of silk worms." Giving, as it does, the contents of the various documents in the Colonial Office, it directs the historian to the original sources of information as to early discoveries on our coast, and the settlements from time to time attempted. It is of especial service, as illustrating the earliest history of Virginia and New England, and the islands and dependencies Britain still holds on these coasts. This volume, however, stops short of the date at which Carolina was effectually settled, and contributes nothing to the elucidation of her history, except an account of the unsuccessful attempt to colonize South

Carolina in the year 1629, by French Protestants, under the directions of Mons. Bellavene and the Baron de Sancé. The colonists were taken to Virginia, and the whole scheme frustrated. Could this publication be encouraged, and brought down to the times of the American Revolution, it would be of the greatest utility in reference to the history of the several States of North America. It is a work, however, of such labor and expense, that it could only be carried to its completion by the aid of Government. America is far more interested in it than Britain. Nothing, however, can be done till this cruel war, which now oppresses us, is at an end.

3. *A New Digest of the Acts and Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.* Compiled by the order and authority of the General Assembly. By Rev. WM. E. MOORE. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee. pp. 633, 8vo.

The preceding is the title of the Digest of the Acts of the General Assembly, as set forth by our New School brethren. It was prepared by a committee appointed by the (New School) Assembly, in 1854, of which the compiler was one. The material, down to the period of the division of the Church, in 1837, '8, is the same, necessarily, with that of our own Church, prepared with such labor, and so satisfactorily, by Rev. Samuel J. Baird. To this compilation the committee of the New School Assembly acknowledge themselves greatly indebted. The work is printed in excellent style, on firm paper, with clean page, and a table of contents and index open and plain to the eye, and remarkably easy for reference. The volume is less in its number of pages than our own Digest. "Much," says the compiler, "has been omitted that is now obsolete, or that was temporary, or that pertains to institutions not

now under our control. For the most part, reports, protests, proposals, and other papers, not the Acts of the Assembly, have been omitted. But where the very words of the records are not used, the fact is signified by brackets."

4. *Commentary on Ecclesiastes, with other Treatises.* By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D. D., Professor of Theology at Berlin. Translated from the German by D. W. SIMON. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1860; pp. 488, 8vo.

Though this volume has been in our hands some months, it has not been convenient for us to notice it hitherto, and this now tardy recognition of it can be of little service to any. Its author is well known as one of the most uncompromising enemies of Rationalism that has yet arisen in Germany, and has dealt it some of the severest blows it has ever met with. His great work on the Old Testament Christology, his masterly defence of the Pentateuch and of Daniel, have given him an established reputation as a man of learning and an able and fearless champion of the Scriptures as the inspired Word of God. The least satisfactory of all his writings is his Commentary on the Apocalypse, which certainly did not add to his reputation as a sober interpreter of prophecy. The reader will find the present work on Ecclesiastes pervaded by a pious spirit, and if he does not agree with him as to its authorship, and the time of its composition, will yet find it a valuable help to the understanding of this deeply interesting, and, to some extent, difficult portion of the Sacred Scriptures. Dr. Hengstenberg does not regard Solomon as the writer of Ecclesiastes. He accepts the view of Grotius and the Rationalists, that its composition belongs to a later age, which he conceives to be the period when the Persians held dominion over the people of God, and they were oppressed under the powers of this world. Wisdom is

introduced as a person speaking to men, in the character of Koheleth, the Assembler (Preacher), and this Koheleth is none other than Solomon himself, presented to our view as the incarnation of wisdom. For our own part, we see nothing in the arguments of Hengstenberg sufficiently convincing to induce us to relinquish the common opinion, which ascribes the book to Solomon as its author, and supposes it to have been composed after his experience of earthly pleasure, as he looked back, humbled and penitent, over a life in which he had strayed far from the path of duty. To us this is the most consistent view of its authorship, though abandoned by most of the modern scholars of Germany. The other treatises contained in this volume are, Prolegomena to the Song of Solomon, a Lecture on the Book of Job, a Lecture on the Prophet Isaiah, an Essay on the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture, and a discussion on the Jews in their relation to the Christian Church. In this last he contends against the Literalists, who hold to a future glorious kingdom of the Jews, and the continued nationality of converted Israel.

-
5. *The Beauty of Immanuel. His Name shall be called Wonderful.* By LEROY J. HALSEY, D. D., author of "Life Pictures from the Bible," "Literary Attractions," etc. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 204, 12mo.

This little volume resembles its predecessor, "Life Pictures from the Bible," and is written in the same easy, descriptive style, which constitutes one of the chief excellencies of the author. The theme is the most noble one: The Wonderful Counsellor, the Light and Life of men. No uninspired pen could do it justice. If one can contribute nothing new on such a subject, it is pleasant to read

what shall be written "touching the King," when the "heart is inditing a good matter," and the words are traced by "the pen of a ready writer."

6. *Words of Wisdom Illustrated and Applied.* Being a Sequel to "Little Words." Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 285, 16mo.

Pleasant stories pleasantly told, full of instruction and counsel, which we hope our youthful readers will ponder and heed.

7. *Cares and Comforts; by the Author of Lame Letty.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821 Chestnut street, Philadelphia. pp. 190, 16mo.

No child could read this capital story without the deepest interest. The author shows how the cares of this life may become comforts, by the influence of religion on the soul. We see its blessed effects here on the lambs of the flock. And the way of salvation is made quite plain in the history of "Little Ruth and her brother Sammy."

The Child's Mission. By Mrs. SARAH S. T. WALLACE. pp. 44, 16mo.

Remarkable Escapes from Peril. pp. 308, 16mo.

A Mother's Prayers Answered. pp. 190, 16mo.

Marion Leslie: or, the Light of Home. With an Introduction by the Rev. H. A. BOARDMAN, D. D. pp. 295, 16mo.

Mackerel Will. By the author of "Gilbert Gresham," etc. pp. 190, 16mo.

These volumes fully warrant the favorable opinion we have already repeatedly expressed of the valuable "Series for Youth," issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, of which they form the continuation.

8. *The New Parasol, and other Books for the Young Children.* American Tract Society.

This is a nice little volume, in 24mo., full of pleasing and interesting narratives, taken both from the Bible and from life. The Parables of our Saviour are explained in a manner suited to the "least and lowest." Also, a description is given, in a condensed form, of the manners, religion, and geographical position of all the heathen countries, calculated to arouse in the minds of the children a desire to send to the benighted heathen the "Lamp of Life," and to have the lost sheep brought back into the fold.

9. *Blind Bartimeus: or, the Story of a Sightless Sinner, and his Great Physician.* By Rev. WILLIAM J. HOGE, D. D. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 257, 18mo.

This admirable little work has been noticed by us before. It contains many instructive lessons, both for the converted and the unconverted. It points the believer to holiness, to duty, and to God; and points the unbeliever to a Saviour. All the barriers which the sinner has built up to shield himself from the darts of conscience, it throws down, and so leaves him bereft of his mock humility.

Then it shows him that Jesus is sufficient for all sinners, as well as that His grace alone can save.

An account is given of Blind Bartimeus, and a comparison drawn between his condition and that of the sinner, blinded by sin, and then healed by the Saviour's touch.

The book opens with the narrative as recounted by the three Evangelists, with some remarks of the author, by way of reconciling the seeming contradictions in the several accounts.

10. *Marcia and Ellen, the Drunkard's Children.* By Mrs. M. J. P. S. American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 126, 18mo.

This is a very interesting little work, founded on fact. The story is told in a simple and easy style, which will not fail to please our little readers. The awful consequences of intemperance are depicted in a very striking manner, and the powerful influence of trust in God is shown in the history of the two young heroines.

11. *The Flower Boy of the Prairie.* American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 102, 18mo.

The hero of this story presents a model to all boys, and his history is very attractive. It is an account of one of the families of the earliest settlers of the Western States, and bears the additional charm of its main facts being well authenticated.

12. *Sketches from the History of Jericho, in Illustration of the Power of Faith.* American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 106, 18mo.

This volume is designed to illustrate the power of faith. It is got up in a very attractive form. An interesting biog-

raphy of a number of the Bible heroes may be gleaned from its pages, in connection with the history of that far-famed city. We recommend it to the large as well as the small children.

13. *The Rocket*. American Tract Society. pp. 118, 16mo.

A most interesting account of the origin of railways and locomotives; and of George and Robert Stephenson, father and son, the wonderful engineers who were chiefly instrumental in bringing them to their present perfection, and introducing them into common use. Let all the boys and girls get it and read it.

How the Tract Society came to publish it, we can not tell. It is no more *religious* than a narrative of engineering skill might be expected to be; and the few pages from a Sabbath Manual tacked to it at the close, to supply the felt defect, do not mend the matter.

The Jail-Bird, etc. American Tract Society. pp. 128, 16mo.

May Coverly. American Tract Society. pp. 224, 16mo.

14. *Coins, Medals, and Seals, Ancient and Modern: Illustrated and Described*. Edited by W. C. PRIME, Author of "Boat Life in Egypt and Nubia," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861; pp. 292.

This is a beautifully printed volume, on tinted paper; and is well fitted to meet the editor's design. It is his "desire to encourage in the young a taste for numismatic study, and to discourage the folly of collecting worthless pieces of metal, whose sole value is in their scarcity, and

on which so much time and money have been expended." He sets out with a brief sketch of the origin of coins, and the progress in the art of coinage among ancient and modern nations. A large portion of the work is properly devoted to American coins, of which numerous representations are given. Many valuable hints are offered to young collectors, with price lists of English and American coins; the latter being quite full, descending even to election medals, political tokens, and temperance and tobacco medallets. The distinctive value of the volume rests upon the portion devoted to American numismatics and the well-executed illustrations, amounting to several hundred, which will be especially useful to those who have not access to large and well-arranged collections. The remainder appears to be chiefly taken from H. NOËL HUMPHREY'S excellent Coin Collector's Manual.

15. *The Children's Picture-Book of Quadrupeds and other Mammalia.* Harper & Brothers. 1861; pp. 276, square 16mo.

The title sufficiently indicates the character of this book. It is a vast improvement on works of the same kind which we read in our boyish days, most of which we have been obliged carefully and laboriously to forget. The scientific details in this are reliable, and are suitably relieved by anecdote, so as to keep alive the attention of the young reader.

16. *The Children's Bible Picture-Book.* Harper & Brothers. 1861; pp. 321, square 16mo.

We would not hesitate to commend this volume, also, if it were not for the pictures. These ought, surely, either to gratify the love of the beautiful, or cultivate the taste,

or convey useful knowledge; but in this case, very few of them can be regarded as accomplishing any one of these objects. Some of the originals, of which these are copies (?), are among the finest works of art in existence; but we look in vain for aught to remind us of their beauty here. See, for example, the mangled distortion of Da Vinci's *Last Supper*, not to mention others. As to the instruction they may afford, we would rather not teach our children to look upon a figure bearing a mediæval banner as a truthful representation of Christ when He appeared to Mary; or upon a monk with shaven crown as a picture of the Martyr Stephen. Many of the other engravings are even more objectionable than these. Both this volume and the last are admirably printed, on tinted paper.

17 *Stories of Rainbow and Lucky.* By JACOB ABBOTT. Harper & Brothers. 1861; pp. 192, 16mo.

Rainbow is a negro boy, and Lucky, his intelligent horse. The design of the tale is to exhibit the benefits we would derive from social equality with the negro. Rainbow is an angel, as the negro always is to such pseudo-philanthropists as Jacob Abbott. The book presents the most degrading type of abolitionism.

ARTICLE VII.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

I. AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEWS.—CONTENTS.

- I. *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, April, 1861: Edited by Benj. J. Wallace and others. Article I. The Gallican Church. II. City Churches. III. The Imprecatory Psalms. IV. Philological Examination of Isaiah VI., 9, 10. V. The Sceptre of Judah. VI. The Relation of the Church to Reforms. VII. The Arrow-Headed Inscriptions. VIII. Motley's History of the Netherlands. IX. Literary and Theological Intelligence—1. England. 2. France. 3. Germany. X. Notices of New Books.
- II. *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, April, 1861: Edited by Chas. Hodge, D. D. Article I. The Physical Training of Students. II. The Mode of Baptism. III. Covenant Education. IV. Rawlinson's Herodotus. V. The Apostolic Benediction. VI. The Church and the Country. Short Notices.
- III. *Evangelical Review*, April, 1861: Article I. The Ministerium Question. II. Baccalaureate Address. III. The Work of the Education Society. IV. The Lord's Prayer. V. List of Publications by Lutherans in the United States. VI. Emmaus Orphan House. VII. A Proposed Plan for a General Union of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, etc. VIII. Exposition of II. Peter 3: 12. IX. Notices of New Publications.
- IV. *Christian Review*, April, 1861: E. G. Robinson, Editor. Article I. Archetypes. II. The Greek Church. III. The Inspiration of the Apostles. IV. The New Trial of the Sinner. V. Conant's Matthew. VI. Immateriality of the Soul. VII. Berkeley and his Works. VIII. Notices of Recent Publications. Theological and Literary Intelligence.
- V. *Theological and Literary Journal*, April, 1861: Edited by David N. Lord. Article I. The Handwriting on the Wall, Daniel V. II. The Autobiography of A. Carlisle, D. D. III. Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapters LXIV., LXV., and LXVI. IV. The Sense of $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu$, Acts III. 19. V. The Benefits of a Knowledge of the Purposes God has Revealed in Respect to His Kingdom. VI. Pontius Pilate. VII. Indications that the Sedimentary Strata were formed Simultaneously, not in Succession. VIII. R. F. Burton's Travels in the Lake Regions of Africa. IX. The Lessons Taught by the late Extraordinary Political Events, and the Catastrophes to which they are Tending. X. The Study of the Prophetic Scriptures Specially a Duty at the Present Time. XI. Literary and Critical Notices.
- VI. *New Englander*, April, 1861: Article I. The Lives of the Haldanes, as illustrating the Rise of Congregationalism in Scotland. II. The Present Attitude of the Church toward Critical and Scientific Inquiry. III. The Acquisition of the Amoor. IV. Missions in India. V. Motley's United Netherlands. VI. The Pulpit. VII. Guizot's General History of Civilization. VIII. George Müller and the Life of Trust. IX. The Martyrs under Queen Elizabeth. X. Dr. Bushnell's Christian Nurture. XI. Ralph Waldo Emerson on the Conduct of Life. XII. Notices of Books.

- VII. *Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, April, 1861: Article I. The Conflict of Modern Philosophy. II. Thomas Carlyle. III. Thomas Babington Macaulay. IV. Nast's Commentary. V. Methodism in Canada. VI. Philological Study of the Latin Language. VII. Lady Maxwell. VIII. Baptism and Church-Membership of Children. IX. Brief Reviews. X. Notes and Correspondence. XI. Repertory.
- VIII. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, April, 1861: D. D. Whedon, D. D., Editor. The Order of Nature and Miracles. Atmospheric and Oceanic Currents. Buddhism: Its Origin and Results. Old Mackinaw. The Pauline use of the Word *ἀπὸς* as it Applies to the Doctrine of Depravity. The English Language. McCosh on the Intuitions. Barth's Northern and Central Africa. The State of the Country. Foreign Religious Intelligence. Foreign Literary Intelligence. Synopsis of the Quarterlies. Quarterly Book Table.
- IX. *DeBow's Review*, July, 1861: Article I. The Times and the War. II. The Constitution of the Confederate States. III. Our Position and that of our Enemies. IV. The Future of our Confederation. V. Chapters from an Unpublished Novel. VI. Sea-Coast Defences. VII. The Path of Disunion. VIII. The Belligerents. IX. Modern Warfare. X. The Southern Confederacy. Department of Commerce. Miscellany. Editorial.
- X. *American Theological Review*, April, 1861: Edited by Rev. Henry B. Smith, D. D. Article I. Annihilation. II. Slavery among the Ancient Hebrews. III. Rothe's Address on Philip Melancthon. IV. The Old Testament in the New. V. Christian Zeal. VI. The New Latitudinarians of England. VII. The Sinaitic Manuscript. Theological and Literary Intelligence. Literary and Critical Notices of Books. News of the Churches and of Missions.
- XI. *Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository*, April, 1861: Edited by Edwards A. Park and Samuel H. Taylor. Article I. The Cross in Nature and Nature in the Cross. II. The Necessity of the Atonement. III. *Epistola ad Rusticum Apologetica*. IV. Speculation and the Bible. V. Exposition of Zechariah XIV. VI. The Salvation of Infants. VII. The Genealogy of Christ. VIII. Editorial Correspondence. IX. Notices of New Publications.
- XII. *Pacific Expositor*, May, 1861: Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., Editor. The Centurion of Cesarea. An Efficient Ministry. The Launch, and Life Machinery. The Princeton Review. Across the River. Presbytery of California—Report on the State of Religion. Training of Youth in California. Are all the Churches to divide? Horrors of Civil War. Attacks upon the Expositor. Mercantile Library of San Francisco. Rev. Dr. Phelps. State of the Country. Rev. Wilson Blain. Brain-work office. "Spoiling for a Fight." Miscellaneous Notices. Rev. N. B. Klink. Rev. John Hall—Religious Liberty—Christian Advocate—Every Little Helps—Apology. Fine Opportunities Offered. The Dormitory System. The Ancient Classics. Rev. Dr. Murray—The City College. The Presbyterian Sunday School Visitor. Prize Premium. Notices of New Books.
- XIII. *Southern Episcopalian*, May, 1861: Edited by Rev. C. P. Gadsden and Rev. J. H. Elliott. Miscellaneous. Poetry. Editorial and Critical.

II. BRITISH PERIODICALS.

- I. *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1861: Article I. Dixon's Personal History of Lord Bacon. II. The Republic of Andorre. III. Political Diaries. IV. Eton College. V. Remains of Alexis de Tocqueville. VI. Essays

- and Reviews. VII. Autobiography and Letters of Mrs. Piozzi. VIII. The Fables of Babrius. IX. Forbes's Iceland. X. Election of President Lincoln and its Consequences.
- II. *London Quarterly Review*, April, 1861: Article I. The Pearls and Mock Pearls of History. II. Euphuism. III. Lord Dundonald. IV. Spiritual Destitution in the Metropolis. V. German, Flemish, and Dutch Art. VI. African Discovery. VII. Lord Stanhope's Life of Pitt. VIII. Indian Currency, Finance, and Legislation. IX. Iron Manufacture.
- III. *Westminster Review*, April, 1861: Article I. Mr. Kingsley on the Study of History. II. The Sicilian Revolution. III. Voltaire's Romances and their Moral. IV. The Universities and Scientific Education. V. Early Intercourse of England and Germany. VI. The Cotton Manufacture. VII. Maine on Ancient Law. VIII. Eton. IX. Austria and her Reforms. X. Contemporary Literature.
- IV. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, May, 1861: The Ministry and the Budget. Mrs. Beauchamp's Vengeance. Motley's History of the Netherlands. The Euthanasia of the Ottoman Empire. The Executor. The Origin of Species—A New Song. Life of the Right Hon. William Pitt, by Earl Stanhope.

III. FRENCH PERIODICALS.

- I. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Mars, 1861: Paris. I. Valvèdre, première partie, par M. George Sand. II. L'Atelier de Phidias, Étude tirée de l'Antique, par M. Beulé, de l'Institut. III. L'Expédition de Garibaldi dans les Deux-Siciles. Souvenirs et Impressions personnelles.—I.—La Sicile, par M. Maxime Du Camp. IV. L'Agitation Allemande et le Danemark, par M. A. Geffroy. V. De Exploitation de la Propriété Foncière et de la Vie Rurale en France, par M. L. Villermé. VII. Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—VII.—Les Théories Polygénistes, le Croisement des Groupes Humains, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VI. Les Shikarees, Chasses dans l'Inde, Entretiens Cynégétiques du Capitaine Henri Shakspeare. VIII. Poésie.—Le Rêve d'une Reine d'Asie, par M. André Lefèvre. IX. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X. Essais et Notices.—Affaires de Pologne, par M. Saint-Marc Girardin. XI. Affaires d'Espagne et le Ministère O'Donnell, par M. Ch. de Mazade. XII. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- II. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Avril, 1861: Paris. I. Valvèdre, seconde partie, par M. George Sand. II. La Californie en 1860, ses Progrès et sa Transformation, par M. L. Simonin. III. L'Expédition de Garibaldi dans les Deux-Siciles, Souvenirs et Impressions personnelles.—II.—Les Calabres, par M. Maxime Du Camp. IV. Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—VIII.—Les Théories Polygénistes et M. Agassiz, dernière partie, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. V. La Politique du Libre Échange.—I.—Transformation Économique de l'Angleterre, par M. André Cochut. VI. Les Suffrages d'un Penseur Italien.—Leopardi et sa Correspondance, par M. Charles de Mazade. VII. Les Voyageurs en Orient.—VIII.—Des Turcs et de la Condition des Chrétiens en Turquie d'après une Enquête confidentielle du Gouvernement Anglais, par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Académie Française. VIII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX. Revue Musicale.—Le *Tannhauser* de M. Richard Wagner, par M. P. Scudo. X. Essais et Notices.—Le Système Pénitentiaire Irlandais. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- III. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Avril, 1861: Paris. I. Les Peintres Flamands et Hollandais en Flandre et en Hollande.—Rembrandt et Van der

- Helst, les Hollandais, par M. L. Vitet, de l'Académie Française. II. l'Outrage du 4 Janvier 1842, Histoire d'un Coup d'État avorté, d'après des Documents nouveaux, par M. E.-D. Forgues. III. Valvédre, troisième partie, par M. George Sand. IV. Le Mormonisme et les États-Unis, par M. Elisée Reclus. V. L'Expédition de Garibaldi dans les Deux-Siciles, Souvenirs et Impressions personnelles.—III.—Cosenza et la Basilicate, par M. Maxime Du Camp. VI. La Russie dans le Caucase.—II.—Les Peuples Montagnards, par M. E. Dulaurier. VII. L'Échelle Mobile devant le Corps Législatif, par M. L. de Lavergne, de l'Institut. VIII. La Littérature Nouvelle.—Des Caractères du Nouveau Roman, par M. Emile Montégut. IX. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X. Essais et Notices.—Le Progrès Agricole dans le Bocage, par M. Henri Proust. XI. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- IV. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Mars, 1861 : Paris. Sommaire : La Mission Évangélique et l'Italie. Marguerite de Valois, reine de Navarre. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois—La question romaine.—Le dernier écrit du M. Louis Veuillot.—Le crise aux États-Unis ; un discours du nouveau président.—La doctrine de Hegel appréciée par M. Schérer.—*L'Ouvrière*, par Jules Simon.
- V. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Avril, 1861 : Paris. Sommaire : Le Cantique des Cantiques. Marguerite de Valois. Bulletin Bibliographique.—*Voyage en Terre Sainte*, par F. Bovet. Revue du Mois.—La célébration de la passion et les mandements des évêques.—Condamnation de la civilisation moderne, par l'Encyclique papale. Un grand parti à prendre pour l'Église.—Publication des œuvres complètes de M. de Montalembert.—Progrès du véritable individualisme.—Réponse à quelques attaques.—Grave situation des Chrétiens de Syrie.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 3.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXI.

ARTICLE I.

THE BATTLE OF FORT SUMTER: ITS MYSTERY AND MIRACLE—GOD'S MASTERY AND MERCY.

When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it.—Deut. 20 : 10, 12. Also, 2 Chron. 32 : 5-8; Ps. 22 : 7-9; Is. 25 : 11, 12; Num. 31 : 49; Is. 29 : 8, 4.

We have been called together to the sanctuary—the house of prayer, of promise, and of God's presence and powerful interposition—originally by the generally expressed sentiments of this community, and more recently by the unanimous voice of our Southern Congress, and the proclamation of the President of the Confederate States, and our own Government. Never was there a louder appeal, and never a more imperious necessity. We have been coerced into a war. It is a religious, and yet an irreligious and anti-Christian, war. We have crossed swords with the Northern confederacy over the Bible. We have met each other face to face at the same altar, invoked fire from heaven on each other, and appealed to the God of battles, to whom belongeth vengeance, to avenge us against our adversaries. The fearful guilt and amenability to the righteous judg-

VOL. XIV., NO. III.—47

ment of God is confidently transferred, by the judgment of each party, to the other, and Heaven's impartial tribunal appealed to for its infallible and inexorable verdict. The Word and providence of God are appealed to, with self-conviction, by both parties. This is a religious country, and religion is made to lend its sanction, and to consecrate the war as holy and sacred. This is a Christian land, and Christ is now entreated to send—not peace, but a sword. This is a Protestant nation, and yet liberty of conscience, of thought, and speech, and action, can be maintained by eleven sovereign States, and ten millions of its free-born citizens, only at the point of the bayonet, the edge of the sword, and the flash of dread artillery. This is a land of freedom, where thirty-four sovereign States or nationalities were united, by voluntary compact, in a constitutional confederacy, for the greater security of their individual sovereignty, by providing for the equal and impartial interest of each and all; and yet eleven of these can confederate together, under a similar compact, for the preservation of their own original and inherent rights, and the prevention of an ever-aggravating political controversy and national strife, by resisting unto blood; and conquering a peace, from some twenty States, and as many millions of professing republicans and Christians, now in arms to subjugate, enslave, or annihilate us.

All forms of religion, Jewish and Christian, and all forms of Christianity, Romish and Protestant, High Church and Low, are now found ranged side by side, under common leaders and common chaplains, and uniting in acts of common worship, praise and prayer.

What a spectacle to God, to angels, and to the world! What lamentation in heaven! What a jubilee in hell! What a triumph to despotism and infidelity! See how these Christians hate one another, and how Republicans, by a sectional majority, take the Government out of the hands of a million majority, and put it into the hands of a mil-

itary despotism; which sets aside the Supreme Court; tramples on the Constitution; ignores, and even opposes Congress; against all constitutional authority sets up Scott as a military dictator; calls for seventy-five thousand and accepts two hundred and fifty thousand troops; proclaims war; creates a self-chosen military Board to supercede State authorities; declares martial law; sets at defiance the fundamental right of *habeas corpus* and the decrees of Courts, even of the Supreme Court; abolishes trial by jury; not only raises armies, but orders their number and term of service, and compels them to take a test oath of allegiance; builds, purchases and hires ships of war; mans, equips, and gives them secret and peremptory orders; blockades ports of States still declared to be in the Union; divides such States into military districts; takes military possession of Maryland, against the declarations of her authorities; shoots down her citizens, forcibly seizes her arms, dwellings and property; imprisons her citizens without charge or trial; establishes a hostile camp commanding Baltimore, and opens the batteries of Fort McHenry on the city; takes military possession of St. Louis, and shoots down men, women and children in her streets; foments and aids civil war in Virginia, Kentucky, Texas, and Missouri; invades Virginia, and takes military possession of Hampton and Alexandria, where it brutally murders a peaceable citizen defending his own house, family and property against an infamous soldiery who were permitted to rob and pillage an unarmed and unresisting population, and to outrage helpless women; has destroyed public property in ships, buildings and forts, to an amount of some twenty millions of dollars, and involved the country, even in the period of a few months, in a loss of not less than one thousand millions of dollars; which has justified the cowardly assassination of a resident citizen of Washington, at the door of his own house, to which he had been summoned for the cold-blooded purpose of murder; hung,

without trial, a merchant of Hampton, Virginia, for shooting an officer who took forcible possession of his store and goods, and struck him in the face with his drawn sword; stripped a gentleman of the same town stark naked, and in that condition marched him as a prisoner to Fortress Monroe; destroyed crops and houses, and other property, in a single county, and in a single week, to the extent of five hundred thousand dollars; commended the retention of all fugitive slaves; attempted through a slave cook to poison the food of the soldiery; plots the assassination of President Davis; violated all the confidential sanctities of the telegraph and the post-office; established a reign of terror, by a system of espionage and threats, over men and women, over the press and free speech; and against all law, human and divine, is now proceeding, unless God prevent, to carry devastation throughout the South, until it is brought into prostrate subjection; who privateers, while proclaiming it to be piracy and worthy of death; and who employs mercenary foreign hirelings to invade, ravage, and destroy unarmed and unsuspecting towns of a neutral State, shooting its inhabitants, and barbarously trampling and kicking to death an infirm old man, eighty years of age.

ALL THIS, and MORE, has been done within the space of a few weeks. All this has been perpetrated, after the refusal of power, even by an almost exclusively *Republican Congress*, and without waiting for another, which is called only to ratify these acts, and prostrate themselves and the Constitution before the usurping despot, and while the Constitution, which Lincoln swore to "preserve, protect, and defend," neither authorizes *him nor Congress* to make war against a State, much less against eleven, and, we may say, fourteen States, such power having been expressly withheld by its framers, after full deliberation. Mr. Lincoln is, therefore, not only a usurper and a military despot, but a perjured traitor, as is now declared by the recent judg-

ment of Chief Justice Taney, who administered to him the above solemn oath, in the presence of multitudes, and before the righteous tribunal of Heaven's avenging justice. Military officers are permitted in Virginia to command the silence of the press; prisoners are detained at Washington who surrendered under protest against violated faith, and refused a hearing, although taken by a subordinate officer while preparing to evacuate Alexandria within the time agreed upon, under a flag of truce sent from the *Pawnee*, the commanding officer declaring that he knew of no agreement. This unscrupulous and audacious tyrant sanctions acts of military dictatorship which transcend the power of any monarch upon earth, and overwhelm in oblivious ruin *magna charta*, the bill of rights, *habeas corpus*, trial by jury, and every right for which Englishmen and our fathers have contended, unto blood, for ages past. Might now makes right, and unchained devils, with all the shameless passions of brutish beasts, are let loose to ravish and ravage, even neutral States. Not only at Alexandria, but at Hampton, are these rascalities perpetrated, and near Norfolk, a father was compelled to witness the brutal outrage of his own daughter, a young lady of sixteen years of age.

“Oh, thou Almighty! awful and supreme!
Redress, revenge an outraged nation's wrongs!
Shower down your curses on the tyrant's head!
Arise, the Judge, display your vengeance on him!”

Such, alas! is the opprobrious spectacle now exciting the contumely and ridicule of patriots, philanthropists and Christians throughout the world. The war upon the South now is, not to subject them to the Government and Union of the United States, as they existed, but to a new Government—without law or constitution—fanatical, remorseless and tyrannical.

To sustain us in encountering such a war, against such an enemy, we must be able to satisfy our conscience, from

God's Word, that we may properly pray for and expect God's powerful providence to be with us, to guide and govern our counsels, give efficiency to our plans, and valor and victory to our armies.

As to the rectitude of our defensive war, we propose to consider it hereafter, as the effort has been very extensively made, by clergymen at the North, to justify the aggressive war of the Northern Government, and to condemn ours as rebellious, and as exposed to the righteous and explicit condemnation of God.

On this occasion, we will restrict our argument, and your attention, to the glorious victory of Fort Sumter, considered, first, as a signal proof of the powerful providence of God; and, secondly, as a pledge and promise of God's continued providence and protection over us.

However minute and multiplied the wheels of human events, there is a Spirit that animates them, and a divine Redeemer who overrules and disposes all their revolutions to the accomplishment of His wise and preconcerted purposes. The government of this world of ours—sinful, chaotic and rebellious as it is—is upon His shoulder, and all power, over all flesh, is put into His hands. He supports all, permits all, restrains all, and limits all. He protects His friends, punishes His and their enemies, and rewards His people's confidence and services. Christ, however, thus regulates all things, not by direct and immediate control, but through the instrumentality of angels, who are sent forth as ministering spirits; by evil and lying spirits, who are permitted to delude His enemies; and of good and wicked men, who fulfill His purposes while pursuing their own ends.

Holy and pure, Christ makes these wheels "full of eyes," wisely and judiciously to work together for His glory and the good of His people. Supreme and sovereign, profound, inscrutable, irresistible, and infallible, He harmo-

nizes promises and providences, and providences with providences, in infinite wisdom, love, and power.

It is, therefore, a most clear and Christian duty to recognize, admire, and adore this providence; to observe it carefully; remember it gratefully; duly to appreciate it, and heartily and humbly to acknowledge it, not only in the thanksgiving of the lips, but also in the consecrated devotion of our living energies. Such recognition of providence will fill the heart with praise for the goodness and mercy manifested by the Lord our Redeemer in his innumerable interpositions for our preservation and deliverance. It will impart singular confidence in all future exigencies. It will secure Christ's continued presence and powerful aid, in answer to our prayers, and in conjunction with our efforts. It will inspire a sweet tranquillity, in reposing on Him who only maketh us to dwell in safety.

But if all this is true of ordinary providences, how much more is it true of such as are extraordinary. Extraordinary providences are instructive warnings, of great importance in God's government of the world, and to be very solemnly considered. "The voice of the Lord crieth out unto the city, and the men of wisdom shall see His name." "Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?" The true believer will ever say—"The Lord hath wrought all our works in and for us." Moses, by Divine direction, wrote a memorial of the victory over Amalek, as the result and reward of prayer, and built there an altar, with the inscription—"The Lord is my Banner." The Jews established the feast of Purim to commemorate their signal deliverance from Haman's purposed destruction, as "an anniversary throughout every generation, every family, every province, and every city, that those days of Purim should not fail from amongst the Jews, nor the memorial of them perish from their seed." Several Psalms are entitled "To Bring to Remembrance;" and

many of the names of places were mementoes of God's providences—as, Bethel, “the house of God;” Beer-lahairoi, “the well of him that liveth and looketh on me.” God also is called by titles which have the same moral purpose. He is called Jehovah Jireh, “the Lord will provide;” Jehovah Nissi, “the Lord is my banner;” Jehovah Shalom, “the Lord send peace;” Jehovah Shamruch, “the Lord is there;” Jehovah Zidkenu, “the Lord my righteousness;” and Ebenezer, “hitherto hath the Lord helped us.” The Lord also assumes such titles to Himself, as, when he calls Himself “the Lord that brought Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees;” “the Lord that brought them out of Egypt;” “the Lord that gathered them out of the North country.”

I.

We proceed, therefore, to establish the first position, and to show that in the events connected with the occupation, siege and fall of Fort Sumter, and the unconditional surrender of its garrison, we have a signal display of the powerful providence of God. The event is in every way wonderful, marvellous, and only not miraculous, though all the more stupendous, that all was accomplished by natural causes and human agency.

The fort itself is considered by General Scott as one of the strongest in the whole country. Mr. Russell compares it to Sevastopol. Major Anderson, and military men generally, have regarded it as commanding the whole harbor, and the city also. Mr. Russell is of opinion that no navy in the world could resist it, and that every fortification erected against it might easily have been destroyed.

It was, therefore, universally considered impregnable, and its reduction impossible, either by bombardment or assault, except at a fearful loss of life. It was repeatedly declared that the whole power of South Carolina could not conquer Fort Sumter in forty-five weeks, and that it would

annihilate and silence all our batteries in an hour or two. This Major Anderson very foolishly published, on more than one occasion, and his officers also. It was, indeed, the belief he could shell and destroy our city.

Major Anderson expressed perfect assurance of his ability to consummate these threats to his Government; declared that to do so he required no reinforcement or supplies; and warned our authorities against the fatal and suicidal policy they were pursuing. Mr. Russell says: "He held all our fortifications in professional contempt;" and he declared he only required an hour to silence them every one.

After examination, it was the reported opinion of General Beauregard that the fort could be taken by bombardment, but that it was a work of time; and that an assault, if not impracticable, was both highly dangerous and doubtful. In this view Major Ripley had previously concurred.

The facts fully justify these views. A parapet sixty feet high, with the largest kind of guns *en barbette*, commanded vertically every interior position and movement of his opponents, while the remainder, of seventy-five guns, swept the horizon within twelve-feet thick walls and the most impregnable casemates. To man these guns and mortars, he had one hundred and nine men, who actually worked them. For three months he was busy in strengthening the walls, closing up the entrance and port-holes, preparing loop-holes for sharpshooters, and grenades and rocks for assault; in undermining the wharf, and arranging interior guns so as to sweep the entrance, and traverses for the protection of his barbette guns. It was, also, confidently asserted by Northern papers that he had been amply reinforced, and supplied with all kinds of stores, and if he wanted—as Mr. Russell, on the very doubtful testimony of Doubleday (or Foster), affirms—requisite instruments for sighting his guns, it was not for want of opportunity to bring them with him when he first dishonorably entered

the fort, with two ship-loads of materials, provisions and drink, selected by himself; nor because any principle of honor prevented him from forming secret plots with Mr. Fox, and other emissaries of Lincoln, who, under false and treacherous disguises, were permitted to visit him, for his reinforcement and the destruction or subjugation of those who were relying on his honor, and supplying, with liberal hand, not only his wants, but luxuries, also. Besides, to counterbalance any such disadvantages, Major Anderson had long practical experience as a teacher and author of practical gunnery, having been the instructor of General Beauregard himself; having for months drilled and practiced his men, and having provided for each gun carefully written instructions, besides the marks referred to by Mr. Russell.

Major Anderson had pledges, also, of coöperation and reinforcement as soon as hostilities commenced. And when he refused to surrender, he knew that a fleet of five vessels, with six thousand troops, muffled boats and oars, and every possible preparation for landing cavalry, and infantry, and flying artillery, were due at our harbor on April 11th or 12th, and he saw them within hailing distance during the whole time of the engagement. Indeed, I could plainly see them, in company with thousands of others, from the Battery, while a favorable wind, clear sky, the signals from the fort, and the sympathies and loud imprecations of every spectator, invited and urged their approach.

To meet this fleet, some six or seven thousand men were posted at various convenient positions on the islands, as if to point out the best landing-places, and welcome them with warm and very substantial salutations; while not more than two hundred and fifty men manned the batteries which were actually employed against Fort Sumter, and these almost entirely raw and inexperienced, and with no other protection than the contemptuously despised and

hastily extemporized batteries. Two of the most prominent of these were, moreover, very generally considered to be mere slaughter-pens.

The taking of Fort Sumter had been, for months, the subject of universal thought, conversation and planning, and had awakened increasing solicitude and doubt as to its practicability, except by the fearfully destructive method of assault. Even after the firing of Friday was over, this opinion was generally expressed among the crowd, many of whom were ready and eager to join in an assault, which was projected by the citizens, if permitted by the military authorities. It was on Saturday morning, April 14th, that four thirty-two pounders *en barbette* were put up in presence of the crowd on the Battery, in addition to five twenty-four pounders already in position, with ammunition and every needful appliance at hand, and manned by the Citadel Cadets, who were in camp on the Battery Green, with lines formed and sentries on duty. This evinced that the enemy most dreaded was the fleet, and that the post of greatest and of reliably anticipated danger, and of most honorable exposure, was designedly held by such companies as the Washington Light Infantry, the South Carolina College Cadets, the Zouaves—each largely and most conspicuously represented by members of this congregation—and by similarly exposed companies on Morris Island and its inlets.

The hazardous magnitude of the enterprise of encountering Fort Sumter, under all the circumstances detailed, is demonstrated by the views expressed since the event throughout this country and Europe. It has been regarded as without a parallel, and incredible, that such an arduous achievement should have been accomplished without loss of life. The course pursued by critics has, therefore, been, universally, either to diminish its importance by denying the strength of the fort and of Major Anderson's position, or to deny the truthfulness of our reports. And hence, to this very day, various witnesses are found testifying to the fact

of some thousand men having been killed, including Gen. Beauregard. A telegraph was actually read, amid a tumult of acclamation, from his pulpit, by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, to the effect that Fort Moultrie was dismantled, every other battery silenced, a great number killed, and the fleet inside the harbor.

Now, this incredulity was perfectly natural and necessary. It was fully shared in by every inhabitant of Charleston and of the South. Among the spectators who listened to the confused noise and shouts of the battle, who saw the white smoke rising from the cannon's mouth at every fateful discharge, who heard their deep and awful roar, sounding as if issuing from the belly of hell, belching forth fire and smoke, and forming a sulphurous canopy of death over the field of strife, and who followed in their course the red-hot shell streaking the atmosphere with a trail of hissing fire, and when they burst, discharging their destructive missiles with accumulated violence—every spectator, we say, of these sights felt in every ball a sympathetic pang of agony, and anxiously and tearfully—and some on their knees, by fasting and prayer, pleading for the life of loved ones exposed to the fearful hail-storm of shell and bullets—awaited the tidings of certain and extensive fatality. And when, from hour to hour, through Friday and Saturday, tidings were received that nobody was seriously injured, and when, after the flag was a second time lowered, and the white flag took its place, and the fort was surrendered, and the smoke of battle cleared away, and the thunder of artillery had died into silence deep as death, and the first wild burst of universal gratulation and acclaim had subsided into solemn seriousness, and it was authoritatively made known that not a single individual was killed, and crowds of living men were seen walking on the parapets and around the fort of Sumter, a thrill of grateful delight ran through every heart. Eyes unused to weep were filled with tears. Tongues unaccustomed to pray or praise were vocal with thanksgiving

to God, to whom alone belonged the miracle and the mercy of such an unparalleled deliverance. "I seldom go to Church," said a gentleman, "and have no religion, but I do recognize God's providence in this event, and thank Him for this glorious victory." When the bells began to peal, a lady in a carriage exclaimed that she hoped every bell in the city would ring out plaudits for our brave soldiers. "Madam," said a gentleman within hearing, "I hope they will ring until they call us all to the house of God, there to humble ourselves before Him, and acknowledge that this is the Lord's doings, and that it is marvellous in our eyes."

But this event is remarkable, and beyond all precedent, in its political effect upon the country. It aroused, and concentrated in union with the destinies of the South, the great hearts of Virginia and of Tennessee. It cemented into one living mass of patriotic ardor every Southern spirit, however previously divided. Nor was its effect less wonderful upon the distracted and hostile parties at the North. Every gun fired against Sumter was oratorically represented as aimed at the life of the nation, and the unconditional surrender of the flag and fort was considered as a dishonor, to be wiped out only by the subjugation or extermination of the South, the demolition of Charleston, and the reduction of South Carolina to a barren and uninhabited wilderness, sown with salt, and over which the foot of man shall never pass. "The war having begun at Charleston, must end at Charleston, and it must be the bitter end of Charleston."

Now, while the fact of a united North, the call for seventy-five thousand troops, the declaration of war, and whirlwind preparations for war against the South, are incontrovertible as consequent upon Sumter's fall, there is no rational connection between the fall of Sumter and the consolidation of the North in support of a military despotism, and in the usurpation of all the powers of the

Constitution, of the Supreme Court, of Congress, of the States, of the judiciary, and of every power, human and divine, and in a lawless, unchristian, inhuman, and barbarously wicked and licentious irruption of mercenary vandals upon the South.

The life of the United States was no more, nor in any degree as much affected, as that of Great Britain after the separation from her of this very North. The life of the United States is in each sovereign State, and in the consenting union of as many States as may agree to combine together for their mutual safety and welfare. At first, nine States thus united—then thirteen, and, from time to time, one sovereign State after another. And it is simply ridiculous to say that a union which consists of no fixed number of States, which refused to assume a national name, which expressly limited the union, withheld any power to interfere with or prevent the future separation and secession of any State as a coequal sovereign, and which reserved to each State all the powers not expressly delegated—that such a union is lost by the withdrawal of ten or eleven States out of thirty-four.

As to the flag being insulted, about which there has been such a flutter of new-fledged “spread-eagleism,” we challenge the production of a case in modern history in which such chivalrous respect was shown to an absolutely helpless enemy, in danger of momentary explosion, and to his flag, which had for months flaunted defiance in our faces, and which he was permitted both to salute and to carry with him to the North, that by its help his vaulting ambition might overleap itself, and, after playing fantastic tricks before high heaven and the swarming myrmidons of usurping despotism, take at its crisis that wave of fortune that might lead him on to an inglorious and bad preëminence.

And as to our alleged aggression and initiation of the war, the charge is equally puerile and self-contradictory. “The first act of war was committed by the Government

of Washington against South Carolina, when fortresses, intended lawfully only for her protection, were *armed for her subjugation*. That act of war was repeated, when armed preparations were twice made to reinforce these means of her oppression. It was repeated, when she was formally notified that these means of her oppression would be strengthened, 'peaceably, if they could be; forcibly, if they must.' And it was only, then, after a magnanimous forbearance, little expected of her ardent nature, that she proceeded to what was *an act of strict self-defence*, the reduction of Fort Sumter."

The attack on Sumter was, therefore, the last link in a chain of events, beginning with the unauthorized and timid treachery of Major Anderson, which was itself a declaration of warlike aggression, and continued in all the acts of tortuous duplicity and threatening of an insolent Government, during which provocation was followed by patience, until South Carolina was abused as a cowardly braggart, and nothing was left her but submission to the forging around her limbs of the chains of a despotic tyranny, or an appeal to arms.

The further charge, of adding robbery to resistance, is insufferably false. By the Constitution, no fort could be erected within the territory of a State, except by its permission. But if not erected, how could it be held, against its wishes and interests? And was not the forcible seizure and holding of Sumter, on a war footing, ready for instant assault, and with powerful guns frowning defiance and destruction to our chief city, a most arbitrary usurpation of authority? Three-fourths of all its cost, and equipment, and maintenance, had been borne by the South, and the faith and honor of South Carolina, and of the Confederate States, were pledged to meet all equitable demands for it, and for all other property which had pertained to the United States in common. And with what face can this usurping North talk of honesty and good faith, while it

grabs, and holds by military force, all the forts, arsenals, mints, navy yards, buildings, territories, and treasures, not only within the non-seceding States, but also, as far as possible, within the Southern States, and which now holds by military domination the State of Maryland and portions of Virginia, Missouri and Kentucky, destroying property and lives, and shooting down, hanging, and imprisoning peaceable citizens, who defend their property and denounce lawless robbery?

No! the fall of Sumter sealed the declaration of Southern independence; united eleven Southern States; established free trade and Southern manufactures, commerce, literature, and social organization; created a new empire on the earth; turned from the North the overflowing stream of wealth that had enriched and exalted her; and arrested in its irrepressible conflict the fanatical, unholy, and atheistic crusade against God's Word and providence, and the vital institutions of the South, which the Republican party and the present administration are pledged to consummate. Hence the pride, passion, and desperate fury, which, under the plea of patriotism and defence of the Government, threatens to pour twenty millions of Goths and Vandals, and mercenary hirelings, and with an ocean's might sweep before its irresistible deluge every living inhabitant of the South.

The victory of Sumter derives its greatest importance from this developement of the real *animus* of the North. The Government must be consolidated. The South must be subjugated. The majority must govern. The sovereignty and reserved rights of States must be branded as monstrous fabrications. New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, must be sustained in growing magnificence, and, therefore, bounties on Northern fisheries, navigation laws, protection by tariff for every Northern interest, exclusion of the South from all benefits of foreign competition, postal arrangements, territorial aggrandize-

ment, must be maintained. And to secure this, the Constitution must be set aside, the Supreme Court ignored, Congress set at naught, and only convened when military despotism is established, and all liberty of speech and action, and all the rights of freemen, are abolished, and mobs, or self-constituted boards, or military courts, determine rights and decree justice, and decide for life or death, and displace courts of justice, and all law and equity—in other words, to give the sanction of a coerced rump parliament to the decrees and doings of an unprincipled Government, which is itself confessedly governed by the Black Republican party.

To this despotism democracy, conservatism, anti-abolitionism, and even Christianity, are all subjected. The pulpit, the Bible, the Church, the college, the seminary, the religious press, the courts of the Church, are all made subservient, and with sacrilegious impiety bow the knee to that golden image set up by the American Nebuchadnezzar; while the star-spangled banner takes the place of the cross, covers the communion table, and is sung as a doxology in the Church, the prayer meeting, and the theological seminary commencement, and waves over God's sanctuaries.

Thus has Sumter opened the eyes of the North, like those of Adam and Eve, to see good in evil, and evil in good, to see "a holy and sacred war," which "God knows to be right," in a diabolical and unnatural invasion of sovereign States, which is in violent conflict with every provision of the Constitution, as it is against every dictate of reason, humanity and religion; and to see in the Lincoln dictatorship "the Government of the United States and the ordinance of God," which is to be obeyed at the peril of "damnation"—while its own advocates admit it has "set aside the Constitution," and has no more lawful or constitutional authority to do what it is doing than the Emperor of Russia or of China.

But Sumter has also opened the eyes of the South, to see that the soul of the Northern confederacy was consolidated despotism—the many-headed monster of a blind, heartless and unprincipled majority—to which constitutions, laws, honesty and honor were ropes of sand, or as the cords with which Samson was bound; that conservative and Christian men at the North, if not in heart in unison with it, were impotent against it, and that she must now or never redeem, regenerate, and disenthral herself from a despotism worse than any other, because, under form of law, it could make laws, alter the Constitution, and subject to its will every guard against unlimited tyranny, and every guarantee of individual liberty. The South has *dared to assert* her independence. But the sleeping lion is now rampant, and has sprung upon her. His eyes glare perdition. His claws are in her sides. His appetite for blood is now whetted. His horrid teeth stare frightfully from his opened jaws, and we are in the death struggle for liberty.

But again: Sumter has also opened the eyes of Europe to the true character and purposes of the Northern usurpation, and its attempted subjugation of the South; to her hypocrisy; to her aggressions; to her perfidy; to her selfish sectional aggrandizement; to her greedy, grasping monopoly of trade and commerce; and her reduction of the South to a mere tributary province, from which she might derive an increasing annual tribute of hundreds of millions of dollars. The North has lost character and caste. She has sunk already from a first to a third-rate power. She is snubbed and stricken in the face, and her policy dictated to her. She is forsaken, denounced and despised, and, under the intolerable affectation of pity, she is reproved, repudiated and defied, by British, French, and Spanish navies, now tracking her desperate course. Nor has the conduct of our Southern Government, in relation to Sumter, been less powerful in leading Europe to a conviction and recognition of our determination and ability as a belligerent power; as

authorized to issue letters of marque; as having displayed signal wisdom, energy, and moderation; as entitled to a peaceful separation and prompt recognition; as the victim of Northern rapacity and aggression; as invincible in a defensive war, and certain of ultimate triumph; and as having been driven into this war for self-preservation.

The fall of Sumter was, therefore, an event of vast proportions, in *itself* considered, requiring some twenty-four batteries to reduce it and repress the fleet; requiring some seven thousand men to man these batteries, and meet the shock of an invading army, and the guns of an assembled fleet. Two thousand balls, from twenty-four to forty-two pounders, during two memorable days, Friday and Saturday, were hurled from monstrous cannon, with scientific skill and deadly purpose. The fire from Sumter was desperately aimed at life, as is evident from Major Anderson's continued incredulity as to the humiliating defeat of all his proclamations and prophecies, and by the perfect aimlessness of many of his balls, but as designed for men, and not for *merlons*. And that, after all his efforts, and the malicious plans and purposes of Doubleday and Foster, not a single life should be lost nor limb fractured, is a most signal proof of the wonderful power of Divine providence, a mystery and a miracle of mercy; and when taken in connection with the world-wide results which must flow from it to the present and all future generations, the fall of Sumter, and the bloodless victory of South Carolina, after an outlay of nearly a million of dollars from her own treasury, and with exclusively South Carolina troops, is an event which must, to the end of time, occupy a brilliant page in the record of Carolina's glory, and the annals of the fame and achievements of our Confederate States.

II.

And wherefore, it must be now asked, has the omnipotent and omniscient God ordered and overruled this won-

derful providence? Nothing, most surely, of less consequence than the eventful victory would portend, and that is, a final separation from the North, in Church and State; an independent Southern Confederacy; a continued development of that unparalleled problem of African Christianized civilization, and through it, of a community which for intellectual, political, commercial, and Christian progress, and for the necessary connection of its material interests—its great, world-commanding products of cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar, indigo, turpentine, tar, live oak, and hard pine, not to mention all other products, in grain, cattle, and breadstuffs, to which it is equally adapted—is without a rival in the history of the world. This is the manifest result, and as manifestly God's destiny. God's finger is seen writing in visible letters before our eyes, "The glory has departed—come out from among them, and be ye separate." The mystery of providence, long hidden, God has now made manifest, and the secret things that belonged unto Him, He has now revealed unto us and to our children. And the proof is: that God's providence is interpreted, and His will revealed, by His Word and working.

Now, the whole movement of the South is based upon God's Word, simply and sincerely interpreted, believed and obeyed, and upon the recognition of God's authority, power and providence, in forcing among us millions of laborers; in sanctioning and requiring their service; in providing for them a climate, soil, and seed and labor, adapted to them, and designed as a benefit and blessing to the world; in imposing upon us their superintendence and these cultures as a solemn trust for mankind at large; and in blessing our labors, in a marvelous manner, with all spiritual and temporal good.

Looking to God and to His Word, praying with all prayer for counsel and direction, giving earnest heed to the dictates of conscience, and guided by all the lights of past experience, and by all the probable issues of the future, the

South has unbounded confidence in interpreting the victory of Sumter as an earnest of God's continued presence, providence and power, with her counsellors, her armies, and her people. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him, and He will show them His covenant."

Begun in prayer and humiliation, and continued in private, and public, and national recognition of God, every step in this Southern movement has been pointed out by a voice from heaven, saying: "This is the way, walk ye in it," so that our very rashness, improvidence, and blind folly have been overruled, and made to work together for good. Both in what He has prevented, what He has perfected, and what accomplished, God's stately and majestic steppings are manifest, and it is impossible to look back upon the daring course of this little State, alone and unbenefitted, and unprepared in any form or degree, challenging possession of this fort; ordering its reduction; throwing up its forts in the face of Sumter and its Government; firing, with only five rounds of ammunition, upon a vessel full of troops, with the guns of Sumter thrown out, and Doubleday on his knees pleading for permission to fire upon their sand-heap and unprotected soldiery; upon the kindled wrath and insolent message of the now valorous commander, and upon numberless incidents in the long period of daily unanticipated delays, deceptions, and plotted destruction, without admiring and adoring the conspicuous providence and protection of God.

The very first step taken by our Convention was to appoint Commissioners to negotiate, through the President, with Congress, for the possession of the forts in our harbor, as property to be held in honorable trust until finally and satisfactorily accounted for, while authoritative assurances were given to Major Anderson that no attack would be made upon Fort Moultrie, and he knew that such a thing as a mob never had existence in Charleston.

Notwithstanding these assurances, Major Anderson continued, with the most belligerent intent and activity, to fortify the fort in every way, both externally and internally, and reported it to be impregnable against any popular assault. He had also privately led to the belief that his purposes and feelings were peaceful and sympathetic. And yet, without cause, without orders, while reinforcements had been refused as unnecessary, and the arms in the arsenal were put under the protection of the State, and an officer who had attempted clandestinely to remove them was withdrawn, Major Anderson, by a strategetic nocturnal movement, which can only be justified from the charge of cowardly distrust in himself and the honor of this State, as a necessary act of war, spiked the guns, and burnt their carriages and other property, and transferred whatever was available to Fort Sumter, over which he raised the flag of Fort Moultrie, which was afterwards lowered for the sign of surrender, and proceeded to put it into a condition impregnable against any attack possible by us. This act of war the Government disclaimed, and yet approved, and in so doing made a declaration of war against South Carolina, as plain and formidable as words and actions could do it.

This declaration of war was confirmed by the treatment of our Commissioners, and of our subsequent Commissioner, and of the members of Congress, who assured him, from the President, that no attempt would be made to reinforce, or to attack the fort, at the very moment that the *Star of the West* was secretly, and with the most furtive and false representations, sent, with two hundred and fifty armed men, to Fort Sumter, under cover of being a merchant steamer. Will any man, in his senses, deny that this was another act of deceptive hostility, only to be justified by a state of *open* and *malignant* war? Surely, it was an act of *mean*, *dastardly*, and *dishonorable* war, under the professions of peace and a flag of truce. And who can avoid recognizing the presence and providence of God with us, in the

knowledge, some how obtained by friends in Washington or New York, in time to give us warning on the night before her arrival, and in the efficiency given to a partial battery, with only five rounds of ammunition? And what will those moon-eyed patriots of the North, who try to skulk from the everlasting infamy of forcing this war upon this country, in this age, amid these Churches, and under institutions based upon the consent of the governed, and securing to every State sovereignty and self-government and the consequent right to remain in, or to remove out of, the Union they had voluntarily formed—what will they say to the storm of denounced vengeance which swept over South Carolina, the numberless plans concocted for the reinforcement of Sumter and Pickens, and the actual reinforcement of Pickens, Monroe, and Key West, the formidable and multiplied defences, and the presence of a powerful naval force? Say, ye gods who rule in Gotham—say, ye Goths and Vandals—was this war, or was it peace?

While Mr. Seward, by lying deceit, was filling the country with the assurance that Fort Sumter was to be evacuated; soothing our Commissioners with prospects of a peaceful evacuation, for weeks after an official refusal to hold any communication was written and withheld—while Mr. Seward authorized Judge Campbell, of the Supreme Court, to confirm our Commissioners in their views, and through them the authorities in Montgomery and Charleston—various messengers, with despatches, and under false pretences and names, visited the fort, and made observations and plans with Major Anderson (who was still enjoying our hospitalities), to reinforce with a powerful fleet, and, as it was said, six thousand men. Was this, which was all done in time of peace, war, and a dishonorable and perfidious war, or what was it? And the discovery of secret despatches, betraying the lying stratagem in time to expect and prepare to meet the fleet—was this second warning, like that given

to Esther, from God, or from the devil, or from our enemies? Who can doubt?

The secret correspondence, since published by Governor Pickens, and the annihilating letters of Mr. Harvey to the public and to the Secretary of War and President, prove incontestibly that the determined policy of peace was abandoned in order to arouse, by the sacrifice of Major Anderson and the provocation of an attack, the present war spirit at the North, and thus save the Republican party, and give a pretext for usurpation, despotism and bloodshed.

And yet, even then, though in a published letter Major Anderson had mercifully warned us, and threatened a fearful infliction, three separate overtures were made to him to evacuate at any time convenient to himself, and in the most honorable manner. This, in the perfect knowledge and confidence of immediate reinforcements from the fleet then more than due, he could, without any real bravery, boldly decline to do; for had the fleet been resolutely determined, at whatever loss, to do it, they might very possibly have succeeded. Was, then, his peremptory refusal to accept of any overtures of evacuation, and his declaration that if the United States flag was fired upon, he must fire—in other words, that as soon as the fleet commenced hostilities he must open his batteries upon us—was that, I ask, a declaration of war, or not?

Charleston, South Carolina, and the South, originated the battle of Sumter, and precipitated war? Hear it, O heavens, and be astonished, O earth! After months of conferences and compromises, in and out of Congress, rejected; after insult, tergiversation, deceit, promises and pledges broken, preparations for war amid professions of peace—after actual invasion and threatened destruction—was ever such long-suffering and patient forbearance manifested before—such willingness to believe treacherous foes, and hope against hope, and chivalrously feed and hearten, and then open the way for a helpless enemy, in his own time and

way, and with the honors of war, to unite himself to his confederates in arms, to concentrate and continue war upon us? Never! Nor would the impetuous valor of Carolina, stung with asserted dominion over her, and burning with shame at her irresolution and timidity, have endured so long, but from her relations to her sister States, and deference to them. Multitudes were ready, with reckless precipitancy, to unite in an assault, from the very night of the furtive occupation of the fort.

And what, I ask, but God's present, restraining and directing providence, held in check fool-hardy intrepidity during the three months in which she stood alone? Whence the wisdom and moderation of our rulers, military officers, and citizen soldiery, which repressed such dangerous impetuosity, and which led our people, as with one heart, to look to God, to recognize and confide in him; which inspired such courageous preparation and readiness for conflict; such fortitude and perseverance; such unanimity; such willing sacrifices; such wise counsels; such energetic measures; such scientific and inventive skill in devising and in constructing forts; such a conciliatory spirit and eminent statesmanship, and dispatch in the action of our Convention, in the appointment of its cabinet, in its papers addressed to the public, and in its proposed Constitution for a Southern Confederacy? Was not God's providence manifest in the mediation and wise delays of Senator Davis and others, and afterwards of Judge Campbell, in Washington; in the glorious results of the bloodless victory over the *Star of the West*, and its magic power in uniting and harmonizing seven Southern States; in the wonderful manner in which they were united in opinion, and cemented into one; in their early Congress; in the election of Mr. Davis; in their provisional Constitution, tariff, and military and financial arrangements; in the unanimity with which the people ratified and approved their acts; in the speedy assemblage of a regular Congress and adoption of a per-

manent Constitution; in the perfect organization of a Government; and in the universal favor with which their measures have been received, even at the North, until recently, and in Europe? Was there not a manifest providence in that blinded madness and fatuity in the Federal Government which led to the rejection of every overture from Virginia and Kentucky, and in the proclamation of war, which has added four more powerful States to the Southern Confederacy? Who that has eyes to see, or head to understand, can fail to realize that God was with us, as our Emanuel, and to cry out, What hath God wrought? But the wise and gracious providence of God toward the South in this movement, is further manifested in leading her to take her present stand against the tyrannous usurpations of the North, while yet strong in men, in means, in spirit, determination, hope and confidence of victory; in providing her beforehand with some portion of the arms and ammunition now so necessary; in giving her time to organize, arm, equip, and discipline; and, thus far, in granting such wonderful success to all her movements.

In December last this State and city were wholly unprepared to undertake a war. Our forts, our arms, our arsenal, were in possession of Federal troops. We had no fortifications, no organization, no military commanders of experience, and but little ammunition. Any attempt at fortifying ourselves at Moultrie, Pinckney, Johnson, and Morris Island, might easily have been prevented by Sumter and a fleet; and in the numberless delays and disappointments, and contradictory reports, and vacillating policy, of the Administration, which deferred hope and delayed action, until the last hidden battery was finished and the rifled cannon was placed in position, and a force adequate to all emergencies were at their posts and thoroughly drilled, and General Beauregard could say that every thing was in readiness—*which was only on the night of the attack*—do we

not behold the omnipotent and omniscient providence of God, making all things work together for the glorious result accomplished?

The resignation and devotion to the Southern cause of naval and military officers, to such a multiplied extent, and including the greatest, wisest and most energetic in the Federal service; the organization of new and efficient floating and land batteries; the ardor, self-denying labor, and unflinching endurance of our citizens, and, preëminently, of our State soldiery; the hopeful confidence and devotion of our people; and, above all, God's wonderful providence during the battle, in giving coolness, intrepidity and endurance to our men; in directing our fire, and diverting that of the enemy; in so immediately crippling and driving him away from his barbette guns and interior mortars, which must have been destructive to life; in delivering, in numerous instances, from apparently inevitable death; in diverting the energies of our enemies by frequent fire; in blowing up their cartridges, grenades, and other preparations for defence and destruction; in closing effectually their magazine; in enveloping them in smoke, and causing momentary danger of the general explosion of their magazine and mines; in imparting such daring and chivalrous spirit to Senator Wigfall and the aids of General Beauregard; in awakening such universal sympathy and desire to succor the heroic bravery of Anderson and his men; in securing to South Carolina, and preëminently to her Charleston soldiery, such unequalled glory and unmitigated rejoicing; such untarnished honor and such triumph over all feelings of retaliation or revenge; in crowning with such a halo of splendor a State so ridiculed and reviled for her contemptible littleness and pride; in a victory of unrivalled significance and almost miraculous mercy, achieved by her own counsels, her own money, and means, and men, with the addition of her illustrious general and other high officers and engineers—these are, each and all,

the stately steppings of God's wonder-working and majestic providence, working out, in His own mysterious way, our defence, deliverance and glory.

The fall of Sumter and of Sumter's flag was a signal gun from the battlements of heaven, announcing from God to every Southern State, "This cause is mine—come ye up, come to the help of the Lord against the mighty," and saying to the North, "Thou shalt not go up, nor fight against your brethren. Return every man unto his house, for this thing is of Me, saith the Lord." It was the tocsin of alarm and defeat to our foes, and the trumpet-call to battle and to victory to every laggard friend. It was the knell of the departed Union, and the annunciation of a new empire on the earth. It inaugurated, with loud acclaim, the unfurling of a young nation's flag; and in the destruction of two lives, and the serious injury of three others, in the abortive attempt to salute the flag of a desecrated and now subjugated Union, it was a startling rebuke of that idolatry which has spread that flag on the communion table, suspended it at the entrance and over the steeples of Churches; which has delivered it, even at Princeton, to theological students, who were exhorted to "stand by *our* flag"—not that banner which Christ has given because of the truth—who, having made the Chapel ring with its national song, filled the air with shouts and hurrahs! Oh, how did God punish such profanity at Sumter, and again at Alexandria, where Colonel Ellsworth suffered death for his indignity to the Confederate flag, and a seaman from the fleet, who attempted to replace it with the Federal flag, fell and was instantly killed!

The fall of Sumter has acted like the spear of Ithuriel. It has transformed the seeming into the real shape and proportions of the man. It has revealed the North to itself, to us, and to the world. It has revealed us to ourselves, and to one another, as confederated by bonds of honor and happiness, which make us, while "distinct as the billows,

yet one as the sea," and as the sea, world-wide in our commercial circumference, and producing commodities which are the source of priceless and ceaseless blessings to every continent, and omnipotent, under God, to resist any power exerted to arrest our progress and roll back our tide of empire.

The fall of Sumter has made bare and brought to light the hidden works of darkness and mystery of iniquity. It has proved that, with all the conservatism and professed love of peace at the North, the love of power is greater; that with all their devotion to the Union, it means a union of Southern interest for the enrichment of the North, and of Southern conservatism in politics and religion for the repression of anarchy and fanaticism; and that the real eagle so fondly worshipped is the golden one. Love for the South evaporates, and leaves only love for self. Piety succumbs to pride, and patriotism to passion, and charity itself, while covering any multitude of sins, and forgiving all manner of evil, and tolerant of all the errors and isms which spawn and multiply among them, sees in disobedience to the tyrant nothing but damnable heresy; in secession from the hateful conspiracy against our rights and liberties, an unpardonable sin; and in toleration for the exercise of self-government, and in consent that we should be governed by chosen rulers, an enormity only equalled by that which cast Satan out of heaven, and Adam out of Paradise. Union with us was purgatory, but union without us is perdition. The South has been confessedly abused, pillaged, and reduced to a tributary province, but Northern conservatism requires, on peril of destruction, that we shall rely upon its "unmeaning promises of good intentions, which amount to nothing more than irresponsible promises to be merciful to the vanquished."

"The howl of vindictive passion," clamoring for a war of vengeance and subjugation, has at length reached our

Church. That sacred sanctuary, our holy and happy Zion—where the scattered tribes have been accustomed to repair, and feel how good and how pleasant it was for brethren to dwell together in unity—has been polluted, and “made a den of thieves.” The Old School Presbyterian Church—the last link that held fast to union, amidst the crashing timbers of the hastening wreck—is now broken; willingly, wilfully and wickedly broken—broken against the protestations of the wise, and in the unavoidable absence of almost all true-hearted representatives of their Southern brethren, and against the formal advice even of the wily Cabinet at Washington. The Church of our revolutionary fathers is now yoked to the chariot-wheel of Cæsar, and, in the madness of a base and venal servitude, is pledged to prayerful loyalty and devotion to an imperial despot, whose little finger is heavier than any yoke ever imposed by Britain, and under whose heel their own liberties, as well as ours, and the Bible, the palladium of them all, and the Constitution, and all laws, human and divine, are crushed into submission to the higher law of his own “irrepressible conflict,” and to the will of a wild, lawless, and godless majority.

Amid these wild waves of tempestuous commotion, with war raging around us, and woes innumerable enveloping our future, God has given us, in the bloodless victory of Sumter, an anchor of hope, both sure and steadfast—a pledge and promise of defence and deliverance. And, though not yet referred to by any writer, I find, in recent researches, that in 1755, in the commencement of our revolutionary struggle, Dr. Langdon, on May 31st, calls upon the people to praise God “that in the late action at Chelsea, fought on May 27th, when several hundreds of our soldiery, the greater part open to the fire of so many cannon, swivels, and muskets; from a battery advantageously situated; from two armed cutters and many barges full of marines; and from ships-of-the-line in the harbor—not one man on

our side was killed, and but two or three wounded, although one hundred and five of the enemy were killed, and one hundred and sixty wounded.

Mr. Mansfield, also, in a discourse, preached at Roxbury, in November, 1775, remarks: "Providence has smiled upon the camp, in permitting so few fatal accidents, and has evidently been its safeguard." "I am informed," he adds, "*that by means of two thousand balls thrown from the opposite lines, five men only have been taken off. I perceive, also, that by reason of three hundred balls, etc., thrown into Roxbury in the course of one month, but two were wounded, and no man was immediately killed. It is to be remarked, also, that not one person was hurt in the course of above three hundred shells thrown into a fortification upon ploughed hill, in Charlestown.*"

Thus did God encourage our revolutionary fathers in their long and desperate contest with the mightiest power on earth, by such signal proofs of His extraordinary presence, and providence and blessing, to put the most undoubting trust in Him, and to look for that divine succor which could make them conquerors, and more than conquerors, over all their enemies. *And this lesson our fathers learnt by heart, and carried with them through all the perilous disasters and distresses of their seven years' war. "The Lord," they said, "will be our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. He can command the stars in their courses to fight His battles, and all the elements to wage war with His enemies. He can destroy them with innumerable plagues, or send faintness into their hearts, so that the men of might shall not find their hands. In a variety of methods He can work salvation for us, as He did for His people in ancient days, and according to the many remarkable deliverances granted in former times to Great Britain and New England."*

Our enemies themselves, therefore, being judges, God has thus far, in the bloodless, and eventful, and uncalculably important battle of Sumter, and in a series of victories

since of our troops and batteries, who (with immensely weaker forces, and when taken by surprise) have intimidated and disheartened our enemies; greatly inspirited and fired the courageous daring of our soldiery; inspired confidence and good hope to our people generally; and powerfully commended us and our cause to other nations around us, and to the European powers, who are most deeply interested in this revolution.

And now, O Lord God of our fathers! who didst lead them through dangers and death, discomfort and defeat, and all the perils and sacrifices of the revolution, to final victory, independence and glory, undertake for us, their children, inheritors of their blood and blood-bought heritage of liberty. We lift up our eyes unto Thee. We have looked to Thy Word and providence to know Thy will and our duty. And Thou hast appeared, O Lord God of hosts, on our behalf, and done great things for us, whereof we are glad. And now, O Lord God, behold this great multitude who have come up against us, to destroy us without cause. Thou who sittest in the heavens, look down upon these rulers who take counsel together, and upon this people, who imagine a vain thing, and do Thou hold them in derision, and break them in pieces as a potter's vessel.

Our cause is open unto Thee, with WHOM—and not with THEM—we have to do, and we appeal to Thy righteous justice. We ask no subjugation of our enemies, nor any portion of their rightful inheritance, privilege or property, nor any unnecessary destruction of their persons. But we ask, O righteous God, a just, honorable and lasting peace—that we may enjoy life, liberty and happiness, under the pure and uncorrupted Constitution of our fathers. We ask THEE to avenge us—to avenge us of our adversaries—to vindicate our righteous claims—to justify our course—and to commend our character and counsels to an *impartial present*, and to all future generations.

The Constitution, and the Union under it, as ordained by Thee, through the ordinance of our fathers—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

Our solemn compact, entered into with our present enemies, in Thy sight, and recorded in the chancery of heaven—with all that it gives and withholds, with what it positively and negatively lays down as to the respective provinces of national and State Government, with what is reserved and what is recorded, and with the coequal character, rights, and territorial privileges, under the internal institutions and laws of each united sovereignty—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The first treacherous violation of that compact, in 1787 and 1789, by our Northern confederates, in wresting from us equal rights in the territories of our own generous donation—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The fugitive slave law, THEN first established as a compromise, on which alone the South yielded to continued union—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT, and to the open, persistent and perfidious violation of it for forty years past, and to the existing laws of many of the very States who are fighting for a union they have themselves nullified, as “a compact with hell, and iniquitous before God.”

The act of Congress establishing slavery and a rigid slave code over all the Louisiana territory, in accordance with the terms of the treaty with France—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The refusal by Congress, on three occasions, to admit Missouri as a State, under that act and treaty—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The Missouri Compromise—reluctantly, and to her own grievous dishonor and injury, *submitted to by the South*—and by which she was again robbed of her territory, to the extent of several large States—is there, to testify to Southern honesty, honor, and generosity, and to the perfidious

rapacity of a self-aggrandizing North—AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The many acts of insolent and audacious violation of the Missouri Compromise, and the continued rapacious grasping of power and property by the North—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The fishery bounty, the navigation acts, the tariff monopolies, the home appropriations, the postal laws, by all which the South has been made to pay yearly hundreds of millions into Northern hands—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The crusade and irrepressible conflict against slavery, based upon a higher law than the Constitution and the Bible itself, and in open conflict, O God! with Thy Word and providence—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The unintermitted and increasing abuse, defamation, false witness, lying calumny, incendiary publications, treasonable insurrections, raids and underground railroad robberies, the arson, theft and murder excited by abolition emissaries, and the murder of Southern citizens in the streets of Northern cities, without redress, and with the connivance or requisition of State authorities—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The long-suffering patience, and warnings, protestations, appeals, nullification, and conventions of the South—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The nomination, election, and inauguration of Lincoln, on the very basis of this perfidious, aggressive, unconstitutional, and infamously dishonorable policy—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The course of Carolina, and the offered compromises of every other State, *until dignity was sunk in abject entreaty*, almost as degrading as that of Kentucky itself, ARE THERE, and *their contemptuous rejection*—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The usurpation of Lincoln, Scott & Co.—the arbitrary, unconstitutional, tyrannous, unnatural, inhuman, and diabolical course pursued by them—the barbarities perpetrated, the blood of patriot martyrs murdered, the curses of outraged women, the wailing of widows, the tears of orphans, houses burned, cities subjugated, fields devastated, *all decency and civilization set at defiance by unlicensed lynx-eyed generals and soldiers*—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

May the Lord hear us in this day of trouble, and the name of the God of Jacob defend us, send us help from His sanctuary, and strengthen us out of Zion. We will rejoice in His salvation, and in the name of our God we will set up our banners.

Thus saith the Lord God of our fathers, I will deliver thee and this city out of the hands of your enemy, AND THIS THAT HE HAS DONE SHALL BE A SIGN UNTO THEE, FROM THE LORD, THAT THE LORD WILL DO THIS THING THAT HE HAS SPOKEN.

ARTICLE II.

THE WALDENSES AND INFANT BAPTISM.

It is proposed in this article to show that the rite of infant baptism has always been practiced by the Waldensian Church. The antiquity of the body of Christians known by this name is conceded by ecclesiastical historians of every party. All Protestant writers agree in ascribing to them great purity of doctrine and of life, in a time of abounding corruption in both. Deriving the articles of their faith and their rules of conduct immediately from the Scriptures, and maintaining their right to do so against the authority of the papal hierarchy, to which the entire Christian world besides bowed in unquestioning servility,

their views and customs are regarded as having no ordinary weight in determining, on all controverted points, what the doctrines and usages of the primitive Church were. Hence, Prelatists have made anxious search among them for some trace of a diocesan episcopacy. Hence, too, our Baptist brethren have labored, with the zeal they are accustomed to bestow upon all subjects relating to the rite from which they take their name, to create the impression that they rejected the ordinance of infant baptism. The expression "Waldensian Baptists," has of late years become one of frequent recurrence in addresses and writings designed to promote the views of the anti-pedobaptists. An examination of the question at issue is justified by its importance, whether that importance be real, or merely factitious.

Preliminary to the direct testimony in support of our position, are two or three facts, of much presumptive value. One is, the fact that the Waldenses of the present day observe the rite. Some four or five years since, this was denied, or at least questioned, in certain quarters. But later investigations, directed to the point, have removed every pretext for doubt on the subject. The following is an extract from a letter of Dr. Revel to Dr. Robert Baird, which first appeared in the *New York Observer*, and was subsequently copied into various journals throughout the country. We insert the passage below, not only as setting forth the present practice of the Waldenses, but also for the light it throws upon other aspects of the matter in controversy, as we shall hereafter see. In order, however, that our readers may properly estimate the position of Dr. Revel, who here appears both as a witness and as an authority, they should bear in mind that he fills the highest office known in the polity of the Church to which he belongs—the Moderatorship of their Synod—an office held during life; and, further, that he is the President of their highest literary and theological institution. If any man

living may claim the right of speaking authoritatively on such a subject, it is he.

PASTOR REVEL TO REV. DR. BAIRD.

As to the questions which you have addressed to me touching the *mode of administering Baptism*, I hasten to answer them in the briefest and most precise manner possible. 1. The mode of baptizing in our Churches is *pedobaptism*, by the sprinkling of pure water on the forehead by the Minister, who pronounces solemnly the sacramental words, Matt. 28 : 19, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 2. This practice has never varied in our Church, and we have never had, nor do we now have, any opposing or Baptist party. 3. Although the Waldenses of Piedmont have always been *pedobaptists*, we find enemies who accuse them not only of rejecting the baptism of children, but baptism in general! This accusation has apparently some foundation, inasmuch as in the middle ages it was brought against those who in the South of France were called *Waldenses*, but who were a portion of the *Cathari*. It is thus that the work of Rainerius, "*contra Waldenses*," sets forth and charges upon us the doctrines and practices of the *Cathari*. But you know that the *Cathari*, who for a long time existed in the South of France, derived their doctrines from the East, which they wrought up into a mixture of Gnostic, Manichean, and Paulician principles, with some of the truths of the Gospel, and that, according as there were more or less of the evangelical element, they professed a *dualism* absolute or relative. But all the *Cathari* were agreed in rejecting all that was traditional and external. They pretended to reestablish the primitive and apostolic simplicity, and this under a form corresponding to their own principles. They rejected *pedobaptism*, and, for the most part, baptism in general. The first class maintained even that John the Baptist was an agent of Satan, and that his baptism was a means of enrolling disciples. They pretended that in the New Testament *baptism* stands for *repentance*. The true baptism for them was made by the imposition of hands and the prayer which they called *consolamentum*, and the latter was of a double nature. They had one for the *credentes* (those who were just introduced into the sect), and another for those who were called *perfecti*, or *consolati*.

It being conceded, then, that the Waldenses practice infant baptism in the present day, it devolves upon those who deny that they have practiced it from the beginning, to show when and by what means the change in their views was effected. A revolution as important as this in the views of a whole Church in relation to one of the two sacraments which they hold to be of divine authority,

would surely have left some trace upon the page of history. We have not been able, after reading various accounts of them, from various sources, to find the slightest intimation of such an event. Jones, a Baptist historian of England, who has written largely concerning them, from their rise in the world to the end of the seventeenth century, whilst, as we shall show in the sequel, he endeavors to destroy, by suppressions and misquotations, their testimony in favor of the ordinance, does not pretend that any change had taken place in their practice up to the time when his history left them. It is simply impossible for the change to have taken place since that time, and yet no one have transmitted a record of it—no one, not even the Waldensians themselves, have known when and how it came about.

Another admitted fact, pertinent to our object, is, that at the Reformation, in the sixteenth century, under the labors of Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Calvin, and others, the Waldenses affiliated with these men, and with the Churches planted by their ministry. Salutations were interchanged between the parties by deputies and written correspondence. Subjects on which a difference of opinion existed, or were supposed to exist, were freely discussed. Yet, in all their conferences, that of infant baptism was not once alluded to as a matter to be adjusted. Here there was a perfect agreement, so far as appears from the extended records which have descended to our times, between all concerned, Waldensians, Lutherans, and Calvinians. Between Calvin and the Waldenses the most fraternal relations existed, from the time of his residence in Strasburg to the close of his life, as may be seen in his letters, recently published. The effect of this intercourse, developing so beautiful a harmony of views, was the rapid and unresisted absorption of the Waldensians into the Reformed Church, except that portion residing in the Valleys of Piedmont. Here, being more concentrated and strong, they have maintained to this day their distinctiveness as a

religious body, in intimate fellowship, however, with the evangelical Churches of the Calvinistic type contiguous to them. All this may be seen in detail in Adam Blair's elaborate history of the Waldensian Church; also in the "Israel of the Alps," the elegant work of Dr. Muston, Pastor of the Waldensian Church at Bordeaux, and son of the Muston who was for many years Moderator of the General Synod.

Soon after the Reformation began, the Anabaptists of Germany arose. Why did not the Waldenses seek fellowship with them, instead of the party of Luther and Calvin? This would have been their natural recourse if they had been Anabaptists. Murdock, the learned translator of Mosheim's Church History, says: "It is a well known historic fact, that in the sixteenth century the genuine descendants of the old Waldensians, Wickliffites and Hussites, who were numerous in France, Belgium, England, Bohemia, Moravia, etc., readily united with the Lutheran and Reformed communities, and at length became absorbed in them, and that very few, if any, of them ever manifested a preference for the Mennonites, or for any of the anti-pedobaptist sects of the age; which is adverse to the supposition of a literal or legitimate descent of the Mennonites from the pure Waldensians." *

Another consideration, of no small weight in connection with this, is, that there was much in the opinions and practices of the times when the Waldenses came into view as a distinct body of Christians, and for many centuries afterward, to force them into a position of antagonism to the ordinance of infant baptism. The rite was shamefully abused by the Papists. Its nature, design and offices were all perverted. A multitude of silly, superstitious ceremonies had accumulated around its administration, against which the clear spiritual perceptions of these Bible-taught

* Mos., III., 229, Note.

Christians could but revolt. So that it would have been a matter of no great surprise if they had allowed their feelings of disgust to carry them to the extreme of rejecting the ordinance itself. But they wisely discriminated between the abuse and the legitimate use—between the rite as instituted by God, and as deformed by excrescences originating in human folly. Against the latter they protested in the most pointed terms, as will be shown in some extracts from their accredited writings, to be adduced hereafter; to the former—the ordinance itself—not a word of opposition has yet been produced from the formularies of their faith, or from any author acknowledged by them as an exponent of their views. Its rejection or omission by them, under so strong temptations to such a course, would make little or nothing against the institution, as historically attested; their adherence to it, is testimony of much value.

The three considerations now proposed would go far, in the absence of more direct proof, to demonstrate that the Waldenses were Pedobaptists. They are confirmed, however, by testimony that leaves no room for argument or doubts. Before proceeding to adduce that testimony, it is proper to exhibit the sources from which it is derived.

After the excitement attending the inauguration of the reform commenced by Luther had in some degree subsided, and the Protestant community had assumed a definite shape, the history of the remarkable people who, in much poverty and in despite of severe persecutions, had maintained a pure faith and worship, from a period extending many centuries back towards the days of the Apostles, began to engage the inquiries of leading minds in the Reformed Churches. Efforts were instituted for gathering all the existing monuments and relics of their origin and early years. It was known that they had manuscripts among them containing statements of their doctrines, and directions as to the order of their worship. Diligent search

was made for as many of these as might have survived the lapse of time and the calamities to which the people had been subjected by their enemies. In 1602 the Provincial Synod of Dauphiny, in France, lying adjacent to the region in which the Waldenses had their principal Churches, appointed "certain persons to collect all sorts of documents bearing on the history of the life, doctrines and persecutions of the Albigeois and Vaudois," or Waldenses. These papers were afterwards transferred to Jean Paul Perrin, a member of that Synod, and pastor of the Church at Nyons, (not Lyons, as is frequently represented,) which was situated near the borders of the Waldensian territory proper. Five years later, the National Synod of France, at Rochel, in which Perrin sat as a deputy from Dauphiny, passed an order in these words: "Monsieur Perrin is intreated to finish his begun history of the 'True Estate of the Albigenes and Waldenses;' and to help him in it, all persons having memoirs by them, either of the doctrines, discipline or persecutions of those poor saints of Christ, are charged to transmit them to him with all possible care and diligence." In 1609 the National Synod, held at St. Maixant, received a report from Perrin of his progress, with a rude draught of the work, which was approved by the body, and five of their ministers were requested by name to transmit to him "whatever memoirs they have found out, or can get, so that it (the book) may be published suddenly." The Synod at the same time engaged "to assist him with their bounty, to help to bear his great expenses in books, and for its impression." The work was presented to the National Synod, at Rivas, in 1612, and was put into the hands of five ministers, "who were ordered to bring in their opinion of it." In consideration of his charges, the "Synod ordered him (Perrin) the sum of three hundred livres." At a subsequent stage in the sessions of the same Synod, the committee to examine the work having reported, Perrin was desired to review it, and present it to the Synod

of Dauphiny, that it might be published. Again: two years later, the National Synod charges the Synod of Dauphiny to read over Perrin's book, "who is also required, as soon as it is printed, to send a copy to every one of the provinces." The Synod of Dauphiny, in 1617, reported to the National Synod, sitting at Vitré, that it had seen and perused the work, but that, for some reason, not stated, it had not been published or distributed. The National Synod then ordained, "That the said history shall be sent to our honored brethren, the pastors and professors in the Church and University of *Geneva*, who shall be desired by the Synod of Dauphiny to peruse it." The publication was made the next year, and in 1620 the National Synod, at Alez, "applauded and thanked" the author for his work, and being informed of the "numerousness of his family, and that he had a great charge of children," exhorted the Synod of Dauphiny "to take care of him and his family, according to the laws of Christian charity and the great merits of the said Monsieur Perrin."

We have presented these facts, gleaned from the acts, decisions and decrees of the National Synod of the Reformed Churches in France, as published in "Quick's Synodocon," inasmuch as a labored effort has been made to disparage the authority of Perrin, by some who feel that his history, if accredited, is fatal to their cause. Perhaps no book was ever written with more diligent and persevering efforts to render it trustworthy. But Perrin does not stand unsupported.

In 1669 Leger, "Pastor and Moderator of the Churches of the Valley," published his "History General of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, or Vaudois," in which he inserted various documents which were recognized as the authoritative exponents of the Waldensian faith, as far back as any such records could be found. In many passages Leger gives the original text of the papers in the Romance or Provençal language, in columns parallel

with his translation into his vernacular French. Perrin and Leger publish, for the most part, the same documents, and in the same words. A comparison of the two works, so far as the subject now in hand is concerned, has led to the detection of only one discrepancy, and that as to a word, merely, that does not materially affect the sense of the passage.

Leger and Perrin are sustained by Sir Samuel Morland, who was Oliver Cromwell's ambassador at the Court of Turin, and who, whilst in their country, made an extensive collection of their documents then extant, which he has inserted in his large history of the people. His position, as representative of the English Government, then sympathizing deeply with the persecuted Churches of Piedmont, afforded him rare facilities for gathering materials for his great work. The original manuscript copies of the documents which he obtained he deposited in the Library of Cambridge University, where they still exist. Morland gives the same documents that Perrin and Leger had given, with only such slight variations in their contents as naturally occur when copies are multiplied by transcription.

In the appendix to his history, Blair, already referred to, has published an English translation of the most important of the papers furnished by the three authors above named. In the extracts which we shall presently make, we shall use his work, having verified them by a comparison, severally, with the passages as found in the three older authors. With this explanation of what is meant by the writings of the Waldenses, and of the means by which they have been transmitted to us, we proceed to the testimony they afford on the subject of infant baptism.

I. Our first extract is made from the "*Spiritual Almanack*." This appears to be a summary of the faith of the Waldenses, compiled from other documents of authority among them. It is published by Perrin and Leger. The date is very ancient. Blair states that the writings com-

prised in it "are mentioned as existing in 1120; but the slight diversity of dialect suggests the probability that some of them, as the Discipline, might be earlier, or that they were composed at different times. At all events, the Waldenses and Albigenses have unanimously agreed that these declarations express their sentiments in regard to the doctrine, government, morality, and discipline of the Church; and demonstrate that Christianity was still preserved in the Valleys and in the South of France."* Dr. Muston, in his "Bibliography of the Waldenses," appended to his work, whose title has already been given, mentions the "Spiritual Almanack," and says that its treatise on the sacraments, from which we are about to quote, is to be met with in a number of Vaudois works.†

The Almanack treats of baptism, as of other points of doctrine, and, after giving an exposition of its general design, holds this language: "And for this cause we present our children in baptism, ‡ which they ought to do to whom the children are nearest, as their parents; and they to whom God has given this charity." Nothing could be more explicit than this.

II. "*The Ancient Discipline of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of the Piedmont*," (published by Perrin, Leger, and Morland.) Perrin says this was the discipline under which the Waldenses and Albigenses lived. Morland states that it was extracted out of divers authentic manuscripts, written in their own language, several centuries before either Calvin or Luther lived. It received the express approbation of Luther, Melancthon and Bucer. Its great antiquity, to say nothing of its contents, renders it a document of rare interest. Our concern, however, is with its testimony bearing on the question of infant baptism. The ninth

* Blair, I., 223, 224.

† *Ibid.*, II., 476.

‡ Et c'est pour cela qu'on presente les Enfans au Baptême.—Leger.

article relates to dancing, or balls, and condemns that species of amusement with a severity of language that we do not remember ever to have seen surpassed. Among the reasons assigned for its sinfulness, this is given: "They who thus dance break the agreement which they made with God at their baptism, when their God-fathers promised for them to renounce the devil and all his pomp." The promises here supposed to be broken by their dancing were made *for* them, not *by* them—a plain implication that they were baptized at an age when they were regarded as incapable of making promises for themselves.

III. In 1442, at Kuttensburg, was held a Synod of the Taborites, a branch of the Waldensian community, in which a full Confession of their Faith was made. The tenth article is in these words: "Baptism is the external sign of the internal washing from sin. Children can also be initiated, on condition, however, that having come to an advanced age, they make a public profession of their faith."*

IV. In the latter part of the fifteenth century, the Bohemian Brethren, another and highly honored branch of the Waldensian family, having a respite from persecution, prepared a full system of rules for their government and discipline. Among the duties assigned to the deacons, was that of aiding the pastor, by instructing the children and catechumens; and it is added: "Being viewed as candidates for the ministry, they occasionally preached the Gospel in the villages, under the minister's inspection, and baptized children in his absence." Further on, in the same document, we have this statement: "At Baptism a text was the ground of a short discourse, to show that God's covenant extended to the issue of believers; prayer offered to God to cleanse the infant from corruption by the blood of Christ, to regenerate it by the Spirit, to give it the seal of grace

* See the Confession, *in extenso*, quoted by Blair (Vol. II., 77) from Lenfants.

by baptism, and to place it among his chosen; the minister then named the child, and baptized it with pure water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."*

V. The United Brethren of Bohemia, mentioned in the last paragraph, in 1508 presented to King Ladislaus and his Nobles an "Apology," in which they defended themselves against various charges brought against them by their enemies; also a "Confession of Faith," which was subsequently enlarged, and in 1535 was addressed by the Nobles and Barons of Bohemia to Ferdinand, King of the Romans and Bohemia. Both of these instruments are preserved by Perrin. Leger and Morland give an abridgement of the Confession. Here are extracts from both:

(a.) From the "*Apology*." The fourth reproach, which they say was cast upon them by their "adversaries, like angry, barking dogs," was, that they denied the baptism of infants; to which they replied in the words of the Spiritual Almanack: "The time and place of those who ought to be baptized is not ordained, but the charity of the Church and congregation ought to serve as the rule in it, etc. And, therefore, they to whom the children are nearest allied are under obligation to present the infants to be baptized; as are the parents, and those to whom God has given such a charity." This passage is important, as showing that the Spiritual Almanack was still held in repute as the authorized exponent of their doctrines, and also as showing their views up to the time immediately preceding the Reformation. On this article in the "*Apology*," Perrin makes a remark which serves to explain whatever seeming practical neglect of the rite, if any, existed among them, namely, that when the Waldensian pastors were absent from their own charges, in the service of the Church at large, the children were

* Blair, II., 100, 107, quoting from Holmes, pp. 64-91, and "Account of the Bohemians," pp. 75-138.

long kept without baptism. In such cases, some parents allowed their children to receive the ordinance at the hands of the Romish Priests; others would not consent to this, in consequence of the superstitious ceremonies the Priests appended to its administration. Muston, Blair, and other writers on the affairs of this people, tell us that, the pastors being few, and the Churches widely dispersed, the former were accustomed to itinerate from Church to Church, occupying frequently one or two years in making their circuits. This accounts for their absences, as mentioned by Perrin.

(b.) From the "*Confession.*" Article on Baptism. "Likewise they teach that children are to be baptized unto salvation, and to be consecrated to Christ according to His Word: 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' etc.* Our friends, therefore, depending upon these words, baptize children in the name of the Holy Trinity. Because the place is universal, 'Teach all nations, baptizing them,' etc. Nor do they henceforth rebaptize them, nor have they ever rebaptized."

We give another extract from this Confession, and ask that special attention may be directed to the clause put in *Italics*. It shows, not only that baptism was administered to those who were incapable of exercising personal faith, but, also, what class of persons were intended when personal faith was mentioned as a prerequisite to baptism. The subject of the Article from which we quote is the sacraments, Baptism and the Supper. After insisting upon a due attention to these institutions of the Gospel, the Confession proceeds thus: "The sacraments of themselves, or, as some say, *ex opere operato*, from the work wrought, do not confer grace upon those who are not first endowed with

* Nous enseignons semblablement qu'il faut baptizer les Enfants a salut, et les consacrer Jesus Christ selon son commandement, etc.—Leger, Book I., 101.

good inclinations, and inwardly quickened by the Holy Spirit, nor bestow that justifying faith which renders the mind of man obedient, trusting and compliant to God in all things; for faith is necessary to precede—we speak of adults—which may vivify man by the Holy Ghost, and may inject good notions into the heart; for without faith, neither salvation nor righteousness exists, nor do sacraments do good to any one.”

If children were not subjects of baptism, the reference to adults, in the above, is unmeaning. Besides, unless children are an exception to the rule requiring personal faith in order to baptism, then the Brethren assert that they are incapable of salvation. It is the inevitable dilemma, “no baptism, no salvation.”

VI. In 1532, at a time when George Morel, who fills a large space in the Waldensian history, was a pastor in Piedmont, and wrote the memoirs of their Churches, states that above eight hundred thousand persons professed the religion of the Waldenses, the pastors and heads of families in the Valleys of Piedmont assembled at Angrogna, subscribed certain articles of faith, which, as they affirm, they “have sworn that they believe, and wish to hold themselves as acknowledging them conformed to the Holy Scriptures, and containing the summary of doctrine, which has been taught from father to son, according to the Word of God, as the faithful have done in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah.” The seventeenth Article reads thus: “That touching the matter of the sacraments, the Holy Scriptures determine that Jesus Christ has left us only two sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, which we receive to show that we wish to continue in the Holy Communion in which we are entered by Holy Baptism, *being little infants*, and for the commemoration of the sufferings of Jesus Christ, who has washed us from our sins by his precious blood.”

This Confession is recorded by Perrin, Leger, and Morland. Blair states that the manuscript is preserved in the Library at Cambridge.

VII. In 1541-2, the Waldenses of Merindol presented to the Parliament of Aix, the King, and others, a "Confession of Faith," containing twenty-six sections. The seventeenth is on Baptism, and concludes with these emphatic words: "They, also, err egregiously, who remove children from Baptism." The heresy of Anabaptism had, not long before, arisen in Germany, and was spreading with the rapidity that usually attends the progress of fanaticism in times of high and general excitement in the popular mind. Hence the form of the deliverance on the subject of infant baptism.

This Confession is also recorded by Perrin, Leger, and Morland. Faber gives it in Latin, the expression above quoted being quite as decisive as it is in our English translation.

We have thus produced a series of extracts extending over four centuries, beginning with the earliest authentic records which history furnishes of the people, and ending about the time when the Waldenses, with an exception already noted, were merged into the Reformed Churches. It would be easy to produce evidence of their continuing to a much later date—indeed, to the present day—in the practice of the rite. But it is unnecessary, since the controversy concerns, not the modern, but the ancient, people of that name. Nor have we adduced all the testimony which their acknowledged documents supply. There are others, which, to our own mind, are not less decisive than those which have been cited; as, for example, a passage in their celebrated treatise styled "Antichrist," in which they inveigh so severely against the superstitious appendages with which the Romish Church had corrupted the ordinance—such as the sign of the cross on the infant's breast and forehead, the salt in its mouth, the spittle in its

ear, the plunging it three times in the water, with much else of the same character—against all which things they vehemently protest, yet not a word do they utter in denial or disparagement of the rite itself. If, however, what has been brought forward shall not be deemed satisfactory to any one of our readers, it is not probable that any number of passages from the same sources would suffice for his conviction.

We turn to evidence of another character—the expressed opinions of historians who have investigated the subjects. Passages might be cited from the pages of Perrin, Leger, and Morland, showing that they had no doubt as to the observance of the ordinance among the Waldenses from the rise of that community. And no one ever possessed greater facilities for obtaining correct information than they. It is needless, however, to occupy our space with quotations from their pages, giving their individual opinions, since it will occur to every reader that they could not have entertained a doubt on the subject without discrediting the very documents which they have published to the world as the genuine writings of the Waldensians, and the authoritative standards of their faith.

Dr. Gilly, a clergyman of the Established Church of England, who has published “*Researches among the Vaudois*,” the result of two or more “*Excursions*” into the Valleys of the Piedmont, to whom that people, says Dr. Muston, are indebted for the establishment of the College over which Dr. Revel now presides, and who, as the same writer remarks, is “one of the most voluminous, learned and interesting of all modern authors who have written on the subject of the Vaudois”—Dr. Gilly says: “Nothing can be more false than the calumny that the Vaudois object to infant baptism,” and adduces passages from their ancient writings in support of his assertion.*

* See Preface to Jones' Church History, fifth English edition, where Jones makes a feint of answering Gilly.

Dr. Wall, whose candor is only equalled by his learning and vast research, devotes a considerable space in his "History of Infant Baptism" to the question now before us. The result of his investigations is, that whilst there were probably some small and short-lived sects, sometimes confounded with the Waldenses, in the fifteenth century, that rejected infant baptism, "for the main body of the Waldenses, there is no probability at all" that they rejected it.* The reader, by turning back to Dr. Revel's letter to Dr. Baird, may learn something of the sects here referred to.

Allix, an English clergyman, published in 1690 his "Remarks on the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont," a work on which we have seen high encomiums bestowed by writers in the interest of our Baptist brethren. From the favor with which Jones and others of his party seem to regard Allix, we supposed, until we examined his book, that it contained evidence of some kind which they could make available to their cause. But not a sentence tending in that direction did a careful scrutiny of his pages bring to view; on the contrary, much of another tenor. One passage must suffice in this place. Allix is assigning reasons why the Patarines, a sect of the eleventh century, "were, for the most part, of the same opinions that were afterward asserted by the Waldenses," and he mentions as the sixth: "Because we find the Berengarians" (who, he states, were of the same stamp with the Patarines) "exposed to the same calumnies which were afterwards imputed to the Patarines and Waldenses. This is evident from the discourse of Guimondus, Bishop of Avasa, † where he accuseth them of overthrowing, as much as in them lay, lawful marriages and the baptism of infants." ‡ From this it is manifest that Allix regarded the charge that the Waldenses denied infant baptism as a

* Vol. II., pp. 273, 266, 267.

† Lib. I., *contra*, Bereng.

‡ Allix, pp. 134, 135.

calumny. The passage shows another thing—that the denial of the ordinance of infant baptism, and the denial of the lawfulness of the marriage union, were coupled together—a significant fact, which one often encounters in traversing the dreary wastes through which the history of that age leads him, but a fact which one who knows what the Manichean heresy was, and knows to what extent it was then prevailing, even in the West, will have no difficulty in accounting for.

The list of authorities might be extended almost indefinitely, including such names as Archbishop Usher, Richard Baxter, Milner, Faber, Murdock, (translator of Mosheim,) Blair, Muston, Rev. T. Sims, of England, (who has examined the question particularly, and decides that the “Waldenses have, *to a certainty, always* approved and practiced the baptism of infants,”) and, to mention no others, the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, Gieseler, Professor in Göttingen, whose immense learning and rigid impartiality have placed him in the highest rank of authorities. The passage to be given is contained in a letter addressed by Gieseler to Dr. Muston, and may be seen in “The Israel of the Alps,” Vol. I., page 3. Gieseler denies that Peter de Bruys, (the father of the Petrobrusian sect,) was one of the Vaudois. “For,” he adds, “in the first place, he taught many things contrary to the doctrine of the Vaudois. He denied that infants ought to be baptized and that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ was celebrated after its celebration by Christ himself.”

In view of this overwhelming array of testimony and authorities, our readers will be surprised that a fact thus established by every species of evidence of which a historical event is capable, should ever have been called in question. They will be curious to know on what pretence it has been denied. We propose to gratify them in this very natural desire.

As far as we are authorized to speak on the subjects, by an investigation in which no little time has been employed, and a large number of books has been consulted, there are only two writers in the department of ecclesiastical history, whose researches have led them to examine the original sources of information, and whose success in their labors has caused their works to survive the authors, that venture to deny the prevalence of the rite amongst the Waldenses, before or since the Reformation, viz: Robert Robinson and William Jones, both of England. They were both Baptists, but this circumstance ought not to prejudice their credibility, if they had not made an unfair use of the authorities on which they rely for their statements.

Robinson, a man of brilliant parts and varied accomplishments, after attaining a high position among the Baptist ministers of England, adopted Socinian views, without, however, renouncing the dogmas of his former brethren in relation to the proper mode and subjects of baptism. Subsequently to the change of his faith, he wrote his "Ecclesiastical Researches," in which his effort throughout is to show that all the ancient Christians, who are worthy of the name, were Socinians, immersionists, and anti-pedobaptists. The intense sectarianism of his book, the bitter spirit pervading it, and its frequent palpable perversions of the established truths of history, have prevented it from acquiring any extensive credit or circulation, and it is seldom referred to by other writers, unless it be to find in Robinson support for opinions which all respectable historians contradict. The reader who may be able to command patience sufficient to carry him through one-third of the book, will be prepared to assent to every word of the following estimate of Robinson, from the pen of Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover Seminary, (a man from whom our Baptist brethren are very fond of quoting on certain points,) in a letter to his colleague, Dr. Leonard Woods, and published by the

latter in his "Infant Baptism." * Professor Stuart here speaks of another work of Robinson, that on Baptism, but his strictures are equally applicable to the work before us. "Having so often heard the book spoken highly of, and knowing something of Mr. Robinson's talents and character, I had a great curiosity to see it. I have examined it on various topics, and confess myself to be greatly disappointed, and not a little disgusted. There is every where in it an air of almost *profane levity*, which at times breaks forth into the most gross and *palpable indecency*. * * * Withal, there is such a gross and palpable unfairness in Robinson's examination of the testimony of the Christian Fathers, and such a shallow criticism, both on them and on the New Testament, that one may well wonder that this book should meet with encouragement among men of sobriety and good sense. There is, indeed, an appearance of a kind of learning in the author; but it is merely that of a literary *gourmand*, who has read every thing curious and entertaining, and but very little that is solid, and has reasoned and reflected still less on what he has read." Dr. Miller, of Princeton, has somewhere published an opinion of Robinson, concurring with that of Professor Stuart and Dr. Woods.

Robinson labors with great diligence to evade the testimony in favor of infant baptism among the Waldensians and other dissidents from the Romish Church. After one and another captious objection, which he seems conscious his readers will not regard as of any weight, he boldly asserts that neither the term "Infant," nor the term "Baptize," as used in the middle ages, is sufficiently definite and precise to enable us to determine positively that the one means a child of a few months or a few years old, or the other means the rite known in the Christian Church by that name. His words are: "The words 'Infant,' and

* Second edition, p. 140.

‘Baptism,’ either alone or in conjunction, prove nothing, unless they be accompanied with explanatory circumstances.”* Again, he says: “In the time of Claude (ninth century) baptism was got down to children—not to natural infants, but to such as had begun to speak. The word infant, in this district, as in every other, was used in a vague sense for a minor.”† In proof of this assertion he quotes the inscriptions on monuments over the remains of young persons of different ages, as two, thirteen, eighteen, and so on. Yet not one of the inscriptions contains the word *infant*, but all, the word *innocent*. This substitution of the one term for the other, the language being foreign, would easily mislead the careless or the unlearned reader, and on that account is the more disingenuous and culpable a ruse on the part of the author. When, in the times of which he is writing, infants are mentioned as the subjects of baptism, Robinson would have us believe that they were persons “who had begun to speak,” and might have been of any age between two and eighteen or twenty-one, if that was the point at which they ceased to be minors; all which is contradicted by the very etymology of the word itself, (*in*, not, and *for*, I speak,) and to its use among all nations who have derived it from the Latin language, as denoting those who, whatever the exact number of their months or years, are not capable of speaking and acting for themselves.

For a Baptist, maintaining that immersion, and nothing else, is baptism, it is a strange admission that Robinson makes, when he says that the word baptism means nothing when alone, or when in conjunction with the word infant, unless there be some other circumstance to fix the meaning. He not only makes the concession, however, but adduces proof of its correctness, citing a passage from the code of King Liutprand, in which the guardian of a child

* Ec. Res., p. 385.

† *Ibid.*, p. 469.

is allowed to *baptize* it—that is, to *chastise it with the rod or lash*. “Here,” he adds, “is an infant baptism performed with a switch, without water.”* The conclusion which Robinson reaches, and to which he would conduct his readers, is, that when the baptism of infants is spoken of in the times and countries in which the Waldenses lived, nothing definite can be inferred from the use of the terms; they may mean simply that the good people had their children flogged. Our readers will now understand what Professor Stuart intended by the author’s “*profane levity*.”

Yet Robinson, in another place, yields a point, which, in his own view, seems decisive of the question in hand. We ask special attention to his words, which, in spite of his adroit qualifications, imply all that we could desire: “There is one general clue to the history of the baptism of babes, but how far it leads into the history of the practice of baptism among the Vaudois, must be left to each reader to imagine. Baptism is a relative institute, and all Christians consider it so. Some think it is an institute connected with a profession of Christianity, and of course it is related only to temporal Church fellowship. This is the opinion of the Baptists. Others suppose it is connected with sanctification and the pardon of sin, and related to the future state, and, consequently, that it is necessary to salvation. *If, therefore, the Vaudois held the doctrine of original sin, as it should seem they did, baptism was as necessary to their dying babes as it was to those of the Catholicicks.* This is a mere conjecture, founded on theory, and such conjectures ought to have little weight, because few men reduce all parts of their own theories to practice.” It is very evident that, after all his desperate expedients to overthrow the historical proofs of the rite, Robinson either was fully persuaded, or strongly suspected, that it was practiced among the Vaudois.

* Ec. Res., p. 386.

Jones, however, is more confidently relied on as an authority for the anti-pedobaptism of the Waldenses than Robinson. Indeed, his work seems to be held in the highest consideration by our Baptist brethren, as is evinced by the facts, severally, that, after going through five editions in England, it was republished in America; that it has been commended by distinguished names in their communion; and that it is the source from which their controversial writers draw the most of their statements and extracts touching the subject before us. In the body of his work, Jones does not assert, in direct terms, that the Waldenses rejected infant baptism—at least, such a declaration, if made, has escaped our notice. He does, however, what is equivalent in effect, and is even more discreditable to him as a historian—he suppresses the evidence by which the contrary might have been demonstrated. In the preface to the fifth edition of his book, issued twelve years after the first, having grown bolder, as we may presume, from the toleration of his literary crime, he vauntingly proclaims that the people of whom he wrote were anti-pedobaptists, and makes a feeble effort to substantiate his position. We shall see to what expedients he has recourse in order to make this impression.

In the treatise called “Antichrist,” to which a reference has already been made, and whose antiquity and authority as an exposition of the Waldensian doctrine Jones admits, as do Perrin, Leger, Morland, and all who have duly investigated the subject, we find a protest against certain specified errors of the Romish Church. Jones quotes this document at considerable length, acknowledging himself indebted to Perrin for the copy he used. Here is a passage as found in Perrin, certain parts of which we *Italicize*: “The third work of ‘Antichrist’ is, that he *attributes the regeneration of the Holy Spirit to the dead outward work, baptizing children in that faith,* and teaching that thereby baptism and regeneration must be had; and therein he confers

and bestows orders and other sacraments, and groundeth therein all his Christianity, which is against the Holy Spirit."* And here is the same passage, as found in Jones, professing, too, to quote from Perrin: "*He teaches to baptize children into the faith, and attributes to this the work of regeneration; thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, with the external rite of baptism, and on this foundation bestows orders, and, indeed, grounds all his Christianity.*"† The careful reader, by examining the two versions of the passage, will be at no loss to perceive the vital difference between them, nor to surmise the purpose of Jones in the variations he has made. The former version makes the Waldensians protest against the perversion of infant baptism, as practiced among the Papists; the latter makes them protest against the ordinance itself. The one, by necessary implication, sanctions the rite; the other condemns it. Yet Jones not only had the temerity to alter the passage, when citing it in his original work, but the audacity, twelve years afterwards, to appeal to his own corrupt version in support of the error he sought to propagate.

It may be proper to state, here, that the treatise, "Anti-christ," is given by Leger and Morland, as well as Perrin, and that they give the passage above cited in the same form, with a variation of a word, only, that does not affect the sense. The original of the clause, "baptizing children in that faith," is, "*bapteia le enfant en aquella fe*"—*aquella* being a demonstrative pronoun, agreeing with *fe*, and requiring the phrase to be translated *that faith*, and not admitting of Jones' rendering, *the faith*. But Jones was compelled to mistranslate the words, in order to conceal the fact that he had omitted the preceding and the governing part of the sentence. Dr. Wall, in his "History of

* Perrin, Book III., ch. VIII.

† Jones, Am. ed., p. 338; also Pref. to fifth English ed.

Infant Baptism,"* quotes this passage in the form in which it appears in the three authors above named. Yet in a recent work by Dr. Curtis, Professor of Theology in the University at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, styled "The Progress of Baptist Principles," it is cited in the mutilated form in which Jones presents it, a note being appended in these words: "Jones' Church History, page 338, whose quotations I have followed, he having gone over the whole ground carefully, with Wall and Perrin before him." We have met with the passage in the same dismembered form in other writers of that school, all of whom, we charitably suppose, received it from Jones, without an examination of its authenticity. It is thus that errors are transmitted from one writer and from one generation to another, the wrong and the shame being divided between the author who originated it, and his too credulous followers.

One other instance of similar speculation on the part of Jones, and we dismiss him. He is giving an account of the faith and practices of the Waldenses in the time of Louis XII., of France, as ascertained by special inquiry, made under the instructions of that monarch. Among other things, he states that it was reported to Louis that "they kept the Sabbath day, *observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive Church*, instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith, and the commandments of God."† For this incident, and the manifesto of the Waldensian doctrines and customs, Jones refers to Perrin as his authority. Turning to Perrin, we find the passage in these words: "They kept the Sabbath duly, *caused their children to be baptized according to the primitive Church*, taught them the articles of the Christian faith, and the commandments of God."‡ Here, also, the Italics are ours. Let the reader compare the two places so designated in the two extracts. He will understand how it is that

* Vol. II., p. 242.

† Page 348.

‡ Book I., ch. V.

Jones, and those who in their investigations go no farther back than to his history, can find no evidence that the Waldenses baptized their children.

But it may be asked, how does Jones dispose of the several passages which have been extracted, in the former part of this article, from the Confessions, and similar papers of the people? He simply omits them, in some instances quoting nearly the entire documents, except their testimony on this one subject. It is painful to speak in such terms of an author whom any portion of the Christian world are disposed to consider respectable. But much is due to the truth of history, and it is better that the reputation of one man should suffer, than that a whole community of Christian people, and they among the worthiest that ever existed on the earth, should lie under what they themselves pronounced a grievous calumny.

Here and there, in the writings of those who treat of the Waldenses, occur incidental remarks, which, considered apart from their connection with the particular topics to which they belong, might be construed as favoring the views of our Baptist brethren on the question at issue. The most important of these remarks is one from "Limborch's History of the Inquisition," Vol. I., ch. VIII. Jones quotes it; so does Dr. Curtis; and so, also, others of the same party. Jones, as usual, mutilates the passage. We shall, therefore, cite Dr. Curtis' more full and accurate version of it, thus: "To speak my own mind freely, the Albigenses and Waldenses appear to me to have been two distinct sects, and they were entirely ignorant of many tenets now ascribed to them. Particularly, the Waldenses appear to have been plain men, unskilful and inexperienced, and if their opinions and customs were to be examined without prejudice, it would appear that, among all the modern sects of Christians, they bear the greatest resemblance to that of the Mennonites." Dr. Curtis tells us that the Mennonites are the "Modern Dutch Baptists."

It will not fail to occur to our readers that evidence of the anti-pedobaptism of the Waldenses must be in much request, when such as this passage affords—so meagre is it at best, and reached by so wide and toilsome a circuit—is passed down from one generation to another of controversial writers. That it really imports nothing as to the matter under discussion, we should not deem it worth the space it occupies on our pages to show, were it not that our opponents appeal to it with a confidence that stands in an exact ratio, but, as it happens, inversely, to the value of the testimony. (1.) Limborch simply offers his opinion, and this is done with an air of timidity, which implies that he was aware that the preponderance of respectable authorities was against him. (2.) He does not state, nor intimate in the most indirect terms, that the resemblance which he supposed to exist between the Waldenses and Mennonites, had any respect to infant baptism. Not a word on that subject occurs in his book, within ten pages of the passage cited from him. There are many particulars in which the two sects may have agreed, and yet infant baptism not have been included. (3.) An application of the ordinary canons of criticism would suggest to the ingenuous reader that the resemblance which he refers to, lay in the general characteristics of the parties, as plain men, unskilful and inexperienced, rather than in an agreement in any one specific article of faith or practice. And (4.) in the very chapter from which the passage is extracted, Limborch expressly exonerates the Waldenses from the charge of denying baptism to infants. In accordance with his purpose throughout the chapter, which is, to prove that the Albigenses and Waldenses were distinct sects, he classifies the opinions which he says “were common to them both,” in which list nothing is said of infant baptism, and then the opinions held by the Albigenses, but not by the Waldenses. Under this latter division, he states that it was reported of the Albigenses: “That they condemned the

baptism of water, saying 'that a man was to be saved by their laying on of hands upon those that believed them, and that their sins were to be remitted without confession and satisfaction; that no baptism availed any thing; no, not their own.'" "We read, also," continues Limborch, "in the sentence of Petrus Raymundus Dominicus de Borno, that he heard Peter Auterii, (a famous doctor among the Albigenses,) teaching, among other things, 'That the baptism of water, made by the Church, was of no avail to children; because they were so far from consenting to it, that they wept.'" In connection with their views rejecting all baptism by water, Limborch enumerates various other errors, such as the sinfulness of marriage, the denial of the human nature of Christ, of the resurrection of the body, etc., in all which they betrayed their Manichean origin, and then adds this emphatic declaration: "These opinions of the Albigenses are not one of them ascribed to the Waldenses, who had quite different tenets, which are never mentioned in the sentences of the Albigenses.* Here is Limborch's testimony as a historian. It is positive as to the opinions of the Waldenses on the subject before us, and his name may be added to the long list of authors of the highest repute, confirming our views. Or, if the passage quoted by Dr. Curtis from his pages is to be still used as implying a resemblance between the Waldenses and the Mennonites in relation to infant baptism, we oppose to it the authority of Jones himself, who says: "An impartial review of the doctrinal sentiments maintained by the Waldenses, the discipline, order, and worship of their Churches, as well as their general deportment and manner

* The Albigenses of whom Limborch speaks were not the people usually associated with the Waldenses, but a family of the Cathari, mentioned by Dr. Revel in his letter to Dr. Baird. Limborch did not make the necessary distinction between parties which it suited the purposes of Papal writers to confound together under a common name, in order that they might be subjected to a common odium.

of life, not to mention their determined and uniform opposition to the Church of Rome, affords abundant evidence of the similarity of their views and practices to those held by Luther, Calvin, and the other illustrious characters, whose labors, in the sixteenth century, contributed so eminently to effect the glorious Reformation. Most of the Catholic writers who lived about the time of the Reformation, and the age which succeeded it, clearly saw this coincidence between the principles of the Waldenses and those of the Reformers, and remarked it in their works.* If it shall be said that the matter of baptism is to be excepted in Jones' "similarity" and "coincidence," we shall claim that it be excepted, also, in Limborch's "resemblance."

Another recourse of those who would establish the anti-pedobaptism of the Waldenses, is, to charges preferred against them by Papal writers, and that in the days when these evangelical Christians were the objects of unremitting persecutions on account of their dissent from Papal doctrines and opposition to Papal rule. As far back as the times of Richard Baxter, and down to the present day, declarations proceeding from such a source, and originating in just such motives as the circumstances would naturally imply—declarations which the people they concern have themselves pronounced calumnious—are found bespangling the pages of our opponents in this controversy. The space which it would be proper for us to occupy will not permit the citation and review of all these precious *morceaux*. We shall confine ourselves to the examination of one, and it shall be that on which the most stress seems to be laid, if we may judge from the frequency with which it is employed. Allix mentions that Rayner, or Reinerus, a Dominican, in exposing the errors of the Waldensians, says: "Some of them hold that baptism is of no avail to infants, because they can not actually believe." Allix does not

* Jones' History, p. 357.

quote the charge as endorsing it, for, as we have seen, he held the contrary view. The sentence occurs in a long extract, covering some eight pages, in which a great many things are said by Rayner respecting the people of whom he writes, some of which were doubtless true, and others are manifestly false.

Who was this Rayner? An apostate—not from the Waldensian Church, as is sometimes asserted—but from the sect of the Cathari, with whom he had lived for seventeen years, according to his own account—“*conversatus sum cum eis.*”^{*} Abandoning his original faith, he became a Papist, a Friar, and an Inquisitor. It was his office to search out the heresies that lurked among his former brethren, and we may reasonably suppose that he was not lacking in the zeal which usually distinguishes proselytes. He could but understand that the greater the energy he displayed in his appointed work, the kindlier would be the smiles which would cheer him from the high places of the hierarchy he served, and the more rapid his promotion. This Rayner, with such antecedents and such prospects, wrote a book; concerning whom? It seems difficult to decide. Dr. Wall, who appears to have examined the book with special care, says that he mentions the name of the Waldenses but once, and whom he means by it, Wall avers that he does not know.[†] Robinson says that he does not once mention the Valleys of the Piedmont, unless he meant to include them in a general description, when he said that Leonists were in all the cities of Lombardy, and had spread themselves into all countries.[‡] The title of his book is “*Summa de Catharis et Leonistis.*” Now, the Cathari differed from the Waldenses more widely than the latter differed from the Papists. They revived, or else inherited, the ancient ab-

* Gieseler C. His., III., p. 395. Neander, do., IV., p. 579.

† Vol. II., pp. 254, 257.

‡ Ec. His., p. 446.

surdities and abominations of Eastern Gnosticism.* Allix says they were a sect of the Manicheans, and, further, that "Manicheism is the most wild heresy that the devil could ever suggest." The Leonistes, or Poor Men of Lyons, were nearly affiliated to the Waldenses, so much so as to be often mentioned as the same people. But Rayner makes no distinction between the Cathari and the Leonistes. He wished to extirpate both, and it favored his scheme to confound them, so that he could charge upon the latter all the monstrous heresies of which he knew the former to be guilty. Thus, he accuses them—both sects alike—of holding that "marriage was nothing but sworn fornication," with other sentiments too offensive to decency to be named. We know that some of the charges are utterly, foully false, as it respects the one party; and if some are false—so acknowledged by Jones, Robinson, and all writers—why may not that concerning infant baptism be false also?

In justice to Rayner, however, it should be mentioned that he does not say that the sects of which he wrote did, all of them, or the majority of them, deny infant baptism, but "*quidam eorum*," some of them. No one has ever questioned that there were in that age some small and transient sects who were liable to the charge; such, for example, as the Manichean Cathari, who renounced all water baptism; the followers of Gundulphus, who held it useless, both for infants and adults; and, a little later, the Petrobrusians, who maintained that infants, being incapable of salvation, were also incapable of baptism. Our discussion has no reference to these sects, but to the Waldensians, who held no ecclesiastical or fraternal relations to such errorists.

We conclude this article, already unduly extended, with an extract from Richard Baxter's treatise on Baptism, in which he gives utterance to his sense of the injustice done to the Waldenses by arraigning them on charges preferred

* See Neander, or any standard Church History.

by their Papal enemies. Having referred to the testimony afforded in their own writings, that they observed the rite of infant baptism, and to the accusations of such writers as Rayner, which had been recently revived by a certain Mr. Tombes, a Baptist minister in his vicinity, the good, the saintly Baxter, exclaims: "Now, after all these clear vindications of these godly men (the Waldenses) from the malicious accusations of the Monks and Friars, who would have thought that such a man as Mr. Tombes, or any other Protestant that hath any profession of conscientiousness, should ever dare so openly to make the world believe that the malicious Papists speak truth in accusing these men; and that all our divines' vindication of them is false? Yea, and their own vindication of their own faith is false? And all this, to have somewhat to say for his own cause!! What a cause is that, that must be thus defended! Why may not Mr. Tombes as well strike in with Cope's and others' testimony against our 'Book of Martyrs,' or with the Papists in their foul lies against Luther, Calvin, Beza, Zuinglius, etc., as he doth here? Nay, would not this make the world believe that all other of the Papists' slanders of the Waldenses (as to be Arians, Manichees, Witches, Buggerers, etc.,) were true, as well as this? For, if the Papists' testimonies be better than ours, yea, or the men's own, in one thing, why not in another? * * * He that will dare to do thus, what will he not dare? And what testimony will he not think valid, that will lean on such as these? And how small a matter will satisfy him that will lean on this! * * * I pray God convince him; for bare evidence, and reason, and Scripture, will never do it, while such reasoning as this seems satisfactory or honest."*

* London edition, 1653, p. 159.

ARTICLE III.

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.
●

When we remember that, according to Presbyterians, the Church of God has existed, more or less visibly, in the world ever since the fall of man, and that now the people of God themselves differ as to the most radical points of Church polity, we are in danger of doubting that God has given a definite form to His House. To guard ourselves from falling into such a doubt, we may call to mind that civil government has been an object of study to the wisest and noblest of our race in all ages, and yet to-day, not only conventions and senates, but mighty armies, dispute the radical principles of constitutional liberty. But civil government *is* a science. National and civil disputes could be adjusted by reason, without appealing to the sword, were men not blinded by those lusts from which wars arise.

The subject announced at the head of this article is high—a matter, perhaps, too high for us to exercise ourselves therein. With respect to an object so complex, we fear that our thoughts will seem scarcely hinged into a skeleton, yet it is our earnest desire that these thoughts may correspond to reality, and thus be *truth*, and that they may form, though a rude, yet a truthful, sketch of the “true Tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched, and not man.” If, as a branch of the catholic Church, we are correct in saying: “The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate,” this government must be some thing comprehensible by these officers. Its constitution and laws they may understand. And though, as one of these officers, we may fail to reach

this height, we may comfort ourselves with the saying: *In magnis voluisse sat est.*

This magnitude of Church government, as an object of thought, and its consequent difficulty, to some extent accounts for the imperfection of our knowledge of this object. But we may find another reason in the nature of language—the relation of language to thought. Here let us step aside from the direct path to pluck a flower—a flower not so much of expression as of thought: “Admitting, even, that the mind is capable of certain elementary concepts, without the fixation and signature of language, still these are but sparks, which would twinkle only to expire; and it requires words to give them prominence, and, by enabling us to collect and elaborate them into new concepts, to raise, out of what would only be scattered and transitory scintillations, a vivid and enduring light.” The languages of the Church were first Hebrew, then Greek, after that chiefly Latin, and now, with us, English. From these changes of language, and our imperfect knowledge of them, they have failed to yield us a vivid and enduring light—to give us a *science* of the Church. The twinkling and expiring sparks of thought have not sufficed to reveal the symmetry and beauty, the order, firmness, and duration of the Christian temple.

Assuming, at present, some principles held, with a noble loyalty to Christ, by Presbyterians, for centuries—principles baptized with the blood of martyrs—we will briefly consider the courts of the Church; how they are created; their powers; their number; their mutual relations; their relation to the State. Since, according to Presbyterians, ruling powers, strictly, are vested by Christ exclusively in those courts, the full and complete consideration of the points now mentioned would involve the entire subject of Church polity.

These courts may be said to be created by the people who are subject to their rule, because each member of a

court is elected by the people he represents. "Though the character, qualifications, and authority of Church officers are laid down in the Holy Scriptures, as well as the proper method of their investiture and institution, yet the election of the persons to the exercise of this authority, in any particular society, is in that society." Thus, though the constitution and laws of the Church, and the powers of Church officers, come down from heaven, the officers themselves arise from the people, being chosen out of the people, and by them.

This theory, that the Church, catholic or national, grows from the people—grows by particular churches voluntarily uniting with other particular churches, and thus forming more general churches—exhibiting a more extensive visible unity among the followers of Christ, is of importance at the present time, because some seem to think that new and local churches spring into existence at the bidding of some great central court, and that the new church derives its constitution, laws, and life, almost, from this previously existing Church. What else does Dr. Baird mean, (*Digest*, Part VI.,) where he says: "From the facts presented below, it will appear that the General Assembly is not a body created by the voluntary union of Presbyteries and Synods, as is some times assumed, but itself the original body whence they have derived their existence and powers"? We say No, to this. The new Synod, Presbytery, or Session, derives its existence, powers, and life, as directly from Christ, as the Assembly did. It is the voluntary union of smaller courts which forms a larger court.

We know the language of the Constitution may seem to favor the opposite theory. The General Assembly is said to have the power "of erecting new Synods." The Synod has the power "to erect new Presbyteries." The Presbytery has power "to form or receive new congregations." This language of our constitution may be illustrated by the commission of the Prophet Jeremiah: "See, I have set

thee this day over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant." The Prophet is said to do what he only declares God would do. Thus, an existing church may, without abuse of language, be said to erect or create a new church, when it declares, with authority from Christ, the terms of admission into the kingdom of Christ, and receives the new church into visible union with itself.

To illustrate the principle, let us take a case which is frequently occurring, the organization of a new congregation. A Presbytery sends forth an evangelist, with power to preach to a people, and organize them into a church, upon their credible profession of Christianity. The minister proclaims to the people the existence of the kingdom of Christ, its ineffable blessings and glories, and the terms of admission. This new people believe, and signify their desire to enter the kingdom; their names are enrolled, and they elect their officers. Now, so far as the agency of man is concerned, who is it that erects, forms, or creates this new church? The evangelist? the Presbytery who sent him? or the new people themselves? We think it is the last. And the officers to govern this church may be said to be created by the people that elect them, though the powers they are to exercise have been prescribed in the constitution and laws which Christ has given to the catholic Church.

This may be predicated of every court above—the Session, the Presbytery, Synod, and the General Assembly. Of each court, even of the Assembly, it may be said it was created by the people whom it was intended to govern; but the constitution, defining the powers of the court and the laws to be administered, are from Christ.*

* With great respect for our correspondent, we submit that the courts of the Church can not, in any just sense, be said to be *created* by the people.

Touching the formation of Church courts, we may adopt the language of a former number of the Review, (Vol. XII., No. 3): "The Presbytery is a union of Sessions—the Synod is a union of Presbyteries—and the General Assembly is, or ought to be, a union of Synods." Making the Assembly a union of Synods would be more regular—more symmetrical. Indeed, we may regard this as a fact. True, in the United States Assembly, the ratio of representation is made by the Presbyteries, and the amending power is vested in the Presbyteries; but the roll in the Assembly is called by Synods; the Assembly was at first constituted out of four Synods; the Assembly reviews the records of Synods, not those of Presbyteries; the Assembly has power to erect new Synods, the Synod to erect new Presbyteries. The Constitution of the United States divides each State into Congressional Districts, and assigns to each District a representative; yet the Federal Government is, or was, a union of States, not of Districts. Then, why not say that the Assembly is a union of Synods? This theory, had it been

The mere election of the members, severally, is not the creation of the body.

So, also, we submit that the people who have been organized as a new church by the evangelist, or by the Presbytery, can not be said to *create* that church nor its officers. Such a people do but *compose* the church, and they but *elect* the officers.

Touching the meaning of Dr. Baird, in the passage quoted by our correspondent from his Digest, we understand him to be speaking simply in a *historical* sense. The actual rise of the General Assembly was antecedent to the formation of all but sixteen of the Presbyteries, and all but four of the Synods. In the organism of "the Presbyterian Church in the United States," the General Assembly was, as to all the Synods and Presbyteries, with the above named exceptions, the *root*, in a *historical* aspect, out of which the inferior courts arose.

Upon several other points in this interesting and suggestive article, we would take issue with our correspondent, but it is the first time he has ventured upon our hospitality, and as we desire to secure his returning to visit us again, we wish to be very civil. Our readers must give their candid consideration to his views.—[Eds. S. P. R.]

generally adopted and followed by Southern Presbyterians, in the dissolution and reorganization now going on, would have prevented much confusion—would have added *majesty* to the movement. With what dignity could the Synod of South Carolina, for sufficient cause, have declared the dissolution of its governmental union with the Synods of the United States—a union effected through the Assembly! Then this Synod could have met other Southern Synods on the platform of a constitution which the Synods, in the order of nature, if not of time, had before there *was* an Assembly.

Southern Presbyterians, recognizing the Confederate Assembly to be a union of Synods, may improve the system of reports. They may ignore the unconstitutional order of the United States Assembly, requiring reports from the Presbyteries directly to the Assembly. We know by experience the confusion this order has produced, especially in congregational reports. We have thus considered, briefly, the manner in which Church courts are originated. But there is a question logically prior to this.

Presbyterians say that governmental power—distinguished from the power of teaching, and from the pregnant right of election, which is secured to the people—is vested in a grand system of courts. This system consists of thousands of Congregational councils, each equal in power and dignity with every other Session. Next comes the grade of Presbyteries, each having a jurisdiction limited geographically, and by a written constitution. Such is the union of similitude between these Presbyteries, that the definition of one fits every other. Next are the Synods, and, finally, a supreme court, called the General Assembly.

Now, the question is, is this form of government a human constitution, or is it divine? The language of our Fathers is modest: "We hold it to be expedient, and agreeable to Scripture and the practice of the primitive Christians, that the Church be governed by Congrega-

tional, Presbyterian, and Synodical Assemblies." They cite some passages from the New Testament, to show that this form is Scriptural. But on the principle, which is eminently Presbyterian, that God has never established but one catholic visible Church, we think that light may be thrown from other points upon the Church, to reveal its form. The Christian Church is the succession and perpetuation of the Abrahamic and the Mosaic. A law once enacted is in force until repealed. This is the foundation of infant membership in these last days. But when we quote any constitution or law of the Mosaic Church, as a precedent for present practice, we are likely to be met with the objection: That law was political—it was judicial, or it was ceremonial—not moral, and binding upon us. But we think that "the form of the house" under the Mosaic dispensation, as to *government*, is a grand type to us.

That we may see the relation of the Mosaic government to modern Church polity, let us quote a passage in this Review, Vol. XIII., p. 44. Here is announced what is termed the great law of differentiation. To illustrate this law, on the next page it is said: "In proportion as society advances, differentiation of social character, and specialization of social functions (division of labor) progresses also, until, in the highest conditions of society, each man is confined to the performance of a single function."

Now, this great law of differentiation finds an illustration in the most dignified of all departments of human activity—in government. We will attempt an illustration. What unity of power—what a combination of social functions—do we see in Abraham! His family, including his servants, formed a tribe or nation, and was, also, primarily the visible Church. In this society Abraham was at once the principal instructor and the High Priest, performing the most solemn acts of the priesthood—he was king, judge and jury, and was a successful military chieftain.

In Egypt we find some division of power, because there were elders over the people. But the Mosaic government was a great advance in differentiation. The functions of sacrificing and of teaching were given to the Priests and Levites. As to government, the whole nation was divided into twelve tribes—the tribes were subdivided into great families—and these, again, were subdivided into less families, called houses of fathers (Num. 1 : 2). There was not much consolidation in the government. There was much local self-government. The chief magistrate, at first called judge, then king, was a limited monarch. He was debarred, by a strict constitution, from absolutism.

Yet there was much unity of power. Especially, the ecclesiastical and civil powers were not separated. The ecclesiastical and civil laws were intermingled in the same books. There is not satisfactory evidence that there were two sets of courts, one for Church cases, the other for civil causes. The High Priest, the chief minister of divine worship, was the President of the supreme court. David, in whose reign the Mosaic government culminated, was a lawgiver to the Church, the king of the country, the sweet Psalmist of Israel, and the greatest military chieftain of his time.

It was not until after the advent of Christ that governmental powers were divided into two great classes, and the Church and State became two separate, independent, and coördinate organizations.

The powers of civil government have been divided and subdivided, so as to make a complex and refined organism, according to the maxim: without division of power there is no constitution; without constitution, no liberty. This division was made by the framers of the Constitution of the United States, with an approach towards perfection, we hope, now, in our blessed Confederacy. There is a triple division of these powers—those delegated to the Confederacy; those to the State governments; and those which

the people still retain, not having delegated them to either government. Among the powers retained by the people of the several States, is the high sovereign power by which they ordained and established both State and Federal governments, and by which they can modify, change, or abolish them at pleasure.

Let us quote a passage here from Mr. Calhoun's work on Government, to illustrate the division of power in the Government of the United States: "Taking all the parts together, the people of thirty independent and sovereign States, confederated, by a solemn constitutional compact, into one great federal community, with a system of government, in all of which, powers are separated into the great primary divisions of the constitution-making and the law-making powers; those of the latter class being divided between the common and joint government of all the States, and the separate and local governments of each State respectively; and, finally, the powers of both distributed among three separate and independent departments, legislative, political, and executive—presents in the whole a political system as remarkable for its grandeur as it is for its novelty and refinement of organization. For the structure of such a system—so wise, just, and beneficent—we are far more indebted to a superintending Providence, that so disposed events as to lead, as if by an invisible hand, to its formation, than to those who erected it. Intelligent, experienced, patriotic, as they were, they were but builders under its superintending direction."*

As to division of powers in ecclesiastical government—as to constitutional guaranties from oppression—the system may be simpler than in the State; for the officers have, substantially, but one everlasting code to which they can require obedience. This, of itself, is a mighty wall of sal-

* Page 198.

vation from ecclesiastical tyranny, where the people are not too ignorant or careless to perceive it.

The distinction between the constitution-making and law-making powers, is not of so much consequence in the kingdom of Christ. Church courts, according to Presbyterians, have only judicial and executive powers, and there is much less danger of oppression from the right of judging upon laws already made, than from "the usurped claim of making laws."

True, we speak of the power of a majority of Presbyteries to amend the Constitution, and of our courts legislating; but the products in either case are only *judge-made* laws. They are laws evolved from a written system by judicial interpretation—"by good and necessary consequence."

To return nearer to the question in hand: Can we use the Mosaic form of government as a great type of instruction, at least in erecting "the true Tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched, and not man?" or as a light to show us what this Tabernacle is? We think so.

We can not now enter upon a lengthy argumentation to prove this. We will only say, that the visible Church was not disorganized at the advent of Christ—the form of government was not abolished; great alterations were made in the mode of worship, and there was a great extension of the blessings of the Church; but the inspired Apostles, saying nothing of a revolution in ecclesiastical government, vesting its powers in Presbyteries, some local, and at least one—which was sufficient for the time—supreme court; all this affords a strong probability of a perpetuation of the Mosaic form of government. For that government, being primarily ecclesiastical, and only secondarily civil, it is more properly an example to the Church than to the State.

Now, the basis of the Mosaic economy was the division of the people into four ranks of communities. The primary communities were termed "houses of fathers." A

union of these formed a family. A union of families, a tribe. A union of the twelve tribes formed the nation, or Church of God. Corresponding with these, the prefects, or judges, advised by Jethro, were of four ranks. The analogy of our form of government to the Israelitish is obvious, and the more, when it is remembered that both governments are only judicial and executive upon divine laws.

And for this reason, the analogy of our Presbyterian government is with the judicial system of this country, rather than with the legislative. And a government of courts, ascending from the primary and local to the larger and more general, and ending in one supreme, seems to be founded in nature. It satisfies two great principles, that the accused be tried as near his home as convenient, or near the scene of the facts to be investigated; and that the more difficult cases may ascend where they may be adjudicated by the greatest wisdom of the system. In every country where the people enjoy constitutional liberty, there is such a system of courts.

The formation of a grand central court, as our General Assembly, is in beautiful harmony with one of the chief ends of the organization of the Church. This chief end is, the execution of the order: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." This is a great work, requiring the coöperation of all the people of God, united and represented by an Assembly. And this is analogous to the fact of civil government, that there are certain great powers which can be successfully executed only by a federal government.

We think the opinion of Presbyterians, that the form of Church government is divine, and that that form is a system of courts having judicial and executive powers, may receive confirmation from a new source. We believe that our views are in harmony with the great laws of "typical forms and special ends," so fully illustrated by McCosh. The one, "typical forms," as well as the other, "special

ends," will be found in the dispensations of God *in the kingdom of His Son*, and point to a most interesting analogy between nature and revelation.

To apply these laws to the topic in hand: God gave His people, through Moses, a *form* of government, which is typical to His Church now, though that form was modified, especially at the coming of Christ, to suit a grander field of operations. It would result from this that we can not now comprehend the "true Tabernacle" without recurring to the Old Testament. And this harmonizes with the words of the Apostle: "The *law* was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." We must yet consult Moses for law and forms of government. But we can not pursue this thought now, for we can not make this article exhaustive; we shall be satisfied if it prove suggestive.

There is an application of a principle in a preceding paragraph we desire to make. The principle is, that the visible Church grows into visible unity, by the voluntary union of particular churches, to form more general churches. Thus, a General Assembly is created by local bodies. Let us connect with this another principle, that visible or governmental union, however important, is not essential to Christian character. The necessity of the visible union of believers in one organization, is one of the chief errors of the Papacy. This visible union of all the professors of Christianity, Papists said, could only be effected through the Pope; and without it a man could not be saved. But we distinguish between the union of the invisible Church and that of the visible. The former union is essential to salvation, and indissoluble. The latter is not. And, in the present state of the world, it is, perhaps, not possible to extend the governmental union of a Church beyond the limits of a nation. Then, the fact of the formation of the Southern Confederacy, and that for reasons we heartily approve, is an adequate cause for dissolving—not spiritual

union with Northern Presbyterians, if they are Christians—but external governmental union.

True, three centuries since, Scotch Presbyterians contemplated an Assembly representing and visibly uniting all Presbyterians in all nations under the heavens. This may occur in the Millenium, but it is a sublimity to which we can not at present aspire.

Let us close this article, in which our thoughts have not been connected with a golden chain, by reminding our readers of the *importance* of the subject, and especially now.

Constitutions and forms of government, in Church and State, are among the most complex and difficult, yet the most ennobling and important, objects of thought. For the subjects of a large part of history are usurpations of unjust and unconstitutional power, and consequent oppression; the subject of nearly all the other part of history is resistance to usurpation, calling into play the most godlike virtues of our nature.

And our Southern Zion is amply justified in her profound sympathy with our Confederacy in the bloody conflict for constitutional liberty. Boasting of a complete separation of Church and State, we may forget how intimate is the relation of these divine institutions, and how powerful is their mutual influence. Civil and ecclesiastical tyranny have ever been closely combined. On the other hand, constitutional liberty in the Church, tends to bring about constitutional liberty in the country. And this, in its turn, has the most happy influence upon the Church, which never flourished extensively, and for a long period, where despotism prevailed. This conflict, then, is not merely for temporal advantages, but for the noblest opportunities for spiritual and eternal life.

ARTICLE IV.

ANALOGY BETWEEN THE FORMATION OF THE
PIHEL CONJUGATION IN HEBREW AND THE
PERFECT TENSE IN LATIN.

The Pihel conjugation in Hebrew is *intensive*, and, like the frequentative verbs in Latin, such as *dicito, ventito, cantito*, from *dico, venio, cano*, “is formed by reduplicating one of the letters of the root; on the principle that, as the repetition of a sentence or of a word imparts a greater degree of energy to discourse, so the reduplication of even a part of a word may be employed with like effect. The letter selected for reduplication is generally the second radical, whereby the greatest degree of force is obtained; since this letter can thus be made audible in both syllables, which is not the case with either of the others.” The roots generally consist of three consonants, and this is the regular way of forming the conjugation, but in case some obstacle arises, in the nature of the radicals, to the carrying out of this law, then some other expedient is resorted to, by way of compensation.

The principle is, that the peculiar idea of the conjugation must be carried out by protracting some part of the root; and if the right radical will not admit of it, it takes another, “which will serve instead, and at the same time show that the second radical would have been reduplicated, had this not been forbidden by its nature.”

This is accomplished in three separate ways:

1. The first vowel is lengthened, especially when the second radical is a guttural, since the dwelling longer upon a syllable, by lengthening it, confers an emphasis equivalent to the forcible expulsion of the voice in reduplicating a consonant.

The verb to kill, *katal*, is regular, and forms this conjugation by doubling the *t* and changing the vowel before it; it then becomes *kittal*, to kill often, in which the *a* has the sound of *a* in *sale*. But when the middle letter is a guttural, or *r*, which is of the same nature, and can not so easily be doubled, to compensate for it, the vowel before it is lengthened; *barak*, instead of becoming *birrāk*, is *bārāk*, but the vowels differing from the root, in that both have here the sound of *a* in *sale*.

2. When the second radical is *vav* (*v*, *w*), on account of the weakness of this letter, the *third* is doubled in its stead, and *v* rests in its homogeneous vowel, *o*—*e. g.*, *komam*, for *kivvam*.

3. When the second letter is *repeated* in the root, the first is reduplicated in the intensive form—*e. g.*, *sabab* becomes *sibšüb*, which, by transposition, becomes *sibsüb*, the *a* having, as before, the sound of *a* in *sale*.*

Now, we apply the same principle to the preterite of the Latin verb, to express “the state consequent upon the completion of an action.”

It seems to have been a law here, too, that the peculiar idea of this tense shall be expressed by lengthening something pertaining to the root. There must be a *prefix*, an *affix*, on an internal prolongation of the *vowel* of the root. Of these methods, it may be difficult to tell which is the regular and normal one, answering to the doubling of the middle radical consonant of the Hebrew; but probably the reduplication of the first consonant is, after the analogy of the Greek, where this is the rule, with few exceptions; as, when a verb begins with a double consonant, with any two single ones, except a mute before a liquid, or with *ρν*; as *ζάω*, *ἔζηκα*; *ψάλλω*, *ἔψαλκα*; *στέλλω*, *ἔσταλκα*, etc.

We may not be able to see, in every case that the reduplication does not occur, the reason of it, but in many cases

* See Nordheimer's Heb. Gram., §§ 142, 143.

the same reason will hold as in the Hebrew; and the same classes of letters do not reduplicate the gutturals, with *r* in general, and *v*, and those hard to enunciate, or not euphonic. The reduplication is confined to the third conjugation of verbs, which is believed to have been the original one, as the third declension of nouns is the parent of all the others. As authority for this opinion with regard to conjugations, Anthon, in his Latin Prosody, refers to Struve.*

The only consonants admitting reduplication, according to Poët (Etym. F., p. 23), are *c*, *p*, *t*, *d*, *m*, *b*, *f*, *st*, *sp*, etc.; as *cado*, *ce-cid-i*; *peplo*, *pepuli*; *tango* (root *tag*), *te-tig-i*; *do*, *de-di*; *mordeo*, *mo-mordi*; *fallo*, *fe-falli*; *sto*, *steti*; *spondeo*, *spospondi*; *scindo*, *scidi*, for *sci-cid-i*. Harrison says: "It should be remarked that the radical of the reduplicated perfect is uniformly short, and that if it has been increased in the present and similar tenses by the addition of a consonant, the root in the perfect recovers its simple form."† The Latin had no gutturals properly, and we miss from the above list the palatics, *g*, *q*, *j*, which come the nearest to gutturals, with the weak consonant, *v* and *r*, together with *h*, which, though called an aspirate, must have had, in some cases at least, like *hē* and *hhēth* in Hebrew, a guttural sound; as we see in *veho*, *vexi*, (*vecsī*); *traho*, *traxi*, (*tracsī*). So that, on the whole, we shall see that, though more letters are not doubled in Latin than in Hebrew, the same that fail to be reduplicated in the latter are not in the former.

We will proceed to show, then, the strong analogy between the methods of forming the Pihel conjugation in Hebrew and the perfect tense in Latin. As, in the former, we have the regular formation by reduplicating the first syllable of the root, generally with a change of the short vowel, just as with the vowel preceding the letter doubled

* Ueber die Lateinische Declination und Conjugation, Königsberg, 1823.

† Harrison's Lat. Gr., p. 251.

in Hebrew—*e. g.*, *katal*, *kittal*, “the first being accompanied by the shortest vowel, *i*, by means of which the reduplication of the letter following can be the most forcibly expressed”—so *fallo* makes *fēfalli*; *tango*, (root *tag*, the *n* merely strengthening the present,) *tēlīgi*; *cado*, *cēcīdi*; *parco*, *pēpērci*. *Sto* (Gr. *ΣΤΑΩ*, hence an *a* belongs to the root,) *stēti*, and, compounded, *constīti*. But when this mode of formation is not, or can not be, for some reason, carried out, it is compensated for :

(1.) By intensifying the radical vowel. *Facio*, *fēc-i*; *video*, *vīd-i*; *venio*, *vēn-i*; *lavo*, *lāv-i*; *jacio*, *jēc-i*: here, in each case, the first vowel of the root is short, but is lengthened in the perfect; hence the rule of prosody, that preterites of two syllables lengthen the former. We think that this explanation is more simple than that of Grimm, who contends that such verbs originally had a reduplication, and lost it in the course of time. Thus, *venio*, *veveni*, *ve'eni*, *veni*; *video*, *vividi*, *vī'idi*, *vidi*; *fugio*, *fufugi*, *fu'ugi*, would be the process of contraction.*

(2.) We have an addition to the end of the word. This may be *ui*, *vi*, or *si*. *Habeo*, *habui*; *Amo*, *amavi*; *Angeo*, *anxi* (*angsi*). The *ui*, and *vi*, are only different forms of the same thing.

(3.) We may have a long vowel, with this ending in *si* added, and one of the consonants of the root dropped. *Mitto*, *mīsi*, (*mitsi*); *Rodo*, *rōsi*, (*rodsi*); *Rado*, *rasi*, (*radsi*). In some cases the consonant is retained, but assimilates to the termination; *cedo cessi*, instead of *cedsi*.† *Premo*, *pressi*. But *defendo*, *defendi*, in which the *s* in *si* is rejected. There is no case of reduplication when a letter is already repeated in the root, by which I mean all that precedes—are—ere—ire—of the infinitive; *bibo*, *vivo*, *ningo*, *gigno*, have *bibi*, *vixi*, *ninxi*, *genui*.

* Anthon's Lat. Pros., pp. 16, 17.

† This seems a singular case of *d* going into *s*.

If the above supposition is not an approximation to the truth, and the reduplicated perfect is not the normal form, from which the others deviate, for certain reasons arising from the nature of the letters and the laws of euphony, then there can be no regular system, and the language exhibits a very irregular and composite character. Zumpt (Gram., sec. 154) calls this form of the perfect an "*irregularity*."*

And if the case of the Latin is illustrated by the Hebrew, the question arises, has the former at any time, at its origin or since, been influenced by the latter, or are these compensatory variations the results of the laws that relate to the human mind, and the organs of speech? From the relation, or, rather, want of relation, in ancient times between these two people, it is not probable that the language of one influenced that of the other, either in its vocabulary, in the formation and inflection of words, or in grammatical construction. Any similarity, then, must arise from the same circumstances, and the same laws of mental and physical constitution.

Comparative philologists put these two languages in very diverse families. And "what influence the Semitic family, especially the religionized Judaic portion of it, has had, directly or indirectly, on the development of any or all of the Indo-European family, it would be a matter of capital interest, were there sufficient data for such an examination, to investigate and decide."†

* The ethnical affinities * * * * satisfactorily established by the investigations of Niebuhr, Müller, Lepsius, Donaldson, and others, are a guide to the affinities of the Latin language, and point out the elements of which it is composed. These elements are Umbrian, Oscan, Etruscan, Sabine, and Pelasgian; but the Etruscan was a compound of Oscan and Pelasgian, and the Sabine was the link between the Umbrian and Oscan, therefore the elements of the Latin are reduced to three, viz: Umbrian, Oscan, and Pelasgian.—Browne's Rom. Class. Lit., pp. 42, 43.

† Modern Philology, by Dwight, p. 25.

As the perfect tense in Latin also performs the office of an aorist, or indefinite past, some are disposed to say that those perfects that add *si* were originally aorists, and that this termination corresponds with the Greek ending *sa*. *E-tup-sa*, *nup-si*, and *tur-si*, have a great resemblance. And the resemblance is equally great in the case of liquid verbs in Greek, that lengthen the penult and add *a* to the termination, as, *mēno*, 1st aor., *ē-mein-a*; *nēmo*, 1st aor., *ē-neim-a*; and those Latin verbs that form the perfect by adding *i* only, and lengthening the penult, as *vīdeo*, *vīdi*; *ago*, *ēgi*; *fra(n)go*, *frēgi*.

Latham says: "when a difference of form has ceased to express a difference of meaning, it has become superfluous. This is the case with the two forms (the reduplicated perfect, *tetigit*, and the one in *si*, as *vixit*.) One of them may be dispensed with; and the consequence is, that, although in the Latin language both the perfect and aorist forms are found, they are, with few exceptions, never found in the same word. Wherever there is the perfect, the aorist is wanting, and *vice versâ*. The two ideas, *I have struck*, and *I struck*, are merged into the notion of past time in general, and are expressed by one of two forms, some times by that of the Greek perfect, and some times by that of the Greek aorist. On account of this, the grammarians have cut down the number of Latin tenses to *five*; forms like *cucurri* and *vixi* being dealt with as one and the same tense. The true view is, that in *curso* the aorist form is replaced by the perfect, and in *vixi* the perfect form is replaced by the aorist.

ARTICLE V.

THE PERSONALITY OF GOD, AS AFFECTING
SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Simonides, the poet, when questioned by Hiero, the king, concerning the nature of God, demanded a day for consideration. The question being repeated at the expiration of the time, he begged to be allowed two days longer, and after having frequently evaded an answer, by still prolonging the period of deliberation, the king at length demanded the reason of this strange procedure. Simonides, who was a philosopher as well as a poet, gave the pregnant reply, that the longer he thought upon the subject, the greater was the difficulty of a satisfactory answer. Obscurities multiplied to reflection. "Behold, God is great," says Job, "and we know Him not, neither can the number of His years be searched out." The inscription upon the altar at Athens, which furnished Paul with a text for his memorable sermon on Mars Hill, contains a confession of ignorance, which can never cease to be true until God ceases to be infinite, and we the creatures of a day. He must ever be, not only the unknown, but the unknowable God. "Canst thou, by searching, find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea."

In striking contrast with these representations of antiquity we have a modern statement, that the very essence of God is comprehensibility—that it is His nature to be known, and that only in so far as He is intelligible, can He be said to have real existence.

To explain how such contradictory conclusions have been arrived at, we must understand the problem which, from the dawn of speculation, philosophy has set herself to solve, and the methods by which she has conducted the investigation. The point has been, to unfold the mystery of the universe—to tell whence it came, and how it has been produced. Being in itself and being in its laws—the causes and principles of all existing things, the great master of ancient speculation makes to be the end and aim of that science which he dignifies as wisdom. It is clear that, in every inquiry into causes and principles, the final answer must be, God. He is preëminently the Being from whom all other beings spring, and the constitution of the universe must be referred to Him as the ground and measure of its existence. In this general answer, which resolves every thing at last into God, every philosophy which deserves the name, whether in ancient or modern times, has concurred. They all end in Him. But when they undertake to answer the further question, what He is, and how all things centre in Him, they come to different results, according to their different views of the nature of the universe, and its relation to its first principle, or cause.

According to Aristotle, those who first philosophized on the subject, directed their attention to the principle of things, defining a principle as that of which all things are, out of which they are first generated, and into which they are at last corrupted, the essence remaining, though changed in its affections. What this essence was, this nature of things, whether one or many, the philosophers were not agreed. The language employed by Aristotle in recounting early opinions, and the subsequent history of philosophy, suggest different views of the nature of the universe. 1. It may be regarded as an organic whole, similar to the body of an animal or the structure of a plant; and, then, as the law of its being would be simply that of development, we could easily explain its phenomena, if we could only

seize upon the germ, from which it was gradually unfolded. The inquiry, in this aspect, is into the *αρχή*, the seminal principle, and its law of manifestation and of growth. Given this principle, in itself and in its law of operation, and the problem of the universe is solved. You find God, who is at once the commencement and the complement of being.

2. Or the universe may be regarded as a complex whole, a unity made by composition and mixture, consisting of parts entirely distinct in themselves, and held together by some species of cohesion. In this aspect the problem is, what are the elements of which it is compounded, and how are they sustained in union and combination? The answer here might be atheistic or not, according as the doctrine of efficient causes was excluded or rejected. The ancient arguments for Theism proceeded, for the most part, upon this conception of the universe, and postulated the necessity of a designing mind and a controlling Providence upon the arrangements of matter. The universe was a vast and complicated machine, which required mind to construct it, and mind to regulate its movements. Or, 3.

The universe may be regarded as absolutely an unit, a single being, whose essence or nature determines its phenomena, as if by logical necessity. There is a something which is the substratum of all properties—in which they inhere, and from which they are derived, as qualities are dependent upon substance, and when this essence, which is synonymous with being, has been discovered, we have found God. He is the essence of all things. They are only manifestations or properties of His infinite substance. This, it is needless to add, is the most ancient form of the philosophy of the absolute.

Modern schools of philosophy have pursued essentially the same tracks in explaining the mysteries of being. The most striking difference is, not in relation to the problem to be solved, but in relation to the point from which the investigation takes its departure. Ancient speculation

fastened on the objective and material, and its principles and causes were primarily, as Aristotle remarks, in the species of matter. Modern speculation begins with consciousness, and, confounding thought with existence, reality with knowledge, has made the laws of thought the regulative and constitutive principles of being. God is nothing but the complement of primitive cognitions—the collection of those fundamental ideas which are involved in every act of spontaneous consciousness, and whose nature it is, not only to be intelligible, but to furnish the conditions of the intelligibility of every thing besides. The characteristic of all the systems, whether ancient or modern, which makes God figure at the head of their various theories, as cause, principle, or law, and which resolve all phenomena into manifestation, combination, or development, is the stern necessity to which they reduce every thing. Pantheism and Positivism, how much soever they may differ in other respects, unite in the denial of a personal God. They consequently exclude, with equal rigor, the possibility of morals and religion, and shift the grounds of the certainty of science. It is the personal God, whose name we regard with awe and veneration, whose throne is encircled with clouds and darkness, and who must for ever be the unknown God. He is the great mystery which, once admitted, throws light upon every thing but the depths of His own being. He is the Infinite One who, transcending all the categories of thought, and mocking the limits of all finite science, can only be adored as a Being past finding out. He is the God whom human nature has spontaneously acknowledged. It is a corrupt philosophy, not the dictates of humanity—a spirit of bold and presumptuous speculation, and not the instinctive voice of the human spirit—that has replaced Him with a law, a principle, or an element. So radical and all-pervading is this truth of the personality of God, so essential

to all the dearest interests of man, that we propose to make it the subject of a more distinct consideration.

I. It may be well to begin by explaining what is involved in the notion of a *personal God*. What is it, in other words, to be a person?

A definition of a simple and primitive belief is not to be expected. We may describe the occasions on which it is elicited in consciousness, or the conditions on which it is realized, but the thing itself is incapable of being represented in thought. We have, for example, a belief of power and of substance, and we can detail the circumstances under which the belief is felt; but power and substance, we are incompetent to define; they are, to us, the unknown causes of effects which we experience. So it is with person; what it is in itself, what constitutes and distinguishes it, we can not comprehend—but there are conditions on which the belief of it, as the unknown and inexplicable cause of obvious phenomena, is developed in consciousness. These conditions, as the necessary adjuncts of the natural and spontaneous belief, we are able to apprehend.

1. The first circumstance which distinguishes this notion, is that of individuality. The notion is developed only under the antithesis of some thing different from itself, which takes place in every act of consciousness. Every instance of knowledge is the affirmation of a self, on the one hand, and a some thing which is not self, on the other. There is the subject knowing, and the object known. A man believes his own existence, only in believing the existence of somewhat that is distinct from himself. He affirms his personality, in contrast with another and a different reality. When, therefore, we assert the personality of God, we mean to affirm that He is distinct from other beings, and from other objects. We mean to affirm that He is not the universe, either in its matter or form, its seminal principle or final development.

He is essentially separate from it. His substance is in no sense the substance of the things that we see. He might have existed, and through a past eternity did exist, without them. They are objects to Him as a subject—no more parts of His own being than the material world is a part of ourselves. This notion of individuality is essential to every conception of the Deity, which enables him to use the pronoun I. An absolute Being can not be a person. The God of Pantheism can not say, "I will," or "I know"—and the notion of such a being ever reaching the stage of what the absolute philosophers call self-consciousness, is a flagrant contradiction in terms. When subject and object are identified, there can be no consciousness, no knowledge. When they are carried up to indifference, the result is personal extinction.

2. But, though individuality is a necessary adjunct of the notion of person, it is not always a necessary sign of its existence. There may be individuals that are not persons. The trees which we see around us, the plants and animals that cover the surface of the globe, are all individuals, but they are not persons. There are other conditions essential to the developement of the notion; these may be reduced to two—intelligence and will—or intelligence and conscience. Self is affirmed only in consciousness, and consciousness is the property only of intelligence. A being that can not reflect, and attribute its thoughts or impressions to itself, that can not say, "I think," "I feel," "I believe," can not be regarded as a person. It is probable that the brute has no reflective consciousness. He has present states, but does not distinguish, in the spontaneous feeling, the antithesis of subject and object. This is, possibly, the condition of infancy, also. But the dignity and full significancy of the notion of person, are developed in the sphere of morals—in which man is regarded as the subject of rights, and the responsible author of his own actions—to be a person, is to be one who can

regulate his motions according to a law, and who feels that there are certain things which he can justly claim as his own. He who can say, "I have a right," evinces himself, in the highest sense, to be a true and proper person. Hence, as morals are conversant only about voluntary states and acts, the doctrine has become common, that personality is seated exclusively in the will—but this narrow and restricted view puts asunder what God has joined together. Intelligence and responsibility can never be divorced, and though it is in the sphere of duties and of rights that the importance of self becomes most conspicuous, yet the simplest act of knowledge can not possibly take place without the recognition of it.

3. Another thing, equally essential to self-hood, is the feeling of absolute simplicity. It can not be divided, or separated into parts. Consciousness is an unit—responsibility is an unit. Every person is not only separate from every other being, but is incapable of discription in himself.

When, therefore, we maintain the personality of God, we mean distinctly to affirm that He is an absolutely simple intelligence, possessed of consciousness and will, who acts from purpose, and from choice, and is not to be confounded with any of the creatures of His hand. He is not a blind fatality; not a necessary principle; not a necessary law. He has every attribute which we recognize in ourselves as beings of reason and of will. It is preëminently in our personality, and the qualities which perfect and adorn it, that the image of God consists, in which man was originally formed, and this is the immense chasm betwixt us and the other creatures that inhabit this globe.

The plant has life and sensibility—the brute is capable of perception and motion, and exhibits, perhaps, some rude traces of dawning intelligence. But neither plants nor brutes have any thing approximating to the feeling of self-consciousness. Neither can rise to the affirmation of

a self, and neither is the subject of rights or duties. But to man it belongs to say, "I," "Me," and in this respect he resembles the God that made him. But, while the essence of the Divine image consists in the property of personality, the perfection of that image consists in the knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, which invest a person with all its dignity and excellence. All retain the essence—none but the redeemed have now the qualities that adorn. It is still true that God has set His eternal canon against murder, because the life which is violently taken away is the property of him who, as a person, still resembles his Maker, and has rights which can not, with impunity, be disregarded. Take away from man his personality, and the destruction of a human being would be no more serious a thing than the slaughter of a beast. It is the sanctity which is thrown around a person, as the reflection of the Divine glory, that makes it so awful a thing to be a man. He who can say, "Myself," is immeasurably nearer to God than any other form of being. He is not only from God, but like Him. Not only carries impressions of the Divine character, as the sun, the moon, and the stars, but carries in his bosom resemblances of the Divine attributes. We are not only His creatures, but His offspring, and, regulating our thoughts of Him by the analogies of our own nature, "we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." We should rise to the conception of His majesty, as of one that made the world, and all things therein—of one who, as Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands.

This statement of the conditions under which the notion of personality is realized, will correct the error into which the ignorant and unreflecting are apt to fall, of confounding it with figure, or material shape. We apply the term person so constantly to our bodies, that there is an imperceptible tendency to make the possession of a body essen-

tial to personal existence. But a little consideration will convince us that our bodies belong to us, but are not ourselves. We use them, and act through them, and by means of them. They are organs and instruments, but have not a single characteristic of personality. It is not the eye that sees, but the man that sees by means of the eye; it is not the ear that hears, but the man that hears through the instrumentality of the ear; it is not the leg or the foot that walks, but the man that walks by their help. These organs may be destroyed, and yet the power of vision, of hearing, of motion, remain in full integrity. They can not be exercised, for the want of the proper appliances, but they are there, and, could similar organs be replaced, could be easily called into action. In affirming, therefore, a personal, we are not affirming a material, God, bounded by any outline of figure or shape, or circumscribed to any space. We affirm a spirit—who is essentially self-conscious—whose essence is knowledge, holiness, power, and life—a spirit infinite, eternal, unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. We affirm the existence of that great Being who sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in. That great Being, who, dwelling in glory and light inaccessible—the King eternal, immortal, invisible—permits us to behold the skirts of His robe in the analogies of finite personalities. We can catch a glimpse of Him, but we can not see Him, and the overpowering force of that glimpse causes us to fall back in ourselves, exhausted and wearied under the mighty idea of God. He alone is great—He only doeth wondrous things.

II. The difference is immense between the admission and rejection of such a being in every department of thought and of action. Speculation, equally with practice, changes its character according to the nature of the Divinity that terminates its inquiries. Upon the hypothesis of Pan-

theism, or any hypothesis which construes God into a logical, physical, or metaphysical necessity, the relation of the finite to the infinite can only proceed, as a great living writer has observed, upon the supposition of the immanent, or, more correctly speaking, of substantial identity. Given this pervading essence, this principle of being, and all things can be deduced from God with as rigorous certainty as the propositions of geometry from the definitions of the science. He being what He is, they must be what they are. He is necessary cause—they, necessary effect; He, necessary substance—they, its necessary affections. It is obvious that, upon this theory, all science must be *a priori* and deductive, and Spinoza was consulting the exigencies of his system full as much as the spirit of the age, in reducing his philosophy to the forms of mathematical demonstration. The case is very different upon the supposition of a personal God. There, the universe is the product of will. It is an effect which might or might not have been; its nature and constitution are alike contingent; all depends upon the choice, the purpose, the plans of the Creator. Philosophy becomes an inquiry into the designs of God, and these designs, as in every other case, must be determined by the appearances submitted to the scrutiny of experience. We have no data to determine beforehand what kind of a thing the world should be—what kinds of creatures it should contain—by what kind of physical laws it should be governed. We could not construct it from any principles upon which the understanding might seize. The simple circumstance that it and all its phenomena are contingent, puts it beyond the reach of philosophical anticipation, and establishes at once the method of induction as the only method of inquiry. Speculation, upon this hypothesis, is the reduction to unity of the facts of observation—the elimination of the laws which create and preserve the order which the will of God has established. Though the universe is a contingent effect,

it is not the offspring of caprice or arbitrary power. In ascribing it to a personal God, we ascribe it to a Being who is possessed of wisdom and knowledge, and whose will is always determined by the infinite perfections of His character. We may expect, therefore, to find a plan which is worthy of this august and glorious Being, and we can pronounce, with confidence, beforehand, that whatever is essentially contradictory to wisdom, goodness, and truth, can not enter into the scheme. But, when the question arises as to the concrete realities that shall positively be called into being, man can know, either in the world of matter or of mind, only what he has observed. In a personal being, you introduce the operation of a free cause—power becomes will, and the only necessity which is conceivable is that of acting from design. The whole problem of philosophy becomes changed—the absolute is resolved into a metaphysical absurdity—and a principle of existence apart from the omnipotent will of a creator, is a mere delusion. Hence the Scriptures recognize God in every thing: It is His almighty arm that sustains the fabric of the universe. He projected and keeps in their orbits those planets, suns, and adamantine spheres, wheeling unshaken through the void immense. It is His to create the sweet influences of the Pleiades, and to loose the bands of Orion. All things live, and move, and have their being, in Him. But not in Him, as part and parcel of His own existence—not as the properties or developments of His nature—but as the products of His will, which are absolutely nothing without that will. God's purpose: this is the only principle of being which the Bible recognizes. The counsel of His will: this is the goal of philosophy—the last point which science is capable of reaching. All our inquiries end at last in the confession: "Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in Thy sight. For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever! Amen."

We regret that we have not time to enter more at length into this discussion, and to show how the deductive and inductive methods of philosophy are essentially dependent upon the admission or rejection of the personality of God. Many who are enamoured with what appears to them to be a very profound and earnest philosophy of life, are not aware that the very spirit in which that philosophy is born is at war with the first principles of Theism. They do not see that any theory which involves a necessary principle of the world, excludes contingency, and, consequently, the operation of all will. It is clear, too, that this principle, if it exists, must be sought in consciousness. As thought, upon the hypothesis in question, must be the reflection of existence, and as we ourselves are a species of microcosm, we must look into the depths of our own souls for those great, controlling elements which determine the existence of every thing around us. We shall surely be able to find those fundamental and unquestionable data, stored away in the recesses of our minds, which shall contain the absolute explanation of every thing—those laws or primitive cognitions which belong to, and constitute, the Eternal Reason. We shall be able, in other words, to find the only God that can exist in ourselves. What Madame De Staël said of Fichte, that he announced the purpose of a future lecture in these atrocious words—“We shall proceed to make God”—is perfectly in keeping with the whole genius and temper of a speculation that expects to find any other nexus but that of a personal will between the finite and the infinite.

The question of a personal God might well be suspended upon the results, in science, to which its method of investigation has led. Bacon expounded the law, and since Bacon, what has not been accomplished? There is not a conquest in the world, of matter or of mind, which has not been won by the spirit of the inductive philosophy. It has explored every nook and corner of nature; it has

trusted to nothing but its eyes and ears, and those eternal laws of thought which constitute the forms of knowledge. It has found order, law, a plan; it has discovered design, the operations of intelligence and will, and penetrated beyond nature, to nature's God, as the author and finisher of all. It has seen and known. What, on the other hand, has Pantheism done? Nothing, absolutely nothing, but transmute into its own jargon the laws which induction has established. The empirical, indeed, it despises; but, unfortunately, the empirical is all that exists; and in despising that, it destroys the possibility of any real science of things. To sum up all that we would say in a few words, experimental philosophy is grounded in the hypothesis of a personal God. The Jehovah of the Bible is presupposed in the method of induction. The method of pure speculation is grounded in the hypothesis of a necessary cause, or principle, and identity of substance is presupposed in its methods of inquiry. The nexus between the finite and the infinite, in the one case, is will, and will alone; in the other, it is that of immanence, or in-being. The universe, according to one, is the product of Divine power; according to the other, it is God Himself, coming into sensible manifestation—the chicken hatched from the egg. The problem of philosophy, in one case, is to discover the plan of God, as gathered from the actual operations of His hands; according to the other, the very notion of a plan or design becomes an insoluble contradiction. According to the one, man knows nothing, until he has learned from observation and experiment; according to the other, he carries the elements of omniscience in his bosom. This is a faithful picture of the spirit and genius of the two systems. Judge them by their fruits.

III. The two systems are equally in contrast in their influence upon the whole department of moral obligation. According to the scheme of Theism, the relations betwixt God and man are those of a ruler and a subject—all intelli-

gent beings are under authority and government. They are placed in subjection to a law, which they are bound to obey—but which they are at liberty to disregard—and their happiness or misery is dependent upon their obedience or disobedience. The simplest, perhaps the most primitive, notion which we are able to form of the Father of Spirits, is, as Butler suggests, that of “a master, or governor. The fact of our case, which we find by experience, is, that He actually exercises dominion, or government, over us, at present, by rewarding and punishing us for our actions, in as strict and proper a sense of these words, and even in the same sense, as children, servants, subjects are rewarded and punished by those who govern them.” This is not so much, says the same great thinker, a deduction of reason as a matter of experience, that we are under His government in the same sense that we are under the government of civil magistrates. All this is obviously inconsistent with the theory of Pantheism. The ruler and the ruled must be distinct; and yet, upon the hypothesis in question, they are essentially the same, only under different manifestations, or in different stages of developement. A law is a measure of conduct prescribed by a superior will, and the notions which underlie it are those of rightful authority, on the one hand, and the possibility of obedience or disobedience, on the other. Both these notions are discarded by Pantheism; and, as it deprives us of will, so it leaves us no other law but that of the necessary evolution of phenomena. It demands, on the one hand, an inviolable necessity, and, on the other, a rigid continuity. Obligation is the correlative of law, and rewards and punishments are the expressions of merit and demerit. But justice is utterly annihilated—reward, as distinct from mere pleasure—punishment, as distinct from mere annoyance or pain, becomes unmeaning. All moral differences in actions are contradictory and absurd, where the effect is a necessary manifestation, or an inevitable developement. Sin, as moral

disorder or evil, can not be conceived; it becomes only one step in the stage of events—a contrast in individual life, or the history of the world, by which the balanced harmony of a complicated system is preserved. It is no more liable to blame than the bitterness of wormwood, or the filth of oil; and he who, by patient continuance in well doing, seeks for glory, honor, and immortality, is no more entitled to praise, or to eternal life, than sugar for being sweet, or milk nutritious. These are only parts and parcels of the grand world-process. Good and evil occupy the same position as light and darkness, or any other contrasts in nature. Sin, as a transgression of the law, deserving death, is a pure fiction. The system, therefore, in obliterating moral distinctions, and reducing the differences of right and wrong to the category of necessary contrasts, not only makes war upon the government of God, but aims a decisive blow at the government of man. It is in deadly hostility to the principles which hold society together, and impart to States their authority. Strike out justice and moral law, and society becomes the mere aggregation of individuals, and not their union by solemn and sacred ties, upon the basis of mutual rights and duties, and man ceases to be any thing but a higher class of beasts. Every being works out its destiny by the same resistless process. These conclusions could be verified by a copious appeal to the best and purest philosophers who have speculated upon morals in the spirit of Pantheism. The accomplished Schleiermacher could make no more of sin than Fichte or Hegel. The deepest convictions of conscience, the most earnest utterances of the soul, the sense of guilt and demerit, the ineffaceable impression of justice, he was obliged to explain away, in obedience to a system which, in the extinction of a personal God, had removed the centre around which alone these sentiments could find place. They are, indeed, memorials of a personal God, which never can be totally destroyed. We feel that we

are under law, that we are responsible for our actions, that we are capable of praise or blame. We feel that there is a right and a wrong in human conduct, and no sophistry can eradicate, in some of its manifestations, the sense of justice. So clear is the connection between God and our moral nature, that we can never get quit of the notion of Him as a ruler until we have suppressed the voice of our consciences. It is here, more than any where else, that we recognize the personality of the Supreme Being. We feel His existence, because we feel the pressure of His law, and have ominous forebodings of reward or punishment. Apart from the existence of a personal God, it is impossible to construct a consistent scheme of moral philosophy. We must stumble at the very threshold in explaining the great central fact of obligation. Turn it and twist it as you may, it always leads you to a superior will as the immediate ground of duty. Virtue never becomes law until it is enforced by authority. That will, to be sure, is determined by the nature of the person, and the ultimate ground of moral distinctions must be traced to the essential holiness of God. He can not but will what is right, and it is precisely the relation of right to this perfect and holy will that creates the obligation of the creature. From God all moral distinctions proceed, and to God they naturally and necessarily lead. Their very essence is destroyed the very moment you lay your hand upon His throne.

Here, then, the contrast between Pantheism and Theism is fundamental. It goes to the springs and measures of human action. Society, the State, the Family, every sphere into which the moral element enters, becomes, in the speculations of the Pantheist, a very different thing from what our natural sentiments lead us to apprehend, and from what is possible to be realized in experience. Man, in all his interests and relations, is a very different being, according as you view him in one aspect or the other; a moral subject under the government of God, or the prop-

erty and affection—the mere *modus*—of an all-pervading substance.

It is vain, therefore, to treat those speculations which strike at the personality of God as the harmless excursions of curiosity. True, the instincts of nature, in the ordinary tenor of life, are stronger, upon the whole, than these disastrous conclusions, but still they are not without their mischief in the humblest sphere, and on great occasions, when great interests are at stake, in periods of agitation and revolution, they may prompt to the most atrocious crimes. The Reign of Terror could never have been distinguished by its enormities, if God and retribution had not first been banished from the minds of its guilty agents. It is no light thing to make a mock at sin. He who trifles with the eternal distinctions of right and wrong, not only foregoes the blessedness of the next world, but introduces disorder and confusion in this. He is an enemy to earth, as well as to heaven. The belief of a superintending Providence is the guardian of society—the security of the State—the safeguard of the family. Its influence pervades every interest, and sanctifies every office of man; it ennobles his actions; sweetens his affections; animates his hopes; gives courage in the hour of danger; serenity in time of trouble, and victory in death. If there be a God, it is a great thing to be a man; if there be none, and men should universally act on the belief that there were none, we had rather be any thing than a member of the human race. Hell and earth would differ only in topography.

IV. But there is another aspect in which the two systems remain to be contrasted, and the immense importance of a personal God, such as nature and the Scriptures reveal, to be evinced.

Upon the hypothesis of Pantheism, religion becomes a contradiction in terms. What Howe long ago asserted of the scheme of Spinoza, is equally applicable to every system which abolishes the “Thou” of our prayers—that “though

he and his followers would cheat the world with names, and with a specious show of piety, it is as directly levelled against all religion as any, the most avowed, Atheism; for, as to religion, it is all one whether we make nothing to be God, or every thing; whether we allow of no God to be worshipped, or leave none to worship Him." But, apart from this consideration, which, of itself, is conclusive—apart from the circumstance that religion necessarily implies moral government, and is founded on the relations of a moral and intelligent agent to a supreme law-giver—piety is subverted by having no object upon which to fasten its regards. It consists essentially in affections, in fear, reverence, veneration, and love, which presuppose the existence of a person upon whom they can terminate. Its highest form is that of fellowship with God. It holds communion, a real, living intercourse, with the Father of our spirits. We speak to Him in the language of prayer, penitence, faith, thanksgiving, and praise; He speaks to us by those sensible communications of His grace, which make us feel at once that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. This free circulation of the affections and interchange of offices of love, is the very essence of spiritual religion. But when you remove a personal God, you destroy the only condition on which this state of things is possible. There is no being to love, no being to adore, no being either to swear by, or pray to; and all that remains of piety is a collection of blind impulses and cravings, which must create their object, and which in their developement, according to the law of suggestion, are, singularly enough, termed a life. The disciples of this school employ the language of genuine devotion, and seem to be intent upon a more full, vigorous, and earnest piety, than that which is fostered by symbols and creeds. Their hostility to the latter is pretended to be grounded upon an intense zeal for the Spirit. But when we come to look beneath these phrases, and inquire into

the life which is so warmly commended, we find nothing but the earnings of humanity—a pervading sense of emptiness and want—without reference to their moral character and tendencies, exalted into architects of God. It is the study of these wants, and the fabrication of a being, or a principle, or any thing that seems suggested by them, that constitutes the whole life of godliness. It is like leaving a hungry man, from the mere impulse of appetite, in the first place to conceive, and then to create, bread; or a thirsty man, from the mere craving of his thirst, to image, and then produce, water. A craving enables us to recognize the suitable object, when presented, but never to frame either the conception of it, or the reality, beforehand. If a man had never seen, or tasted, or heard of food, he might have starved to death without knowing what he wanted. The feebleness and dependence of the creature may prompt it to admit the self-sufficient and Almighty God, when once He is revealed. But without being made known upon other grounds, the sense of dependence, however intense and penetrating, could never have carried us farther than a *something* on which we were dependent.

But in religion it is universally true that all our longings are the results, and not the antecedents, of knowledge. It is what the mind knows that inspires its aspirations and affections. Religious instincts are the offspring of reason and truth, and not the blind feeling of nature. When we know God, and sin, and ourselves; when we understand the law, and our destiny, then comes a sense of guilt, a longing for pardon, a desire of holiness, and peace. It is light let into the soul—truth pointed by the Holy Spirit—that awakens every truly religious emotion. We feel because we believe; we do not believe because we feel. The eye affects the heart; it is not the heart that produces the eye.

Men in their unconverted state are compelled, from the dictates of conscience and the voice of reason, to recog-

nize a personal God; but only in those relations in which the guilty stand to a judge—they believe, and tremble. Hence their anxiety to suppress the conviction. They would gladly embrace some principle of beauty, or feminine pity, which would bless their persons, without paying attention to their crimes. They would gladly fall back upon some impersonal spirit of nature, smiling in the stars, or whispering in the breeze, about which they could indulge in soft and romantic sentiments, without being put upon the troublesome duties of penitence, faith, humiliation, and self-denial. They, therefore, can spare a personal God, because they have nothing to hope, and much to dread, from Him. But the truly Christian man is robbed of every thing, if you take away his Lord and Master. He has, indeed, lost a friend, and such a friend as no substitute can replace. When he is unable to cry, "Abba, Father," his spirit is burdened with intolerable anguish. The very life of his soul is extinguished.

The privilege of communion with God is the reward signalized in no system but that of the Gospel. The completeness of the notion is there developed, and the manner in which it may be realized in individual experience, definitely described. It reconciles man to God, and God to man, and institutes a fellowship which, though it may be occasionally disturbed, can never be broken off. The love which it enjoins and engenders, is the union of the soul with the Author of its being—not the absurd imagination of the mystic, of being absorbed and swallowed up in God—as a drop in the ocean. "There is nothing, therefore," says an able writer, "we should be more anxious to protect from every presumptuous attempt to disturb the holy boundary between God and the creature, than just the opinion of the imperishable nature of love which binds both together. Instead of the self-hood of the personal creature being destroyed in the perfection of its love to God, it is much rather thereby elevated to its

full truth, and revealed in its eternal significance, as the subject and object of a love between God and the creature. Then does man first of all come into the true possession of himself, when he gives himself to God; whoever loses his life, shall find it. What true love to God desires is, not at all abstract identity, not a resolution into the Divine Being, but perfect and undisturbed fellowship with God, just as is promised in the Scripture, as its highest end—not that it shall *become* God, but shall see God face to face." The result of any hypothesis which confounds them, it may be added, is the simple destruction of one, or of both. In this aspect, therefore, Pantheism is most fatal in its results; it contradicts every principle of our religious nature, and, in leaving us without God, leaves us without hope in the world. It lays an interdict upon all the piety of the heart, and cheats us with the delusive sentiments of a vain fancy. It gives us poetry for God.

V. The personality of God has, also, a decisive influence upon the question in relation to the credibility of revelation, in itself, and in its miraculous credentials, which is now so keenly agitated among Neologists and the orthodox. The rigid continuity of nature is assumed, because nature is only a blind manifestation of properties and attributes which belong to a necessary substance. But the very moment you postulate intelligence and will, and ascribe the constitution of the universe to a free cause, its order is altogether contingent, and whether it shall ever be disturbed or not, depends entirely upon the plans and purposes of that wisdom which presides over all. Temporary and occasional changes may contribute to the ultimate end to be achieved. Occasions may arise, from the operations of subordinate intelligences, which will render extraordinary interpositions the most effective instruments of good. Miracles certainly become possible, since He who made nature can control it; and they become credible, if circumstances should ever be such as to render them important.

As to revelation, it is antecedently credible, upon the supposition that God is a person, that He should hold intercourse with His intelligent creatures. Persons naturally seek union; society is the sphere in which this mysterious reality becomes fully and completely developed. All finite persons would be miserable if there were none to converse with, and every principle of morality, truth, justice, and benevolence, supposes the existence of a social economy. So intimate is the connection between society and personality, that, in our humble judgment, the infinite God could neither be holy nor blessed unless there was a foundation for society in the very essence of Deity. A God that was only a single person, would want that union without which the person would be imperfect. Solitude may be enjoyed for a while, but it is imprisonment and death if made permanent. Hence, there is a deep philosophy in the doctrine of the Trinity. The Triune God is an all-sufficient God—all-sufficient to Himself, and all-sufficient to His creatures. Before time began, or the stars were born, the Father rejoiced in the Son, and the Son rejoiced in the Father. There was the deepest union, and the most ineffable communion, and it was only to reflect their blessedness and glory that other persons, and other societies, were formed, whose laws and principles must be traced to the very bosom of the Deity.

God being a person, therefore, it is antecedently likely that He would condescend to hold communion with His creatures; and hence all nations, whether barbarous or civilized, have assumed it as an indisputable truth, that the Deity converses with man. Go where you will, there are altars, oracles, and priests. This general consent in the credibility of revelation, is the testimony of the race to an original feeling of the soul; a premonition, on the part of God, of what may be expected at His hands. The voice of nature is never a lie; and hence, given a personal God, we may confidently conclude that He will not be without

messages to those who are capable of intercourse with Him. He will delight in condescending to talk with His subjects. The instinct of personality for union will prompt it, benevolence will prompt it, goodness will prompt it, and wisdom will direct and regulate all. With humility and reverence be it spoken, but there may be a something in the bosom of the infinite God, arising from His personal relations to us, analogous to those feelings of tenderness and solicitude which a parent cherishes, and which impels him to pour forth on his children our words of parting counsel.



ARTICLE VI.

THE SCOTCH-IRISH, AND THEIR FIRST SETTLEMENTS ON THE TYGER RIVER AND OTHER NEIGHBORING PRECINCTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA.*

There is nothing more common to thoughtful and civilized man, than the disposition to inquire into the past, and to trace the race from which we sprang to its earliest beginnings. But whoever attempts it, whether he be plebeian or king, will find his ancestry lost in some barbarian tribe, springing from others as savage as itself, which fill that pre-historic period between Japheth, the son of Noah, and modern times. Even the chosen seed, whose line can be traced the farthest back, ends in a race of idolaters. And, proud as we justly are of our immediate ancestors,

* This article was delivered at Nazareth Church, Spartanburg District, S. C., on the 14th of September last, as a Centennial Discourse, in commemoration of the early settlement of the Scotch-Irish on the Tyger River. It was not intended as a complete history of the Churches of the Up-Country, being confined to one portion of it, and not including events subsequent to the Revolution.

whether we be Saxon, Gaul, or Gael, we shall find ourselves to have sprung from pagan huntsmen, herdsmen, or fierce warriors, who remained such till they were tamed and softened by the true religion, and humanized by the culture of letters.

The migration of the Scots, it is believed, was through north-eastern Europe, by Belgium and the North of France, to Ireland. There they certainly lived in the third century, and there they first received the light of Christianity. In the sixth century, a colony of these Irish Scots* migrated to North Britain, and, settling in the County of Argyle, established there a kingdom, subjugated the Pictish tribes that were before them, and the ancient Caledonia was thenceforward the land of the Scots, and SCOT-LAND it remains till now. Thither went from Ireland, in the same century, Columba, surnamed Saint, and established what has been called his convent, on the island of Iona, but which was much more a school, under something like presbyterial supervision, for training ministers and missionaries of the Cross. Such were the ancient Culdees of Scotland, "worshippers of God," who held the pure doctrines of God's Word, and the Presbyterian government, a thousand years before Calvin was born, when the rest of the world were "wondering after the beast."†

Their light glimmered on amid the darkness which oppressed the nations, nor wholly ceased till Wickliffe, the

* The *Scoti Ierni*. See Claudian, a Latin poet of the fourth century, xxii., 251; and Buchanan, *Hist.*, p. 34.

† Their opposition to Rome may be judged of by the following extract from the poems of Talliessin, who is supposed to have lived about A. D. 620:

"Wo be to that priest yborn,
That will not cleanly weed his corn,
And preach his charge among:
Wo be to that sheperd, I say,
That will not watch his fold alway,
As to his office doth belong:
Wo be to him that doth not keepe
From *Romish* wolves his erring sheepe,
With staff and weapon strong."

Usher, *Religion of the Ancient Irish*, p. 83, where the original Gaelic may be seen. See, also, Mason's *Primitive Christianity in Ireland*, p. 43.

morning star of the Reformation, arose. Their missionary labors were widely extended; their schools scattered over many countries of Europe, and attended by almost fabulous numbers. Let it be, even, that they were of a Scythian stock, as some have held, proverbial among the Greeks for the extreme of barbarism, they were now a Christian and intelligent people, and that unquenchable fire of soul, and courageous endurance, which had carried them forward over such tracts of country, to the farthest shores and islands of Europe, lived and burned brilliantly within them.

But the chilling influence of superstition at length invaded even them. The priest became lord of their conscience, and that mysterious darkness which arose from Rome, as its centre, spread like the morning mists over the hill-sides and crags of Scotland, and settled gloomily and heavily upon its lochs, and glens, and romantic valleys, over highland and lowland alike.

At length the day of Scotland's deliverance came. The voice of Luther awakèd new echoes on those shores. Patrick Hamilton, a youth of royal lineage, of attractive and polished manners, and cultivated mind, a friend of Luther and Melancthon, whom he had visited at Wittenberg, was burned at the stake—Scotland's first martyr—exclaiming, "How long, O Lord, shall darkness cover this realm? How long wilt Thou suffer this tyranny of man?" A "shrewd and canny Scot" advised the Archbishop, when he burned any more, to burn them in cellars, "for the smoke," said he, "of Mr. Patrick Hamilton hath infected as many as it blew upon." Other martyrdoms, however, followed. Helen Starke, after witnessing the execution of her husband, was strangled in a pool of water. George Wishart, a man of noble birth, before whom crowded audiences wept, glowed, and trembled, as he preached, was burned at the stake. John Knox would have accompanied him in his hour of danger, but Wishart forbade him. "Go back to your pupils; one is sufficient for one sacrifice."

This same Knox became the man of his age in Scotland; her great Reformer. He was the man, valiant for truth, of whom the Regent Morton, himself of the dauntless race of Douglas, as he looked thoughtfully into his grave, said, "There lies he who never feared the face of man." Noble prototype was he of his fearless countrymen, at whose return to Scotland from his exile, consternation seized the enemies of the Reformation. "John Knox! John Knox is come! he slept last night at Edinburgh!" was the frantic cry which announced the ruin of their plans.

On the third of December, 1557, the first covenant, in this land of covenants, was signed. In 1560 the first General Assembly was held. Out of a weekly exercise, or prophesying, conducted by the ministers, exhorters, and educated men of the vicinity, met for expounding the Scriptures, grew the classical Presbyterian. To this was added the provincial Synod, and the whole order of the Presbyterian Church stood at length revealed.

James I. was the first Presbyterian king of Scotland, and right lustily did he promise, till he became sovereign of England, when his cry at once was: "No bishop, no king!" We are indebted to this inconsistent, corrupt, and pedantic monarch for two measures of incalculable good. One was, the setting on foot the English version of the Scriptures, from him called King James' version, which, however, had been suggested both by the Scotch Assembly and by the English Puritans. The other is, the project, attempted in 1559 and 1572, by Queen Elizabeth, in the counties of Down and Antrim, of colonizing the northern provinces of Ireland with a Protestant people. Reasons of State determined him to discountenance the Roman Catholic religion, especially in Ireland. Several of the Northern nobles resented his determination, and conspired against his government. Their lands were confiscated, and reverted to the crown. These territories James, with great wisdom,

arranged to plant with English and Scottish colonies ; and he resolved to replace its scattered, miserable, and turbulent population with the adherents of a purer faith. The country was exceedingly desolate, and covered with innumerable woods and marshes. Its towns and villages had been levelled with the ground—its herds and products swept away by the war. Little remained except the isolated castles of the English, and the miserable huts of the natives, suffering under the evils of pestilence and famine. The escheated lands were disposed of to English, Scottish, and Irish undertakers of the crown, who agreed to colonize them. From the proximity of the country to Scotland, the Scotch settlers greatly predominated. They were a hardier people, stood the climate better, had fewer inducements at home, and were more favored by the king. Londonderry, Coleraine, and Belfast, were planted by the English, chiefly, but the counties of Down and Antrim were settled by the Montgomeries and Hamiltons of Scotland, who brought over many Scotch gentlemen and farmers.

Thus, after the lapse of nearly a thousand years, the Scots, whom Ireland gave to Caledonia of old, came back again to occupy their ancestral homes, and the *Irish Scots*, as they were called in the sixth century, became the *Scotch-Irish* of the seventeenth.

There came, also, in the first third of the seventeenth century, several noble ministers from Scotland, and some from England, under whose labors religion was greatly revived, and conversions were multiplied. "Preaching and praying," says Livingston, "were pleasant in those days." "And it was sweet and easy for people to come thirty or forty miles to the solemn communions they had." Though Presbyterian in doctrine and discipline, they were, at first, nominally comprehended within the pale of the Established Church of England, enjoying its emoluments and dignities, under the generous and friendly toleration of Archbishop Usher.

This season of loving kindness did not always last. Under Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, came persecution, and the Scotch-Irish began to look to America for an asylum. The "black oath," so called from its direful consequences, was administered by Wentworth, Lord Lieutenant, for these services made Earl of Stafford, who imprisoned and heavily fined even women who refused to take it. He even conceived the idea of banishing all the Presbyterians from Ulster. Afterwards came the Irish rebellion, in which one hundred and fifty thousand Protestants perished, during which the famous siege of Derry occurred, whose defence is still read with all the interest of romance. It was then the Scotch sent over an army to Ireland, with Chaplains in every regiment. With the concurrence of the Colonels, these Chaplains appointed Church sessions in each regiment. In the four regiments stationed at Carrickfergus, the ministers found themselves in a condition to hold a Presbytery; which, accordingly, was held on the 10th of June, 1642, and was the first Presbytery regularly constituted in Ireland.

It was more than one hundred years after this before this upper country of South Carolina was settled. But the Scottish settlers in the North of Ireland were, meanwhile, extending their cords and strengthening their stakes in their Irish home, bringing back to the Erin of their remote ancestry that pure faith and form of Church polity, which these, a thousand years before, ere yet they were overlaid by Rome, gave to North Britain, and made it, even then, a land of learning and piety. Her ministers were still educated in Scotland. She sympathized with all of Scotland's sufferings, wrongs, and tears, though the hand of persecution did not press as heavily upon her. A bright example was set before the Scotch-Irish by the country out of which they had come. The measures set on foot by the Reformers for the settlement of schools, made the Scotch superior in intelligence to any other nation in Europe.

“If a Scotchman was taken into a warehouse as a porter, he soon became foreman,” says the historian, Macaulay. “If he enlisted in the army, he soon became a sergeant.” And, in spite of her barren soil, Scotland made astonishing progress in all the arts of civilization. The same was true of the Scotch-Irish on the green shores of Erin. If they could not establish their schools by law, they could by private effort. And the province of Ulster, which their fathers found a wilderness, they have covered with beauty.

The South of Ireland is profusely blessed in the gifts of nature, in a far richer soil, and a milder and more genial climate; the whole, indeed, is an emerald set in the flashing ocean. The North is rougher, colder, and less genial, and yet, as you enter the province of Ulster, you have left the region of filthy cabins, sturdy beggars, dilapidated villages, and wretched, neglected farms, and fields of sluggards, luxuriant with thorns and thistles; and you enter a territory of rich culture, of comfortable dwellings, and thriving towns. You have passed from a land of joyous, often, but yet careless idleness, where the pig, cow, and child, herd together in miserable hovels, into a province where the diligent husbandman, the enterprising merchant, the intelligent, plodding mechanic, are found, and the virtuous housewife, who “seeketh wool and flax, and worketh diligently with her hands,” who “layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff,” who “maketh fine linen, and selleth it, and delivereth girdles unto the merchant;” and “whose candle goeth not out by night.” It is the land of your Presbyterian ancestors, inhabited by a race instinct with the sense of right, and hatred of oppression; of an instructed, and not superstitious, conscience; educated in a pure faith, versed in that vigorous theology which Augustine, Calvin, and Knox, professed; their understanding, and reason addressed by an educated ministry on the Sabbath day, and their household virtues stimulated and formed by the voice of praise and prayer at the

domestic hearth. Behold your ancestors! Behold their country, and their religion, which have made them what they are!

Their love of adventure, their crowded population, and the religious disabilities under which the Government sometimes placed them, led many to seek in the colonies of America a new home, where they might again take root.

The older parts of Carolina had, almost from the beginning, some few representatives from the North of Ireland. From the year 1735 they came in larger colonies, and settled in Williamsburg, below, spreading themselves constantly further, over Sumter, Darlington, Marion and Horry. Pennsylvania was, to them, also, a favorite resort. They first settled in Buck's County, north-east of Philadelphia, and then stretched westward, in Chester, Lancaster, and York, to the haunts of the wild Indian, with whom they came, at last, into terrible collision. Their ministers were nearly all of liberal education. Some had taken their degrees in Scotland, and some in Ireland. Among them were the Tennents, Blairs, Francis Allison, Beaty; and of American birth, educated in the Scotch-Irish schools and colleges, Drs. Stanhope Smith, Patrick Allison, and others; civilians also, Judges Breckenridge and McKean, Chief Justice Williamson the historian of North Carolina, and Dr. Ramsay the historian of our own State; distinguished Generals of the war of the Revolution too numerous to mention; Robert Fulton, who applied steam to the propelling of vessels; and many divines and civilians distinguished in the history of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.

The emigration of Scotch-Irish into the Up-Country of North and South Carolina was from Pennsylvania, either by gradual migration of families through the mountain valleys of Virginia and southward, or by a direct removal; or from Ireland to the port of Charleston, and by wagon, pack-horse, or often on foot, to their settlements here.

The line of emigration from Pennsylvania was through Kittatinny valley, west of the Susquehanna, to the Potomac, and through the valley of the Shenandoah, southward. To how large an extent our population was introduced from this source, the names of Lancaster, York, and Chester, from counties of the same name in Pennsylvania, themselves show.

This was the earliest emigration into the upper portion of this State, and, as it preceded the present division of counties, which did not occur till the year 1798, and also the division into precincts, which dates back to the year 1769, we will designate the settlements by other and more ancient names. The earliest of them all was "The Waxhaws," called from the tribe of Indians who have given name to one of the tributaries of the Catawba. Another famous settlement was "The Long Canes," in a direction south-west from the other. The earliest date of the first of these settlements appears to have been the year 1745; the date of the latter is not exactly known. Two families, of Gowdy and Edwards, were found in it by Patrick Calhoun, and those who came with him, in the year 1756. Gowdy was an Irishman, and seems to have settled in the neighborhood of old Cambridge, about 1750. Both of these names, "The Waxhaws" and "Long Canes," were, in usage, of indefinite extent.

If we look across the State from the Waxhaw settlement, in a south-western direction, we find, to the right of a line drawn to Gowdy's, in Abbeville, the present districts of York, Union, and Spartanburg, the greater portion of Chester, the north-west part of Newberry, the whole of Laurens and Abbeville, and the newer districts of Greenville, Anderson, and Pickens. Of these districts, Lancaster will appear to have been the first settled; Chester, Spartanburg, and Laurens, to have been settled in 1749

or 1750; Newberry, to have been settled in 1752*—though Judge O'Neal dates the settlement of Adam Summer, in the Dutch Fork, in 1745—Union and Pendleton, in 1755; Abbeville, in 1756; York, in 1760, and Greenville, in 1766.

The first very distinct notice of settlers on Waxhaw was in May, 1751, when six or seven families came thither from the North. In the fall of the same year, a few more joined them, and a considerable number early in 1752, chiefly from Augusta County, Virginia, and the back part of Pennsylvania. The first grant of land to Robt. McElhenny dates in 1751, and the first sermon preached among them was in February, 1753, by John Brown, then a probationer.

On the western side of the Catawba, on the waters of Fishing Creek, settlements were made of Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania at nearly the same date—1748, 1749, 1750, and 1751—and the same minister, Mr. John Brown, preached the first sermon of which we have any record among this people, at Landsford, on the Catawba, a point intermediate between them and the settlement on the Waxhaw. The Church here established was called, to distinguish it from another higher up the stream, and which was formed a little later, Lower Fishing Creek, and, subsequently, after its pastor, Richardson's Church, and is now known, its location having been somewhat changed, as Cedar Shoals. The settlement extended itself higher up the stream, and gave rise to another Church, which bears the name Fishing Creek at this day.†

The settlement and Church in Union District was not quite so early. Its first planting was in the years 1754 and

* The date of the settlement on Duncan's Creek.

† Between the two there appears at one time to have been a middle Fishing Creek Church, which became afterwards absorbed in Richardson Church. Catholic Church, on Rocky Creek, to the right of our line, was settled in 1758;(?) organized in 1759 by Mr. Richardson; called and settled James Campbell as their pastor in 1772, and enjoyed his ministry for a year and a half, in connection with the neighboring Church of Purity.

1755, by Scotch-Irish emigrants from Pennsylvania, who had lived under the ministry of Rev. Mr. Cathcart. Several heads of families, among whom were the names of Brandon, Bogan, Jolly, Kennedy, McJunkin, Young, Cunningham, Savage, Hughs, Vance, Wilson, settled in these then uninhabited wilds. They first lived in tents, and then erected cabins. Several of these households were persons of true piety. They frequently met on the Lord's day for reading the Scriptures, prayer and religious conversation, looking wishfully for the time when they should be visited by ministers of their own faith. They subsequently erected a Church on Brown's Creek, about four miles from Unionville, on the Pinckneyville road. This house of worship was intended to be used by Presbyterians and Episcopalians in common, and hence was called "The Union Church." It seems to have been a place of some note, since the name was transferred to the county, and is now borne by the district, and the village which is the seat of justice.

Earlier than this, and parallel in point of time with the Fishing Creek, and almost with the Waxhaw, was the settlement of the Scotch-Irish on the confines of the present districts of Spartanburg and Union, upon the Fairforest, a tributary of the Tyger River. It dates its origin from the settlement of seven or eight families from Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, who migrated to this spot from the years 1751 to 1754, in which year they were visited by the Rev. Joseph Tate, their pastor in Donegal, Lancaster county, whence they had emigrated.

Outside of the limits of Union District, within the confines of Newberry, and yet connected with the waters of the Tyger and the Enoree, was an early Church, now, perhaps, almost forgotten, known as the Grassy Spring Church. Its original founders, also, emigrated from Pennsylvania, were Scotch-Irish by race, and of the Presbyterian faith, and settled on the Enoree, Indian Creek, and Tyger River,

which are near each other in this part of the State. This settlement was made from the years 1749 to 1758, and from these various localities they met together at the Grassy Spring Church to worship the God of their fathers.

Duncan's Creek, in Laurens, (waters of the Enoree,) was not far off. The settlement upon it was by Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania, chiefly, in the year 1758. They built a house of worship in 1763 or 1764. Little River Church, near the line between Laurens and Newberry, was organized in 1764. Bethel, in York, and Bethesda, are nearly of the same date. Bullock's Creek, in the south-west corner of the same district, 1769 or 1770, and a few other Churches in the Up-Country date previous to the Revolution.

Among these Churches stands the Nazareth Church, in whose bounds we are now assembled.* Eight, ten, or twelve families settled here, on the waters of Tyger River, near its source, between the years 1760 and 1765. The Word of God was precious to them, and, as early as 1766, they obtained supplies, who preached the Gospel among them, occasionally, at least, and, as an early but brief history of this Church† informs us, was soon after organized. The more exact date of this organization is ascertained ‡ to be the Spring of 1772. The names of the families honored as the founders of this community are Anderson, Miller, Barry, Moore, Collins, Thompson, Vernon, Pearson, Jamison, Dodd, Ray, Penny, McMahan, Nichol, Nesbitt, and Patton. These were the names of the settlers migrating, directly or indirectly, from Pennsylvania, where their first homes in America were.

* See Note, p. 472.

† MS. History of the Second Presbytery of South Carolina, prepared by a committee of the same, appointed in October, 1808, consisting of Rev. John B. Kennedy, Dr. Waddel, and Rev. Hugh Dickson. Minutes of Second Presbytery, October, 1808, pp. 123, 124; April, 1809, p. 184.

‡ By a cotemporary record in a Family Bible, still preserved.

Into this goodly country these men, in most instances, no doubt, accompanied with their wives and children, came to set up their tabernacle. It was, indeed, a goodly land, a "land of rivers of water," "of springs sent into the vallies which run among the hills," of forests goodly like Lebanon, or the oaks of Bashan, with their grassy carpet or their tangled vines; of wooded mountains, or rolling hills, or undulating plains, or prairies covered with a rich growth of cane. The margins of many streams almost equalled the cane-brakes of the South-West. These facts are established by the names which many of the streams in the Up-Country still bear, as Reedy River, Reedy Fork, Cane Creek, and Long Canes. The cane growth of the country was, we are told, the standard, to many, of the fertility of the soil, a growth twenty or thirty feet high denoting the highest fertility, and that no higher than a man's head, a more ordinary soil.* And the tradition is preserved that one of the tributaries of the Tyger River received its name from the scene of woodland beauty which burst upon the view of the first emigrants. George Story and James McIlwaine, if we have their names aright, had encamped on a commanding eminence; a beautiful valley stretched far in the distance, a grove of lofty trees concealed the meandering of a stream which fertilized the tract below. The rays of the declining sun shed their departing beams on the tree-tops that waved over the wide amphitheatre in the evening breeze. One of the two, McIlwaine, it is said, exclaimed: "What a *fair forest* this!" The name attached itself to the place, and then to the bold and lovely stream, which, rising in the mountains, sweeps on, dispensing fertility and refreshment to the central portions of this and the neighboring districts below.†

* Logan's History of Upper South Carolina, p. 11.

† See, for this tradition, "Major Joseph McJunkin, or Original Sketches of the Revolutionary History of South Carolina," *Watchman and Observer*, Sept. 21, 1849. These valuable papers are from the pen of Rev. Jas. H. Saye.

These forests were not unpeopled. The buffalo, deer, and other wild game, the panther,* the wild-cat, the wolf and bear, and other beasts of prey, filling the night with their dismal cries, roamed through them; the beaver, architect and engineer together, built his works across the cold streams, and birds of varied plumage sang through the day and night around them.

The occupation of the hunter, the herdsman, and the farmer, were sometimes distinct, but in many instances, or in most, united in the same person. A large trade in peltry was carried on in the early history of this colony, through the port of Charleston, and to obtain the hides and skins, valued in Europe, many a huntsman, beside the native Indian, coursed through these primeval forests. The occupation of the herdsman, too, was largely followed, and cow-pens, or ranches, for cattle and those who reared them, were established at different points. One of them has become historic as the scene of a decisive battle of the Revolution, in which some of your ancestors took part. The unerring rifle could in a short time supply the table with abundant food for several days, and to the hardy yeoman life in the woods was not without its charms and sources of improvement; developing that self-reliant, independent, and heroic character, which is rarely to be found in the din of cities. If they were not clothed in soft raiment, they wore the more serviceable vestments domestic industry provided—the deer-skin moccasin, and the products of the wheels and looms of their wives and daughters. If they lacked some of the far-fetched delicacies modern appetite craves, their tables were loaded with abundance, and with food which the city epicure now seeks for at a great price.

* Commonly called tiger in this State. The Tyger River is said to have derived its name from a battle which took place on its banks between a tiger and a bear, in which the tiger was victor. The old orthography is retained in the name of the river. The Indian name was Amoyeschee.—Mills' Statistics, p. 762.

The first settlers had the choice of lands in this part of the State, and it has been remarked that the Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania, who had some experience of America, and were, also, first on the soil of these upper districts, were more favorably located than those who came afterwards, directly from the North of Ireland, through the port of Charleston. Whether it were so in this community, we know not. But in 1767 or 1768, other families came here direct from Ireland, receiving their head-right of one hundred acres, and supplied with the most indispensable implements of agriculture by the Colonial Government. These families bore the names of Caldwell, Coan, Snoddy, Peden, Alexander, Gaston, Norton, and others. The same was true elsewhere. The Irish element succeeded the first immigration of the Pennsylvania Irish.

These settlements must have been greatly dependent, at first, on themselves for religious worship. But they were encouraged and strengthened by visits of ministers from abroad. The Waxhaw people were visited in February, 1753, by Mr. John Brown, a probationer from Pennsylvania, and in 1754, by Rev. Mr. Rae, of Williamsburg Church, in the Low-Country, and by Mr. Tate, of the Synod of Philadelphia. In the same year the Rev. Daniel Thane, of New Jersey, sent out to the new settlements by the Synod of New York, preached either here, at Fishing Creek, or Fairforest, under a spreading oak. In 1755 they heard the Gospel from the lips of Messrs. Hogg, Hugh McAden, and others. Mr. McAden preached to that people in November of this year, and at Fishing Creek, and so did Messrs. Brown and Rae, whose names are distinctly mentioned in connection with this Church. Mr. McAden also preached at James Atterson's (Otterson's) on Tyger River, a few miles above Hamilton's Ford, and at James Love's, on Broad River.

At this time the Waxhaw and Fishing Creek congregations put themselves under the care of the Old Scotch

Presbytery of Charleston, with the view of obtaining ministers from Scotland. Robert Miller, from Scotland, who had been occupied in teaching, and had been licensed by the Presbytery of Charleston, was called and ordained as their minister in 1756. He was a lively and popular preacher, but in a little more than a twelvemonth was deposed for irregularity of conduct. The congregation were dependent on various supplies, till, in 1759, they settled as their pastor the Rev. Wm. Richardson, of Egremont, England, a graduate of the University of Glasgow, who came to America in 1750, and resided for a season with the celebrated Samuel Davies, in Virginia. He and the Rev. Mr. Martin had been sent out by a society in New England and one in Scotland, acting conjointly, as missionaries to the Cherokee upper towns in this State. The Cherokees took up arms against the whites, and Mr. Richardson became pastor of the Waxhaw Church, having been ordained to this end by the Presbytery of Charleston. This energetic and faithful minister, besides serving his own congregations, travelled far and wide over this new country, preaching, organizing Churches, and administering the ordinances of God's house.

But now came a season of dreadful trial to these devoted people. The Indian tribes, which almost surrounded them, became incensed against the whites, and rose in arms to destroy them. The inhabitants of Long Canes, in Abbeville, fled for refuge to the older and more settled parts of the country. A party, of whom Patrick Calhoun was one, who were removing their wives and children and more valuable effects to Augusta, were attacked by the Cherokees, on February 1st, 1760, and, according to cotemporary journals, some fifty persons—according to other accounts, twenty-two persons—mostly women and children, were slain, and fourteen carried into captivity. After the massacre, many children were found wandering in the woods. One man brought fourteen of these young fugi-

tives into Augusta, some of whom had been cut with tomahawks and left for dead. Others were found on the bloody field, scalped, but living still. Patrick Calhoun, who returned to the spot to bury the dead, found twenty dead bodies, inhumanly mangled. The Indians had set fire to the woods, and had rifled the carts and wagons, thirteen in number.* This sad news filled the whole province with consternation, and the miserable fugitives, who sought refuge at Waxhaw and in the Low-Country, dependent on the charities of friends, were living witnesses of these deeds of barbarity. The Cherokees crossed the Enoree in this vicinity, if not then, yet later, compelling your fathers to establish "forted" houses in different localities, to which they could resort for defence. The children of Mrs. Hampton, and Messrs. James Reid, John Miller, Orr and Anderson, fell victims to Indian violence. In the old congregation of Grassy Spring several were brutally murdered. A stockade fort was built for protection at the house of Mr. Otterson. Into this the Quakers, also, fled for refuge, but would not take up arms. While here the Presbyterians assembled, usually, every evening, to read and pray, and "chant their hymns of lofty cheer." But the incursions of the savages became so frequent that these people, too, evacuated their fort, and fled for shelter to different inte-

* This attack was made on February 1st, 1760, on a descent just before reaching Patterson's Bridge, as they had stopped to encamp for the night, while they were entangled by their wagons, and could make but little resistance. Some, by cutting loose the horses, and joining a portion of the company in the advance, were so fortunate as to escape, under cover of the night. Among the slain was the mother of the family, Mrs. Catherine Calhoun, and a curious stone, engraved by a native artist, marks the spot where she fell, among her children and neighbors. Two little girls, daughters of William Calhoun, brother of Patrick, were carried into captivity, the eldest of whom was, after some years, rescued; the other was never heard of.—MS. of M. E. Davis. The grandfather of Mr. Samuel Clark, now of Beech Island, and several members of his family, were killed in the attack. The wife and four children escaped.

rior parts. The same was true of the Union Church, on Brown's Creek. They, also, betook themselves to Otterson's Fort for an asylum; but on leaving it, nearly all the Presbyterians retired to Pennington's Fort, on the Enoree.

During this season of calamity numbers of the inhabitants fell victims of Indian barbarity; yet, amidst these melancholy scenes of skirmishing, wounds, and death, in the intervals of military duty, this little band of Presbyterians kept up still their worship, observing sacredly the holy Sabbath, for more than two years of dreadful anxiety and hardship. After the French war was brought to a close, by the peace of 1763, these fugitives again, for the most part, returned to their homes, not always to remain in safety. In the congregation of Long Canes, about the end of 1763, the Creek Indians broke in and killed fourteen persons in one house, on the Savannah River.

The settlements, however, continued to increase in strength, and their Church organizations to become more complete. To this the labors of Mr. Richardson greatly contributed. At Long Canes, for example, in 1764, in a few days, he baptized about sixty children, and from the time he left home till he returned to his own Church, a space of about four or five weeks, he baptized about two hundred and sixty. The Synod of Philadelphia and New York sent out various ministers to labor as missionaries in these distant settlements. In 1765 Rev. George Duffield, of the Presbytery of Carlisle, spent three or four weeks with the Long Cane people, whose bounds had now become so large as to compel them to hold worship in different places, which became the centres of new Church organizations. Mr. Duffield also visited other Churches, and this tour of his was rich in religious blessings to our people. It would detain you to tell you of all. Rev. Robert McMordie, of Donegal Presbytery, in 1766, Mr. McCreary, from Pennsylvania—who received a call from the Long Cane people, now separated into several allied Churches, which call was

signed by two hundred and forty-nine persons—Mr. Bay, of Maryland, father of the late Judge Bay, Mr. Thomas Lewis, of Rhode Island, and Mr. Daniel Fuller, a Congregationalist, of New England, in the years 1767 and 1768, all performed useful and acceptable missionary service among the Churches.

In the year 1771, Rev. Azel Roe and John Close, of New Jersey, followed in their footsteps. They ordained elders in the Long Canes settlement, now Abbeville District, and administered the Lord's Supper, our authorities say, for the first time in all that land. In 1771, Rev. Josiah Lewis, of New Castle Presbytery, administered the Lord's Supper in different Churches, and Mr. Lewis ordained the first elders in Fairforest Church. Mr. Halsey, Mr. Tate, and Joseph Alexander, also visited them, and in 1778, the Lord's Supper was administered to them for the first time, by the Rev. Messrs. Alexander and Simpson. We find, also, the name of Mr. Campbell, probably a member of Charleston Presbytery, and settled in North Carolina, and James Edmonds, of Charleston, mentioned as laboring among them. In this way, principally, the Churches of this Up-Country were supplied with the ordinances of God's house, before the Revolution.

Mr. Richardson's useful life was terminated suddenly, and in a melancholy way, in the year 1772, an event deeply regretted, and his name should be held in lasting remembrance. In the same year the Rev. John Harris, whose name first appears on the roll of the Presbytery of Lewestown in 1768, and who visited the Carolinas at the appointment of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, in 1770, moved with his family from Maryland, settled on the waters of Little River, in Abbeville, and took charge of the Churches of Upper and Lower Long Cane, and of Bull Town, or Rocky River. Before 1774 he had removed his ecclesiastical relations, and had become a member of the

Presbytery of Orange.* The Rev. James Creswell, also, of the Presbytery of Orange, organized the Church of Little River in 1764, and continued its pastor till 1778, when he was removed by death. The Rev. Joseph Alexander, afterwards Dr. Alexander, a native of Pennsylvania and a graduate of Princeton College, removed from Mecklenburg county, N. C., and became pastor of Bullock's Creek, in York District, in 1776. The Rev. John Simpson, born of Scotch-Irish parents in New Jersey, a licentiate of New Brunswick Presbytery, came to Fishing Creek in the fall of 1773, and was ordained by the Presbytery of Orange as pastor of the Churches of Upper and Lower Fishing Creek, and, subsequently, of Bethesda, in York. These three ministers are all that we find regularly settled over the Churches of this region at the commencement of the Revolution, with the exception of Wm. Raynoldson, who came from Ireland in consequence of a call sent thither, who was intemperate and schismatic, and took the Tory side in the Revolutionary struggle. Mr. Hezekiah Balch had been pastor of Bethel Church, York, but, soon after the beginning of the war, removed to Tennessee, and Rev. Thomas B. Craighead was ordained over the Waxhaw Church in 1779, but retired from the country the next year, on the appearance of the British army in these parts.

During all this period these congregations were receiving an increase by direct immigration from Ireland. Before and after the Revolution, the reply to questions, "Where are you going?" addressed to movers on the road from Charles-

* Mr. Harris was graduated at Nassau Hall in 1753, and on the 12th of October, in the same year, was taken on trials by the Presbytery of New Castle. In 1756 he was ordained pastor of Indian River, near Lewes, Delaware, and resigned in 1769. In the spring of that year he was sent, by the Synod, to Virginia, North Carolina, and "those parts of South Carolina that are under our care." In 1771, the Synod ordered him to supply at Hitchcock's and Cartridge Creek, in Anson County, North Carolina, for three months. He joined Orange Presbytery in 1774, and was set off, with five others, in 1784, to form South Carolina Presbytery.—Webster, p. 670.

ton, would be, "to *Chaster*," or, "to *Long Canes*." Some, as the father of Dr. Waddel, who arrived in Charleston in 1776, passed through this province to the Up-Country of North Carolina.

Now came the war of the Revolution, with all its severe trials. Not the least of these sprung, in this upper country, from different views on the merits of the contest. Most of the Scotch-Irish took the side of the Colonies, the emigrants from Scotland direct were more inclined to the Royal cause. This division of opinion prevailed the most extensively in the region between the Broad and Saluda Rivers; in some places the Royalists outnumbering the Whigs. In the fall of 1775 the memorable tour of Rev. Wm. Tennent and Wm. Henry Drayton, sent out by the Committee of Safety in Charleston, and accompanied by Col. Richardson, Joseph Kershaw, and the Rev. Mr. Hart, of the Baptist Church, was made, for the purpose of strengthening the friends of resistance, confirming the wavering, and confuting the Royalists. They commenced their efforts among the Germans about Granby, with poor success. Mr. Tennent would preach, and afterwards address the people on public affairs. He crossed the Saluda at Beard's Falls, preached at Jackson's Creek, Fairfield; at Rocky Creek Meeting House, in Chester, (now Catholic Church,) at Fishing Creek—where he found in Rev. Mr. Simpson a congenial spirit—at the Rev. Mr. Alexander's, on Bullock's Creek; at Bersheeba Church, in the north-western part of York; at another Church of Mr. Alexander's, on Thicketty Creek. He met the Tories, "the nabob Fletchall,"* the two Cunninghams, and Brown, afterwards

* His name is spelled *Fletcher* by Mr. Saye, but *Fletchall* in Mr. Tennent's Journal and elsewhere. He lived at McBeth's Mill, in Union District, was taken prisoner by Col. Thompson and his men in 1775, (being found hidden in a cave,) and was sent to Charleston by Col. Richardson, with one hundred and thirty-five others. After the fall of Charleston he held a commission under the Crown. His estate was confiscated in 1782.

a famous Tory officer, at the muster-ground at Mr. Ford's, on the Enoree. He stayed with James Williams, on Little River, who afterwards fell at King's Mountain, and at whose house he was hospitably entertained; he preached for Mr. Creswell, who ministered there and at Ninety-Six; preached on Long Cane, at Boonesborough;* at one of Mr. Harris' preaching sheds; and on all these occasions, after the religious service, he addressed the people on public affairs. In this instance he was succeeded by Rev. Mr. Harris and Mr. Salvador. He also preached at Bull Town, and talked afterwards for three hours on the great question of those times; spent the night at Patrick Calhoun's; visited Fort Charlotte; took a military survey of the whole; gave orders to build the platforms for fighting the cannon and small arms. In the intervals of his preaching, all along, he was obtaining signatures to the Association, and forming volunteer companies, like a man in dead earnest. He crossed the Savannah, passed down to Augusta, called at Capt. Hammond's on Snow Hill, found his house "forted," and one of the finest situations in the whole colony; found a large body of militia there ready to move with Wm. Henry Drayton upon the Tories; found every considerable house in Augusta fortified. The whole journal is a remarkable record of a most important mission, disclosing the eloquence, activity, and energy of one of our Scotch-Irish

* This was the site of Fort Boone, called, probably, in honor of Thomas Boone, Governor of the Province. It was built for defence against the Indians, and was resorted to afterward for protection from marauding parties, whether Indian or Tory. It was a palisade fort, with port-holes, and had within a school house, minister's house, and other log buildings. Much of the catechetical and other instructions of Mr. Harris were given in this and other *forts*. The father of Rev. Dr. Gray, now of LaGrange, Tennessee, and his aunt, a venerable lady, not long since deceased, attended as pupils and catechumens of Rev. John Harris, in Fort Boone. The preaching station was the origin of the Church of Hopewell, built afterwards about three miles distant, and known at different times as Fort Boone, Boonesborough, and Hopewell Church.—MS. of M. E. D.

Presbyterian ministers, son of the celebrated William Tennent, who lay in the trance and saw things which it was not lawful to utter.

We feel ourselves burdened with the multitude of traditions which crowd upon us, and which belong to this period. The Up-Country eventually became, to a large extent, the battle-ground of the war of the Revolution, and where the tide was turned in our favor. But the whole contest was one of cruel suffering. The most bloody foes your fathers had were neighbors reared with them, acquainted with all their ways, and more unforgiving than those who had crossed the ocean to fight us. Your soil was the camping-ground of friendly and hostile forces, resounding under the hoofs both of Washington's and Tarleton's dragoons, and wet with the blood of your kindred and their foes.

Through the diligence and labor of your pastor, we have been able to learn the story of "the Plundering Scout," who passed through these neighborhoods some eighty-four years ago, taking every thing that could be of value to them, horses, cattle, beds, and bedding; hanging one aged man in his own gate-way, and hacking another with their broad-swords. And of the "Bloody Scout," of which "Bloody Bill Cunningham" was the presiding genius, who came after, like Death on the pale horse, and Hell following; of their killing the sick man (Capt. Steadman) in his bed; of their hacking the boy, John Caldwell, in pieces; of their killing John and James Wood, and the last, notwithstanding his wife's entreaties; and of the death of John Snoddy at their bloody hands. If the cruel chieftain, William Cunningham, led this party, their acts are not to be wondered at. He that could shoot his neighbor, John Caldwell, in his own yard, in his wife's presence, could hew down, at Hay's Station, Daniel Williams and his brother Joseph, a lad of fourteen, both brothers of Col. Williams, who fell at the head of the South Carolina column at King's Mountain, and could encourage his fol-

lowers to torture the wounded and dying, was capable of all this.

We have read of the bravery of your men—of Major David Anderson, who fought at Ninety-Six, at the siege of Charleston, at Eutaw Springs, and at Augusta; of Captain Andrew Barry, who met the foe at Musgrove's Mill and the Cowpens; of Captain John Collins, who fought on many fields, both in Carolina and Georgia.

We have read of Col. Thomas, of Fairforest, who commanded the Spartan Regiment till the fall of Charleston, three of whose sons watered the tree of Liberty with their own blood, and whose sons-in-law held commissions in the war. Of Wm. Kennedy, Samuel McJunkin, Major Joseph McJunkin, Gen. Thos. Brandon, Capt. Wm. Savage, Col. Hughs, and Major Otterson, in old Brown's Creek Church, below, who, with one other man, captured thirty of Tarleton's cavalry on their retreat from Cowpens; and of Samuel Clowney, of Fairforest, who, with his negro man, captured four of the enemy.

We have read of the brave women of the Revolution—among them, of Mrs. Thomas, of Fairforest, and her ride of fifty miles, from Ninety-Six, where her husband was prisoner, to Cedar Springs, to warn her neighbors and children there of a threatened attack, and of the heroic defence of her house by Culbertson, her son-in-law, who fired on the large band of attacking Tories, while she, her daughters, and her son Willie, loaded; of Mrs. Dillard, and her arrival on a gallop, to warn the camp of Col. Clarke, at Green Spring on Lawson's Fork, after she had prepared supper for the Tory band, led by Ferguson and Dunlop; of Dicey Langston, who forded the Tyger River at the dead hour of night, the waters reaching to her neck, floundering on, in bewilderment at times, to warn the settlement, where her brother lived, of the "Bloody Scout;" of Ann Hamilton, who seized the Tory that was firing her father's house, by his collar, and hurled him down the

stairs. There were Scotch-Irish Elders in this upper country, such as Gen. Pickens, Major Otterson, Col. James Williams, who fell at King's Mountain, with three hundred and seventy-five Royalist enemies killed or wounded, and various others, that did their country good service in that conflict. There were Presbyterian Ministers of the Gospel who helped on the cause of freedom. The classic Alexander, from his pulpit in the "old Log Meeting-House," at Bullock's Creek, and some times here, also, would discourse with inspiring eloquence of his country's wrongs, while the stalwart men and brave lads, with rifle in hand, kept guard over him and the worshippers alike. There was John Simpson, at Fishing Creek, who stirred up his people to take up arms against the enemy, and set them the example. He shouldered his rifle, and was in the engagements at Beckhamville and Mobley's, and was with Sumter in 1780—was with him when surprised by Tarleton at the Catawba Ford, and narrowly escaped with his life. As a consequence of his zeal, his house was plundered and burnt; his study and library set on fire and consumed, save the few books Mrs. Simpson could carry forth in her apron. James Creswell and John Harris lent their aid, too, to the good cause. You might have seen the latter, now fleeing from his vindictive enemies and taking refuge in the thickets of the forest, now in his pulpit on the Sabbath, his gun in the desk beside him, his ammunition suspended from his neck, after the fashion of the day, the reverent worshippers bowing *upon their arms* as he fervently lead the public prayer, or, with upturned faces, listening to the words of truth and soberness, so much needed in that time of peril, which came from a sincere and feeling heart, though uttered with stammering lips. In another neighborhood, on Rocky Creek, (waters of the Catawba,) the eccentric William Martin, the only Covenanter Minister then in the Colony, with tremendous energy roused the people to defend their homes and

avenge the blood of their slaughtered friends, and the cruel injuries of the wounded men, whose mutilated forms might be seen in the old Church of Waxhaw, converted into a hospital after Buford's defeat, and filled with the groans of the wounded, instead of the songs of worshippers.

Such were your heroic ancestors. Around you are places memorable, if not as fields where great battles were fought with vast armies, yet for important engagements. Some times the fortunes of war were against us, as at the Waxhaws, Rocky Mount, and Fishing Creek; but for the most part, were in our favor, as at Green Spring, Musgrove's Mill, Cedar Spring, Hanging Rock, Beckhamville, Waterce Ford, King's Mountain, Rugely's Mills, Fishdam Ford, Blackstock's, and the Cowpens, a battle all-important to the establishment of our independence, which turned the tide of war away from these mountains and valleys, and was the first in those successive steps which rescued Carolina and the remaining Colonies from British oppression. Before us this day are the descendants of those brave men who had a hand in all these deeds of valor, and those heroic women who sustained them, and some times rescued them in the perilous conflict.

The Scotch-Irish, too, were well acquainted with the principles of constitutional liberty and representative government. The English Puritans had done their share—the Hampdens and Sydneys of the days of Cromwell; old John Knox and the signers of the Solemn League and Covenant—the brave old men that inscribed on their banner, "For Christ's Crown and Covenant"—those whose views, and faith, and discipline, were of the Genevan type; but the men of North Ireland, in this country, seem to have excelled them all in hatred of oppression and in the love of regulated liberty. The native Scotch and the Scotch-Irish have not always agreed. Scotch communities in these Colonies some times sided with the Crown, but the Scotch-Irish always with the friends of liberty. We have not

time to enter into the discussion now. But we claim that the views of the thoughtful men of this stock have been borne out in a very especial manner in the constitutions of our American governments.

Another thing we claim for this race of men—yet not for them alone—a high valuation of the blessings of education. This they have in common with the native Scotch. Indeed, we might allow, if any should claim it, the superiority of these. They certainly set the bright example, as the mother Church. It is one great feature of Protestantism, in opposition to Papacy. It is especially a feature of the Calvinistic faith, as developed and carried forth among our fathers. It is the education, not simply of the intellect, training it to feats of dialectics, storing it with ancient lore, or making it sensitive, like the Grecian mind, to outward beauty. It is the education, rather, of the whole man, aimed at the religious principle within as first, informing it with the knowledge which is not of the earth, earthy, but is of heavenly origin—seeking first to establish the kingdom of heaven within, and then adding, over and above, all these things of use and beauty, to make up the perfect man.

From our earliest history, therefore, the Church and the school-house have gone together. As soon as rude dwellings could be erected in the primeval forest, there was a rude Church to stand at some central point, and a rude school-house by its side, or elsewhere, where, with the catechism of the Westminster Divines, and God's Holy Word, the elements of an English and a classical education were obtained. To the more private school succeeded the academy, and then the college, above which the university, after the European model, is, in some few places, seeking to rise.

Of the ministers whom we have named, Dr. Joseph Alexander, of Bullock's Creek, was a noted teacher, resorted to by many young men who afterwards rose to distinction in

society. We have heard the late Gov. David Johnson speak of him as an accomplished scholar, and in terms of the highest praise. "He gave me all the education," said he, "I ever had." Another of these schools was taught by James Gilleland, Jr., on the Tyger River, in which Samuel B. Wilson, of the Union Seminary, was taught. Of Dr. Moses Waddel, Mr. Calhoun, who was his pupil, said: "He was the father of classical education in the Up-Country." McDuffie, Legaré, Petigru, Judge Butler, Wm. H. Crawford, and many other distinguished men, were among his pupils. Indeed, it is the testimony of old men, reared in this portion of the State, that education was altogether in the hands of our own people, and conducted chiefly by our Ministers.

Many of these schools obtained notoriety, and received incorporation. The Mount Zion College and Society was incorporated in 1777, during the war of the Revolution, and, under the able Presidency of Rev. Thos. Harris McCaule, conferred degrees, and was very flourishing. From 1786 to 1795, sixteen candidates for the ministry, from its walls—Wm. C. Davis being the first, and John Cousar the last—were licensed by the old Presbytery of South Carolina, under the care of the General Assembly. Nine years before this, in 1768, Rev. James Creswell and others were incorporated as the "Salem Society," to support a school and seminary of learning near Little River Meeting-House, in the district of Ninety-Six. The school taught by Rev. John Springer, at Old Cambridge, was chartered as a college. In 1778 the Catholic Society, in Sumter, was chartered for the same interest. In 1797 Rev. James Templeton, James Jordan, and others, were incorporated as "The Spartanburg Philanthropic Society," for the erection of an academy, and at the same time the Rev. Joseph Alexander, James Templeton, John Simpson, Francis Cummings, and others, received incorporation as "The Trustees of Alexan-

dria College," to be erected near Pinckneyville, where Dr. Alexander had long taught.

It is pleasant to see the same value put upon educational institutions by the generation and the congregation before us. The High Schools, male and female, which you have reared, and the pleasant Village of Reidville, which has grown up around them in these three years past, are evidences of this, and auguries of good to your children after you.

Thus have we detained you long with the history of your ancestors. They have been called pugnacious. This character belongs to the excitable Milesian, of Southern Ireland, but your ancestors were law-abiding, and when they fought, it was not in passion, nor self-will, but for a just and regulated liberty. They have been called head-strong and obstinate. But they had only that tenacity of purpose which even the Roman Horace praises—which succumbs not in adversity—which bears up under discouragements, and stops not till its noble purposes are accomplished. They have been called over-scrupulous, but they did not stand divided and hesitating, like the Scotch Presbyterians at the battle of Bothwell Brig, till their enemies overwhelmed them. One common soul possessed them in their hour of peril.

The faith which they professed—the religious element which underlies their character—gave them energy of purpose, as it has to all who have embraced it. That Calvinism which was the terror of kings and the friend of republics; which the dissolute Charles II. declared was not fit for a gentleman, because it lifted the lowly into greatness, making him a king and a priest unto God; which took the liberties of England into its keeping, and restrained absolute monarchy in France, Scotland, England, and Ireland; which claimed intelligence for the people, and planted the common school in every congregation; which gathered the children morning and night around the

hearth-stones, to listen to the Word of God, to chant the sacred psalm, and hearken to the voice of prayer; which inspired the maidens of those days with lofty courage; which made your patriot sires take down their trusty rifles and go forth, in God's name, believing that their neighbors, animated by the same motives, would be found by their side, as they fought for their wives and their children, and, above all, for the glorious heritage of freedom which their fathers had left them; this, we hesitate not to say, had far more to do with their energy of character than most are willing to allow.

Noble men! noble women! matrons and maidens both, who inhabited these wilds when the night air was broken by the howl of the wolf and the piteous cry of the panther! who gathered into your fortified houses when the painted Indian or cruel Tory were prowling around! Ministers of God! Richardson, Alexander, Simpson, Creswell, Harris, venerable Elders over the Saviour's flock! leaders, too, oftentimes, on the ensanguined field! Williams, who fell foremost on the gory sod! Pickens, hero in many a battle! Ye leaders of true-hearted men! Thomas, Anderson, Moore, Williamson, Collins, and ye men that were led by them to victory or death! we cherish your memories this day. We rehearse the story of your deeds and sufferings. We would be encouraged by your example to go forth on every holy and honorable path. We would gather strength from you—your principles, your religion, and your God—to press on in the contest in which we are even now engaged, that we may fight your battles over on a grander scale, and secure anew that inheritance of freedom and right transmitted by you to us, and which, but for this effort, is for ever lost!

ARTICLE VII.

EXPLANATORY NOTE.

It is a matter of great regret with us, that our remarks in the July number of this Review, upon the presence of the South-Western Delegates in the last General Assembly, should have proved offensive to any of those brethren. We can only plead the privilege of a free press to comment freely upon the official conduct of public men. It was our opinion that no Southern man ought to have attended the Assembly, inasmuch as our country was at that time at open war with the North. And we hold the same opinion still—but we do not, and did not, claim to judge for any one but ourselves. It seemed to us that the brethren who attended the Assembly put themselves into a false position, and would find their attendance misinterpreted on all hands; and so it certainly has proved. We designed no offence in expressing that opinion, but considered it incumbent on us, as a reviewer of the Assembly, to refer to the matter, as to the other points which were likely to be of interest to our readers.

To one of these Delegates, in particular, we would express our regrets for having given currency, in our review of the Assembly, to an unjust statement respecting him. We refer to what we put on record, on the authority of the *Philadelphia Presbyterian*, as to the Rev. Mr. McInnis, of New Orleans, having said that the Southern people, generally, did “not sympathize with the rebellion.” We had reason to believe that the Rev. Dr. John Leyburn, of Virginia, was reporter, as usual, for his own paper, and we copied the statement, therefore, as probably correct, on *his* authority. But we added the expression of our hope that the *Presbyterian* was in error. What more could we do? Nevertheless, the statement, being denied by Mr. McInnis,

is, of course, not correct as concerns him; and, therefore, unsolicited by him, we take this opportunity of putting down upon our own pages this acknowledgment of the error, and this expression of our regrets for the injury done to him.

We are, also, free to say, with respect to the important and difficult question of the relation of the kingdom of Christ to the kingdoms of this world, upon which we expressed ourselves strongly in our review of the Assembly, that further reflection has modified essentially our views. It is, indeed, difficult to say, in every case, where, precisely, Church power ends, and the power of the State begins. Rebellion is *a sin*, and sin may be condemned, of course, by any Church court, because the Church may enforce all that the Word reveals. But how far the Church court is authorized to go in determining between a lawless rebellion and a just and righteous revolution, it is difficult to decide. When a new Government is set up, *de facto*, and Christian men have to judge whether they ought to obey it or to adhere to their old allegiance, we must acknowledge that the Word of God does not enable any Church court to give them light in their doubts and darkness. The Scriptures command servants to obey their masters, and children their parents, and subjects their rulers; but the servant always knows his master, and the child his parent, while the subject sometimes can not tell who is his lawful ruler. Here the moral question depends on a political one; and that political one is not determined in the Word, and, therefore, it is not the Church that can point out to the honest but doubting subject where his allegiance is due.

We confess our need of more light upon the whole subject. We are not able to say how far, in the very midst of revolution and war, individual Ministers of the Gospel may go in making use of their rights, or in assuming to discharge their duties of citizenship; nor can we decide how far the individual Pastor, in his pulpit, may go in manifesting his sympathy with the old Government or the new, as

the case may be, in the way of exhorting his flock to constancy, to patience, to obedience; or in the way of asking the Divine blessing on the cause of the one or the other side. And how far, then, may the Assembly of Pastors go in the same line of manifesting a sympathy with either the one Cæsar or the other, in the way of appointing a day of fasting and prayer for the Divine blessing; or in the way of joining, themselves, in the prayers of the Moderator, or of any other brother, for the favor of the Almighty to either army; or in any kind of recognition of the solemn and sorrowful condition of their divided and distressed country?

Acknowledging this state of embarrassment and doubtfulness of mind about the subject, of course we are bound to withdraw, and do hereby withdraw, all our expressions which reflected on the Southern Commissioners in the last Assembly, as not having done justice to the question or to their own country in the debate. It was a question very difficult indeed to deal with, in full justice. We have no doubt that they were patriotic and honest men, and that, having felt it their duty to go to the Assembly, they discharged their obligations there in the fear of God, and as faithfully and ably as any other like company of brethren could have done in the same circumstances.

It was very far from our design to wound the feelings of any one of those brethren, or to injure their reputation, in the Church or the State. With Scotch-Irish blood running in our veins, we have to speak, usually, with some warmth and earnestness; and occasionally we write, our friends have often told us, with a seeming abruptness. This, we suppose, can hardly be charged to our blood. Neither the warmth nor the abruptness, however, have any mixture of malice. We love our brethren. We desire, with all our heart, the peace of the Church. We salute them with the Apostle's salutation, of Grace, Mercy and Peace. May the blessed Master smile on us all, and use us all, in our new circumstances, for His own glory, and the comfort and prosperity of Zion!

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 4.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

*Fathers and Brethren of the Board of Directors
of the Theological Seminary :*

On entering formally upon the discharge of the duties of the office into which I have just been inducted, I beg leave to express the deep feeling of responsibility which oppresses me, and of self-distrust, which would have prevented my listening to the call to it, had I believed that I was free to decide in accordance with my own opinion of my fitness. But without obtruding upon you an account of the many reasons which would have induced me to refuse it, clustering more or less closely around the one already presented, permit me to say that I did not dare to yield to them, because the Synod of Georgia, in appointing me to this office, did not act so hastily that I might have regarded their appointment as the result of accident. And hence, although I can not shake off the anxious fear that they have been mistaken in the estimate which led them to make the choice, I may not do otherwise than obey, and

VOL. XIV., NO. IV.—65

go forward in the path which has been set before me, trusting in the judgment of the Church Court which called me, rather than in my own; and above all, relying for wisdom and understanding upon the Infinite Source of light and knowledge.

The oppressive feeling of responsibility is greatly increased by the fact that I have been called, not to discharge the duties of an office already well known, in which the experience of many predecessors affords guidance, but to organize an entirely new department of instruction, without a single similar chair in any theological school, either in America or Europe, to serve as a model. There is, it is true, a chair of Natural Science in the New (Theological) College of the Free Church of Scotland, at Edinburgh; but it is so different in its design from that which you have established, that it forms no exception. "The peculiar business of its course consists in an illustration of the three following branches, into which natural science may be divided: I. Synthology; II. Biology; III. Geology." And it is regarded as merely "destined to embrace a practical course of natural theology."* The task assigned me is all the more difficult on account of the various and even conflicting views which prevail respecting its nature, and the brief and somewhat indefinite instructions given in the resolutions of the Synods of South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, by which the chair was established. For these reasons, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to present to you my own views as to what you have given me to do, and the mode and spirit in which it is to be done, in order that, if I have not mistaken your design, I may go forward the more confidently; and if I have misapprehended it, that I may have the benefit of your counsels and your instructions in changing, restricting, or extending my plans.

* Introductory Lecture: By John Fleming, D. D.

The need of some means of giving to our theological students a more thorough acquaintance with natural science, as far as it has any real or imaginary connexion with revelation, has long been felt; for it has been evident, especially during the last fifty years, that disbelief in the word of God has been relying for its support and its justification, before the reasoning world, more and more upon the several branches of natural science. The arguments brought forward in defence of the truth, have often been characterized by such ignorance of the actual nature and force of the objections urged against it, that they have, not unfrequently, been injurious to the cause defended, and promotive of the scepticism attacked. This has always been the case to a painful extent, as well as at present, when perverted science furnishes infidelity with so large a proportion of its weapons. The most excellent works of many divines, in every age and every branch of the Church, have too often been marred by ineptitudes and fanciful absurdities, whenever they have touched the material works of God. But it has only comparatively recently become important that the connexion between the works and the word of God should be made the subject of special study in a theological course. It has become so now, by the increased number of points of supposed contact, and the wide prevalence of the opinion, in almost every community, and among all classes of people, that the relation subsisting is that of antagonism. Our ministers have by no means been behind the age in this field of knowledge, as has often been tauntingly said; but they have not all been sufficiently in advance of it. Here, as in every thing else which will fit them to understand fully the Word which they preach, to refute the sophisms of unbelievers, and to remove the doubts of those whose faith has been shaken, they should be, if possible, far beyond those whom they would teach.

It has been perceived, by all who can appreciate the amount of study and investigation involved, that the discussion of these topics embraces too wide a range to suffer it to be attached, without great detriment, to existing departments of instruction. It has been wisely thought that it would be better to leave it untouched, than to place it where it could not receive proper attention from either instructor or instructed; for it has been chiefly imperfect, one-sided views that have given rise to the wide-spread belief that there is antagonism. It would only have aggravated the evil to have intrusted the new department to any one who was already fully occupied, as each professor should be, with the appropriate duties of his own chair.

The first step in our Church Courts, looking to the supply of the want so generally felt, which led to any definite result, was taken by the Presbytery of Tombeckbee, in the autumn of 1857; when the following preamble and resolutions, introduced and warmly supported by the Rev. Dr. James A. Lyon, of Columbus, Mississippi—to whom this chair owes so much, from its inception to its final establishment—and as warmly supported by the Rev. Richard S. Gladney, of Aberdeen, were unanimously adopted, viz.:

“*Whereas*, We live in an age in which the most insidious attacks are made upon revealed religion through the natural sciences; and as it behooves the Church, at all times, to have men capable of defending the faith once delivered to the saints, therefore, ‘

“*Resolved*, That this Presbytery recommend the endowment of a professorship of the natural sciences as connected with revealed religion, in one or more of our theological seminaries, and would cheerfully recommend our churches to contribute their full proportion of funds for said endowment.

“*Resolved*, That the same be brought before our Synod (of Mississippi) at its next meeting for consideration.”*

The Synod of Mississippi subsequently, at its meeting in 1858, unanimously approved this proceeding of the Presbytery, and “cordially recommended the same to the consideration of the next General Assembly.”

In the mean time, the attention of the Hon. Judge John Perkins, of “The Oaks,” near Columbus, Mississippi, was directed to the subject, by frequent conversations with his friend and pastor, the Rev. Dr. Lyon. Already fully convinced of its importance, his purpose to coöperate must have been strengthened by the illustration before him, in the neighboring city of Columbus, of the use made of the natural sciences by sceptics, and of the great value of a studied acquaintance with these sciences, and their true relations to revealed religion, as evinced in the triumph of his pastor over all unbelieving assaults. Judge Perkins had previously determined to consecrate a princely sum to the purposes of theological education; and now his resolution was taken to devote a portion of it to the establishment of the proposed professorship. He munificently offered, first, the sum of thirty thousand dollars for its endowment in the Theological Seminary at Columbia; and subsequently, supplemented this amount with ten thousand dollars more, that the chair might be amply and generously sustained. The Board of Directors most gladly accepted the princely offer; and, on the 15th of January, 1859, the arrangements respecting the donation were consummated; the Seminary having been aided here, too, by the invaluable services of the same sterling friend to whom it had been so deeply indebted at every other step.

The written instrument of gift, of the above date, conveying the sum of fifty thousand dollars to the Seminary, of which twenty thousand dollars was for other purposes,

* Southern Presbyterian Review, Vol. XII., p. 182.

“*Witnesseth*, That whereas the said John Perkins is anxious and desirous of making an investment of funds during his life, which will be a permanent source of good to his fellow-creatures after his death: and whereas he is fully satisfied that the greatest good in his power to bestow upon his fellow-men may be effected by and through the Board of Directors above mentioned, in the manner, way, and under the restrictions hereinafter mentioned and stated: Now, for and in consideration of the premises, the said John Perkins hath given, granted, and donated, and doth by these presents give, grant, and donate, unto the said Board of Directors, and their successors in office, the sum of fifty thousand dollars;” * * * * “under the following conditions, purposes, objects, plans, restrictions, and stipulations; that is to say: First, as we live in an age in which the most insidious attacks are made upon revealed religion through the natural sciences; and as it becomes the Church, at all times, to have men capable of defending the faith once delivered to the Church, it is the object and design of the said John Perkins, and it is hereby ordered, and directed, and made, by these presents, one of the conditions, restrictions, and stipulations of said gift, that thirty thousand dollars of the same shall be vested, as a permanent fund, for the endowment of a professorship in said Theological Seminary, of the Natural Sciences as connected with Revealed Religion.”* In October, November, and December, of the same year (1859), the Synods of South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, in accordance with your recommendation, adopted the following resolution :

“*Resolved*, That in accordance with the conditions annexed to the generous donation of Judge Perkins, there be added to the existing departments of instruction in the Seminary, a chair, to be entitled the Perkins Professorship

* Minutes of Synod of South Carolina, 1859, p. 43.

of Natural Science in connexion with Revelation; the design of which shall be to evince the harmony of science with the records of our faith, and to refute the objections of infidel naturalists."

And thus the establishment of the chair was completed; and that, without trenching upon the ordinary resources of the Church; but attended, rather, by such a consecration of wealth to the service of God as is well fitted to stimulate others to devote, in a similar manner, freely, and during their life-time, and while that which they give is still their own, the substance which they have received from the bountiful hand of God. To Mississippi, exclusively, is the Seminary indebted for it; inasmuch as it originated in the efforts of Dr. Lyon, in the Presbytery of Tombeckbee; it was cordially recommended by the Synod of Mississippi; and its ample pecuniary basis was provided by the distinguished citizen of Mississippi, whose honored name it bears. Thus, immediately after the Synod of Alabama had adopted the "Seminary as their own, to cherish and care for, support, help, and encourage it," the sister State on her western border made good her claim to it as her own, too, in an eminently practical and praiseworthy manner.

The Synod of Georgia, to which belonged the choice of the professor, postponed the election for a year, assigning as the reason, that the Synod "feels so deeply the responsibility of proceeding to an election which will be final, and which will involve so much the future character of our Theological Seminary," that it "decides that it is for the best interests of our Church to pause, and postpone an election to said professorship, until our next regular annual meeting, in 1860." At that meeting, they made their choice. And now, Fathers and Brethren of the Board of Directors, though with many misgivings, and with anxious solicitude lest I prove unable to occupy properly the posi-

tion assigned me, I have obeyed the call, and have come to ask your further counsel for my direction, if I have in any respect failed to understand the designs of the Church.

The general design is evident enough: but there are at least three methods by which it may be executed; and hence arises the doubt: for it may be intended that each shall receive equal attention, and the special objects of each be aimed at; or only one of them, to the exclusion of the others; or one chiefly, and the others subordinately. In the first place, the harmony in question may be evinced by showing that science proves the existence of God, and that He has attributes identical, as far as she reveals them, with such as are ascribed to Him in His word. From the observation, both of the "general order prevailing in the material world," and of the "special adaptations" of objects to the purposes which they are to serve, the being and the unity of God may be inferred, and also His wisdom, power, and goodness. If we proceed in this direction, the work will be to present the outlines of Natural Theology, as ordinarily understood, and to compare its doctrines with those of Revealed Theology: to develop the Apostle's declaration, that "the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead"; to examine how the heavens, and all His other wonderful works, "declare the glory of God."

In the next place, the harmony may be evinced by observing the analogy which subsists between nature and revelation, in other respects than those which it belongs to natural theology to consider. From the analogy observed between them, from the "identity of their style," and from the similarity of the difficulties in each, it becomes evident that both have proceeded from the same hand. In pursuing this course, natural science is found to present much, which, while it might be presumptuous to say that it confirms the truths of revelation, at least

illustrates them, and enables us to understand them more clearly, to grasp them more firmly, and to overcome objections which might otherwise be perplexing. When we have been habituated to contemplate the almost illimitable extent of creation, and its almost immeasurable past duration, which science makes known, the words, infinite and eternal, are of vastly grander significance to us, although we still utterly fail to comprehend them in their fullness. When we have been listening to the lessons of science concerning the care which the Creator takes of all his creatures, down to the minutest, and those which we so often proudly regard as beneath our notice, we must find it easier to understand the lessons of the Word concerning His constant provident watchfulness in our behalf. When we have become familiar with the numerous interruptions of absolute uniformity in the flow of events in the history of our earth, and with the beginnings of new orders of things, which science reveals to us, so entirely independent of the antecedent ordinary course of nature, the objections of the subtle sophist to the possibility of the miracles by which the Word is authenticated, can not give us any uneasiness; for they are too palpably inconsistent with what we thus come to know of other departments of God's government. We are, indeed, rather led to anticipate that there will be in the moral world extraordinary events, which we can not assign to ordinary causes, just as there have so often been in the material world. Science further illustrates, in numberless ways, many other truths of revelation; and when it fails to do this, when it fails to throw light upon the mysteries contained in the Word, it presents us with other mysteries of its own, which must, at least, effectually keep us back from the folly of rejecting the Word, because of its sayings dark and hard to be understood.

In the third place, it may be the design of the professorship to evince the harmony only where it has been

doubted or denied, or where opinions prevailing among scientific men either are, or are supposed to be, inconsistent with our sacred records; in other words, to scrutinize the nature and the force of current and popular objections to the Scriptures; to meet them, and to set them aside, by proving that they spring either from science falsely so called, or from incorrect interpretations of the words of the Holy Bible. This would involve a careful study of the fundamental principles of the various branches of science from which the objections are drawn, and of their details, carried far enough to enable one to judge correctly of the amount of truth in each objection. It would involve, further, the careful study of the principles of biblical interpretation, as far as these relate to the mode in which the works of God are spoken of. The comparison of the results obtained thus, if the processes have been properly conducted, must inevitably evince entire harmony, or, at least, the entire absence of discord.

Now, it is this last which I regard as constituting the field on which most labor is to be expended; not that the first two are to be wholly neglected: but this chiefly embraces the duties of the professorship.

If this view is the true one, it will be proper to look more closely at some of the details included in the plan. What, then, are some of the leading points of supposed antagonism between science and revelation?

It is affirmed, on the one hand, that the Sacred Scriptures explicitly teach that the heavens and the earth, embracing the whole material universe, were brought out of absolute non-existence not quite six thousand years ago; and that, from the time when matter began to exist, from the first beginning of creation, until the creation of the first human being, not quite six days elapsed; that the work of creating and preparing this earth to be the abode of man, and of creating all animals that have ever existed, with man at their head, was begun, carried on, and ended, within the

first six days of time. On the other hand, it is maintained that we learn, from the investigation of the structure of the earth, and of the causes by which the peculiarities of its structure have been produced, that, instead of six days, the whole period that has elapsed since the creation of man is an exceedingly minute portion of the time since the first animals, whose remains still exist, were created; and that the earth had been in existence during a period immeasurably beyond our power to measure, prior to the creation of the first living being that has left any trace of its having been an inhabitant of the earth; that the creation of man and contemporaneous animals is really one of the most recent events in the earth's history; that the world, during almost inconceivable periods of time, had been preparing for man's abode; during part of which time, it was apparently without life, and, during the rest, it was the dwelling place of successive races of organized beings, not one of which remained alive when man received it, perfectly fitted to be his home.

Intimately connected with many of the facts involved in the discussion of this point, is the question relating to the introduction of death into our world, and even into the universe. It is evident that those who maintain the views last presented, can not believe that there was no death in the world until after man had sinned. They further insist that we may be convinced that man's sin had nothing to do with the death of the lower animals, by an examination of the structure of the teeth, claws, organs of digestion, and other parts of existing carnivorous animals, which were created at the same time with man. They receive with incredulity the suggestion, that the untold myriads of animals, which they call pre-Adamic, perished in anticipation of man's sin; and they utterly reject, as equally inconsistent with natural history and the Scriptures, the supposition that the carnivorous structure may have been the result of a modification of that previously belonging to

graminivorous animals. Opposed to this is the belief that the Scriptures teach that death was utterly unknown before the fall of man; and that when we read that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," not man's death alone is spoken of, but all death; the death of the simplest and minutest animalcule, as well as of the sinning lord of creation.

Another instance of antagonism is furnished by the opposite views respecting the Noachian deluge. The Bible, we are told, teaches, most unequivocally, that the waters of that deluge spread over the whole earth, and that they stood not less than fifteen cubits above the highest summits of the Himalayas, the Andes, the Rocky Mountains, the Alps, and the loneliest desolations of the icy Arctic deserts, never seen by human eye, as well as the highest hills and mountains of Mesopotamia, and the adjoining regions, to which man's habitations may have extended: and that the whole earth, with all its distinct zoölogical regions obliterated for the time, was entirely destitute of every breathing thing, except those preserved with Noah, and his sons, and their wives, in the ark. Others find in nature reasons which absolutely forbid their belief of such propositions. They find that the number of animals which would need the ark's protection is far beyond its capacity; that if it were not, passing by the impossibility of all existing under the same climate for a whole year, without a constant miracle, they find the geographical distribution of animals to be such that their collection, from remote continents and islands of the sea, from the burning inter-tropical deserts, and the ice-bound fastnesses around the poles, and, still more, that their re-distribution to their present homes, involves an expenditure of miracle which is incredibly disproportionate to the end in view; the destruction of corrupt mankind by a flood of waters.

The question of the unity of the human race brings to view another point of direct antagonism between some

votaries of science and all believers in the Bible. The Bible is held to teach, with a clearness that can not be misunderstood, both directly and by implication, that the whole human family is descended from the single pair, Adam and Eve; the inspired Apostle's saying is quoted, "God, that made the world and all things therein * * * hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth:" and this oneness is necessarily implied in the doctrines of original sin, the federal headship of Adam, and the atonement of Christ. It is impossible to admit any doubt as to this unity, and at the same time believe in the truth of the most vital doctrines of our religion. And yet, it is most strenuously maintained by many, of no small repute in the scientific world, that numerous branches of knowledge conspire to prove this dogma false, and to demonstrate the diversity of human origin. The white, black, red, yellow, and brown races, with many intermediate, are held to be distinct species of animals, descended from different ancestors; closely allied to one another, it may be, but not more so than many species of the lower animals, universally admitted to be distinct. This is supposed to be demonstrated by the diversities in their anatomical and physiological characteristics, and by the difference in their mental constitution; by the constancy of these diversities, as proved by pictures on the monuments of Egypt; by the determination of "the bounds of their habitations" by natural laws, just as rigidly as the bounds of the habitations of any other animals. For similar reasons, it is further maintained, not merely that the human genus has descended from many pairs of ancestors, but, also, that these were distributed geographically at the time of their introduction, as we now find their descendants.

In support of these doctrines, and others which have some connexion with natural science, several other branches of knowledge are appealed to continually; and the considera-

tion of these, as far as they are supposed to affect such doctrines, and, therefore, the truth of the Bible, may be fairly regarded as coming within the confines of this department; all the more reasonably, since they are, as regards their connexion with revelation, always classed in the popular mind with the sciences which belong to it under a stricter definition of its terms. Of this nature is a knowledge of Egypt, and her monuments and their inscriptions, which are represented as teaching many a lesson totally irreconcilable with our sacred records; and a knowledge of the antiquities of the Chinese, the Hindoos, and other Eastern nations, whose established chronology, it is claimed, sets aside, by irrefragable proofs, that of the Hebrew Scriptures as entirely worthless, the fabrication of some modern sciolist. Indeed, the whole subject of chronology, as far as it is not included within the department of biblical exegesis, and every part of archæology, with a similar exception, would, if this extension be just, also claim investigation from this chair. It would involve too minute details, if the attempt were made to enumerate the points of opposition which are alleged to exist in this direction. I will mention but one, which clearly illustrates the necessity of embracing the subjects just specified. As before stated, it is held that the Bible teaches that man was created less than six thousand years ago. In opposition to this, we are told that, although man was introduced at a late period of the earth's history, he has been in existence not less than from thirty thousand to one hundred thousand years; and that this has been proved by the archaeological monuments and the authentic chronology of many nations, no less than by geology and palæontology.

These are some of the questions, showing the nature of all, which I regard it as my chief duty to examine and to discuss before the classes in the Seminary. What is the method to be pursued in doing this: in what spirit are the

investigations to be carried on: and what results may be anticipated?

It is evident that it will be impossible to ascertain whether science and revelation agree or disagree, without an intimate acquaintance with both, as far as they are to be compared. To gain this, then, would seem to be the first thing to be done. While thus engaged, the most untrammelled freedom of inquiry must be allowed; and on both classes of subjects, our decisions must be regulated by their proper evidence. In this preliminary investigation, we must neither be governed in our views of natural science by what we may have believed to be taught in the Bible; nor, on the other hand, must we do violence to the words of the Bible, under the influence of our belief in any supposed teachings of science. There must be the most unbiassed readiness to accept as truth whatever is proved. And yet, at the same time that we advance with the fullest liberty, it should be with the profoundest humility and distrust of our own powers, joined with the deepest reverence for all that God makes known to us, both in His works and His word. Under the influence of such feelings, and proceeding with the firm conviction that truth, like its Author, is ONE, we can hardly fail to make progress in all attainable knowledge; while we will be kept from the folly of believing that there are real inconsistencies, demonstrating error on one side or other, merely because we have not succeeded in comprehending the actual mode in which the different sections of the truth are related to each other. Believing firmly and cordially that every part of the Bible is the very word of God, and that, therefore, every part of it is absolutely true, in the sense in which it was the design of its real Author, the Holy Spirit, that it should be understood, I also firmly believe that nothing will be found inconsistent with it in the established teachings of natural science: I do not say, of nature; for with my unwavering confidence in the truth of the Bible, I

would regard that as a mere truism, the utterance of which would be superfluous; but, of natural science, as it is expounded by its own votaries, and as its propositions are determined according to its own laws of investigation. Contradiction would necessarily imply a want of truth some where; but this, I think it may be made to appear, by the most rigorous reasoning, does not exist. And in all cases where there are still unadjusted apparent differences, which, it must be admitted, do exist, it can be shown that it is infinitely more probable that they result from imperfect understanding of the meaning of the Word, or of the bearing of the scientific truth, or both, than from any real inconsistency. There are independent propositions in intellectual and moral science, and even in theology, which are seemingly inconsistent, and almost contradictory; and yet we never think of abandoning our belief in any of them, if each stands on a firm basis of its own. In no case do the imperfectly understood relations under consideration present more serious difficulties than these, and very seldom as serious. I further believe that there is no seeming discrepancy, where the denial of the truth on either side would not involve vastly more perplexing embarrassment than its reception on both. We have nothing to fear for the records of our faith from the freest examination in every direction. Let antiquity be searched; let the created universe be scrutinized, as far as the human intellect, so gifted by its Creator, can reach: though in the process we will see many errors which have clung around our own minds, and which may have prevented our seeing the meaning of the Divine word, that Word will derive continually new lustre from every advance in knowledge, and unbelievers will at each step be more and more without excuse for their irrational doubts.

In seeking to obtain and to impart a suitable acquaintance with natural science, it will be proper, first of all, to examine the logical and philosophical basis upon which its

branches rest. In the analysis of every science, we come at last to certain principles on which the whole fabric is founded, and on whose truth the entire trustworthiness of the whole depends. These first principles can not, in any case, be established by ordinary reasoning; but must be such that they command the assent of every rational being, as soon as they are stated and understood. After having carefully scrutinized these first truths, and rejected all that can not endure the proper tests, and determined the limits of the applicability of such as are retained, it will be necessary to pass in review the doctrines of the several sciences concerned, and to weigh the evidence in favor of each, and the objections against each, so as to ascertain, as accurately as possible, the exact amount of confidence that is to be placed in them. We will, doubtless, in such an examination, find much that we must receive as certainly true; much that is certainly false, or, at least, wholly unproven; with much that presents such evidence as to leave us in doubt. Under the first head, I would place the teachings of geology respecting the antiquity of the earth, and the gradual nature of the processes by which the Creator brought it into its present condition: under the second, I would place the teachings of such ethnologists as deny the specific unity of the human family, and of those who maintain the extreme antiquity of man: under the third, I would place all that affects the character and extent of the Noachian deluge.

In all these preliminary discussions and investigations, only such evidence and arguments as strictly belong to science should be admitted; and these should be allowed to produce their legitimate effects, without regard to possible difficulties in which our conclusions may entangle us. Our cross-examination of the witness should be conducted with the design of learning exactly what he knows; of eliciting this knowledge from him unbiassed by any fear of evil to himself in consequence of his utterances, or of evil

to either of the parties, since we examine him as judges, and not as advocates. And we must not estimate the truthfulness of the witness himself by the correspondence of his testimony with our preconceived notions; but these we must change as his evidence requires, if his character for undoubted veracity has been previously established by the proper tests.

In the next stage of our inquiry, the absolute truth of the ascertained text of the Bible is assumed, as having been demonstrated in other departments of instruction; and the sole object here will be the determination of its meaning, by the application of judicious and established rules of interpretation. Here, as before, it will be grossly improper to attempt to make the language bear any construction inconsistent with these rules; to torture it into accordance with our preconceived opinions of its meaning, or with what we believe to be true in science. In all interpretation, we ought, assuredly, to have recourse to the fullest attainable knowledge of the subjects spoken of, derived from every source. And while it is true that we must interpret Scripture by its own laws, it is not less true that we can apply these more efficiently, and with less liability to error, in cases where we have some previous acquaintance with the topics introduced. We are clearly aided in understanding all that relates to the tribes and nations mentioned, by a knowledge of their manners and customs; by geography, in all geographical allusions; by astronomy, where the stars are concerned; by zoölogy and phytology, where animals and plants are alluded to; and so in other cases. We are not to try the truth of the Bible, certainly, by its supposed agreement or disagreement with the teachings of these sciences; but we may, and we must, accept all the aid that they can bring us. This is not denied, with regard to the subjects just mentioned; but when other sciences, equally well established, are added, there is sometimes immediate dissent. This

dissent would be quite justifiable, were the attempt made to force the Bible to speak in the language of science. To do this would be quite as unreasonable as the attempt, which is so frequently made, to force science to utter that which will accord with our views of the meaning of the Bible; and it should be strenuously resisted. But I see no reason why we should not accept this external assistance in doubtful cases; nor do I see why the assistance should be accepted, where some scientific principles are concerned; and rejected, when it is offered by others equally well proven. If it be objected to these views, that if science can be justified in its rejection of aid from the Bible, by the same reasoning it may be shown that the Bible should refuse all aid from science; it is replied that this would be just, were the question of the truth of the Bible on trial; that must be determined by rules of evidence with which natural science can have very little to do. But the objection is manifestly without foundation, when we remember that the natural sciences are based upon principles which it would be foreign to the design of the Bible to teach, and upon material phenomena which it would be unreasonable to expect to find recorded there in scientific form; while, on the other hand, the incidental allusions, throughout the sacred volume, to natural objects, whose very incidental character it is that renders them unavailable to science as formal descriptions of phenomena, presuppose some knowledge of that to which reference is made, and make necessary the application of that knowledge, before the allusions can be understood.

When we come, in the third stage, to compare the results of these two independent lines of inquiry, we ought to expect to find perfect accordance only in case we are perfectly certain that we have reached the absolute truth in science, and that the meaning which we attach to the language of the Bible is indubitably the true one. But how far are we from this position in both directions? As we

have seen, there is much that passes under the name of science that is only probable, at the best; and much that, while it seems possibly true, as long as it is viewed by itself, is shown to be wholly impossible as soon as the scope of vision becomes broader. And who will say that it is otherwise with our interpretations of the Bible? Not, certainly, that there is any doubt as to its meaning when it describes the relations of the Almighty Creator to the universe, His handiwork; or the ruined and miserable condition of man, the sinner; or the coming, and the life, the death, the resurrection, and the ascension of our blessed Divine Redeemer; or the way in which the gift of salvation is imparted to man, and the agency of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Trinity, in sanctifying his soul; or the blessedness of the redeemed, in that presence where there is fullness of joy. In all that relates to these points, and to all the attributes of God, which He intended that we should know, the meaning of the Word is so clear that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. But, whenever we turn aside from these broad tracks of light, we find that the diversity of view on every subject, among those who receive and love the saving truth, proves but too clearly how difficult it must be to reach the exact meaning of that which is revealed. How much more must this be the case with regard to material objects, to which the references are but casual, and without any direct bearing whatever upon the main subject of discourse? Who will venture to assert dogmatically that he has found the exact and full meaning of that which is thus casually introduced? And yet, such is the character of a large portion of the points by which revelation is supposed to be connected with science.

With regard to the record of creation, it may fairly be questioned whether it is possible to convey to us in human language an intelligible account of its mode and its details. To be intelligible, it must be conveyed in language whose

meaning has been previously determined by common use. This determination has been effected by the application of particular words and expressions to known objects and processes. Now, it may well be supposed that the work of creation is so entirely different, in every respect, from any thing which it is possible for us to observe, and thus become acquainted with, and from the ordinary course of change, and the relations in which material objects stand to each other and to intelligent beings, on all which language is founded, that a knowledge of its details can no more be communicated to us than a knowledge of the nature and properties of light can be communicated to the blind. But, however this may be, there is no difficulty in the way of imparting a knowledge of the fact of the creation, and of all its moral bearings, as far as they affect us. But when we seek to go farther, the state of the case may be analogous to our knowledge of the trinity of persons in the Godhead; the fact we know, and its moral import to us; but the exact nature of the personality, and the mode of the union, we do not know; and it is more than probable that these could not be made known to us by human language.

In view of these considerations; the imperfect character of science; the doubt which must hang around many of our interpretations of the Bible, on account of the brief, and therefore obscure, descriptions to be interpreted; and the probability that language may not be adequate to convey the ideas for which we may be looking, and which we may infer it is no part of the design of the Holy Spirit to present; we may expect to find many unadjusted differences, instead of perfectly established harmony. When the comparison is made in the manner described, our surprise will be to find that there are so few apparent discrepancies; and, further, that the number of points of certain connexion of any kind is so small. Complete success, in the work you have given me to do, would be attained, if the real

relationship were positively determined in every case, and this were to be shown to be perfect identity or visible harmony. Whether or not this will ever be attainable, I know not. I, at least, do not hope for it, and I will regard myself as having discharged my duty, and fulfilled all reasonable requirements, when I succeed in presenting one or more possible and probable views of the existing relations, compatible with belief of the truth of both; and have proved that the reception of these involves infinitely less difficulty than any doubt of the truth of the Bible: thus showing, with regard to each point in succession, that it furnishes no one with the slightest excuse for rejecting that which we love and confide in as the word of God.

In conducting such investigations, and in defending the word of God against attacks based upon natural science, we ought to be continually on our guard against a dogmatic adherence to opinions which may not be well founded, and the denunciation as infidel of whatever differs from our own; and, also, against a facile acceptance of every novel and attractive hypothesis which may spring up in the field of science. We are warned of the danger to which we are here exposed, by the history of past controversies, and of embittered contests between interpretations of the Scriptures and views of nature, all of which are now acknowledged to be erroneous. The chief danger seems to have arisen from a disposition which has manifested itself in every age, and which, unhappily, too often evinces its continued existence up to the present day, to regard every mention of material objects as couched in the current scientific language of the day; and from the groundless belief that the sacred volume, besides being fitted to accomplish its chief and highest ends, is also a text-book containing the whole body of scientific truth of every kind, as well as the most authentic and instructive history of human affairs, and the collection of the sublimest and sweetest strains of poetry in existence. .

I confess myself unable to understand how a proposition can be theologically true and scientifically false, when both the theology and the science are accepted as true ; but this does not prevent my perceiving that the statement may be true, when understood in one sense, and false, when understood in another ; and the consequent impropriety of attributing the one meaning to it, when the other is designed. If any one tells us that the sun stands still for a certain period in the winter, and again in the summer, we would hardly be justifiable in replying that there is a gross mistake implied in the assertion ; that he must be ignorant of modern astronomy ; that it stands still all the time. And should we have reason to receive the statement as certainly true, we would not think of making it the basis of a new astronomy, of which one of the principles would be, that at certain periods of the year, called the solstices, the sun is in a state of absolute rest, and during the rest of the year, it is in constant motion. If, in a case like this, we are willing to ascertain the meaning intended, surely we should be equally careful in interpreting the word of God ; and should avoid taking as a formal scientific explanation of a phenomenon, that which is merely a description of it in ordinary language. Although this principle is so reasonable that no one would ever think of calling it in question, it has been in practice sadly neglected. Systems of natural science have been invented in direct violation of it ; for the support of which, not only have the allusions to nature in the narrative portions of the Bible been quoted by the inventors, but also the boldest figures of its most impassioned poetry.

The danger in question exhibits itself in two forms. In the one, there is an eager desire to bring, to force, if need be, the sacred text into accordance with the last doubtful utterance of science, and an impatient contempt towards all who will not at once accept as demonstrated the newly discovered harmony. In the other, although there is pro-

fessed a distrust of all natural science, there is a no less real accommodation of the interpretation to the somewhat antiquated and distorted form of science which has reached the less educated classes of mankind; and this is represented as interpreting the Word by its own light; assigning to it just such a meaning as it would seem fitted to convey to the unlettered, unbiassed mind of a plain, unsophisticated, honest inquirer after truth. In whatever form it may appear, we can not be too careful in guarding against its influence; whether it would lead us to commit the Word to new hypotheses on the outskirts of science, in the region of the undetermined, or to old guesses, which have long been exploded and abandoned. Profiting by the lessons of the past, we will require ample proof of the incorrectness of an interpretation which has long been sanctioned by devout men of learning, before we give it up; and we will scrutinize, with jealous care, the evidence by which all new theories are sustained, affirming new modes of connexion; and we will hesitate long before we adopt them, in the hope that we may avoid changes which may so easily be used to bring discredit upon that which we most highly prize. But, while thus cautious in the examination and admission of all professed friends, lest they be enemies in disguise, and lest they become an element of weakness, if not actual traitors, there should be equal care taken to avoid the other extreme, of rejecting, with scornful contempt, all proffers of alliance and coöperation, and thus doing what we can to drive those who may be friends, or at least neutrals, into the ranks of the enemy. This, too, has been done, to an unfortunate extent, in all ages of the Church. There has been too often a disposition to repress all freedom of inquiry, and to denounce its results, without any impartiality of examination, as opposed to the letter and spirit of revelation. The day when the instruments used in restraining such freedom were material, has passed away; but, unhappily, others are

still used, which sometimes inflict not less pain. There still exists too much of the old spirit in the purest branches of the Church of this day; a spirit that would crush all progress in science, if such progress disturb, in the least, cherished views which may be without real foundation in the Bible, by the employment, not now of material instruments of torture, but by that which has with too much truth been denominated "*odium theologicum.*" This is utterly at variance with the spirit of Christianity and its divine charter. And it is at variance, also, with the general practice of believers in the Bible; for with regard to most subjects, the utmost encouragement is given to the seeker after increased knowledge; and very properly, since every new discovery is found to be an additional illustration of the glory of God. Such encouragement should be given to every inquiry after truth. Not merely should the inquirer be tolerated; but he should have reason to know that he is regarded with approbation, and that his results will be received with candor, while they are subjected to all becoming tests, before they are adopted as true; and that his name will not be cast out as evil, he will not find himself classed with unbelievers, because his views may at first sight seem to be inconsistent with received truth. Let the Church show herself the patroness of learning in every thing, as she has done already in most things; and let her never be subjected, by mistaken friends, to the charge that she fears the light, and can sustain her claims only where this is partially obstructed. Let her, through all her members, exhibit that love for the truth on every subject, which is some times directly forcibly inculcated in the Holy Scriptures, and which is so consonant with their spirit throughout.

This, then, in my opinion, is the spirit by which the incumbent of the professorship should be actuated; these are the objects to be sought, and the plan to be pursued, and the results to be expected. Direct confirmation of

the truth of revelation is not looked for; it is not needed. You can not hope to render more firm the foundation of the mountain of granite. But the fogs which hang around its base, and obscure its immovable nature, and distort, to the beholder, the symmetry of its acclivities, may be dispelled, and thus its solid foundation and true proportions be brought more clearly to view. This, I believe, the faithful discharge of the duties belonging to this chair will tend greatly to effect; success in this will constitute its triumph and its glory.

Complete success I dare not hope for at once; but I shall labor for it with at least faithful industry, and an honest desire to attain and set forth all the truth. And I look to you, and to the beloved Church which founded the Seminary of which you have been constituted Directors, and whose honor and purity should be so jealously guarded, to aid me by your counsels and your prayers, that I may be kept from teaching aught but the unadulterated and unperturbed truth. And above all, I look to the Head of the Church, and to the Creator of the Universe, and to the Author of the Word, to the Triune God of truth, for that wisdom which cometh from Him alone, and by the aid of which alone need I hope to glorify Him in the position to which, I trust, He has been calling me by the voice of His Church.

ARTICLE II.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN
THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth, greeting: Grace, mercy and peace be multiplied upon you.

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN:

It is probably known to you that the Presbyteries and Synods in the Confederate States, which were formerly in connexion with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, have renounced the jurisdiction of that body, and dissolved the ties which bound them ecclesiastically with their brethren of the North. This act of separation left them without any formal union among themselves. But as they were one in faith and order, and still adhered to their old standards, measures were promptly adopted for giving expression to their unity, by the organization of a Supreme Court, upon the model of the one whose authority they had just relinquished. Commissioners, duly appointed, from all the Presbyteries of these Confederate States, met, accordingly, in the city of Augusta, on the fourth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and then and there proceeded to constitute the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States—that is to say, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship—were unan-

imously and solemnly declared to be the Constitution of the Church in the Confederate States, with no other change than the substitution of "Confederate" for "United," wherever the country is mentioned in the standards. The Church, therefore, in these seceded States, presents now the spectacle of a separate, independent and complete organization, under the style and title of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. In thus taking its place among sister Churches of this and other countries, it seems proper that it should set forth the causes which have impelled it to separate from the Church of the North, and to indicate a general view of the course, which it feels it incumbent upon it to pursue, in the new circumstances in which it is placed.

We should be sorry to be regarded by our brethren in any part of the world as guilty of schism. We are not conscious of any purpose to rend the body of Christ. On the contrary, our aim has been to promote the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. If we know our own hearts, and can form any just estimate of the motives which have governed us, we have been prompted by a sincere desire to promote the glory of God, and the efficiency, energy, harmony and zeal of His visible kingdom in the earth. We have separated from our brethren of the North as Abraham separated from Lot, because we are persuaded that the interests of true religion will be more effectually subserved by two independent Churches, under the circumstances in which the two countries are placed, than by one united body.

1. In the first place, the course of the last Assembly, at Philadelphia, conclusively shows that, if we should remain together, the political questions, which divide us as citizens, will be obtruded on our Church Courts, and discussed by Christian Ministers and Elders with all the acrimony, bitterness and rancour, with which such questions are usually discussed by men of the world. Our Assembly

would present a mournful spectacle of strife and debate. Commissioners from the Northern would meet with Commissioners from the Southern Confederacy, to wrangle over the questions which have split them into two Confederacies, and involved them in furious and bloody war. They would denounce each other, on the one hand, as tyrants and oppressors, and on the other, as traitors and rebels. The Spirit of God would take His departure from these scenes of confusion, and leave the Church lifeless and powerless, an easy prey to the sectional divisions and angry passions of its members. Two nations, under any circumstances, except those of perfect homogeneousness, can not be united in one Church, without the rigid exclusion of all civil and secular questions from its halls. Where the countries differ in their customs and institutions, and view each other with an eye of jealousy and rivalry, if national feelings are permitted to enter the Church Courts, there must be an end of harmony and peace. The prejudices of the man and the citizen will prove stronger than the charity of the Christian. When they have allowed themselves to denounce each other for their national peculiarities, it will be hard to join in cordial fellowship as members of the same spiritual family. Much more must this be the case where the nations are not simply rivals, but enemies—where they hate each other with a cruel hatred—where they are engaged in a ferocious and bloody war, and where the worst passions of human nature are stirred to their very depths. An Assembly, composed of representatives from two such countries, could have no security for peace except in a steady, uncompromising adherence to the Scriptural principle, that it would know no man after the flesh; that it would abolish the distinctions of Barbarian, Scythian, bond and free, and recognize nothing but the new creature in Christ Jesus. The moment it permits itself to know the Confederate or the United States, the moment its members meet as

citizens of these countries, our political differences will be transferred to the house of God, and the passions of the forum will expel the Spirit of holy love and of Christian communion.

We can not condemn a man, in one breath, as unfaithful to the most solemn earthly interests, his country and his race, and commend him, in the next, as a loyal and faithful servant of his God. If we distrust his patriotism, our confidence is apt to be very measured in his piety. The old adage will hold here, as in other things, *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*.

The only conceivable condition, therefore, upon which the Church of the North and the South could remain together as one body, with any prospect of success, is the rigorous exclusion of the questions and passions of the forum from its halls of debate. This is what always ought to be done. The provinces of Church and State are perfectly distinct, and the one has no right to usurp the jurisdiction of the other. The State is a natural institute, founded in the constitution of man, as moral and social, and designed to realize the idea of justice. It is the society of rights. The Church is a supernatural institute, founded in the facts of redemption, and is designed to realize the idea of grace. It is the society of the redeemed. The State aims at social order, the Church at spiritual holiness. The State looks to the visible and outward, the Church is concerned for the invisible and inward. The badge of the State's authority is the sword, by which it becomes a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well. The badge of the Church's authority is the keys, by which it opens and shuts the Kingdom of Heaven, according as men are believing or impenitent. The power of the Church is exclusively spiritual, that of the State includes the exercise of force. The constitution of the Church is a Divine revelation—the constitution of the State must be determined by human reason and the

course of Providential events. The Church has no right to construct or modify a government for the State, and the State has no right to frame a creed or polity for the Church. They are as planets moving in different orbits, and unless each is confined to its own track, the consequences may be as disastrous in the moral world, as the collision of different spheres in the world of matter. It is true that there is a point at which their respective jurisdictions seem to meet—in the idea of duty. But even duty is viewed by each in very different lights. The Church enjoins it as obedience to God, and the State enforces it as the safeguard of order. But there can be no collision, unless one or the other blunders as to the things that are materially right. When the State makes wicked laws, contradicting the eternal principles of rectitude, the Church is at liberty to testify against them; and humbly to petition that they may be repealed. In like manner, if the Church becomes seditious, and a disturber of the peace, the State has a right to abate the nuisance. In ordinary cases, however, there is not likely to be a collision. Among a Christian people, there is little difference of opinion as to the radical distinctions of right and wrong. The only serious danger is, where moral duty is conditioned upon a political question. Under the pretext of inculcating duty, the Church may usurp the power to determine the question which conditions it, and that is precisely what she is debarred from doing. The condition must be given. She must accept it from the State, and then her own course is clear. *If Cæsar is your master, then pay tribute to him; but whether the if holds; whether Cæsar is your master or not; whether he ever had any just authority; whether he now retains it, or has forfeited it; these are points which the Church has no commission to adjudicate.*

Had these principles been steadily maintained by the Assembly at Philadelphia, it is possible that the ecclesiastical separation of the North and the South might have

been deferred for years to come. Our Presbyteries, many of them, clung with tenderness to the recollections of the past. Sacred memories gathered around that venerable Church which had breasted many a storm, and trained our fathers for glory. It had always been distinguished for its conservative influence, and many fondly hoped that, even in the present emergency, it would raise its placid and serene head above the tumults of popular passion, and bid defiance to the angry billows which rolled at its feet. We expected to see it bow in reverence only at the name of Jesus. Many dreamed that it would utterly refuse to know either Confederates or Federalists, and utterly refuse to give any authoritative decree without a "thus saith the Lord." It was ardently desired that the sublime spectacle might be presented of one Church upon earth, combining, in cordial fellowship and in holy love, the disciples of Jesus in different and even in hostile lands. But, alas for the weakness of man! these golden visions were soon dispelled. The first thing, which roused our Presbyteries to look the question of separation seriously in the face, was the course of the Assembly in venturing to determine, as a Court of Jesus Christ, which it did by necessary implication, the true interpretation of the Constitution of the United States as to the kind of government it intended to form. A political theory was, to all intents and purposes, propounded, which made secession a crime, the seceding States rebellious, and the citizens who obeyed them traitors. We say nothing here as to the righteousness or unrighteousness of these decrees. What we maintain is, that, whether right or wrong, the Church had no right to make them—she transcended her sphere, and usurped the duties of the State. The discussion of these questions, we are sorry to add, was in the spirit and temper of partisan declaimers. The Assembly, driven from its ancient moorings, was tossed to and fro by the waves of popular passion. Like Pilate, it obeyed the clamour of

the multitude, and, though acting in the name of Jesus, it kissed the sceptre, and bowed the knee to the mandates of Northern phrenzy. The Church was converted into the forum, and the Assembly was henceforward to become the arena of sectional divisions and national animosities.

We frankly admit that the mere unconstitutionality of the proceedings of the last Assembly is not, in itself considered, a sufficient ground of separation. It is the consequences of these proceedings, which make them so offensive. It is the door which they open for the introduction of the worst passions of human nature into the deliberations of Church Courts. The spirit of these proceedings, if allowed to prevail, would for ever banish peace from the Church, and there is no reason to hope that the tide which has begun to flow can soon be arrested. The two Confederacies hate each other more intensely now than they did in May, and if their citizens should come together upon the same floor, whatever might be the errand that brought them there, they could not be restrained from smiting each other with the fist of wickedness. For the sake of peace, therefore, for Christian charity, for the honour of the Church, and for the glory of God, we have been constrained, as much as in us lies, to remove all occasion of offence. We have quietly separated, and we are grateful to God that, while leaving for the sake of peace, we leave with the humble consciousness that we, ourselves, have never given occasion to break the peace. We have never confounded Cæsar and Christ, and we have never mixed the issues of this world with the weighty matters that properly belong to us as citizens of the Kingdom of God.

2. Though the immediate occasion of separation was the course of the General Assembly at Philadelphia in relation to the Federal Government and the war, yet there is another ground on which the independent organization of the Southern Church can be amply and scripturally main-

tained. The unity of the Church does not require a formal bond of union among all the congregations of believers throughout the earth. It does not demand a vast imperial monarchy, like that of Rome, nor a strictly universal council, like that to which the complete development of Presbyterianism would naturally give rise. The Church catholic is one in Christ, but it is not necessarily one visible, all-absorbing organization upon earth. There is no schism where there is no breach of charity. Churches may be perfectly at one in every principle of faith and order, and yet geographically distinct, and mutually independent. As the unity of the human race is not disturbed by its division into countries and nations, so the unity of the spiritual seed of Christ is neither broken nor impaired by separation and division into various Church constitutions. Accordingly, in all Protestant countries, Church organizations have followed national lines. The Calvinistic Churches of Switzerland are distinct from the Reformed Church of France. The Presbyterians of Ireland belong to a different Church from the Presbyterians of Scotland, and the Presbyterians of America constitute Churches, in like manner, distinct from all other Churches on the globe. That the division into national Churches, that is, Churches bounded by national lines, is, in the present condition of human nature, a benefit, seems to us too obvious for proof. It realizes to the Church catholic all the advantages of a division of labour. It makes a Church organization homogeneous and compact—it stimulates holy rivalry and zeal—it removes all grounds of suspicion and jealousy on the part of the State. What is lost in expansion is gained in energy. The Church catholic, as thus divided, and yet spiritually one; divided, but not rent, is a beautiful illustration of the great philosophical principle which pervades all nature—the co-existence of the one with the many.

If it is desirable that each nation should contain a separate and an independent Church, the Presbyterians of these Confederate States need no apology for bowing to the decree of Providence, which, in withdrawing their country from the Government of the United States, has, at the same time, determined that they should withdraw from the Church of their fathers. It is not that they have ceased to love it—not that they have abjured its ancient principles, or forgotten its glorious history. It is to give these same principles a richer, freer, fuller developement among ourselves than they possibly could receive under foreign culture. It is precisely because we love that Church as it was, and that Church as it should be, that we have resolved, as far as in us lies, to realize its grand idea in the country, and under the Government, where God has cast our lot. With the supreme control of ecclesiastical affairs in our own hands, we may be able, in some competent measure, to consummate this result. In subjection to a foreign power, we could no more accomplish it than the Church in the United States could have been developed in dependence upon the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The difficulty there would have been, not the distance of Edinburgh from New York, Philadelphia or Charleston, but the difference in the manners, habits, customs, and ways of thinking; the social, civil and political institutions of the people. These same difficulties exist in relation to the Confederate and the United States, and render it eminently proper that the Church in each should be as separate and independent as the Governments.

In addition to this, there is one difference which so radically and fundamentally distinguishes the North and South, that it is becoming every day more and more apparent that the religious, as well as the secular, interests of both will be more effectually promoted by a complete and lasting separation. The antagonism of Northern and Southern sentiment on the subject of slavery, lies at the

root of all the difficulties which have resulted in the dismemberment of the Federal Union, and involved us in the horrors of an unnatural war. The Presbyterian Church in the United States has been enabled, by Divine grace, to pursue, for the most part, an eminently conservative, because a thoroughly scriptural, policy in relation to this delicate question. It has planted itself upon the word of God, and utterly refused to make slaveholding a sin, or non-slaveholding a term of communion. But, though both sections are agreed as to this general principle, it is not to be disguised that the North entertains a deep and settled antipathy to slavery itself, while the South is equally zealous in its defence. Recent events can have no other effect than to confirm the antipathy on the one hand, and strengthen the attachment on the other. The Northern section of the Church stands in the awkward predicament of maintaining, in one breath, that slavery is an evil which ought to be abolished, and of asserting, in the next, that it is not a sin to be visited by exclusion from the communion of the saints. The consequence is, that it plays partly into the hands of abolitionists, and partly into the hands of slaveholders, and weakens its influence with both. It occupies the position of a prevaricating witness, whom neither party will trust. It would be better, therefore, for the moral power of the Northern section of the Church to get entirely quit of the subject. At the same time, it is intuitively obvious that the Southern section of the Church, while even partially under the control of those who are hostile to slavery, can never have free and unimpeded access to the slave population. Its ministers and elders will always be liable to some degree of suspicion. In the present circumstances, Northern alliance would be absolutely fatal. It would utterly preclude the Church from a wide and commanding field of usefulness. This is too dear a price to be paid for a nominal union. We can not afford to give up these millions of souls, and consign them,

so far as our efforts are concerned, to hopeless perdition, for the sake of preserving an outward unity which, after all, is an empty shadow. If we would gird ourselves heartily, and in earnest, for the work which God has set before us, we must have the control of our ecclesiastical affairs, and declare ourselves separate and independent.

And here we may venture to lay before the Christian world our views, as a Church, upon the subject of slavery. We beg a candid hearing.

In the first place, we would have it distinctly understood that, in our ecclesiastical capacity, we are neither the friends nor the foes of slavery; that is to say, we have no commission either to propagate or abolish it. The policy of its existence or non-existence is a question which exclusively belongs to the State. We have no right, as a Church, to enjoin it as a duty, or to condemn it as a sin. Our business is with the duties which spring from the relation; the duties of the masters on the one hand, and of their slaves on the other. These duties we are to proclaim and to enforce with spiritual sanctions. The social, civil, political problems connected with this great subject, transcend our sphere, as God has not entrusted to His Church the organization of society, the construction of Governments, nor the allotment of individuals to their various stations. The Church has as much right to preach to the monarchies of Europe, and the despotisms of Asia, the doctrines of republican equality, as to preach to the Governments of the South the extirpation of slavery. This position is impregnable, unless it can be shown that slavery is a sin. Upon every other hypothesis, it is so clearly a question for the State, that the proposition would never, for a moment, have been doubted, had there not been a foregone conclusion in relation to its moral character. Is slavery, then, a sin?

In answering this question, as a Church, let it be distinctly borne in mind that the only rule of judgment is the

written word of God. The Church knows nothing of the intuitions of reason or the deductions of philosophy, except as these are reproduced in the Sacred Canon. She has a positive constitution in the Holy Scriptures, and has no right to utter a single syllable upon any subject, except as the Lord puts words in her mouth. She is founded, in other words, upon express *revelation*. Her creed is an authoritative testimony of God, and not a speculation; and what she proclaims, she must proclaim with the infallible certitude of faith, and not with the hesitating assent of an opinion. The question, then, is brought within a narrow compass: Do the Scriptures, directly or indirectly, condemn slavery as a sin? If they do not, the dispute is ended, for the Church, without forfeiting her character, dares not go beyond them.

Now, we venture to assert that, if men had drawn their conclusions upon this subject only from the Bible, it would no more have entered into any human head to denounce slavery as a sin, than to denounce monarchy, aristocracy, or poverty. The truth is, men have listened to what they falsely considered as primitive intuitions, or as necessary deductions from primitive cognitions, and then have gone to the Bible to confirm the crotchets of their vain philosophy. They have gone there determined to find a particular result, and the consequence is, that they leave with having made, instead of having interpreted, Scripture. Slavery is no new thing. It has not only existed for ages in the world, but it has existed, under every dispensation of the covenant of grace, in the Church of God. Indeed, the first organization of the Church as a visible society, separate and distinct from the unbelieving world, was inaugurated in the family of a slaveholder. Among the very first persons to whom the seal of circumcision was affixed, were the slaves of the father of the faithful, some born in his house, and others bought with his money. Slavery, again, re-appears under the Law. God sanctions

it in both the tables of the Decalogue, and Moses treats it as an institution to be regulated, not abolished ; legitimated, and not condemned. We come down to the age of the New Testament, and we find it again in the Churches founded by the Apostles under the plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost. These facts are utterly amazing, if slavery is the enormous sin which its enemies represent it to be. It will not do to say that the Scriptures have treated it only in a general, incidental way, without any clear implication as to its moral character. Moses, surely, made it the subject of express and positive legislation, and the Apostles are equally explicit in inculcating the duties which spring from both sides of the relation. They treat slaves as bound to obey, and inculcate obedience as an office of religion—a thing wholly self-contradictory, if the authority exercised over them were unlawful and iniquitous.

But what puts this subject in a still clearer light, is the manner in which it is sought to extort from the Scriptures a contrary testimony. The notion of direct and explicit condemnation is given up. The attempt is, to show that the genius and spirit of Christianity are opposed to it—that its great cardinal principles of virtue are utterly against it. Much stress is laid upon the Golden Rule, and upon the general denunciations of tyranny and oppression. To all this we reply, that no principle is clearer than that a case positively excepted can not be included under a general rule. Let us concede, for a moment, that the law of love, and the condemnation of tyranny and oppression, seem logically to involve, as a result, the condemnation of slavery ; yet, if slavery is afterwards expressly mentioned and treated as a lawful relation, it obviously follows, unless Scripture is to be interpreted as inconsistent with itself, that slavery is, by necessary implication, excepted. The Jewish law forbade, as a general rule, the marriage of a man with his brother's wife. The same law expressly enjoined the same marriage in a given case. The given

case was, therefore, an exception, and not to be treated as a violation of the general rule. The law of love has always been the law of God. It was enunciated by Moses, almost as clearly as it was enunciated by Jesus Christ. Yet, notwithstanding this law, Moses and the Apostles alike sanctioned the relation of slavery. The conclusion is inevitable, either that the law is not opposed to it, or that slavery is an excepted case. To say that the prohibition of tyranny and oppression include slavery, is to beg the whole question. Tyranny and oppression involve either the unjust usurpation or the unlawful exercise of power. It is the unlawfulness, either in its principle or measure, which constitutes the core of the sin. Slavery must, therefore, be proved to be unlawful, before it can be referred to any such category. The master may, indeed, abuse his power, but he oppresses not simply as a master, but as a wicked master.

But, apart from all this, the law of love is simply the inculcation of universal equity. It implies nothing as to the existence of various ranks and gradations in society. The interpretation which makes it repudiate slavery would make it equally repudiate all social, civil and political inequalities. Its meaning is, not that we should conform ourselves to the arbitrary expectations of others, but that we should render unto them precisely the same measure which, if we were in their circumstances, it would be reasonable and just in us to demand at their hands. It condemns slavery, therefore, only upon the supposition that slavery is a sinful relation—that is, he who extracts the prohibition of slavery from the Golden Rule, begs the very point in dispute.

We can not prosecute the argument in detail, but we have said enough, we think, to vindicate the position of the Southern Church. We have assumed no new attitude. We stand exactly where the Church of God has always stood—from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to Christ,

from Christ to the Reformers, and from the Reformers to ourselves. We stand upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone. Shall we be excluded from the fellowship of our brethren in other lands, because we dare not depart from the charter of our faith? Shall we be branded with the stigma of reproach, because we can not consent to corrupt the word of God to suit the intuitions of an infidel philosophy? Shall our names be cast out as evil, and the finger of scorn pointed at us, because we utterly refuse to break our communion with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; with Moses, David, and Isaiah; with Apostles, Prophets and Martyrs; with all the noble army of confessors who have gone to glory from slaveholding countries, and from a slaveholding Church, without ever having dreamed that they were living in mortal sin, by conniving at slavery in the midst of them? If so, we shall take consolation in the cheering consciousness that the Master has accepted us. We may be denounced, despised, and cast out of the Synagogues of our brethren. But, while they are wrangling about the distinctions of men, according to the flesh, we shall go forward in our Divine work, and confidently anticipate that, in the great day, as the consequence of our humble labours, we shall meet millions of glorified spirits, who have come up from the bondage of earth to a nobler freedom than human philosophy ever dreamed of. Others, if they please, may spend their time in declaiming on the tyranny of earthly masters; it will be our aim to resist the real tyrants which oppress the soul—Sin and Satan. These are the foes against whom we shall find it employment enough to wage a successful war. And to this holy war it is the purpose of our Church to devote itself with redoubled energy. We feel that the souls of our slaves are a solemn trust, and we shall strive to present them faultless and complete before the presence of God.

Indeed, as we contemplate their condition in the Southern States, and contrast it with that of their fathers before them, and that of their brethren, in the present day, in their native land, we can not but accept it as a gracious Providence, that they have been brought in such numbers to our shores, and redeemed from the bondage of barbarism and sin. Slavery, to them, has certainly been overruled for the greatest good. It has been a link in the wondrous chain of Providence, through which many sons and daughters have been made heirs of the heavenly inheritance. The Providential result is, of course, no justification, if the thing is intrinsically wrong; but it is certainly a matter of devout thanksgiving, and no obscure intimation of the will and purpose of God, and of the consequent duty of the Church. We can not forbear to say, however, that the general operation of the system is kindly and benevolent; it is a real and effective discipline, and without it, we are profoundly persuaded that the African race in the midst of us can never be elevated in the scale of being. As long as that race, in its comparative degradation, co-exists, side by side with the white, bondage is its normal condition.

As to the endless declamation about human rights, we have only to say that human rights are not a fixed, but a fluctuating quantity. Their sum is not the same in any two nations on the globe. The rights of Englishmen are one thing, the rights of Frenchmen another. There is a minimum without which a man can not be responsible; there is a maximum which expresses the highest degree of civilization and of Christian culture. The education of the species consists in its ascent along this line. As you go up, the number of rights increases, but the number of individuals who possess them diminishes. As you come down the line, rights are diminished, but the individuals are multiplied. It is just the opposite of the predicamental scale of the logicians. There, comprehension

diminishes as you ascend, and extension increases, and comprehension increases as you descend, and extension diminishes. Now, when it is said that slavery is inconsistent with human rights, we crave to understand what point in this line is the slave conceived to occupy. There are, no doubt, many rights which belong to other men—to Englishmen, to Frenchmen, to his master, for example—which are denied to him. But is he fit to possess them? Has God qualified him to meet the responsibilities which their possession necessarily implies? His place in the scale is determined by his competency to fulfil its duties. There are other rights which he certainly possesses, without which he could neither be human nor accountable. Before slavery can be charged with doing him injustice, it must be shown that the minimum which falls to his lot, at the bottom of the line, is out of proportion to his capacity and culture—a thing which can never be done by abstract speculation. The truth is, the education of the human race for liberty and virtue, is a vast Providential scheme, and God assigns to every man, by a wise and holy decree, the precise place he is to occupy in the great moral school of humanity. The scholars are distributed into classes, according to their competency and progress. For God is in history.

To avoid the suspicion of a conscious weakness of our cause, when contemplated from the side of pure speculation, we may advert for a moment to those pretended intuitions, which stamp the reprobation of humanity upon this ancient and hoary institution. We admit that there are primitive principles in morals which lie at the root of human consciousness. But the question is, how are we to distinguish them? The subjective feeling of certainty is no adequate criterion, as that is equally felt in reference to crotchets and hereditary prejudices. The very point is, to know when this certainty indicates a primitive cognition, and when it does not. There must, therefore, be some

external test, and whatever can not abide that test, has no authority as a primary truth. That test is an inward necessity of thought, which, in all minds, at the proper stage of maturity, manifests itself as absolutely universal. Whatever is universal, is natural. We are willing that slavery should be tried by this standard. We are willing to abide by the testimony of the race; and if man, as man, has every where condemned it—if all human laws have prohibited it as crime—if it stands in the same category with malice, murder, and theft, then we are willing, in the name of humanity, to renounce it, and to renounce it for ever. But what if the overwhelming majority of mankind have approved it? what if philosophers and statesmen have justified it, and the laws of all nations acknowledged it? what then becomes of these luminous intuitions? They are an *ignis fatuus*, mistaken for a star.

We have now, brethren, in a brief compass, for the nature of this address admits only of an outline, opened to you our whole hearts upon this delicate and vexed subject. We have concealed nothing. We have sought to conciliate no sympathy by appeals to your charity. We have tried our cause by the word of God; and, though protesting against its authority to judge in a question concerning the duty of the Church, we have not refused to appear at the tribunal of reason. Are we not right, in view of all the preceding considerations, in remitting the social, civil and political problems connected with slavery to the State? Is it not a subject, save in the moral duties which spring from it, which lies beyond the province of the Church? Have we any right to make it an element in judging of Christian character? Are we not treading in the footsteps of the flock? Are we not acting as Christ and His Apostles have acted before us? Is it not enough for us to pray and labour, in our lot, that all men may be saved, without meddling, as a Church, with the technical distinction of their civil life? We leave the matter with you. We offer you

the right hand of fellowship. It is for you to accept it or reject it. We have done our duty. We can do no more. Truth is more precious than union, and if you cast us out as sinners, the breach of charity is not with us, as long as we walk according to the light of the written Word.

The ends which we propose to accomplish as a Church, are the same as those which are proposed by every other Church. To proclaim God's truth as a witness to the nations; to gather His elect from the four corners of the earth, and through the Word, Ministry, and Ordinances, to train them for eternal life, is the great business of His people. The only thing that will be at all peculiar to us is, the manner in which we shall attempt to discharge our duty. In almost every department of labour, except the pastoral care of congregations, it has been usual for the Church to resort to societies more or less closely connected with itself, and yet logically and really distinct. It is our purpose to rely upon the regular organs of our government, and executive agencies directly and immediately responsible to them. We wish to make the Church, not merely a superintendent, but an agent. We wish to develop the idea that the congregation of believers, as visibly organized, is the very society or corporation which is divinely called to do the work of the Lord. We shall, therefore, endeavour to do what has never yet been adequately done—bring out the energies of our Presbyterian system of government. From the Session to the Assembly, we shall strive to enlist all our Courts, as Courts, in every department of Christian effort. We are not ashamed to confess that we are intensely Presbyterian. We embrace all other denominations in the arms of Christian fellowship and love, but our own scheme of government we humbly believe to be according to the pattern shown in the Mount, and, by God's grace, we propose to put its efficiency to the test.

Brethren, we have done. We have told you who we are, and what we are. We greet you in the ties of Christian

brotherhood. We desire to cultivate peace and charity with all our fellow-Christians throughout the world. We invite to ecclesiastical communion all who maintain our principles of faith and order. And now we commend you to God, and the Word of His grace. We devoutly pray that the whole catholic Church may be afresh baptized with the Holy Ghost, and that she may speedily be stirred up to give the Lord no rest until He establish and make Jerusalem a praise in the earth.

ARTICLE III.

THE ART OF CONVERSATION.

At the outset, we ask pardon of this grave Quarterly, for thrusting upon its dignity a rambling paper, suited rather to the pages of a purely literary journal. Perhaps, in the end, we shall discover it sufficiently fruitful in its suggestions of profitable morality: at any rate, a theme which could engage a Cowper's muse, and point his gentle satire, may not be despised as beneath the condescension even of this right reverend Periodical.

It would be the superfluity of labour to argue here that man is a *social* being. Even the inferior animals are said not to thrive so well in a solitary pasture, as when browsing together in a common herd; and so strong is the associating instinct, that it frequently overcomes the antipathy between hostile tribes, in cases of total exclusion from their own species. How much stronger must the social principle be in man, gifted with reason, and endowed with the divine faculty of speech, through which the domain of mind is not only enlarged, but held in common! Men are not drawn

together in society, as Hobbes paradoxically affirms, by the pressure of self-interest and prudence, but by the force of an original instinct, to which the analogy of all nature seems distinctly to point. It is, indeed, a part of their constitution, which no tyranny, however severe, can destroy; no isolation, however protracted, can extinguish. The reader will remember the illustration given by Defoe, when, upon his solitary island, Robinson Crusoe made a confidential friend of his parrot; and the still stronger case of the prisoner in the Bastille, who attached himself to the spider in his cell; and grieved, as a mother grieves for the loss of a child, when it was wantonly killed, through the malice of the jailer. So burns the heart in every human breast, that its sympathies shoot forth like the tendrils of a vine, and cling to any thing most frail on earth, that it may escape the desolation of utter loneliness. Within the entire range of philosophical speculation, no mystery is more insoluble than the adjustment between these two poles of our nature, the *individual* and the *social*. Each man is securely locked within the limits of his own personality, dwelling in the secret pavilion of his own consciousness, subject to no invasion from without, and girded with responsibilities that are absolutely irremissible; yet, at the same time, touching his fellow-man wherever he may turn, and commingling with the race as the drops unite in the waters of the sea. A microcosm, a world complete within himself; yet depending, for all improvement, upon social discipline, and for all happiness, upon social communion. He can not perfect his own nature in the privacy and seclusion of his own being. It is as natural^f for him to love, as to think or to breathe. If he lock up his affections within his own breast, he pays the forfeit of disobedience to the great social law of the universe, in a blighted soul mildewing beneath the lichen and moss which cover its ruins. His intellectual and moral faculties lie dormant, in the deep abyss of his own nature, until evoked by social intercourse;

just as sparks of fire lie concealed in the cold flint till struck out by contact with the steel. How beautifully is this philosophy embalmed in the flowing verse of Pope:

“ Heaven forming each on other to depend,
 A master, or a servant, or a friend,
 Bids each on other for assistance call,
 Till one man's weakness grows the strength of all ;
 Wants, frailties, passions, closer still ally
 The common interest, or endear the tie :
 To these we owe true friendship, love sincere,
 Each homefelt joy that life inherits here.”

Thus, no man liveth to himself. Society, like the ocean, heaves beneath its mighty tides, and its separate waves, shouldering against each other, sparkle with a phosphorescent light which is extinguished in the stagnant calm.

Political economy teaches that material products derive their value from barter and exchange. The earth is divided into zones and climates, that there may be no perpetuated schism between the races of mankind. Diversity of wants induces that mutual interchange and supply, by which the families of man are drawn together in bonds of brotherhood. The staple, for example, which blooms upon our Southern fields, is but a useless weed until it is transported to the factor, who sells it to the foreign purchaser. The spinner converts it into thread, and the weaver into cloth. The merchant spreads the beautiful fabric upon his shelves; the tailor shapes it into the elegant costumes which we wear; and each prospers, in his turn, upon the new value which each imparts, as the product passes through his hand. So there is a commerce of the mind. The facts of nature lie distributed in magnificent profusion throughout the universe, which patient observation gathers up, and silent thinkers elaborate, until the accumulated treasures of science are poured forth upon the world, to form a portion of its mental wealth. Let it be remembered, however, that great thoughts lying in the mind,

like ore in the earth, do not constitute this wealth. They must be circulated as living truths, and possess an exchangeable value, before the world is enriched. The iron and the coal sleep for ever useless in their subterranean beds, till the miner sinks his shafts, draws them to the light of day, and converts them to the practical uses of life. So the sublime conceptions of poetry, the brilliant speculations of philosophy, the patient inductions of science, and all the images of beauty that fill an artist's dreams, must be rendered palpable in speech, or in the creations of the pencil and the chisel, which are the dies of the mint, impressing a marketable value upon each. They grow, in bulk and value, as they pass from mind to mind, waking up dormant thoughts in all; and, as exchangeable products, swell the volume of our common civilization and refinement. In this intellectual barter, conversation plays an humble, but most important, part: it is the coin, of larger or smaller denomination, necessary as the circulating medium. Books, indeed, are useful as the depositories of knowledge, like the secret vaults of a bank, in which the bullion is safely kept. But the bullion must be converted into coin for the purposes of exchange; and conversation, in all the degrees of the scale, from the large discourse of the schools to the small talk of the saloon, forms the medium through which knowledge is distributed, from the pennyworth of the child to the princely portion of the sage. We do not insist, in this connexion, upon the higher offices of conversation, in cementing society together, through the affections. It is the vehicle of all those courtesies and amenities of life, and of those countless sympathies by which individuals, like separate threads, are woven into a common brotherhood. It answers all the ends of argument and illustration, to signalize its power as a great distributing agent, by which the treasures of individual thought are made to flow together, and form a community of wealth.

Of all the race, it most behooves woman to excel in this art of conversation, simply because she is the organ of society, delegated to the trust, both of creating and preserving it. Society is not formed by the aggregation of individuals, but by their fusion into each other. Its unity must not be overlooked, in considering the number and separateness of its constituent elements. Even the old Atomic philosophers could not build up their world-systems, until they supplied their floating particles with indentures and protuberances, by which to hook and grapple with each other, and gave to them the contrary notions by which they should be brought into contact. So there can be no society without those differences and contrarieties in character, which spring from the opposition of sex, like the two electricities, which attract by their very contradiction. Men, for example, may assemble for ever in their conventions and clubs, may deliberate in Senate Chambers, and frame systems of union without end; but their associations of sand will speedily be disintegrated, from the want of cohesion between the particles themselves. Society, in its true and large sense, is the offspring of love, and requires, for its origin and perpetuation, that generous reciprocation of the affections, which, as woman first inspires them, are assigned to her ministry, to be protected and nourished. This is the solemnity and glory of her position, that she is the organ of all society, the representative and guardian of its interests. It exists only in her presence, and is conserved through her purity. In our superficial thinking, we style her position humble, because she is not decked with the mere trappings of place, and because the subordinate honours of life are snatched from her hands. But, in this very humility of woman is found her glory. The Olympic games, indeed, are not for her; and she may not wrestle with the athlete, nor race with the charioteer. Her voice may not thunder amidst the jar and din of senatorial debate, nor whisper the secrets of

diplomatic intrigue. She may not shout at the head of armies, nor dictate in the councils of war. She builds up no thrones; but her power is beyond that of thrones and governments—the power of persuasion—simply universal in its scope, and irresistible in its tenderness. For this reason, because she is the genius of society, the very pivot upon which it turns, she is called to excel in that science upon which, above all others, the communion and joy of society depend. Whoever else may be indifferent to the power and utility of speech, she may not; and to wield effectively this mighty instrument of social intercourse, should command her highest ambition. It is the baton of her office, her queenly sceptre—let her wield it with a queenly grace.

For all this, woman is eminently fitted by her nature. Her whole constitution, intellectual and moral—we may even add, physical, so far as a nervous irritability may be supposed to affect mental exercises—adapts her to reign supreme in this department. The quickness of her perceptions, the acuteness of her discriminations, the delicacy of her tastes, the liveliness of her fancy, the mental elasticity—bending with ease to all subjects of thought—the facility of her mental associations, and the genial sympathy of her heart, are advantages which seldom unite in any individual of the other sex. Add to these her exemption from the practical duties which devolve upon hard-working, laborious, busy man, and her obligation to excel in conversation might seem well nigh to be demonstrated. A late writer in one of the British Quarterlies accounts for the impossibility of grafting the French saloon upon the institutions of England, by this principle alone. “The Gallic race,” writes he, “is preëminently an intellectual, idealistic race; the English is almost exclusively a political race, and throw themselves too vehemently into action ever to be talkers, *par excellence*; whereas, the very perfection of *la causerie* is, to promote an elegant interchange of ideas, without any

object being too ardently pursued." Substitute in this paragraph *women*, for Frenchmen, who are even more intensely idealistic, and who are further removed from that driving practicalness which leaves men no breath to talk, and the honours of the saloon must be resigned to them, without a contest.

The importance of conversation to general society being, then, assumed, the path is fairly opened to consider what conversation, as an art, fully imports; what qualities of mind and heart are needed in its cultivation; and what obstructions must be surmounted to achieve consummate excellence. Undoubtedly, the talent of conversation is, with some, an original endowment. But this only means that a happy combination of faculties exists, which renders conversation spontaneous and easy. There is a power of concentration which enables one to give his whole attention to a speaker; a readiness of apprehension, which grasps his meaning through the most imperfect half-utterance, and a rapid movement of the mind, which frames a reply as soon as the pause demands it. Through a happy faculty of generalization, one's knowledge may be so beautifully classified, and the logical habit may so place it at command, that the particular needs only to be worked from the general, and all that is required to sustain the current of thought, is supplied upon the first suggestion. Under these conditions, conversation flows quietly in its natural channel, without fatigue, simply because without the least consciousness of effort. But this is simply to say that the talent of conversation, however it may appear to be a native gift, may be cultivated indefinitely, by the discipline of those powers upon which it so obviously depends. Conversation, then, in the common acceptance of reciprocal discourse, is determined upon principles capable of a clear exposition, and which require attention and skill in their management and application.

The features which especially characterize it are *reciprocation*, and *continuity*, or *progress*. It is not a monologue, under the projectile force of a single mind. The force which it obeys is a resultant force, from the impact of combined intellects, each moving from its own side, and giving a separate direction; so that its final course is determined by the compounded influence of all. There must be reciprocity of thought and speech, or there is no commerce of the mind, enriching by exchange. Mere volubility of tongue is but a brawling torrent through some mountain gorge, whose impetuous waters are swallowed up in the sands, or are lost in the stagnant marsh; waters which bear no burden upon their bosom, nor disembogue to swell the volume of the sea. Our words must make echoes in the minds around us, which, like answering caves, must give back the sound, until the swelling reverberation shall rise above the hills, and fill the dome of heaven. Hence the exquisite tact needed to take the gauge of those with whom we are suddenly thrown in contact. The arc of the circle in which their thoughts swing, must be rapidly and accurately measured, and the points must be ascertained upon which a mutual sympathy may be enkindled. This partly explains the proverbial awkwardness which marks the first attempts at conversation, and which is hit off with rare humour by the poet:

“ The circle formed, we sit in silent state,
 Like figures drawn upon a dial-plate;
 Yes, Ma'am, and No, Ma'am, uttered softly, show,
 Every five minutes, how the minutes go;
 Each individual suffering a constraint
 Poetry may, but colours can not, paint;
 As if in close committee on the sky,
 Reports it hot or cold, or wet or dry;
 And finds a changing clime a happy source
 Of wise reflection and well-timed discourse.
 We next inquire, but softly, and by stealth,
 Like conservators of the public health,
 Of epidemic throats, if such there are,
 And coughs, and rheums, and phthisic and catarrh.”

We smile at the picture, in which, perhaps, we ourselves have mournfully figured; but may do well to consider how it illustrates the nature of conversation. The embarrassment is not always due to timid modesty, nor yet to the vanity which can not be sufficiently forgetful of self. It is simply a species of social strategy, manœuvring for a position—the excruciating tuning-notes of the fiddle-bow, a prelude to the harmony. But when, after this preliminary skirmishing, a topic of common interest shall be sprung, it must be managed to mutual advantage. Each must regard the interests of his partners, not speaking all he may wish, nor having the reciprocity all on one side; but just so much as shall elicit a corresponding product from them; so that, upon dissolving the firm, the profits may be distributed in fair proportion, as the property of each.

In like manner, genuine conversation must be marked by a gradual progress of thought, verging, in steady continuity, towards an assigned goal. It proposes to itself an end, though, of course, not so determinate as in elaborate discourse. It is not rational conversation, but sheer twaddle, if destitute of this *terminus ad quam*. Whatever be the topic, the interlocutors close it up between them, as they press it forward to an appropriate conclusion. The mind must not be suffered, like a truant hound upon a false scent, to fly off upon those way-side associations of thought which are perpetually breaking from cover; but the subject, once unearthed, must be tracked through all its windings, till the spoil is yielded to the sportman's hand. Nothing can be more fatal to this progress of thought, than the indolence which permits it to drift away, swept hither and yon by every casual suggestion, like a straw in the eddy of a stream. The reader will remember the artistic skill with which Shakspeare represents these shallow and impertinent associations crowding upon a vulgar mind, in the scene where Dame Quickly recalls to the fickle memory of Falstaff his broken promise of marriage. In a single

sentence, she crowds together the Dolphin chamber and the parcel-gilt goblet by which the false knight swore, the round table and the sea-coal fire, the irruption of the butcher's wife to borrow a mess of vinegar for a dish of prawns: all these, with other details, shoal together in her speech—showing how an untrained mind, at the mercy of chance associations, sweeps 'round within a circle, and comes out nowhere. It is important, therefore, to ascertain the principles of intercommunion between different minds, the regulation of which calls for the advice of the *moralist*, no less than the rules of the *dialectician*.

The first and most essential requisite, undoubtedly, is *knowledge*: supplying the raw material, which, as the shuttle moves in the conversational loom, shall be woven into fabrics, substantial or light, as taste or the occasion may determine. "Out of nothing, nothing comes," is an adage never more profusely illustrated than when discourse is spun from empty ignorance. There may be endless talk—a bleak, barren waste of gossip—but no conversation, in the sense we have endeavoured to define. The spectacle would be grotesque, if it were not humiliating, of ignorance striving to keep up the forms of social intercourse, without resources from which contributions to the common stock may be drawn. Alas! it is often attended with consequences both melancholy and bitter. The tale of brick must be rendered, but there is no straw with which to make it. As there must be speech, gossip and scandal usurp the place of reason and thought; and, from minds not essentially malignant, a thousand waspish slanders swarm forth, and sting wherever they alight. In rural districts, where society is comparatively homogeneous, and social intercourse is not reduced to system, this evil may not sorely press. But in cities and towns, where hundreds are thrown together, an unsorted mixture—where wealth and other accidents force vulgar minds from their own parallel, to range across the breadth of a zone—

the effort to keep up even the forms of social life is some times desolating in the extreme. The homespun conversation about things understood and known, must be abandoned; and the tattling of sheer ignorance, that feels itself compelled to talk, perhaps, without a particle of malice, throws a whole community into a state of anarchy and civil war. One can scarcely refrain from wishing that these brewers of mischief might be visited with the punishment inflicted upon the dame of Narbonne, who, according to Knickerbocker, was "doomed, for her excessive volubility, to peel five hundred thousand and thirty-nine ropes of onions, and actually ran out at her eyes before half the hideous task was accomplished." The remedy for this is knowledge, affording a solid basis for all the negotiation and exchange of social intercourse. This knowledge must be comprehensive and various, embracing all that the most minute observation can collect, and the most copious reading can supply. The power of adapting ourselves to those with whom we are casually thrown in contact, depends largely upon this variety of information, which takes up the habits and pursuits of all. This, together with the requisite discrimination and tact, will put us *en rapport* with all whom we chance to meet. It is not given to any arbitrarily to choose the theme of conversation, which must often take its rise from casual suggestions, and be drifted into its channel by the circumstances of time and place, or by the characters and tastes of those with whom we associate. We must, therefore, often be at fault, if copious reading and mature reflection have not enlarged the area of our own thoughts. Nothing may be safely neglected. History, with her voluminous records; science, with all her mysteries; philosophy, with all its subtleties; belle-lettres, yielding up its flowers from a thousand beds; the whole encyclopedia of knowledge must be compassed; and from that reading, which Lord Bacon says makes a full man, conversation must flow as water

from a reservoir, simply by the pressure of its own abundance.

Let not despair lift up its hands at the gigantic task which is here imposed. We are only sketching an ideal. He who hopes to be a master of this great art must, indeed, be a Leviathan of knowledge; for, to talk discreetly with every man, upon every thing, infers that nothing is unknown. But, as there is an endless gradation in knowledge, there is a corresponding various mastery of the art we are discussing. We simply affirm the proportion between the two. Very large measures of information may be gained by every man who has opportunity and industry, and the degrees of this shall indicate, as on a scale, his ability to converse. The secret of large mental acquisitions is, *generalization*. The memory, however expanded, is incapable of sustaining an infinity of details; and if it were, it would be a confused lumber-room of unrelated facts. But science, in all her branches, has sifted and arranged these, generalizing the principles in which they are implicitly contained, and which are easily borne about with us. A wagon-load of copper pennies would yield but a modicum of wealth; yet, if summed up in bank notes, and bills of exchange, a man might transport millions in his pocket-book. The art of learning consists not only in collecting the particulars of knowledge, but in condensing these into final principles. The law of association will surprisingly assist in unpacking these bales of knowledge, and in bringing out, again, the particular from the general, as the secret spring in the wainscoting of ancient houses often threw open concealed chambers of untold riches. This habit of classifying facts, not only explains the mystery of great learning, but is intrinsically valuable, as being a sort of mental digestion, by which knowledge is assimilated, and becomes a part of the mind itself. This, too, is indispensable in conversation, which requires knowledge always at command. There is not time to draw it forth

from pigeon-holes, nicely labelled, and tied up with red tape. It must be incorporated with the substance of the mind, and scintillate, from the mind's own action, as the electric spark is given out from a charged battery. Whoever hopes, without knowledge industriously collected and systematized, to shine as a conversational star, indulges a dream, vain as any which can visit him in sleep.

We will, then, suppose one to possess all the intellectual furniture which has been described; to be familiar with the schools of philosophy, and the opinions which divide them; to be at home in all the departments of science, able to enunciate the laws by which the material universe is regulated; to have unravelled the thread of history, disentangling the complicated skein of political intrigue and diplomacy; to know the great productions of art in every age and clime; to have ranged over the whole field of polite literature, as found in the classics of his own and of other tongues; all this variety of knowledge shall, by sufficient reflection, have become so entirely his own, that he needs only to touch the spring of association any where, and it flows forth with the spontaneous and regulated fullness of an artesian jet. There remains another requisite of high conversational talent, the *facility* and *felicity of expression*, which shall convey his thoughts with precision and elegance. The *style* of conversation, no less than its *matter*, should be proposed for sedulous cultivation. The gift of the fairy should be invoked, so that pearls may drop from the lips whenever they are opened. Every species of slang, which gains currency from the broad and coarse humour in which it originates, must be excluded. We do not pause to enforce this caupon, simply because the delicacy of taste imparted by intellectual culture will, by its own smelting processes, purge away these impurities, together with those rude provincialisms which mar the catholic and pure dialect of the republic of letters. But that sustained elegance of diction which forms the proper vesture of noble thoughts

can not be acquired without attention. It is the plumage of the royal bird which sustains his flight upward to the sun; and our callow thoughts must be fledged in language suited to the wing upon which they hope to soar. At the same time, this elevated diction must be free from the suspicion of elaboration. Any thing which interferes with the ease and *abandon* of conversation, begets a sense of fatigue and constraint, under which it speedily languishes. The thought must, therefore, go bounding along, never halting for expression, never pausing to put on a Court dress. In order to this, language must not only *seem*, but must actually *be*, *impromptu*; which can only be when it is the habitual style of our thinking. However severe the early efforts in its acquisition, these must have terminated in the ease and naturalness of established habit—so that to think, and to think in elegant language, shall be identical. The thought must weave around itself its appropriate style, and no clicking of the shears must suggest the tailoring by which its costume has been fashioned. No small discipline is required to move forward, in the freedom and hurry of animated conversation, upon this highest summit level of style, without descending into platitudes or tripping into negligence. Yet the difficulty is much abated by the fact that the same copious reading which supplies the material of conversation, supplies also the copious language to be employed. The mind familiar with the affluent diction of the best writers, insensibly catches their tone. Its own vocabulary is enlarged; and ten thousand images, which embellished their pages, start forth from it, warm with life and beauty. Our manners and our style we take up, as plants their color, by absorption from the light that shines around us; and may thus easily betray the company we keep among the great immortals who survive in books.

We are prepared now to consider the art of conversation on its *moral* side, as heretofore we have exhibited its *intellectual*. Here we signalize, as first in importance, a *genial*

sympathy with the society in which we move. Living words can flow only from the heart, the fountain of life. The intellect shines with a light cold as the moon-beam, and can never supply the generous warmth which shall cover society with its grateful verdure. The sensibilities of the heart must supply that sympathy with the active world around us, necessary to all true intercourse. The mere book-worm loses his ability to converse from this cause. For though, as Milton says, "books are not absolutely dead things," yet they are not the warm and living persons upon which our personal affections may be concentrated. The solitary student, therefore, dries away, almost to a mummy, in his constant association with the dead past: and his lack of genial sympathy, like the moat around a feudal castle, cuts him off from the living, breathing world around him. He moves in the midst of it like some spectre of the grave-yard, whose form beats with no pulse of a common life, and whose lips are sealed in eternal silence. An active sympathy can never be counterfeited, nor can it be conjured up by an effort of the will. It must well up spontaneously from the deep within, as the springs of affection mysteriously flow, and force it upward to the lips. It will astonish those who have never made it a subject of thought, how this sympathy flashes from the eye, or trembles in the tone—how, by an electric affinity, congenial spirits are drawn together; while the absence of it creates a vacuum through which the electric current is unable to pass. It is felt and recognized by the young child about its mother's knee, who is instinctively attracted to repose its little confidences in that mother's ear; or else repelled to bury its disappointed love in a mournfulness—one of childhood's shadows—none the less painful because its origin is unexplored. That mother, too, needs this reciprocating sympathy to discharge the full office of a mother's training. She must let herself completely down into that infant spirit with a freshness scarcely less than when young thoughts

and hopes first budded in her own infant breast. Thus only can she converse with her child, and, through oral discourse, commence that education which opens with the cradle, and closes only in the grave. Many unfriendly influences threaten to check this outflow of social sympathy, which must be energetically resisted. The pre-occupation of mind with business, so necessary to professional success, often shuts us up in a selfish seclusion. Affliction and sorrow some times throw their early blight upon the affections, inducing a morbid depression, fatal to all elasticity of spirit. In this may be perceived the value of practical religion, which the Scriptures declare to "have the promise of the life that now is;" in that it sanctifies every relation, and chastens the heart, so that it may not wrap itself in a mantle, and indulge the mere egotism of grief. In all this world of discipline, there is no spectacle more pleasing than a heart which preserves its freshness in the midst of adversity, and in a succulent old age exhibits the enthusiasm which in youth gave out its light and heat at every social contact.

Another moral element entering into conversation is, *habitual self-control*. We use this term in its broadest sense, as meaning more than simple command of temper—but rather the complete mastery of self, in all the forms of its manifestation. The ebullition of spleen under opposition is utterly inconsistent with that refinement of feeling which respects the rights of others as equal to our own; and can scarcely escape from those who have long been under the restraints of social discipline. But there are other obstructions to free intercourse, all having their root in a self-love which needs to be controlled, if it can not be eradicated. There is, for example, your *dogmatist*, who hurls his oracular decisions at your head, and brains you outright with his positiveness. What interchange of thought can there be with one who sits cross-legged, like a Turkish bashaw, and strangles conversation in its birth? There is, again,

your *shallow skeptic*, whose minute criticism will pick to shreds the entire system of human beliefs; and whose eye can see nothing in all the glories of the sun, save the spots to censure upon his disc. His overweening vanity would plunge the world in universal doubt, that in the wild chaos of opinions he may be safe from the risk of being ever detected in error. Where nothing is established as true, nothing can be proved as false. Plainly, there can be no conversation with one who constructs nothing by affirmation, but destroys every thing by universal negation. Then follows your *disputatious sophist*, whose only style of conversation is

“The duel in the form of a debate;”

where nothing is heard but

“The clash of argument and jar of words,
Worse than the mortal brunt of rival swords.”

Surely, we may recoil from these prize-fighters of the social ring, and scorn the Trojan combat, in which

“Daros may beat Entellus black and blue.”

After these, you will find the *self-sufficient egotist*, who, pleased with the endless clatter of his own tongue, usurps the rights of others, and pours forth his stream of speech like water through the broken sluices of a mill-dam. Last of all, this succession of social pests concludes with the *satirical wit*, whose speech, like the Indian's arrow, is always pointed with poison. His wit must circulate, though every stroke of the keen blade cut through some heart; and no feelings are too sacred to restrain the biting jest or scorching repartee. His selfish vanity finds its reward in the laughter resounding to his satire, though it be at the price of bleeding hearts and ruined friendships. These obstructions to social intercourse have their root alike in that inordinate self-love, which leads the moralist to press this canon of conversation: it must be conducted

with a rigid self-control, locking up our vanity from every unseemly exhibition.

Lest we become tedious, we add *true moral courage* as the last pre-requisite to conversation. This preserves intact our individuality, which is placed continually beneath an immense social pressure. The honest convictions, which have been matured through long reflection, are not to be surrendered through a weak complaisance; nor must a single shred of truth be sacrificed to the devouring Moloch of public opinion. Especially is this quality necessary to woman, if she would reign as queen of the social state. We have often boiled with righteous indignation, upon seeing a high-spirited and gifted woman compelled to lower her crest, and succumb beneath the rude charge of pedantry. Her kindling spirit droops; the fire fades from her sparkling eye; and her graceful colloquial powers suddenly collapse, that she may escape the brutal and cowardly stigma of a *bas bleu*. The sensitiveness which shrinks from the offensive epithet, is honorable to her. It is the true womanly instinct which recognizes her power and her glory, as lying in her subordination; and teaches that to flaunt forth, in an assumed superiority, is to abdicate her influence. The violet is her chosen symbol, hiding its modest head beneath its tuft of leaves, yet not restraining its perfume from scenting the air, and so she waits for some friendly hand to pluck her from concealment. It requires no little nerve, combined with exquisite tact, to force down the vile aspersion, and hold her place against ruffian and brow-beating ignorance. Let her, however, remember that the same interval which separates the scholar from the pedant, also divides the woman of genuine culture from the *bas bleu*. The scholar needs not to sow his speech with ostentatious patches of learning, with which the pedant bespangles his, like the dress of a circus clown: so the absence of affectation and cant will always vindicate a woman of generous cultivation from the

offensive charge she so much dreads. Let her remember, too, this vulgar taunt never drops from the lips of her intellectual equals; but the painful echo falls upon her ear from that outer circle of the cowardly and ignorant, who can find no darkness for their concealment, save in the extinguishment of her light. If she be called to sacrifice the one or the other, let her choose wisely between the good opinion of fools, which must be gained through unworthy concessions, and the admiration of wise men, who will touch her hand with reverence, only to conduct her to the throne on which she has the right to sit.

We will gather up these scattered thoughts, and knot them in a single conclusion. It may be well submitted to the educated minds of our country, how far it devolves upon them to elevate the tone of our social intercourse. There is, undoubtedly, a large amount of genial society, where our people meet informally, and without pre-concert. But in our large assemblies, which are meant to give more full expression of the social principle, how languid and dreary the intercourse! These entertainments, unlike the graceful *soirées* of the French, or even the extemporaneous reunions of the educated English, degenerate, for the most part, into so many measured yards of brocade and silk duly crushed in a regular jam—into so many jewels, glittering upon so many heaving bosoms—a vulgar display of fashion and parade, inviting the sharp irony of Goldsmith's Chinese Philosopher, in his "Citizen of the World." Who has not yawned, again and again, beneath the insipidities of what, with a kind of broad burlesque, is called "the best society?" How much, too, of that levity, against which the Church in vain thunders her anathemas, is due to the fact that the crowd lacks amusement, and does not know how to talk? The problem is, how a dozen score of stupid people can amuse each other through five or six hours: a sufficiently hard requisition, if all of them were wise; but with those whose brains have all slipped down to

heel, what resource is there but to fill the weary hours with the unmeaning dance—and THIS IS SOCIETY! We do not speak here as churchmen, but as members of that great family, in which all are bound together; we utter a protest against abuses which destroy even the conception of society. To us, the term suggests a rational interchange of thought, “the feast of reason and the flow of soul;” and the prevailing frivolity of our social assemblies shuts out the communion of intellect—a confession by judgment of mental bankruptcy and poverty. But the evil can not be cured, until rational and pleasing conversation shall be the charm of every circle, and hence the responsibility resting upon us to lift the intellectual tone of society to the desired level.

ARTICLE IV.

TIMOTHY'S OFFICE.

There are few characters in the New Testament that dwell in the heart of the Church with a more affectionate interest than Timothy. His early piety, upon which the aged Apostle seemed to dwell with such deep delight in the last days of his life; his hereditary blessing, that descended in covenant transmission from his grand-mother, Lois, and his mother, Eunice; his filial relation to Paul, who can hardly speak of him without a gush of fatherly tenderness, and his own gentle and beautiful spirit, make him the Melancthon of apostolic men, and shrine him in the most loving remembrance of the whole Church. The very scantiness of the materials left to us about his personal history, combined with the occasional glimpses of it

given in connexion with that of the great Apostle, tends to deepen the charm with which he is invested, rather than to lessen it.

But our interest in him is not purely personal. A still deeper interest invests him in his ecclesiastical and official character. He and Titus are two of the most important links that bind the Apostolic with the post-Apostolic Church, and in their official position are involved some of the most important questions of Church polity. They mark the transition epoch of the New Testament Church, and belong to a condition of ecclesiastical affairs that was steadily assuming what was designed by the great Head of the Church to be her permanent form. If, then, we can obtain a clear conception of their official character, we shall have reached important conclusions in regard to the true form of the Church's polity, in the New Testament dispensation.

We propose, therefore, to take the case of Timothy, and inquire into the nature of the office which he held—an office which is commonly regarded as identical with that of Titus—and thus gather some light on the questions of Church government that are involved in this matter.

There are two passages of Paul's Epistles to Timothy that seem to refer to his office. The first is, 1 Tim. 4:14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery;" the second is, 2 Tim. 1:6: "Wherefore, I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." Assuming, for the present, that these texts do describe the office of Timothy, we will examine some of the theories of that office that have found the most strenuous advocacy. Three of them are most prominent.

I. THE APOSTOLIC THEORY.

It is contended by some that Timothy was an Apostle. Conceding, as they are compelled to do, that the New Testament Episcopos and Presbyter are only different names for the same office—or, at most, different and interchangeable offices of the same order—they find their warrant for a third and higher order of Ministers in the continuance of the apostolic office in the Church, and in an unbroken series of successors to the Apostles, of which Timothy was one of the first, if not the very first, ordained to this high function. It is plain that this question resolves itself into the inquiry, whether the apostolate was designed to be a permanent office in the Church, like the presbyterate, and the diaconate, or extraordinary and temporary, like the prophetic and priestly offices.

Let us grasp the precise question at issue. It is not, whether any one in the New Testament is ever called an Apostle, except the Twelve. The word, in its primary sense, means a messenger, or one sent, and is some times used in that sense. Such a primary sense have all the official terms of the New Testament, such as bishop (an overseer); pastor (a shepherd); prophet (an internuncius); angel (a messenger); elder (an old man); deacon (a servant), etc., etc. As the designation of any one by these terms, used in their primary sense, would not argue an official position, so the calling of any one an apostolos, or messenger, does not prove him to have been officially an Apostle. The question, further, is not, whether the Apostles have successors, in any sense, for they were preaching Presbyters, as well as Apostles. Paul, Peter, and John, thus designate themselves, and in this capacity they were to have successors to the end of the world, and do have them, in every regular preacher of the true Gospel. The question is, whether, as Apostles, as the supreme rulers of the Church, their office was permanent, and whether, in

this character, Timothy, or any other man, can be a legitimate successor of the Twelve? We take the negative of this question, for several reasons.

1. *The Qualifications of an Apostle.*

Dr. Barrow, one of the profoundest theologians that has ever been produced by the Church of England, specifies six qualifications of an Apostle :*

a. An immediate call of God.—(Gal. 1 : 1.) Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by men, (*διὰ*, with the genitive, which is always *by means of*,) but by (*διὰ*) Jesus Christ, and God the Father.

b. To have seen Christ, after his resurrection, so as to be a witness of this fundamental fact. So Peter affirmed in the election of Matthias (Acts 1 : 21, 22): "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us, all the time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of the resurrection;" so Ananias expressly declared to Paul (Acts 22 : 14, 15): "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldst know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of His mouth, for thou shalt be His witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard;" and so Paul affirms, himself, when, vindicating his official rank, he makes the two synonymous (1 Cor. 9 : 1): "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Christ?"

c. Miraculous powers, called by Paul (2 Cor. 12 : 12) "the signs of an Apostle."

d. Power to confer the Holy Ghost, as was implied in the case of Peter and John.—(Acts 8 : 18.)

e. Infallibility and inspiration, so that they could say, "it seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us," and so that all apostolic teaching was authoritative and inspired.—(Matt. 28 : 19, 20.)

* Treat. Pope's Suprem., Sup. 2, § 4.

f. The right to govern all Christian Churches in the world, without any limitation of parish or diocese, called by Paul (2 Cor. 10 : 8) "the authority which the Lord hath given us for edification;" "the care of all the Churches," (2 Cor. 11 : 28), and similar expressions.

These are unquestionably the scriptural qualifications of an Apostle; and as these were not, and could not be, permanent, the office to which they belonged could not be permanent.

2. *The absence of any intimation in the New Testament of the permanence of the apostolate.*

The twelve Apostles are always spoken of as a definite body of men, numbered after the twelve tribes of Israel, and just as incapable of increase as they were. Had other Apostles been added, the original number, twelve, would soon have disappeared, and been lost in the general body of Apostles, just as the original seven Deacons were at last lost in the general body of Deacons. But, instead of this, they are spoken of by Paul as the Twelve, when there were only eleven (1 Cor. 15 : 5); and by Jude (v. 17), and Peter (2 Pet. 3 : 2), in terms that imply a definite body of men, authoritative in their words, who were then nearly all gone. John, in the Apocalypse, speaks of them in the same way, and at a time when there ought to have been many Apostles, if the order was to be permanent, speaks of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.—(Rev. 21 : 14.) Nor is the case of Paul an exception to these views, for he speaks of himself as the least, *i. e.*, the last, of the Apostles. He could be least in no other sense than in the order of time, for in rank he was "not a whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles." He tells us he was "as one born out of due time," *i. e.*, almost too late to be an Apostle, so that Christ had to appear to him miraculously, in order to give him the necessary qualifications; language utterly inexplicable if there was to be an order of Apostles in regular succession through all time.

In the absence, then, of all intimations that the office was to be permanent, we are warranted to infer that it was not designed to be permanent.

3. *The absence of all instruction as to the office, or its future occupants.*

Had it been designed that the apostolate should be permanent, instructions would, surely, have been left in regard to its duties and qualifications. How, otherwise, could the Church have known whom to select, or whether they discharged their duties. Ample instructions are given as to Presbyters and Deacons, the acknowledged permanent offices. Why not as to Apostles, if they, also, were to be permanent? If directions were needed as to the lowest offices, were they not much more needed as to the highest? If a class of men in our country were to claim that they were peers of the realm, would not this claim be destroyed by the absence of all reference to this order in our laws? If, then, the New Testament is equally silent about an apostolic order, its duties, rights, qualifications, or limitations, whilst it is not silent as to the other permanent officers of the Church, the inference is irresistible that such an order was not designed to be a permanent office in the Church.

4. *The disappearance of the very name with the death of the original twelve.*

Two of the primitive offices have been perpetuated under their divinely appointed names, and the primitive Presbyters, or Bishops, and Deacons, have been succeeded by other Presbyters, or Bishops, and other Deacons, down to the present day. If the original Apostles were to be succeeded by other Apostles, why did not the name succeed with them? If they ordained men to be Apostles, why did they not call them Apostles? When Bishops, in the second and third century, began to claim authority over Presbyters, why did they still call themselves Bishops, and never Apostles? And when Bishops now claim to be the only

legitimate successors of the Apostles, why do they never call themselves Apostles? If they have a right to the thing, have they not, also, a right to the name? If they dare to claim the one, why do they not dare to claim the other? Is not every other office perpetuated by its name? Could the office be transmitted, and the name dropped? Were the Apostles so negligent, or their successors so self-renouncing and unambitious, that the one failed to transmit the name, and the other to claim it?

If the apostolic order had been perpetuated, the number of Apostles would have increased with the increase of the Church, and we would have found a proportionate increase in the mention of the name. But the reverse of this is the fact. The name is often mentioned during the lives of the twelve and Paul, and ceases to be mentioned with their death, implying that the office, also, ceased with them.

That this disappearance of the name, Apostle, did not arise from any indisposition to claim it, is proved by a fact which comes out just before the death of the last Apostle. In writing to the Church of Ephesus (Rev. 2:2,) the Lord commends them in these words: "Thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." This proves, (1,) that men claimed to be Apostles, and claimed the name, as well as the power; (2,) that there were certain acknowledged qualifications by which an Apostle could be known; and, (3,) that it was the duty of the Church to try all claimants by these marks. Couple these facts with the others, that, in spite of these claims, the very name of Apostle dropped out of the vocabulary of the Church, and, in spite of this duty, no rule was left on record by which the Church, in after ages, was to recognize the true Apostle, and we have reached almost a demonstration that the order of Apostles was not designed to be, and was not, in fact, a permanent order in the Christian Church.

5. *The Case of Timothy himself.*

It is conceded that, if there were any successors to the twelve Apostles, Timothy was one of them. It is equally clear that, if so, he was the peer of all the other Apostles, Paul not excepted. But it is just as clear that Paul never does treat him as an equal, or call him an Apostle. He is sent by Paul on various missions, and required to return and report to him, as the inferior reports to the superior officer; is instructed and directed in the two Epistles to him as a superior instructs an inferior; and, when named in connexion with Paul, the greatest care is apparently taken not to give him the name of Apostle; whilst Paul, as carefully, gives this name to himself. We never read of Timothy the Apostle, but "the work-fellow."—(Rom. 16: 21.) The phraseology is: "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, and Timothy, our brother," (2 Cor. 1: 1); "Timotheus our brother, and Minister of God, and fellow-laborer in the Gospel of Christ," (1 Thesa. 3: 2); "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ—unto Timothy, my own son in the faith," (1 Tim. 1: 1); "My dearly beloved son," (2 Tim. 1: 2); "Our brother Timothy," (Heb. 13: 23); and this carefully worded phraseology, withholding the title from Timothy, is used in the very Epistles in which are found the only pretended ground for asserting the apostleship of Timothy. This marked omission is a most decisive fact, for had Timothy been an Apostle, would not Paul have said so? Was Paul a man to withhold the title and authority of his peer in office, when he so carefully affirmed his own, and when that peer was his beloved Timothy? This careful omission, and these repeated indications of an official inferiority, show conclusively that Timothy was not an Apostle, and if he was not, the chain of succession is hopelessly broken at the very first link, and the apostolate proved to be a temporary office in the Church, and not a permanent order of the ministry.

6. *The testimony of facts.*

If the twelve Apostles were now on earth, with all their apostolic authority, it is plain that no Church could reject them without the deepest guilt. To reject them, by Christ's own warrant and words, would be to reject Christ, and to forfeit all right to that blessing which he has promised, to the end of the world. Now, if the apostolate be permanent, these modern Apostles have exactly the same authority with the ancient, and they do so claim, in point of fact, and to reject them, is to incur precisely this guilt. Then we have the marvellous fact, that nine-tenths of the Protestant world have been living for generations in this great sin, and yet, that God has been blessing them in it, pouring out His Spirit upon them, and granting them the proofs of His presence, just as if they were not guilty of any such contumacy.

Is this credible? Has God ever before so blessed sin? Do men gather grapes from thorns? Do the fruits of the Spirit grow schism and contumacy? Does not this, then, amount to almost the hand-writing of God in condemnation of this aspiring assumption of the high office bestowed alone on the Twelve, and that illustrious man who closed the college, as the great Apostle to the Gentiles?

Were a further argument needed, it would be found in the utter impossibility of substantiating the apostolic succession, if it was ever designed to transmit it. The theory demands an unbroken series of successors from the Apostles to the present day—a demand which can never be met—so the theory falls by its own weight, and the entire absence of facts to support it. Macaulay presents this difficulty with so much force that we quote a few sentences from his utter demolition of it in reviewing Gladstone's Church and State. He remarks, that the evidence for the fact of apostolical succession depends on the question whether, during fifteen or sixteen hundred years, the history of which is involved in utter darkness, “some thou-

sands of events took place, any one of which may, without any gross improbability, be supposed to have taken place—whether, under King Ethelwolf, a stupid priest might not, whilst baptizing several scores of Danish prisoners, who had just made their option between the font and the gallows, inadvertently omit to perform the rite on one of these graceless proselytes?—whether, in the seventh century, an impostor, who had never received consecration, might not have passed himself off as a bishop, on a rude tribe of Scots?—whether a lad of twelve did really, by a ceremony, huddled over when he was too drunk to know what he was about, convey the episcopal character to a lad of ten?—every such case makes a break in the apostolic succession.” The simple truth is, that it would be just as easy for the ambitious ruler of any petty German duchy to trace his pedigree by lineal descent to the twelve Cæsars, as for any clergyman to trace his episcopal pedigree in lineal succession from the twelve Apostles. The theory which demands this impossibility must, therefore, be rejected, by the stern necessity of facts, as untenable, and, therefore, untrue.

In view of such facts as these, the great mass of the Protestant world would have always rejected, and do now reject, this claim of apostolical succession. Down to the time of Laud, it was hardly heard of outside of Popery, and, in the earlier controversial works, is treated as a Romish tenet. Indeed, it is rejected by some of the most learned Romanists, such as the illustrious Belarmine, who restrict the succession to the Pope, and thus endeavour to establish his infallibility. This is the only consistent form in which it can be held, for an Apostle must be infallible in his official character and teachings.

Since the time of Laud, and down to the present hour, some of the most learned, pious and able men in the Church of England, have rejected it, as leading logically to Popery. Among these, are such great names as Arch-

bishops Whately and Potter, Bishops Pearson, Hoadly, Fell, and Davenant, besides Barrow, Whitley, Willet, Hooker, Chillingworth, Hinds, Lightfoot, Brett, Stillingfleet, Hammond, and others, whose names may be found in Dr. Smythe's learned and able lectures on apostolical succession, and works of a similar tenor. The *Christian Observer*, the organ of the Evangelical party in the Church of England, says of this doctrine of apostolical succession, that "it is a theory which is not only destitute of all scriptural basis, but it is in reality pregnant with consequences that fall nothing short of the worst abuses of Papal despotism." Testimonies just as decisive might be given, from such distinguished modern names in the English Church as Riddle, Stanley, Powell, Jowett, Litton, and others, who have carefully studied and written on this subject, and from whom nothing could have extorted a condemnation of this doctrine but its utter want of any foundation in Scripture, or right reason. We are, therefore, only standing with the greatest thinkers of the Church of England, when we reject this doctrine of the permanence of the apostolic office in the Church, and affirm that the Twelve had not, and were not designed to have, any successors in their apostolic character. This being true, it follows that neither Timothy, Titus, nor any other man, out of the number of the Twelve and Paul, were Apostles, and hence that, whatever Timothy's office might be, at least, it was not that of an Apostle.

II. THE PRELATIC THEORY.

Some contend that Timothy was a Prelate, and Bishop of Ephesus.

This position is untenable, for some of the same reasons alleged against the first, arising from the general argument on the subject of parity in the ministry. All considerations tending to show that there were no Prelates, in the modern sense of the term, in the primitive Church, would

prove that Timothy was not a Prelate. It is useless, however, to give the argument so wide a range, as there are circumstances peculiar to the case of Timothy, which prove the position with sufficient clearness.

1. *He was ordained by a Presbytery.*

It is conceded that a lower office can not confer a higher, and hence a Presbytery can only ordain a Presbyter. If, then, Timothy was so ordained to the office which he held when the two Epistles bearing his name were written, he was a simple Presbyter, and not a Prelate, for the stream can not rise higher than its source.

The two passages already quoted as bearing on this point (1 Tim. 4 : 14, and 2 Tim. 1 : 6), seem to settle this matter beyond all doubt, for it is positively stated that the gift in question was bestowed by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, in the first ; and in the second, it is further explained that Paul was probably the presiding member of that Presbytery, as he speaks of the gift as conferred by the laying on of his hands. There is no discrepancy in these statements, if they refer to the same transaction, for it is just as true of each individual in an ordaining Presbytery, and especially of the presiding officer, that the gift is bestowed by the laying on of his hands, as it is true of the whole Presbytery, and such language is frequently used, without implying that the speaker alone performed the ordaining act.

The transaction referred to in 1 Tim. 4 : 14, was an ordination, for it was the bestowal of some official gift connected with the service of the Church, and not a mere private charism. This is evident from the immediate context, which refers to his official teaching, both before and after the verse (vs. 13-16), in such a way as to show that "the gift" was an official designation to this special work. If it was not an ordination, of course, the parallel passage (2 Tim. 1 : 6) does not refer to an ordination, and as Acts 13 : 1-3 was only a consecration to a particular service, we have no

instance of an ordination in the New Testament, and no scriptural warrant at all for doing it by laying on hands. This is a conclusion to which few will be willing to come.

It was, also, an ordination by a Presbytery. As this fact determines the official rank of Timothy, some efforts have been made to evade it, which deserve a passing notice.

It is said that the Presbytery may have been composed of Apostles alone. But the record does not say so; and, as Timothy was probably ordained in Asia Minor, at a distance from nearly all the Apostles, the supposition is unlikely. But, even if it were true, it would bear very strongly the other way, for it would show that they ordained, not as Apostles, but as Presbyters, which they were, by the statement of Peter and John (1 Pet. 5 : 1, and 2 John 1). But, by every analogy of language, a Presbytery must be a body of Presbyters, and nothing else, and if it confers an office, it must be the office of a Presbyter, and nothing higher.

Others say that the word Presbytery, means the office of Presbyter; but it never has that meaning, and would, moreover, involve a contradiction, for how could an office lay on hands?

Others say that the preposition, *μετα*, only expresses the concurrence of the Presbytery in the ordaining act, and not that it performed the act itself. But when was mere concurrence expressed by the laying on of hands? If the laying on of Paul's hands meant ordination, how could it mean less in the Presbytery? And why do we never afterwards hear of this concurrence, but always find the laying on of hands to mean ordination?

The preposition, *μετα*, may be taken either causally or connectively. If the first, it declares that the gift was bestowed by prophecy, through the instrumentality of the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. If the second, that it was bestowed by prophecy, together with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. As far as the point in question is concerned, it matters not which sense is taken,

for in both cases the Presbytery performed an essential and official part in the ordination. The second sense, however, is the true one.* The plain meaning is, that Timothy was called to the ministry in two ways; first, by an extraordinary call, the prophecies that went before him, and, perhaps, a direct utterance of some prophetic person, endowed with this New Testament gift; and, secondly, by the ordinary call, expressed by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. There was, therefore, in his case, precisely the same elements that are found in the case of every other true Minister of Christ, a divine and a human call. In his case the divine call was by the Holy Spirit, speaking through prophetic men, in an extraordinary manner; in other cases, it is by the same Spirit, speaking in the written Word, and on the heart of the candidate, but in both, amounting to the very same thing, *i. e.*, the expression of God's will. In the human call, the agency is the same, the endorsement by the living Church of the validity of this divine call, by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Hence, we can in no way escape the conclusion that the office which Timothy held when this Epistle was written was bestowed on him, as to its human medium, by a Presbytery, and as a Presbytery could only ordain a Presbyter, Timothy was only a Presbyter, and not a Prelate.

2. *Facts are against this theory.*

It is said that he was Bishop of Ephesus, because Paul exhorted him to abide at Ephesus, for a special reason assigned. But, if so, why beseech him to abide at the place of his abode, and where it was his duty to abide? Does not this request of Paul prove the very reverse, and show that Ephesus was not his place of abode, and hence that he was not its Prelate?

But we have a fact that is decisive of this point. After the date of this Epistle, Paul met the Elders of Ephesus at

* See Winer's Grammar, Part III., § 47, etc.

Miletum, and gave them his final charge. If Timothy was ever the Bishop of Ephesus, it was then; and we have a right to expect some allusion to it in Paul's charge to the Elders. Is there a shadow of allusion to any such thing? Why does he not refer to their Bishop, and urge them to obey him as their lawful Prelate? Was he a man to weaken the hands of legitimate authority, and that the authority of his beloved Timothy? Had this "beloved son" been their Bishop, would he not have commended him to them, and urged them to honor and submit to him? But what was his exhortation? "Take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers (bishops)," thus calling them Bishops of the Church, and giving no sort of allusion to Timothy, or any other prelati Bishop then existing, or likely thereafter to exist, in the Church of Ephesus. Does not this silence prove that there was no such officer there, and that, therefore, Timothy was not the Bishop of Ephesus? But if he was not then, he was not at all, for Paul died soon after this, as he intimated in his farewell address; and all the alleged evidence of the prelati character of Timothy is admitted to be of a date earlier than this interview.

If an attempt were made to fix a later date than this, it would be met by the uniform tradition of the Church, that John spent the last thirty years of his life in Ephesus, a fact which makes any prelati position of Timothy in Ephesus unnecessary, if not impossible; for either John was under the diocesan control of Timothy, which was incompatible with his apostolic character; or Timothy was under the apostolic control of John, which was incompatible with his prelati character. In any event, the inference is plain, that Timothy was not a Prelate, and that this was not the office to which he was ordained by the Presbytery; and we are forced to the conclusion, which Archdeacon Stanley has announced in his able *Sermons and Essays on the apostolic age*, (p. 78): "That we can not

anticipate half a century by calling Timotheus the Bishop of Ephesus, or by elevating that venerable name, as it occurs in the pages of the New Testament, to the single dignity which it has since acquired."

Some of these considerations are equally applicable to the case of Titus, in which there is the additional difficulty, that if he were the prelatic Bishop of the island of Crete, whilst Timothy would only have had the oversight of one city, Titus would have had that of nearly one hundred cities, making not only an inexplicable disproportion in their diocesan bounds, but a charge so extended as to make it almost impossible to perform its duties efficiently. We are, therefore, warranted in the inference, that in neither case was the office held by them that of a Prelate.

III. THE TRUE THEORY.

The real work of Timothy is explained by Paul in 2 Tim. 4 : 5 : "Do the work of an Evangelist; make full proof of thy ministry." As to his ecclesiastical order, he was a Presbyter; as to his special work, he was an Evangelist.

That the Evangelist was one of the officers in the primitive Church, appears from Eph. 4 : 11 : "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers"; from the case of Philip, who is called "the Evangelist," (Acts 21 : 8), and from the case of Timothy, and, we may add, of Titus—for, although not called by the name, his work is clearly that of an Evangelist. To this class, also, belonged Silas, Luke, John, Mark, Epaphras, Epaphroditus, Tychichus, Trophimus, Demas, Apollos, and other co-laborers of Paul.

Calvin says (Inst. IV., ch. III., § 4): "By 'Evangelists,' I understand those who were inferior to the Apostles in dignity, but next to them in office, and who performed similar functions. Such were Luke, Timothy, Titus, and others of

that description, and, perhaps, also, the seventy Disciples, whom Christ ordained to occupy the second station of the Apostles." Stillingfleet says (*Irenicum*, chap. VI., § 19): "Evangelists were those who were sent some times into this country to put the churches in order there, some times into another, but wherever they were, they acted as Evangelists, and not as fixed officers. And such were Timothy and Titus, notwithstanding all the opposition made against it, as will appear to any one that will take an impartial survey of the arguments on both sides."

That these Evangelists were not confined to the apostolic age, as some allege, we learn from Eusebius, who, in writing about the second century,* says that there were then many Evangelists, who performed this work "to those who had not yet heard the faith, whilst, with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the books of the Holy Gospels. After laying the foundation of the faith in foreign parts, as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations, with the grace and coöperation of God. The Holy Spirit, also, wrought many wonders as yet through them, so that as soon as the Gospel was heard, men voluntarily, in crowds, and eagerly, embraced the true faith." And, speaking afterwards of Pantænus, the philosopher, who flourished about A. D. 180, he says, that he went as a preacher to India, and that "there were even there yet many Evangelists of the Word, who were ardently striving to employ their inspired zeal after the apostolic example. Of these Pantænus is said to have been one." †

Such was the work to which Timothy was called, and in which we have reason to believe he spent his life. In the tenderness of his youth, he left his native home, among the

* *Eccles. Hist.*, Lib. III., ch. 37.

† *Lib. V.*, chap. 10.

hills of Lycaonia, traversed with Paul much of Asia Minor, crossed into Europe, and travelled as far as Corinth. We then find him making long tours under the direction of Paul. Now, visiting Ephesus to organize the Church more fully, and rebuke errorists; now, sent to Macedonia on a special mission; now, accompanying Paul in his last visit to Jerusalem; now, sharing his confinement at Rome, or visiting the Churches to report on their condition; now, liberated from prison, and starting on a new tour; and, finally, commissioned at last by the aged Apostle to bring his cloak, to shield him from the chilly damp of a Roman prison, and give him a final look at his books and parchments. Such, then, was Timothy's work, partly an apostolic work, as far as itinerating to preach and establish discipline was concerned, without an apostolic rank and responsibility; and partly a work that was suggested and determined by the ever-varying circumstances of the Church. But it is plain that, as long as the Church had missionary work to do, either in occupying new fields, or maturing the culture of old ones, so long she needed the labours of Evangelists, and so long, we have reason to believe, she enjoyed them. The office of Timothy, then, was a most important one in the primitive Church, and one to which, as the testimony of Eusebius proves, she owed much of her great success.

A question of no small interest arises here, whether this office was intended to be permanent? Many distinguished theologians affirm that it was not, but, like that of Apostle and Prophet, was temporary, and no longer exists. It is true that, in the precise form in which it existed in the primitive Church, it does not any longer exist, for the same facts that created the necessity for the apostolic office, gave a peculiar and temporary form to that of Evangelist. But as to its essential functions, there is nothing in them to make it temporary, but rather the contrary.

There are two great functions of the Church, the progressive and conservative; by the one of which she extends her labors into new territories, by the other, cultivates the ground already occupied. The second is met by the pastoral office; the first can only be reached by that of the Evangelist. Hence, whenever the foreign missionary work has been undertaken, this office has been, of necessity, used, as the foreign Missionary is an Evangelist. Now, as this is a perpetual work of the Church, it would seem to follow that the office by which alone it can be performed, must be a perpetual office.

But in the home-work, particularly in a country situated like ours, there are facts that seem to demand the continuance of this office. There is a vast amount of work to be done in every denomination of the Christian Church, that can not be overtaken by the settled pastorate. The system of colportage is a confession of this need, and an effort to meet it, which can have only a limited success, as it is not the divinely appointed method of meeting it. Different branches of the Church have attempted to meet it in different ways. The Methodist Church has met it most fully, because its whole system is one of Evangelists, from the itinerant circuit-rider up to the itinerant Bishop, who is only a *Presbyter* in rank, though an Evangelist in function, with very extensive powers. The splendid success of this Church as an aggressive system shows the value of this arm of the service, and, had the founder of this system not overlooked the conservative work of the Church, which can only be performed by a settled pastorate, its success would have been proportionably greater. The Episcopal Church has met this necessity, in some of its aspects, by her order of Bishops, who are simply Evangelists, with the sole power of ordination, and large powers of government. Much of the success of this Church, so far as it is due to the activity of her Bishops, is owing to this evangelistic feature, that she selects her best men, and sends them forth clothed with

honor and power, to do the work of an Evangelist. Where no exclusive claims are arrogated for these modes of meeting this want, we have no controversy with those who prefer them, but wish them God speed in every sincere attempt to evangelize the world. But we believe that the scriptural mode of meeting it is equally efficacious, more simple, and less liable to abuses than any other, and that is by the primitive, and, as we believe, permanent office of an Evangelist.

There has been a prejudice felt in our own Church against this office, since the abuses of it during the great revival season of 1830, when Evangelists were guilty of great extravagances, unsettling pastors, dividing Churches, relying on mere human machinery for getting up excitements that scarred over many regions with scars of burning that still remain, and brought the very name of Evangelist into contempt. This prejudice has had much to do with its comparative disuse. We have committed the great error of undervaluing the office, and so degrading it in the estimate of the Church, that a man who was fit for no other place has generally been the one thought of for the work of an Evangelist. Men of superior talent and piety have been sought for, as occupants of important pastoral charges and professorships, whilst any one, it was thought, would do for an Evangelist. We have thus dishonored the office, and lowered it from its scriptural place, and suffered in consequence of this depreciation. It ought to have been an office to which the finest talents of the Church would have felt it an honor to be summoned, as much so as an election to the Episcopate in either of the Churches which have adopted that system. It ought to have an honor, perhaps, higher than the pastorate, for so it seems to have been placed by Christ, and to have been considered in the primitive Church. It is placed in rank only below Apostles and Prophets, and above pastors and teachers, in Eph. 4 : 11; and we have no doubt that its occupants, when they worthily

filled their office, were regarded with a reverence, corresponding to this divine order.

It is a well known fact that this feature was engrafted, in precisely this form, on the Church of Scotland, in the beginning of the Reformation, by the appointment of Superintendent. Scotland was divided into ten districts, to each of which it was designed to appoint a Superintendent, whose residence, duties and stipend, were all fixed by law. Three sections in the First Book of Discipline are devoted to these Superintendents, from which it is plain that their functions were precisely those of the New Testament Evangelist. In giving reasons for making this distinction between ministers, and appointing a larger stipend to the Superintendents, it is stated, "we have thought it a thing most expedient at this time that, from the whole number of godly and learned men, now presently in this realm, be selected ten or twelve, (for in so many provinces have we divided the whole), to whom charge and commandment should be given, to plant and erect kirks, to set, order, and appoint ministers, as the former order prescribes, to the countries that shall be appointed to their care, where none are now." It needs but a glance at the duties, limitations and qualifications of these Superintendents, to show that they differ most essentially from Anglican Bishops—(Calderwood makes out thirteen heads of difference)—and that they were simply Evangelists.

It was found difficult to obtain suitable men for these positions, and their places were supplied by visitors appointed by the General Assembly; and, as the Church became settled and supplied with qualified ministers, they were gradually disused, so that in the Second Book of Discipline, adopted eighteen years after the First, all allusion to them is omitted. They may have been thought to savor too much of prelacy, for the intense Presbyterianism of Scotland—but it is a matter for curious speculation—what

would have been the effect of perpetuating this feature in the Scottish Church.

Whatever may have been true of Scotland, with its limited territory, densely peopled, and fully supplied with ministerial labour, we can not but think that this system, or some thing like it, would have worked well in this country, with its boundless field, its sparse population, and its very limited supply of ministers. Suppose that each large Presbytery, or Synod, had enjoyed the labours of such an Evangelist during our past history, or even for twenty-five years, and the results must have been great. He need not have been a Whitfield, a Nettleton, a Baker, or a Guinness, in his qualifications; but to test the theory properly, he ought to have been one of the most efficient men in the body, who devoted himself to the work, not for a year or two, but for life. What, then, would have been his work? He would, of course, have visited those regions where the Gospel had never been preached, and, gathering the people into court-houses, school-houses, log cabins, or beneath the shade of forests, told them the story of the Cross. He would have discovered, in unexpected places, solitary individuals, or families of Christians, far removed from their churches, and pining under silent Sabbaths, who might have been induced to begin a Sunday-School, which would have been the nucleus of a church. He would have left here and there a book, tract, or newspaper, which would have brought some soul to Christ; and found young men of promise, and, perhaps, of piety, to whom a little aid might have opened the way to an education, and, perhaps, to the ministry, but who, wanting this, have never emerged from their obscurity. He would have gone from plantation to plantation, and enlisted the affections of both servants and masters, so as to be a blessing to both, as well as a common bond of sympathy in the temporal relations of life. He would have visited feeble churches, and preached to them, at regular intervals, until they were

stronger, and finally led them to obtaining a permanent Pastor. He would have visited the larger churches; and, as he told them of the scenes he had witnessed, the wants and desolations of the outlying regions, and the Macedonian cry that came up from them, his statements would have had a force that those of a special agent could not have had, from his impartial knowledge of the whole field. He would have kindled a fresh zeal in these churches. His visits would often have been the occasion for a glorious revival, and he would thus have been the living bond and vehicle of aid and sympathy between the remotest churches. And, as years rolled on, and his voice and form had become familiar over a large district of country, his influence would have grown apace; his experience extended to the minutest facts in the sphere of his labour; his counsels have been invaluable in every projected missionary movement, to a Presbytery or Synod, and his efficiency increased with every year of mature labor. And then, as gray hairs and advancing age began to narrow his circle of toil, how wide and deep would have been the reverence and love which must have clustered around his person—how full his rejoicing over the ever-coming sheaves of the seed he had sown as he went forth weeping, until his mantle would have been ready to descend upon some young Timothy or Titus, who could carry yet farther and wider the work he had begun! Who can measure the influence that such a man must have had, and the work that he must have done? Must he not have carried our outposts farther in ten years than they are now carried in twenty?

And yet, precisely such a class of labourers is included in our system, at least in its theory, if not its practice, and the work that they would do is not done by any systematic agency we are using. It is the great unused arm of our service. Had we Deacons busy in caring for the temporal aspects of the churches; Elders for their spiritual condi-

tion; Pastors feeding the flock diligently; Teachers, from the Sunday-School to the Theological Seminary; and then a corps of judicious, earnest, honored Evangelists, traversing the whole territory, and gathering up every interest not compassed by other agencies, and knitting the whole together by bonds of living sympathy, who can doubt that our march would have been much more rapid, and equally sure? In two years of such labour, Daniel Baker was the means, under God, of converting twenty-five hundred souls, and the success of Nettleton is well known to every intelligent member of our Church. Dr. A. Alexander, in an article published just before his death, mentions that the first two years of his ministry were spent in such labour, and states that, in reviewing the results of the system of evangelism inaugurated at that time by the Synod of Virginia, he saw the most beneficial and permanent results. Had such work as this been spread over many years, by many hands and hearts, who can doubt that results the most precious and enduring would have been reached?

We are glad to see, within a year or two past, an awakening of fresh interest in this work, and the experiment made by several of the Southern Synods, of a regular system of evangelism. As far as we are aware, the success of these movements has fully justified their adoption; and if, in any case, it has been otherwise, the cause will be found elsewhere than in the system itself. We only ask for it a fair trial. And to secure this, the office must be raised to its primitive dignity as soon as possible. The amplest salary must be attached to it, to cover every contingency, and to give it the consideration that will always be attached to a position that has an honorable support. The best men must be elected to it, as to a place of high public trust, and the Church must then patiently wait the result of their large and systematic labours.

There has never been a time, perhaps, when this movement could be more auspiciously made than the present,

when our Southern Church is opening a new chapter in her history, assuming a new form, and girding herself to do the great work to which her Head is calling her. That work, in our wide territory, our sparse population, our paucity of ministers, and, especially, our vast masses of colored people, so difficult to reach by our ordinary agencies, can in no way be so well done, we believe, as by resorting to an extensive use of the primitive, powerful and simple agency of the New Testament Evangelist.

ARTICLE V.

THE VICTORY OF MANASSAS PLAINS.

This glorious victory appears in its true light, when we consider the months that were occupied in marshalling, disciplining, and in every way preparing for this decisive battle, "the grand army" of the North, and the combined forces of the South. To this focus, all the energies, military genius, and unlimited resources of General Scott, converged. "Over one hundred thousand troops," according to their own estimates,* were concentrated to meet, as they

* We find the following in the *New York Times*, of the 18th July:

THE ADVANCE OF THE ARMY.—The utterance of a single word by Lieutenant-General Scott has sent through the American heart a sense of satisfaction that it has not experienced since the dark day of treason dawned. That word is the monosyllable, "March." As it was borne along the lines from Arlington to Alexandria, full fifty-five thousand men leaped to their feet with delight, and prepared for the long-sought encounter with the enemy. All regrets and repinings of the past were shaken off. The memory of toilsome work in ditches, of tedious hours in drill, of days of weary waiting in camp, vanished on the instant. The tents gave up their loiterers, and the hospitals gave up their sick; for the bugle note that sounded "forward," brought the warm blood coursing through their veins as of old, and nothing could restrain their resolution to go with their stouter comrades to the field.

VOL. XIV., NO. IV.—76

believed and published, not one-half that number. Ten thousand regulars, constituting the standing army of the

The tonic to the Nation is equally remarkable and inspiring. We, too, forget our impatience and misgivings. We find the Government in motion: President and Cabinet, General-in-Chief, and Generals of Divisions—officers and men—artillery, cavalry, and infantry—all in motion, and leading the Nation's strength to battle. So grand a spectacle never before was presented to the world—the uprising of a peaceful people, in numbers so vast, and in armament so sudden and complete, to preserve their Government, and vindicate the principles on which it is founded.

With this demonstration of energy, the popular demand is placated; and the press, which has uttered no word of complaint but at popular instance, and has had no purpose but to make the Administration clearly understand the people's will in regard to the war, suspends all criticism, and gives to President and Cabinet, and to the General-in-Chief of our armies, the heartiest applause and support. Let the work go on bravely, as it is now begun. The Administration and the people are abreast. Their hearts beat in unison, and in the mutual good understanding thus begotten, is a moral strength miraculous and invincible.

The popular rejoicings over the news from Washington allow no room for discussion of plans or conjectures of strategy. The army is in motion, and it advances upon the central seats of treason. That suffices. The accomplished and soldierly McDowell, the cautious Patterson, and the impetuous McClellan, heading columns that contain fully one hundred thousand soldiers of the Union, are now advancing upon Richmond. In good time, and in the pre-arranged way, they will enfold that centre of rebellion in a deadly *entourage* of rifle and cannon, and reduce its obdurate temper to the peaceful and prosperous rule of the Republic. That will emancipate Virginia, and once more unlock her closed rivers and harbors.

The *Cincinnati Times*, of the 19th July, says:

THE SITUATION.—Gen. McDowell still advances. One wing of his army has passed through Centreville, and the whole division, at last accounts, was within four miles of Manassas. In the whole advance, we have reports of but one skirmish. At Bull Run the enemy are said to have driven back our skirmishers, with a slight loss upon our side.

This is the only stand they have made. At all other points they left in a hurry, as soon as convinced that our army was approaching. From the fact that they left behind much of their camp equipage and personal baggage, we infer that the chivalrous South Carolinians proved about the fleetest of foot.

We have a story, through the *New York Herald*, that the rebels have held a military consultation, and have determined to fall back on Richmond, where immense preparations are being made for defence. We doubt the truth of the story, and are inclined to the opinion that Beauregard will show fight at Manassas.

If Beauregard makes a stand at Manassas, we shall have news of an engagement to-day. McDowell is "quick on the trigger," and will not pause in front of the enemy.

We are inclined to believe that the reporters have been deceived as to the number of Gen. McDowell's force. Instead of 50,000, we believe it must be double that number. We publish, to-day, a private letter, written by a citizen of Alexandria to his brother here, in which the number is put down at 120,000. It is enough, at all events, to take Manassas without a prolonged engagement.

United States, were among the number. Six batteries of flying artillery, the fame and prowess of which were of

We hear again from Gen. Patterson. Instead of moving upon Winchester, he diverged to the North, and has taken position at Charlestown. This town lies directly between Harper's Ferry and Winchester, and is noted as the place where John Brown and his associates were tried and executed.

The Federal troops are probably encamped in the very wheat-field where the executions took place, and it is not unlikely that some of the Southern chivalry, as prisoners of war, may occupy the same prison in which John Brown was confined! Johnston's position is represented to be strongly fortified on the north at Winchester, and Patterson hesitates to attack him in front. From present information, we think that Patterson will stand still until he can throw a heavy force into Johnston's rear.

This will be an easy task. With the position of the parties, Beauregard's retreat or defeat would place Johnston in a very critical position. McDowell could then turn a heavy force in his rear, by the way of Oak Hill and Strasburg, force him upon Patterson, and prevent all possibility of escape.

A correspondent of the *New York Express* said, just before the battle of Manassas Plains:

Western Virginia will, we now see, soon be cleared from the insurrectionists, and so will all that part of Virginia which borders upon the upper Potomac. When McClellan and Patterson can cooperate, Gen. Scott will start the huge column in front of Washington "for Richmond." for McClellan's movements are all in his programme. Within five miles of me, on the Virginia side of the Potomac, are forty regiments of regular and volunteer United States troops. Pieces of artillery of every size, from the handsome bright brass howitzers to the huge black-painted columbiads, crown the hills, or lie peacefully upon the green earth along the valleys. They rest as peacefully now upon their rolling carriages as so many children in their cradles, but they are ready, and with good men behind them, to give them not only voice, but terrible utterances, whenever the word, "advance," is given.

The following in reference to the notorious Bennett, editor of the *New York Herald*, is from the *Richmond Dispatch*, a few days after the battle:

YANKEE LIES.—Sawney, of the *New York Herald*, does not stand upon trifles. He says "the rebel army actually in action at Bull Run numbered close upon 60,000 men, well officered, well entrenched, protected by masked batteries, and abundantly supplied with artillery." This is a lie out of the whole cloth. The battle was fought upon unfortified ground; there was not an entrenchment or a masked battery within miles of it. What is said of our officers is true; but all the rest is sheer falsehood. The Confederate force actually engaged never exceeded 15,000 men, as may be seen from an inspection of the muster-rolls of the regiments engaged.

"Opposed to them, (the Confederates,) was a conglomeration of badly officered regiments—with an aggregate in the field of not over 18,000 men—with no general commanding—each one fighting on his own hook, and with a totally inadequate supply of cannon," etc.

Thirty-four regiments—the very pride of the Northern soldiery—regiments which the *Herald* itself was accustomed to tell us, before the battle, were invincible, attacked our left wing. They certainly did not number less than thirty-five thousand men. One of the captured officers said they

world-wide notoriety, including sixty-five guns, and some as large as sixty-four pounders, aided by a powerful body of cavalry, made the assurance of victory doubly sure. The time, and place, and mode of attack, were determined by themselves. Their march was guided by traitors familiar with every accessible approach. General Scott and the best leaders in the army conducted this assembled host, and animated them throughout the arduous conflict. It was, however, believed that the Southern forces would not fight; or that if they did, that they would do so only behind their entrenchments, and that they would speedily fall back towards Richmond. A glorious victory or triumphal march had been heralded throughout the land. Never had such jubilant feelings—not of hope, but of expectation, nay, of present and positive triumph—exhilarated the overjoyed heart of the North. Provisions were on the field to celebrate in sumptuous banquet the restoration of a dismembered Union and the annihilation of its traitorous enemies. Fine wines and brandies were on hand in abundance. One hundred hogsheads of bacon, and numerous packages, were directed to Richmond. Our Generals, Lee and Beauregard, were to be hung in sight of the two armies. The eighteenth and twentieth of July, 1861, were, therefore, big with the fate of two confederated empires. Europe, for a time,

were from thirty-seven to forty thousand strong. There were, besides, nine regiments on their left, and nine in reserve: Total, fifty-two regiments of infantry, exclusive of five thousand regulars. As for their artillery, they had Sherman's battery, Carlisle's battery, Griffith's battery, the Rhode Island battery, the West Point battery, and the huge battery of rifled thirty-two-pounders, eighty-one pieces, and they lost all but two in their flight. In one word, it was the most magnificent park of artillery that ever accompanied an army to the field of battle in America.

What object can Sawney have in telling these lies? Is he afraid the mob will tear down his office, if he tell the truth, as they threatened to do with Greeley's, when he published the truth about this matter, and as they would have done had not Greeley speedily fallen back upon his old resource of falsehood?

Gen. Scott has given orders that no more official reports about the battle shall be published. He knows the slaughter was too terrible to be exposed. This fact speaks volumes.

believed that their result must have consummated the doom of the Southern, and the consolidation, as a military despotism, of the Northern Confederacy; that as thus far—by their report—their fortune had kept an onward course, so now they were graced with wreaths of victory.*

Now, that in such circumstances, against such an overwhelming force, one-half of our army of thirty thousand volunteers, many of whom were delicately reared, pro-

* **MAKING NEWS FOR FOREIGN EFFECT.**—The *New York Herald*, of the 20th July, gives a striking illustration of the diligent mendacity of the Northern press which was employed in making up accounts for Europe. The *Herald* says:

The steamers which leave for Europe to-morrow will take out intelligence which will exercise no small influence on the European mind. They will take out the first accounts of the advance movement toward Richmond, and of the gradual concentration of the forces under McClellan and Patterson; of the evident unwillingness or incapacity of the rebels to stand their ground anywhere except behind walls or masked batteries; of the patriotic and vigorous action of Congress, and of the prevalence of a conviction in Wall street that the danger has passed away, and that now the entire suppression of the rebellion is merely a question of time and patience. This news will carry conviction to the European mind; as soon as it is digested, we shall receive assurances from Europe which will dispel any anxieties that may still be felt with regard to the tendency of European policy. The cotton spinners must, for their own sakes, take sides with the winners in this war. As soon as they find that the Southerners, who have bellowed so loudly about their rights, their "sacred soil," and their tremendous courage, evacuate post after post, as soon as attacked; run like sheep at sight of the Northern volunteers, and are never known to stand their ground, except when they have a stout breastwork between them and the enemy, the European public will shrewdly infer that it is not on their banners that victory will perch in this war. As soon as that inference becomes general, the danger of a collision between our naval forces at the Southern ports and foreign vessels will disappear, and an inquiry for United States securities will probably spring up, which will be felt in our markets.

The *Cincinnati Gazette*, of the 22d July, before the news of the victory could reach that place, said:

CAPTURE OF THE BATTERIES AT BULL RUN.—This strong position fell yesterday, before the spirit and courage of the national soldiers. It is probable that, encouraged by the partial repulse of our troops the day before, Beauregard sent strong reinforcements to this position. But nothing can stand before the indomitable pluck of the Northern troops. Manassas will fall into our hands, as Bull Run has. So will Richmond, and every place where the Confederates dare to make a stand. We are now realizing the difference between true courage and false, fire-eating chivalry.

fessional and sedentary men, and almost all citizens "to the manor born," of each of whom it might be said, that

"Pride in the gift of country and of name
Speaks in his eye and step—
He treads his native land"—

that these, of whom a number had barely reached the field from Richmond, and, under all the oppression of fatigue and want of sleep, of food, and of water,* were immediately formed into line in the fore-front of the fiercest battle—that in such circumstances, fifteen thousand men should sustain the shock of thirty-five thousand, including ten thousand regulars, and Sherman's celebrated battery of guns, for fourteen hours; that this battery, so powerfully sustained, should be taken by a bayonet charge of a regiment of volunteers; the entire force of the enemy be thrown into consternation, confusion, and universal rout, leaving in our possession six batteries, sixty-seven cannon—all they had but two—one hundred wagons, some two thou-

* As an instance of the spirit animating all our troops, the *Richmond Enquirer* mentions that the Sixth North Carolina Regiment went immediately from the cars to the battle of Manassas, after eating no meal since Saturday morning. They joined in the pursuit, and were too exhausted to return to camp, but bivouacked on the field. Col. Fisher was the only officer killed.

A correspondent of the *Charleston Courier* writes from General Beauregard's headquarters:

JULY 24, 1861.—My first visit, after paying my respects to General Beauregard, who had kindly invited us to his quarters, was to the Washington Light Infantry Volunteers. I found Captain Conner and his officers all well, but the company had suffered very much. They behaved gloriously, and deserve the highest praise—they behaved like veterans. The Legion only arrived on the ground at two o'clock Sunday morning, after a most harassing trip from Richmond. They had to lay on the ground, without food or water, until daylight, when they were called up to take their place in the picture, with hardly a mouthful to eat or a drop of water, until near the commencement of the battle, when they got a little muddy water. Their position was in the left wing, by whom the battle was fought (principally); after suffering a murderous fire for some time without flinching, they charged a battery, and drove the enemy from it, and then turned it over to a Virginia artillery company to use. After this, they were too much exhausted to pursue the enemy far, the fate of the day having been decided, and the enemy in full retreat, or rather run, for when they started it was pell mell. These, also, lay all night after the battle in a corn-field, without food or drink.

sand prisoners, a stand of colours, and a star-spangled banner, and covering the gory field and their path of flight for miles with between two and five thousand dead bodies, twenty or thirty thousand stand of arms, every implement of war, and be saved only by night from immeasurable destruction; and that after six months' preparation, and world-wide prophetic boasting, they should be driven back to the positions occupied three months before—this surely is a glorious victory and a grand and immortal display of that heroic valour, "whose noble soul all fear subdues," and bravely dares the danger nature shrinks from.

" Ah, never can this land forget
How gushed the life blood of the brave!
Gushed warm with hope and courage yet
Upon the land they fought to save."

For this victory the people of the Confederate States are called upon for ever to render unto Almighty God the glory due unto His gracious and wonder-working Providence. Yet, in doing this, sincerely and satisfactorily, there is an instinct of hearts filled to overflowing with patriotic pride, which demands utterance, and which finds utterance in rapturous applause, for the virtues and the valour of all

" The leaders brave, whose deeds and death have given
A glory to our skies, a music to our name ;"

and not less heartily for the courage of the three hundred private soldiers who died for this victory; and for the sacrifices of those one thousand or more, whose life-long scars and crippled limbs testify to their part in that bloody field; and even for the endurance of all the rest who survived uninjured, to tell, as we trust they will, to their children and children's children, the tale of the glorious victory, and all the various fortunes of that day. All this is right and proper, and no more than they deserve from the hands of

a country grateful to God for them, in being grateful to them.

“Thus should they sleep who for their country die,
 When low and cold they lie,
 By all their country’s wishes blest!
 When spring, with dewy fingers cold,
 Returns to deck their hallowed mould,
 She there shall dress a sweeter sod
 Than fancy’s feet have ever trod.
 By fairy hands their knell is rung,
 By forms unseen their dirge is sung:
 There Honour comes, a pilgrim grey,
 To bless the turf that wraps their clay,
 And Freedom shall awhile repair,
 To dwell a weeping hermit there.”

Nor is such praise and gratitude to men inconsistent with supreme regard to the glorious providence of God. This victory has a two-fold aspect; one, as it is human, and the result of human agency; and another, as it is divine, and is the effect of Divine wisdom and power.

Considered as human, this victory is the result of that combination of laws, material, physical, mental and moral, adapted to the present nature and condition of man, by which God governs the world, and reigns a ruler over the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of the earth. Under this complicated system of mutually adjusted laws, an innumerable combination of instrumentalities and events was necessary in order to secure this victory, and all the individual consequences connected with it.

Soldiers were necessary—true soldiers—with arm to strike and soul to dare; “whose spirit lends a fire even to the dullest peasant in the camp, and from whose metal all their party’s steeled”; generous soldiers, whose pay is glory, and their best reward to die for, or live to share, their country’s freedom; soldiers, whose every name

“Shall shine untarnished on the rolls of fame,
 And stand the example of each distant age,
 And add new lustre to the historic page.”

But for such soldiers officers are also requisite, of a character and capacity proportionately ennobled; leaders who can attract and attach their men, so as to discipline and direct them; whose genius can comprehensively survey, and give unity of purpose, plan, and preparation; equip, provision, and protect; instruct and intensify every patriotic impulse; combine personal dignity and sympathy with their soldiers; elevate true worth; encourage virtue, and repress all mean and dishonorable conduct; and animate, by their presence, spirit, and example,

————— “The brave,
Who rush to glory and a grave.”

Now, our possession of such an army, and such resources, is a just ground for exultation, for self-respect, for confidence for the future, for calm and hopeful expectation of success—nay, for the assurance of triumphant victory. Indeed, by the victories of Bethel, and Manassas, and Leesburg, and many of minor consequence—though in themselves equally important—in the various skirmishes and personal rencontres that have occurred; and even in the occasions of partial defeat, under surprisal and overwhelming numbers, the superiority of the Southern over the Northern soldiery is demonstrated. We have beheld, with thrilling rapture, our heroic men in this battle of Manassas, when overwhelmed, and by the attempt to break their firm array, form, unite, charge, waver—*all is lost!* No!

“ Within a narrow space compressed, beset,
Hopeless, not heartless, they strive and struggle yet,—
Hemmed in—cut off—cleft down—and trampled o'er!
But each strikes singly, silently, and home,
And sinks out-wearied, rather than o'ercome;
His last faint quittance rendering with his breath,
Till the blade glimmers in the grasp of death:
No dread of death—if with us die our foes.”

We may be sure, therefore, that, with any thing like equal advantages in number, arms, and opportunity, our South-
VOL. XIV., NO. IV.—77

ern troops will overmatch those that come up against us. But, at the same time, we are taught, very forcibly, that, as defeat must be to us death and destruction, ignominy and disgrace insufferable, and a subjection to a tyranny more despotic than that of any European, or even Asiatic, *one-man* power, our only dependence is in continued and increased vigilance, unanimity, energy, voluntary service and sacrifice; the enrolment, equipment, and discipline of every man capable of bearing arms, and timely and full preparation of all the armament and appliances of war, as adapted to our sea-coasts and cities, and, above all other, preëminently, for our own beloved Charleston and South Carolina. First and foremost in the revolutionary movement, she is doomed to the direst vengeance. The war, it is said, began at Charleston, and it must end there. Charleston must be razed to the ground, and South Carolina converted into a wilderness, and sown in salt, so that no man shall ever again pass through it.

Let us, then, seek and secure the right men to guard us and to lead us—men with whom

“ Their country first, their glory and their pride,
Land of their hopes, and where their father’s died,
Whose home-felt pleasure prompts the patriot’s sigh,
And makes them wish to live, and dare to die.”

Let all our mothers be—as many of them are—Spartan mothers; and, as they gird on their armour, and bless them for the field, let them point their brave sons to their shield, and say:

“ Come *with* it, when the battle’s done,
Or *on* it, from the field.”

Let us remember our fathers, who still live with us and among us, and by their spell-binding presence still guard our beleagured land; and let us fill every mountain gorge and luxuriant valley, and sea-girt fortress, with the echo of

tramping hosts, and the war shouts: "Onward—for God and freedom! Give us liberty, or give us death!"

Oh, yes! it is the sons of such mothers, and the worthy inheritors of such patriot sires, our young-fledged empire requires to carry her safely through that sea of fire by which she is girt around, and make her conqueror, and more than conqueror, through God, our helper.

"The painted folds that fly,
And lift their emblems, pointed high
On morning mist and sunset sky—
Are these the guardians of a land?
No! if the patriot pulses sleep,
How vain the watch that hirelings keep;
How vain the idol flag that waves
Where conquest, with his iron heel,
Treads down the standards and the steel
That belt the soil of slaves."

Let the South, then, awake, and rise to the height of this great argument. It is now a controversy of swords, and not of words; and the issue is, conquest or enslavement. Home and happiness, the purity of wives and daughters, the sanctity of the fireside, the holiness and freedom of our altars, the security of peace, the prosperity of agriculture and commerce, the pursuit of happiness in the walks of science, and the groves of philosophy, and the studios and laboratories of art; above all, honour, principle, and the highest of all prerogatives—that of national sovereignty—these, and whatever else is precious, all stand or fall with victory or defeat. Let every man, woman, and youth, awake, and gird up the loins of their mind, and, with heart and hand, beneath their own blue sky, and amidst their own green land, and the solemn shades of the church-yard cemetery, swear "for those to live, or with them to die."

Blest with a soil productive in all the elements of life and comfort, let these alone suffice, if driven to the last extremity, and let every product for exportation be destroyed, unless our just and equal rights, according to the

laws of nations at war, are recognized and respected by foreign powers.

Let the last words of the gallant Bee become the watchword of every Southern heart: "Let us, fellow-soldiers, determine to die here, and we will conquer." Let Bartow's dying words, as he fell, leading up his regiment to the assault of a battery—"Boys, they have killed me, but never give up this field to the enemy"—be "engraved in our heart of hearts,"* and thus let us

"Snatch from the ashes of our sires
The embers of their former fires;
And he who in the strife expires
Will add to theirs a name of fear,
That tyranny will quake to hear."

But let us now turn to the solemn and heartfelt contemplation of this glorious, though blood-bought victory, in its divine aspect.

Victory was a goddess in the classic Pantheon, and the universal Fate of heathenism and false religion was, and is, regarded as the father of gods and men, the arbiter of all

* The *Richmond Dispatch* says:

Gen. Bartow died a noble and brave death. He first received a shot which shattered one of his feet; but even in this disabled condition he maintained his place at the head of his men. He had reached a fence which crossed the direction of his charge, and was supporting himself, waving his sword, and cheering his gallant band on to the fight, when some miscreant's ball pierced his brave heart.

The loss of the enemy in the recent battle is variously estimated at from five to ten thousand. Our own loss, which was estimated at five hundred, will, I think, be less, as many who have been reported dead are still living. Gen. Bartow fell before Sherman's battery. A company he had formerly commanded—the Oglethorpe Light Infantry, of Savannah—were lying on their backs loading their muskets, when a perfect storm of balls came in among them, wounding many of them. He seemed perfectly infuriated at this havoc among his *protégés*, and, seizing the colours, rushed forward, saying, "he would take Sherman's battery, or die in the attempt." It was with his second wound he fell—the first one having injured his foot.

A correspondent of the *Cincinnati Gazette* reports, concerning the ill-fated Garnett:

When the rebel General was shot, he was on foot, waving his men back to the conflict. He had waded the Cheat river, on foot, with his men, and when he fell his pantaloons were all dripping with water.

destinies, the disposer of all events, and the irresistible controller of all human actions. We have thus, therefore, in the undissenting voice of humanity, the expression of the doctrine of revelation, that

“ There is a Providence that shapes our ends,
Rough hew them as we may.”

In other words, God is in all, over all, under, and around, and above, all laws, all elements, all forces, all agencies and all agents, whether they be men, or angels, or devils; whether they be powers of darkness, or principalities and powers in heavenly places; that He ruleth over all; that all are His ministers and servants that obey His voice and do His bidding; that this sovereign dominion extends to the minutest atom, and the universal law, so that with Him there is nothing great and nothing mean, the least being as the greatest, and the greatest as the least; and if this is true of all events, even to the falling of a sparrow, and the numbering of the hairs of every head, and if of every situation it may be said: “Surely, God is in this place, and I knew it not,” how much more assuredly is this true of that “first and last of fields, king-making victory”—a field, too, which concentrates the energies of nations, the lives of hundreds of thousands, and the lives and fortunes of millions more, now living and hereafter to be born.

War is the sternest exercise of man’s highest prerogatives and powers, and the field of battle the theatre of earth’s most magnificent array, and of man’s most splendid and heroic achievements. It reveals in man the spirit of a fiend, but proclaims an arch-angel fallen. Originated by wicked lusts, and bringing forth the monstrous passions of malice, hatred, and all uncharitableness, of retaliation and blood-thirsty revenge, it also develops the loftiest virtues which can adorn humanity, and illustrates, in their most exalted exercise, magnanimity, honour, patriotism, fortitude, courage, equanimity, and victory over death and the grave.

War is the great tamer, civilizer, reformer and punisher of wild, ferocious, and debased humanity; the rod of God's anger, the besom of destruction, the wine-press of his fury, and the avenger of the just and good; and the executioner of long-delayed wrath upon the unjust, the avaricious, the covenant-breaking, the usurping, tyrannical and licentious, and God-defying, Sabbath-breaking and Bible-perverting nations. War is often, as in this case, provoked by the falsified faith, and covenant-breaking, and sectional, self-aggrandizing policy of seventy years; by the recent triumph of a sectional and anti-constitutional party; by the declaration and demonstration of coercive and hostile force against eleven free, sovereign, and independent States; and is, therefore, wicked, diabolical, and against all right, righteousness, and law, human and divine: or, it may be, as in our case, defensive of every right—constitutional, human, and divine; and the manifestation, therefore, of the highest virtue known to humanity, and entitled to the praise and benediction of the world, and upon which—if conducted in His fear—we may confidently look for the sanction and support of God, who is able to deliver us out of the hands of all that rise up against us.

“The Lord God is,” therefore, “a man of war.”—**Ex.** 15 : 3.

“Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people: let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world, and all things that come forth of it. For the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. Their slain, also, shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig-tree. For my sword shall be bathed in

heaven: behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. The sword of the Lord is filled with blood, it is made fat with fatness, and with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams: for the Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. And the unicorns shall come down with them, and the bullocks, with the bulls; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion."—Isa. 34 : 1-8.

"O, thou sword of the Lord, how long will it be ere thou be quiet? put up thyself into thy scabbard; rest, and be still. How can it be quiet, seeing the Lord hath given it a charge against Ashkelon, and against the sea shore? there hath he appointed it."—Jer. 47 : 6, 7.

God, therefore, commandeth war, threatens war, inflicts war, and, again, maketh wars to cease. God directs, counsels, and controuls war, and orders all its issues. And God does all this, that men may be afraid of the sword: for wrath bringeth the punishments of the sword, that men may know there is a judgment.

There is a two-fold government of God, with corresponding laws, agencies, ends, restraints, recompenses, and retributions. God has a natural and moral government, the basis of which is truth, justice, honesty, honour, covenant-keeping, upholding and obeying equal and impartial laws, constitutionally formed, and rigidly and impartially administered, and the preservation of pure morality, and family and social order.

Now, God's natural and moral government is adapted to reward those individuals and nations which faithfully maintain these principles, and punish those who violate them, or are partakers and willing associates with their transgressors; and, among the other methods of God's righteous administration of this equal and impartial

justice, is war. God, therefore, promises victory, and threatens defeat, and He brings both to pass according to the counsel of His own will. Arms and armaments, and armies, are vain against His purpose and providence to destroy, and a multitude, with every advantage, are made powerless, and flee before the few and feeble, when disheartened and defeated by a God in arms against them.

“Then said David to the Philistine, Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied. This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee. And all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear: for the battle is the Lord’s, and He will give you into our hands.”—1 Sam. 17 : 45, 46.

And again, we read:

“And at that time Hanani the seer came to Asa, king of Judah, and said unto him: Because thou hast relied on the king of Syria, and not relied on the Lord thy God, therefore is the host of the king of Syria escaped out of thine hand. Were not the Ethiopians and the Lubims a huge host, with very many chariots and horsemen? yet, because thou didst rely on the Lord, he delivered them into thine hand. For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show Himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him. Herein thou hast done foolishly: therefore, from henceforth thou shalt have wars.”—2 Chron. 16 : 7–9.

And again, in Amaziah’s reign:

“But there came a man of God to him, saying, O king, let not the army of Israel go with thee, for the Lord is not with Israel, to wit, with all the children of Ephraim. But if thou wilt go, do it, be strong for the battle: God shall make thee fall before the enemy: for God hath power to help, and to cast down.”—2 Chron. 25 : 7, 8.

And such is the meaning of that terrific passage—Deut. 32 : 29–43. God had declared that, as long as His people were faithful and obedient, He would make them victorious and powerful against any number of their enemies, and He there declares that their “latter end” of discomfiture and shameful defeat was altogether the result of His desertion of them. God did, in innumerable instances, fulfil His promises to Israel; and, through his prophets, He has proclaimed for us the same law, for our warning and encouragement. Thus, in the forty-fourth Psalm, and many others, we are taught to say :

“Through thee will we push down our enemies: through thy name will we tread them under that rise up against us. For I will not trust in my bow, neither shall my sword save me. But thou hast saved us from our enemies, and hast put them to shame that hated us. In God we boast all the day long, and praise thy name for ever. Selah. But thou hast cast off, and put us to shame; and goest not forth with our armies. Thou makest us to turn back from the enemy: and they which hate us spoil for themselves. Thou hast given us like sheep appointed for meat; and hast scattered us among the heathen.”

And in the Apostle Paul’s glowing description of faith :

“And what shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gedeon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae, of David, also, and Samuel, and of the prophets: Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.”—Heb. 11 : 32–34.

It is thus demonstrated that the conduct of God, as the Sovereign Ruler in His supernatural kingdom, is not contrary to, but in accordance and concurrence with, His natural and moral government of the world. It does not

supersede, but is carried on through, the same laws and instrumentalities, according to their nature, "either necessarily, freely, or contingently." * Human government remains. The same rewards and retributions are employed, and the same coexistence and coöperation of divine and human agency mingle in mysterious union in weaving the web of human destiny.

Of this kingdom the Gospel is the law; the Bible, the charter; Christ, the King; we Ministers, ambassadors; the Church, the sanctuary; Sabbaths, its days of convocation, prayer and praise; salvation, the object; heaven, the goal; and the glory of God's grace and mercy, the final end.

Faith in Christ is the condition of salvation; the principle, and itself the highest exhibition of obedience, the most acceptable sacrifice to God; because it honours His Son, and is the fountain of willing service, the root of every grace, the cementing hand between God and the soul, and the inspirer of peace, and love, and confidence, and joyful exultation in God.

The true believer is, therefore, the most diligent worker. He feels that he can do nothing without God, but every thing with Him. He prays, therefore, as if every thing depended upon God, and works as if every thing depended upon his own exertions—his own skill, and diligence, and fortitude. In war, the Christian principle is embodied in the laconic advice of one who was at once one of the greatest Generals and sincerest of Christians: "Trust in Providence, and keep your powder dry." Faith is the parent and nurse of courage, confidence and heroism. "Add to your faith," says the Apostle, "valour—courage," as the original means. And hence, history attests that, while a religious faith has in all ages sustained heroic valour, and that in proportion to its evangelical purity and power, it

* Confession of Faith.

animates the soul to a dauntless intrepidity and daring chivalry.

“When Robert Bruce had marshalled his little army on the field of Bannockburn, to strive for the independence of Scotland, against the three-fold army of Edward of England, the latter saw the Scottish ranks successively kneeling upon the ground, and exclaimed, arrogantly: ‘They are dispirited; they kneel; they supplicate my royal mercy.’ ‘No sire,’ answered a wise and experienced noble at his side: ‘they kneel not to you, but to the majesty of heaven. See, the holy man of God passes along their ranks, and they kneel in order to receive by his hands the benediction of God.’ And soon the sceptered fool was taught, by the terrible issue of the day, that the humility of the pious Scots was not incompatible with a heroism which swept his proud chivalry as chaff before the whirlwind.”

“On that Sabbath morning on which the battle of Lake Champlain was fought, when Commodore Downie, of the British squadron, was sailing down on the Americans, as they lay in the bay of Plattsburg, he sent a man to the mast-head to see what they were doing on Commodore McDonough’s ship, the flag-ship of the little American squadron. ‘Ho! aloft,’ said Downie, ‘What are they doing on that ship?’ ‘Sir,’ answered the lookout, ‘they are gathered about the main-mast, and they seem to be at prayer.’ ‘Ah!’ said Commodore Downie, ‘that looks well for them, but bad for us.’ It was bad for the British Commodore. For the very first shot from the American ship was a chain-shot, which cut poor Downie in two, and killed him in a moment. McDonough was a simple, humble Christian, and a man of prayer, but brave as a lion in the hour of battle. He died as he lived—a simple-hearted, earnest Christian.”

“Yes,” to use the words of Professor Dabney, addressed to the Eighteenth Virginia Regiment, “the sense of God’s

favour and trust in His omnipotent providence, are the true basis of courage: and these are to be sought by sinners, as we all are, only in the paths of repentance. The man who has an approving conscience, who has God for his friend, and heaven for his home, may be insensible to fear; for death to him is no evil; and death is the utmost that human malice and power can inflict.

“The man who cultivates the strongest sense of the world to come is, in all ages, the best soldier. So true is this, that even the military religions of Paganism were found the most potent engines to raise men to an exaltation of martial spirit. What made the old Scandinavian the terror of the feudal ages? He had been taught by his religion, that if he died in his bed, his future state would be obscure and ignoble; but if in battle, with his face to the foe, his immortality would be passed in the Walhalla of the Heroes, in perpetual banquet with princes and conquerors. Mohammed taught the Arabs, that he who died for the Koran was a martyr, who went straight to the bliss of paradise. It was this which made the Saracens the terror of Christendom. The Crusaders were authorized by the Romish Church to believe that every one who fell fighting for the Holy Sepulchre, should escape the pains of purgatory, and go at once to the highest heavens. If, now, these superstitious dreams could inspire men with such indifference to death, what should not be the heroism of the enlightened Christian, who has attained the rational evidence that God is his friend; that heaven is his final home; that his life is shielded by an infinite Providence, which makes his injury or death impossible, until death is his truest blessing, and that ‘all things must work together for good to him?’ Let facts answer this question. While man is, unfortunately, every where a combative being, the truest instances of martial heroism have ever been found among enlightened Christians. Macaulay stated of Cromwell’s famous Ironside Regiment, that not only was it

never conquered in battle, but it never met the enemy, whether impetuous Cavalier, or steady Scot, or the boasted chivalry of Spain, that it did not both defeat and crush the body opposed to it. Cromwell's letters give us the origin of this corps. He informed the Commonwealth generals, that he found the Parliament's army too much composed of scurvy materials, such as 'decayed serving-men and tapsters.' 'But I will go,' said he, 'and recruit among the respectable land-owners, and godly people.' Such was the material of his Ironsides; respectable sons of the soil; sons of Christian households, reared in the fear of God; men who to strict discipline joined the fear of God; and who passed from the prayer-meeting to the field of battle, with their Bibles girt under their armour. And such is, emphatically, the constitution of this regiment, drawn from the flower of our section, the sturdy children of the soil. May your sobriety, discipline, and elevated fear of God, make the Eighteenth to be known hereafter as the invincible Ironsides of this war!"

"And yet there are men, I fear, among us, who, because they have experienced only good from the hand of God, are skeptical of his practical concern in the fortunes of men. Theirs is the sneering atheism which was implied in the remark of General Charles Lee, upon the call of our great Washington to fasting, humiliation and prayer, that our fathers might seek the blessing of Divine Providence on their cause. Thus sneered the cynical old unbeliever: 'I have always observed that Divine Providence is on the side of the strongest battalion;' plainly implying that there was no Providence behind those second causes through which He ordinarily works. Now, I might safely propose to all such shallow and senseless thinkers, to let the destinies of these two men, the carping, malignant skeptic, and the Christian statesman and devout believer, decide whether there is a Providence who notes the sneers uttered against His majesty, and is armed with the means of refuting and

avenging them. I say, let the career of the two men decide which was the happier creed? The unbeliever speedily brought the dense cloud of disgrace, crime, and mortification over his fame, on the field of Monmouth; sank into obscurity and contempt, and spent the miserable remainder of his age, deserted of God and man, in a misanthropic solitude. But the man who knew how to honour and acknowledge God in sincerity, was steadily raised by His providence to the most enviable pinnacle of glory to which uninspired mortal ever rose: 'First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.'

"Away, then, with this unbelief which thrusts God out of this world, as stupid as it is wicked. Let us humble ourselves before that almighty and most present Power, which ties our punishment to our sins as a people."*

* It is with gladness and gratitude, beyond utterance, says the *North Carolina Presbyterian* of August 17th, that we have read the subjoined letter, just received from one of the divisions of the army of the Potomac. Its writer is an officer of Capt. Mallet's company, of the Third Regiment North Carolina State troops, in camp near Acquia Creek, Virginia. "H" is not, we believe, himself a member of the Church; but our readers will agree with us that he could not have written thus had he not felt a deep interest in the subject of religion; while his evident sympathy with the soldiers of his command is most creditable to him as an officer and a man. May he, too, become a subject of that Divine Grace, of whose work in the hearts of his fellow-soldiers he has hastened to record the earliest manifestations.

"MONDAY MORNING, 4½ o'clock, August 5th, 1861.—I witnessed, last night, one of the most solemn and impressive scenes that I have ever beheld.

"In the open air, with nothing over head but the foliage of the oak and the broad canopy of the heavens, was assembled, just in front of my tent, a large crowd of soldiers for divine worship. David Powell, Third Sergeant in my company, delivered a discourse, which, for simplicity, earnestness, and appropriateness to the occasion, I have seldom heard excelled. He spoke to them in that strain which seemed to reach the hearts of his auditory; and, when he had closed his remarks, he asked, while singing the last hymn, all who were anxious about the salvation of their souls, and who desired to be delivered from that thralldom of sin in which Satan had encompassed them, to remain upon their knees, and he would pray for them. This was the most impressive scene of all—when, at the conclusion of the singing, some fifteen or twenty of the soldiers (and I am glad to say, many of them from my own company) were seen on bended knees, as if in silent prayer to Almighty God for mercy and for a safe deliverance from all the dangers and temptations that beset the soldier's path. Then were they prayed for by one of the professors of religion present, and I firmly believe that the prayers reached the Throne of Grace, and were acceptable."

The hand of God in this victory, and His powerful providence in shaping all man's ends, rough hewn and ordered by his wisest skill, is manifest, both in the antecedent events and in the battle itself. There is reason to believe that the schemes of neither of the master-spirits that planned the battle were consummated. The Duke of Wellington has recorded as his experience, that, however wisely a General may plan a battle, when once it commences, God takes the controul of events into His own hands, and all man's foresight is baffled and set at naught by new and unexpected exigencies. It was so here. McDowell, as he reports, intended to have made but one attack, and to have made that three days sooner. Beauregard intended, it would seem, to attack, and not await an assault, and then to draw them back within his entrenchments, and surround and cut them off.

The accomplishment of McDowell's object was defeated by waiting for Patterson's reinforcements, and the unintended battle and retreat of Bull's Run, on Thursday. Had he been reinforced, and appeared at Manassas on Thursday or Friday, Beauregard would not have had one-half his army—would probably have been overwhelmed by an overpowering force. God, therefore, interposed to secure delay; to delude Patterson into tardiness; to give expedition and success to Johnston's retreat and conjunction at Manassas; to bring into the field at successive periods of the day Beauregard's reinforcements, so as to give the appearance of fresh reserves and of illimitable numbers; to enable Beauregard to delay the final onset and victory—which was really secure at one o'clock—until he was fully prepared to realize all its benefits in a total rout, capture, and spoils.

And who but God caused such an unnecessary, inexcusable, and total panic, rout, and abandonment of military stores, to the value of some million and a-half of dollars? This is argued by all the Federal Generals and specta-

tors, including Dr. Russell, to have been entirely unnecessary and unjustifiable by any thing that had occurred, and is wholly inexplicable upon any of the numerous absurd pretexts assigned for it, since, as our enemies declare, they had, up till then, driven us back and beaten us at every point, not knowing that this falling back of our forces was a part of our strategy. We are, therefore, compelled to recognize in this panic the consummation of all God's previous providential preparations, as when of old he scattered the Assyrians and Midianites, and to ascribe salvation and triumphant victory to the Lord.

Let us accept this war as a just judgment upon our ungodly land; as a call to repentance, faith, and prayer; as a test of religious principle and moral fortitude; as a development of Southern national unity; as a baptism of blood for the consecration of this new Republic; and as a means for reformation of manners, and revival of religion.

Let us recognize His providence and favorable goodness in this victory. "The horse is prepared against the day of battle, but victory is of the Lord"—(Prov. 28 : 31). Let not our spirit be that of Julius Cæsar: "I came, I saw, I conquered;" but, in the spirit which led John Sobieski, after his triumph over the Turks, to say, "I came, I saw, God conquered." "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will remember the name of the Lord our God." "Our fathers trusted in Thee, and Thou didst deliver them." Let us say, with His people of old:

"The Lord wrought a great victory that day."

"Wherefore David blessed the Lord before all the congregation: and David said, Blessed be thou, Lord God of Israel, our father, for ever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thy hand is

power and might; and in thy hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all. Now, therefore, our God, we thank thee, and praise thy glorious name.”

“O sing unto the Lord a new song: for he hath done marvellous things: his right hand, and his holy arm, hath gotten him the victory. The Lord hath made known his salvation: his righteousness hath he openly shewed in the sight of the heathen. He hath remembered his mercy and his truth toward the house of Israel: all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God. Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all the earth: make a loud noise, and rejoice, and sing praise. Sing unto the Lord with the harp; with the harp, and the voice of a psalm. With trumpets and sound of cornet make a joyful noise before the Lord, the King. Let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. Let the floods clap their hands: let the hills be joyful together before the Lord; for he cometh to judge the earth: with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity.”

“Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto the Lord, and spake, saying, I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea. The Lord is my strength and song, and he is become my salvation: he is my God, and I will prepare him an habitation; my father's God, and I will exalt him. The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is his name.” “The enemy said, I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil; my lust shall be satisfied upon them; I will draw my sword; mine hand shall destroy them. Thou didst blow with thy wind, the sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters.” “Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously.”

ARTICLE VI.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA.

As the ancient Israelite walked about Zion, beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth—marked well her bulwarks, and considered her palaces, that he might tell it to the generations following—so, with conscious pride, we have been accustomed to speak of the glory of our undivided Church, extending from the ice-fields on the North to the orange-groves in the South, and reaching from the Atlantic ocean to the Pacific, with Presbyteries and Churches in all lands—insomuch that the peals of her Sabbath morning bells, following the chariot wheels of the sun, echoed around the whole earth! Was it not a venial weakness to boast of such a Church, which, like the oak, with centuries upon its boughs, had resisted many a storm, and stood proudly erect in defiance of the raging elements of discord that had sundered nearly all other Churches in the land? But God, in His mysterious providence, had decreed that we, too, should be divided in twain: not by any discordant elements within our own bosom, nor by any intrinsic defect of our ecclesiastical system or Church polity, but by the parting asunder of the State, whose inevitable separation our Church, no doubt, like the girding bands around the ship that Paul was in, retarded. But, as the heaving earthquake snaps asunder rocks and mountains, and even continents, so the resistless upheavings of the State, which has severed our majestic empire into two, has carried with it all other interests, political, commercial, social, educational, and religious: so that the division of the great Presbyterian Church was absolutely unavoidable. The “Spring resolutions,” adopted

by the Philadelphia Assembly, did not divide the Church. But, strange to tell, (and here we see the finger of God manifestly,) those resolutions served, like President Lincoln's war proclamation, to make a unit of the South! But for that action, there were many (and who could blame them?) that would still have been loath to take final leave of a Church so dearly beloved; some, who had kindred and loved ones there; some, who had often taken sweet counsel with pious and congenial spirits there; some, who had sat at the feet of revered instructors there; and some, amongst whom we number ourselves, who felt proud at the greatness and majesty of the wide-extended and undivided Church! Such would have been slow in taking the necessary steps to a separate organization: and with many a pang, and many a bitter tear, they would have finally cut the last connecting cord that bound them to the mother Church. With their harps hung upon the willows, their sad lament would have been: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning—if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth—if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." But those "Spring resolutions," so unnecessary in fact, so much in defiance of all sound reason, so contrary to wise policy, (according to man's wisdom,) and in open violation of the Constitution of the Church, God, as it would seem, permitted to be discussed with such an *animus*, and passed by such a majority, for the sole purpose of making an instantaneous unit of the Southern Churches! So that, without a murmuring word, a jarring sound, or a lingering thought, the entire Confederate Church moved, simultaneously, and with one accord, to the organization of a new Assembly, and the fulfilment of a new destiny. Let us "stand still and consider the wonderful works of God!"

Never was there an Assembly looked forward to with more intense interest than that which was recently organized in the city of Augusta, Georgia, on Wednesday, the

fourth day of December, 1861. For months previously, it was the subject of thought, conversation, and newspaper articles. Every ministerial delegate throughout the entire Confederacy, extending from the borders of Maryland to the remotest bounds of Texas and the Indian Territory, was there. The deficiency, which was comparatively small, was in the Eldership from the South-Western portions of the Church. As an illustration of the unusual interest felt in the assembling of this body, we would mention, amongst other facts of similar significancy, that a Judge, of Tennessee, suspended his Courts in order that he might attend the body as an Elder. Another distinguished Judge, of Florida, obtained permission from the Legislature, as we are informed, to postpone his Court, that he might take his seat in the Assembly. And still another honorable gentleman, of North Carolina, declined being a candidate for a high and responsible post, to which he was certain to have been elected, had he consented to let his name go before the people, since the duties of that post would have required him to be in the city of Richmond at the same time that the Assembly was organized at Augusta, and he preferred taking a place in the courts at the Lord's house, to a seat in the Electoral College at the Capitol.

There were but few young men in that body. The average age of the Commissioners was over fifty years. The Assembly was composed, for the most part, of those who had, in some way, received the confidence of the Church and of their fellow-men, such as Moderators of former Assemblies, Presidents and Professors in Colleges, Teachers in Theological Seminaries, former Secretaries of the Boards of the Church, authors, editors, and faithful pastors, besides physicians, statesmen, judges, and jurists of high distinction. There were, in the body, three former Moderators of the old Assembly, viz: Dr. James H. Thornwell, Dr. Aaron W. Leland, and Dr. Francis McFarland. The Ruling Eldership was remarkable for its distinguished

ability, and rendered important, nay, indispensable, services in the proceedings of the Assembly. Amongst this portion of the membership, we can not forbear the mention of the name of the venerable and honorable Chancellor Job Johnston, now one of the Supreme Judges of the State of South Carolina, to whose opinions on all subjects, but especially those of parliamentary order, of charters, and of all legal questions, the Assembly paid the most marked respect; and those of Judge Wm. A. Forward, of Florida, Judge J. G. Shepherd, of North Carolina, Judge J. T. Swayne, of Tennessee, Hons. W. S. Mitchell, of Georgia, Wm. P. Webb, of Alabama, Thos. C. Perrin, and Wm. P. Finley, of South Carolina, and Dr. J. H. Dickson, of North Carolina. These Elders, and many others that we might mention, were most valuable components of the body. And it may not be improper to state, in this historical sketch, that, aside from the regular members of the body, there were other distinguished Divines in attendance, as visitors, whose valuable counsel was not unappreciated in the deliberations of the House. Indeed, we hesitate not to say that, for wisdom, talent, learning, piety, and rich experience, the Assembly, as a whole, was a most august body of men, for which the Church might well be humbly thankful. *

The style of the deliberations of such a body may be easily inferred from its character. The business, which

* An esteemed brother of the Assembly took pains to ascertain the various descent of the members of the body. His investigations resulted in the discovery of the following facts, which, as a matter of curiosity, we give, as follows, viz: There were in the body ninety-three members, fifty-three Teaching, and thirty-eight Ruling Elders. Of the latter, twenty were Scotch-Irish, nine English, (not one Puritan), six Scotch, and three Huguenots. Of the fifty-five Preachers, twenty-eight were Scotch-Irish, eighteen English, (nine Puritans), five Scotch, two Huguenots, and two German Reformed. Of the thirty-eight Ruling Elders, fifteen were farmers (or planters), twelve lawyers, four merchants, three physicians, two teachers, one mechanic, and one banker.

extended through eleven days, was marked by earnest discussion. Each member seemed to feel resting upon him a solemn and weighty responsibility. There were no set speeches. Truth, and only truth, was clearly the object of every debater. Consequently, the remarks of members were, for the most part, animated, short, and to the point. The Moderator's work was comparatively easy. He rarely, if ever, had occasion to call a member to order. No papers were ruthlessly "laid on the table," in order to get rid of them. The inexorable "previous question" was not passed on a single occasion, nor was it called for more than once, so far as we recollect, and then was not sustained by the House; nor was there any "unfinished business" postponed to the next Assembly. Although it would have been a miracle if the delegates, coming up from twelve States and territories, and from extremes nearly two thousand miles apart, had all seen exactly eye to eye, in all things, yet the proceedings were characterized by a most delightful, indeed, wonderful, harmony. It was emphatically a feast of love. How vividly did we realize the truth and the spirit of that precious song of David: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments. As the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion; for there the Lord commandeth the blessing, even life for ever more."

At the appointed time, the Commissioners all being assembled in the First Presbyterian Church, a marked and deep solemnity visibly pervading the entire body, the Rev. John W. Waddel, D. D., of the Presbytery of Memphis, arose and said: "It will not, I trust, be regarded as an unwarrantable liberty in me, inasmuch as I have been one of the Committee to receive the commissions of the Commissioners appointed to the General Assembly of the

Church in the Confederate States of America, to rise, for the purpose of proposing a presiding officer for the Assembly, under the remarkable circumstances which have assembled us together, and who shall assist in the permanent organization of this Assembly. I nominate, therefore, as a temporary presiding officer, Dr. Francis McFarland, from the Synod of Virginia, Presbytery of Lexington—one every way suited to fill the high office—one venerable and respected, both on account of his age, and his long and valuable services to the Church.”

The nomination was approved by acclamation, and Dr. McFarland took the chair, and said: “I take the chair in obedience to the expressed will of my brethren here assembled. The subject which first occupies our attention is the election of a brother to preach the opening Sermon. It has been extensively circulated, as the wish of the brethren, that the Rev. Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans, should perform this duty, and though it has been stated by the secular papers that I would do so, being the last Moderator present, yet I do not think it at all obligatory upon us to observe this rule; nor do I wish for any thing but that which is perfectly agreeable to you, as it is necessary for us all to proceed with harmony in our organization. I therefore take the liberty to nominate Dr. Palmer to preach the opening Sermon.”

The nomination was sustained unanimously by the House. And, after the preliminary services, Dr. Palmer arose in the pulpit, and said:

“FATHERS AND BROTHERS: This Assembly is convened under circumstances of unusual solemnity, and any one of us might well shrink from the responsibility of uttering the first words which are to be spoken here. I see before me venerable men, whom the Church of God has honoured with the highest mark of her confidence—men venerable for their wisdom, no less than for their age—who should, perhaps, as your organ, speak to-day in the hearing of the

nation, and of the Church. But a providence, which I have had no hand in shaping, seems to have devolved upon me this duty, as delicate as it is solemn. It only remains for me to bespeak your sympathy, and to implore the Divine blessing upon what I may be able to say from the concluding words of the first chapter of Ephesians: "And gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church; which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all."

From these words, the gifted preacher delivered an able and eloquent discourse on the Headship of Christ over the Church. This Sermon the Assembly afterwards ordered to be published in the Appendix to the Minutes.

The Assembly was then constituted, Dr. McFarland still presiding. The roll of the Commissioners being announced by Dr. Waddel, there were found to be present ninety-three members; fifty-five of whom were Ministers, and thirty-eight Elders. Had the roll been complete, there would have been, in all, one hundred and ten members.

There were three nominations for the office of Moderator, viz: the Rev. R. H. Morrison, D. D., of North Carolina; Rev. John N. Waddel, D. D., of Tennessee; and the Rev. Benjamin M. Palmer, D. D., of New Orleans. The Rev. Dr. Morrison said: "It would, indeed, give me pleasure to fulfil any duty that this body might see fit to devolve upon me, but I have been for years in bad health, and could not discharge the duties of the office aright: I therefore hope that my name will be withdrawn, inasmuch as there are many men here who are much better qualified for the task than I am."

Dr. Waddel said: "I hope that I, also, may be allowed to withdraw my name, and I move that Dr. Palmer be elected by acclamation."

Dr. Palmer was then unanimously elected, and, after being conducted to the Moderator's chair, by Drs. Thornwell and Waddel—appointed for that purpose—before taking his seat, he said: "I should have a heart, brethren,

hard to be moved, if I were not penetrated by a sense of your kindness—a kindness twice manifested to me to-day. Under other circumstances, I should ascend to the duties of this Chair with extreme embarrassment, for I am bound to say, that I have but a very slight acquaintance with parliamentary rules and principles, with the forms of proceeding, even in our own Church. It will not surprise me if I am compelled to throw myself upon the charity of my brethren. It shall be my attempt to preside with firmness, kindness, and impartiality, and I shall throw myself upon the kindness of this body for any errors I may commit. I trust that we may enjoy, in an unusual degree, the outpouring of God's Spirit, and that we may labour with earnestness to cause our Church to enter vigorously upon the great work that God has set for it."

The Assembly then proceeded to elect its officers, both temporary and permanent. The Rev. D. McNeill Turner, D. D., of South Carolina, was chosen Temporary Clerk; the Rev. John W. Waddel, D. D., of Tennessee, Stated Clerk; and the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., of Georgia, Permanent Clerk of the Assembly.

The body now being completely organized and equipped for business, the first thing that came up was a paper introduced by Dr. Thornwell, who said: "It seems to me that now is as proper a time as we can select for a very solemn act which we ought to perform. We begin our existence now as an independent Presbyterian Church; we now constitute a formal bond of union between all those Presbyteries and Synods formerly under the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, within the limits of the Confederate States. Our Presbyteries have severally expressed their deference to that system of faith and government held by that Church, and our Synods have done the same. But I think that this Assembly should adopt the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Forms of Discipline and Worship, and

thus have a basis upon which we can proceed. I therefore beg leave to offer the following resolutions;" which, after some discussion, were slightly amended, and are as follows, viz :

Resolved, That the style and title of this Church shall be *the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.*

Resolved, That this Assembly solemnly declare, in conformity with the unanimous decisions of our Presbyteries, that the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship, which together make up the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, are the Constitution of this Church, only substituting the term "Confederate" States for "United" States.

The Moderator, in due time, announced the Committees usually appointed on such occasions. But, in the present instance, more than ordinary interest was felt in the Committees, since their work was not simply to review what had been done by the Assembly's Boards during the past year, as heretofore; but to remodel, reconstruct, and build anew the various agencies by means of which the Assembly was to prosecute its general schemes of benevolence. This was especially true of what may be termed the prime Committees, viz :

I. On Bills and Overtures—Of which the Rev. Francis McFarland, D. D., was the Chairman.

II. On Judicial Business—Rev. R. H. Morrison, D. D., Chairman.

III. On Theological Seminaries—Rev. Peyton Harrison, Chairman.

IV. On Foreign Missions—Rev. James B. Ramsay, D. D., Chairman.

V. On Domestic Missions—Rev. C. C. Jones, D. D., Chairman.

VI. On Education—Rev. Drury Lacy, D. D., Chairman.

VII. On Publication—Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D., Chairman.

VIII. On Church Extension—Rev. R. W. Bailey, D. D., Chairman.

IX. On Systematic Benevolence—Rev. John B. Adger, D. D., Chairman.

X. On the Narrative of Religion—Rev. Aaron W. Leland, D. D., Chairman.

XI. On Foreign Correspondence—Rev. Theodoric Pryor, D. D., Chairman.

An animated and rather protracted debate sprung up, in the early part of the second day's proceedings, relative to the exact ecclesiastical *status* of the Presbytery of the Potomac, of late in connexion with the Synod of Baltimore. The Rev. Dr. John H. Boccock, and others, claimed that that Presbytery should be entered upon the roll as belonging to the Synod of Baltimore, which still holds its connexion with the old Assembly. They urged that the Synod of Baltimore, although still in actual connexion with the Northern Assembly, was, nevertheless, in sympathy and feeling with us, and that, no doubt, so soon as Maryland was free to choose, she would join the Confederacy; and that the Synod of Baltimore, or, at all events, a majority of its Presbyteries, would, in like manner, declare for the Confederate Church. They feared that refusing to enroll the Synod of Baltimore might be construed as evidence of a want of due sympathy for the brethren there, whilst enrolling it, would not only evince our kindly feeling, but be prophetic of what would, in due time, doubtless, take place. Whilst, on the other hand, it was maintained that the Presbytery of the Potomac, in seceding from the Northern Church, did, *de facto*, and of necessity, secede from the Synod of Baltimore, which still adheres to that Church, as the less is contained in the greater; and that, however much this Assembly sympathizes with the brethren belonging to the Synod of Baltimore, and looks forward with pleasure to

the time when they should be component parts of our own body, yet there was a manifest impropriety in enrolling that Synod as belonging to us, when, in fact, it belonged to the other body. "Suppose," said one of the speakers, "that your Presbytery, instead of coming to us, had gone to the Cumberland Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Methodists, or the Episcopalians, and should still claim their relation to the Synod of Baltimore, would it not be preposterous? Now, I ask if coming to us is not precisely the same thing? Are we not just as separate from the old Assembly as they are? I do not see how it is possible to belong to both Assemblies at the same time." The matter was then referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, who reported a minute, which was adopted, and which was to the effect that the Clerk, in making out the roll, should enroll the Presbyteries of Winchester and of the Potomac, not as belonging to the Synod of Baltimore, but as "heretofore in connexion with the Synod of Baltimore."

At an early stage of the proceedings of the body, Dr. Thornwell offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted, viz :

Resolved, That a Committee, consisting of one Minister and one Elder from each of the Synods belonging to this Assembly, be appointed to prepare an address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ through the earth, setting forth the causes of our separation from the Church in the United States, our attitude in relation to slavery, and a general view of the policy which, as a Church, we intend to pursue.

In obedience to this resolution, the Moderator appointed the following members of the Assembly on said Committee :

Ministers.—James H. Thornwell, D. D., Theodoric Pryor, D. D., F. K. Nash, R. McInnis, C. C. Jones, D. D., R. B. White, D. D., Professor W. D. Moore, James A. Gillespie, John L. Boozer, R. W. Bailey, D. D.

Elders.—J. D. Armstrong, Charles Phillips, Joseph A. Brooks, W. P. Finley, Samuel McCorkle, William P.

Webb, William C. Black, T. L. Dunlap, and E. W. Wright.

This Committee, some days after their appointment, reported, through their Chairman, the Rev. Dr. Thornwell, "An Address to the Churches," etc., which was listened to by the entire body, with evident and profound sensation, and was not only unanimously adopted, but, on motion of A. W. Putnam, afterwards amended by William P. Webb, the original document was ordered to "be filed in the archives of the Assembly, and that a paper be attached thereto, to be signed by the Moderator and members of this Assembly"—which was in due form done.

"This able and remarkably powerful address contained a valuable exposition of the position of the Southern Church, its reasons for secession from the Northern Assembly, and its position, especially in regard to slavery. But this argument is one which can not be condensed. Every line is important, to show the connexion of the argument—every word is full of meaning. We will not, therefore, attempt to give a sketch of it." The Assembly ordered the Stated Clerk to print three thousand copies of the Address for general circulation.

In the morning of the third day's proceedings, the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, Secretary of the Provisional Committee of Foreign Missions, presented the Committee's report of what they had done since the separation of the Southern Presbyteries from the old Assembly. From this report, it appears that, although "in relation to the Foreign Missionary work, our people had neither the disposition nor the facilities for further coöperation with their Northern brethren, they were not unmindful, however, of their obligations to the Great Head of the Church. They were willing to sustain their full share of the common burthen, and, in the providence of God, this was assigned them, in connexion with the care of the Indian Mission, and in the support of such Missionaries, in the more remote field, as

had gone from the South. At the same time, the Indian Missions were cut off from all further connexion with the Board at New York, and would have been entirely broken up, if some speedy and suitable provision had not been made for sustaining and carrying them on. The Committee proposed nothing more than to sustain and take the controul of these Missions, and, also, provide for the support of the Missionaries above referred to, until such time as the Church should organize, and take the whole matter into their own hands."

Dr. Wilson also made a report of his visit to the Indian Missions. "There are five large, and a few small tribes in the Indian country, viz: the Choctaws, Cherokees, Creeks, Seminoles, and Chickasaws, besides the Osages, Shawnees, Camanches, etc., numbering in all about one hundred thousand souls. Each particular tribe has a Chief and Common Council, like the States. They were formerly under the protectorate of the United States, but are now about to form a compact with the Confederacy." "There were eight boarding-schools, containing about five hundred scholars—these schools being supported partly by the Missionary Board, and partly by the Indian fund. To carry on this Mission, about twenty thousand dollars will be needed, and it is to be hoped that the Church will take this subject into their earnest consideration. The condition of these Missions is very interesting, and certainly improved. There are now over *fourteen hundred* communicants in the churches."

It is with deep and pleasing interest we look forward to the not very distant day when the Indian territory shall become one of these Confederate States, and when the red man shall legitimately claim his seat, not only in our Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, but also in our Legislative Halls and Senate Chambers. This desirable consummation can be brought about only by evangelical influences. The Gospel is the most efficient of all the

forerunners of civilization. Hence, it is not only a dictate of Christian charity, but of political wisdom, to give liberally to the cause of Indian Missions. To evangelize the red man on our Western border, and the black man in the midst of us, seems, in the providence of God, to be the peculiar mission and high privilege of the Confederate Church and States. And if such be the fact, which we doubt not, have we not reason to adore the goodness and wisdom of the wonderful providence of God in the extraordinary trials through which the nation is now passing!

These missionary exercises, which were so encouraging and gratifying to the Assembly, were immediately followed by others scarcely less interesting, viz: the address of the Rev. Henry Quigg, Delegate from the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, and the reply of the Moderator. The eloquent and stirring discourse of the Delegate was listened to by the House with thrilling interest. In the course of his remarks the speaker, in presenting a summary view of the extent and strength of the Synod which he represented, said: "We have nine Presbyteries, and some seventy Ministers, zealously engaged in the discharge of the duties of their proper functions. We have upwards of one hundred churches and five thousand communicants. Sabbath Schools are established in connexion with nearly, if not quite, all our churches; and in those churches space is usually set apart for the accommodation of our coloured fellow-men, whom God, in His providence, has placed under our protection. Some of our Pastors have displayed a commendable zeal in the in-gathering and instruction of this element in our population. We have two institutions located in South Carolina, one literary, the other theological, established and controlled by our Synod, and both manned by faithful and efficient professors. Hitherto, these institutions have been prosperous, beyond the most sanguine expectations of the founders; indeed, under the smiles of a fostering Providence, they have been as founts from

whence streams have issued to made glad the city of our God. We have several probationers engaged in the work of faith and labour of love through the vacancies and sparsely settled sections of the South-Western States. Our churches, it will be seen, are widely scattered over a broad area—the field occupied being, I may say, coextensive with the Southern States.” * * * *

“We can now sympathize with each other more fully and freely, and feel the ties of love, religion, and patriotism binding us more closely in a common brotherhood. We are one in blood; one in the heritage of a glorious ancestry; one in resistance to tyranny and error, whether ecclesiastical, or political, or both; one in faith; one in doctrine; and substantially one in practice; and hence, for the body that I represent, and for myself, personally, I extend to you the warmest greetings of my nature.

“Nay, indulge me further: Since God, in His providence, has severed the ties which bound you to the North; now that you are cut off from all external affiliation with her, for substantially the same reason with ourselves; since we are both called to labour in the same field, and are both fighting the battles of the Lord against infidelity, fanaticism, and tyranny; engaged in the same warfare, both with carnal and spiritual weapons; both reduced to similar straits, and drawn towards each other by the softening, conforming influences emanating from a common adversity, and being exercised by a sanctified affliction, and thereby drawn nearer to the centre, Jesus, and nearer and nearer one another; may we not indulge the fond hope that the set time to favour our beloved Zion has come, and that the King and Head of the Church, who makes the wrath of man to praise Him, and places wars and revolutions, and the counsels of rulers, and the debates of Senates, under tribute to the advancement and exaltation of His kingdom, has determined that at this historic period, while the nation stands amazed at the wonderful developements of Provi-

dence in obliterating past party asperities, and harmonizing public sentiment, while our sympathies, our piety, and our patriotism, all burn and glow to a white heat, we should be indissolubly *welded* together. As in Australia, Ireland, and the British Provinces, may we not be united, as Presbyterians, in solid phalanx, and go forth with a momentum commensurate with our numbers and resources, overturning every obstacle that should oppose the progress of Messiah's kingdom, conquering and to conquer—the last victory eclipsing the first in the splendour of its achievement. Could this object, to which earnest allusion has been recently made by so many of your Church Sessions, Presbyteries, and at least one Synod, be attained, on a satisfactory and an equitable basis, it would, indeed, be a delightful consummation, and one, I believe, that, to the hearts of many in the Church I represent, would send a thrill of joy. These remarks, it will be understood, are entirely unofficial. But, let me say, whether we are organically united or no, let us at least be united in the bonds of Christian affection; and, while in separate spheres we stand up manfully for Christ and His crown, let us, also, stand up to one another, hand to hand, shoulder to shoulder, and heart to heart."

Dr. Palmer, the Moderator, replied:

"This Assembly extends to you, sir, and the Church which you represent, a reciprocal and cordial greeting. The Presbyterian Church has always had the strongest attachment to that common standard of faith and order to which you have alluded—that system, in devotion to which, and for the preservation of which, we have been called to go through many trials, and sufferings, and afflictions. But along with this fervent attachment to the truth, as set forth in our Constitution, we have ever desired to cherish a large affection to all the branches of the Church of God, and to none more cordially than to that which you represent. You are of our family, and we of yours. We

VOL. XIV., NO. IV.—81

are sprung from a common ancestry; we have the same historic memories; we have had the same conflicts for the truth, and the Church of God. We dwell in the same house, and sit around the same board. We are bound together by the strongest cords of affection and love. Every sentiment expressed by you finds an echo in the breast of every member here. What you have expressed as a wish, and unofficially, may, I trust, turn out a prophecy. May we see the purpose of God in all these political overturnings, in bringing together, in one common body, those who have been too long separated by differences which Christian charity may enable us to overleap; so that, with one heart and one mind, we may labour to increase the Redeemer's kingdom. Bear with you, to the Church which you represent, the cordial salutations of this Assembly."

The venerable Dr. Francis McFarland, in a few pertinent remarks, expressed, no doubt, the sentiment of every member of the Assembly, when he said: "I do trust that the time is coming when we shall no longer be numerically two bodies, for there are very few things which keep us apart, and I know that there is a strong leaning, on both sides, to union. But we must not be pressed together. Let us rather be drawn by the cords of love. I, for one, thank the brother for his kind address."

The Rev. Dr. R. B. McMullen, the Chairman of a large Committee, to whom was referred a paper offered by Judge J. T. Swayne, for the closer union and communion of Christians, presented, at a subsequent stage of the proceedings, a report, which, being amended, was adopted, and from which the following extract is pertinent in this connexion:

To the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, who have several times heretofore conferred with us, and who have so kindly and fraternally greeted us on the present occasion, the Assembly feels drawn with the strongest cords of brotherly love. Theirs is a precious ancestry, who gave a noble testimony for the truth, lifting up a glorious banner against error, and battling faithfully for

Christ and His crown. Towards them our hearts go out in cordial affection, and the Assembly feels that, in the present afflicting circumstances that surround both denominations, no ordinary difficulties should be allowed to keep them asunder. Both have the same faith and polity; the same heavenly Father, and precious Jesus, and Holy Comforter; with one heart, and one hope, bearing substantially the same name, contending against the same enemy, and having the same symbols. Why, then, should they compose two denominations?

In regard to psalmody, which separates us, this Assembly already have fifty-two of the psalms used by the Associate Reformed Church in our book of praise, and now propose that, when another edition is published, which must of necessity be at an early day, they will publish the entire one hundred and fifty psalms in the beginning of the book, if that will be satisfactory to this sister Church. This will bring both bodies nearer to the practice of the good old mother Church of Scotland and Ireland, from which both Churches have descended, as she uses the one hundred and fifty psalms, together with paraphrases and hymns.

This Assembly now cordially greets her sister, and makes her this offer of amity and union. And that the subject may be brought to the consideration of the entire body as soon as practicable, the Stated Clerk of this Assembly is hereby directed to forward a copy of this paper to the Stated Clerk of each Presbytery of the Associate Reformed Church, at an early day.

We would here conclude, in this historical review, all we have to say on this very important subject of Christian union and communion, by inserting the report of the Rev. Dr. Theodoric Pryor, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence:

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, appreciating the precious import of that memorable prayer, addressed by the adorable Redeemer to the Father, in full view of the agony, the Garden, and the Cross—"That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may also be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me"—and, impelled by a sincere desire to meet the full measure of responsibility which devolves upon us, as a branch of Christ's visible Church, in the accomplishment of this vastly important petition, would most earnestly endeavour to draw closer the bonds of Christian intercourse and communion between all Churches, of like faith and order with ourselves, in the Confederate States. This Assembly, therefore, affectionately solicits fraternal correspondence with the following Churches, to wit: The Associate Reformed Synod of the South; the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church; the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church; the Congregation

of Independent Presbyterians, and the German Reformed Church. And in order to consummate this, our Christian purpose and desire, the Assembly will, at its present session, appoint and commission delegates to the aforesaid Churches, with full power and authority to arrange and adopt articles of permanent intercourse and correspondence; which articles, however, shall be submitted to the Assembly for its ratification or rejection.

On motion to adopt the report, the Hon. Chancellor Johnston moved that the "Evangelical Lutheran Church of South Carolina and adjacent States" be inserted in the list of Churches to which this Assembly will send delegates. This gave rise to a discussion on the true nature of Christian communion. The views finally acquiesced in by the body seemed to be those expressed by Dr. Thornwell, as follows:

"There are two kinds of communion. *First*, Christian communion: communion between saints, and the communion of saints with Christ, their Master. This Church has always acknowledged this sort of communion with those who acknowledged Christ as their Lord and Master—as the Saviour of sinners, and one of the persons in the adorable Trinity. I am astonished to hear it intimated that we hold at arms' length any who think thus of Jesus. I have always admitted to the Lord's Table, Methodists, Baptists—all who admit the doctrine of the Trinity—and, if that is not Christian communion, I am utterly at a loss to conceive what Christian communion is. Our Church does not propose to take any new step on this subject, and if you pass a law to that effect, you will seem to imply that heretofore you have not admitted them.

"Now, there is a *second* kind of communion—that is, in the courts of the Church. These courts are not designed to express love to the Master—our spiritual communion and fellowship; but these courts are intended for the government of the Church; as rulers, they meet together for the purpose of deliberating and investigating the various questions before them, and of deciding what is in accord-

ance with the word of God. Into this ecclesiastical communion, we invite those who sympathize with us in the general measures for the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; those who agree with us as to the great principles on which the Church should be administered. It seems to me, therefore, preposterous to invite into this communion those who differ from us *toto cælo*. Christian communion is as broad and free in our Church as any man on the face of the earth could desire it. But, as far as ecclesiastical union is concerned, you defeat the very object you have in view, as soon as you entertain a number of heterogeneous faiths and orders. Again, there is another important consideration for us. We are now going forth, in our separate and independent organization, as a new Church. We are, so to speak, strangers, who now first make their appearance. In our Address to the Churches, we have made our bow, and invited ecclesiastical communion with us of those of the same faith as ourselves. The *onus* of accepting or rejecting rests with them. I think we are perfectly right in taking the action of the last Assembly as our precedent in regard to this matter. Our disruption with that Assembly is not a disruption of our ecclesiastical communion with those Churches; and I submit, that this is as far as we can go with any propriety. It would not be consistent with our position to do any thing more. Take up the subject where the last Assembly left it, and follow it out, as our changed circumstances permit. But let us not confound our ecclesiastical with our Christian relations. It is only Presbyterians that we can consistently invite to take part in our discussions and deliberations; and it would be an insult to invite any one to take part with you, when they believed you to be unscriptural in your views and doctrines." The report was adopted, without the amendment proposed by Chancellor Johnston.

It seems to us exceedingly desirable, at this peculiar crisis in both our national and ecclesiastical history, when old things are passing away; when both Church and State are, as it were, bursting their old shells, and casting them off, in order that they may assume new ones, of larger dimensions, and better suited to the progress of knowledge and humanity; and, on taking a new start in the career of usefulness and high attainments, that all Christians of like faith and practice should "*close up*," to use the language of the Rev. Dr. Foote, "shoulder to shoulder, in an unbroken column, in order that our charge upon the enemies of truth and righteousness, in every form and shape, may be irresistible!" Why should we stand upon technicalities or punctilios? Are not these trifles in comparison with union, which is strength? And yet union, without implicit confidence, is union only in form—it is no union—it is worse than no union; instead of adding strength, it only becomes an element of weakness. Let all true Presbyterians, therefore, become one body, but one in a way that will remove all suspicion, and beget the most hearty confidence, without which the so-called union would be a curse, rather than a blessing.

In obedience to the recommendation contained in the report, the Assembly appointed the following Corresponding Delegates, viz:

To the Associate Reformed Synod of the South—The Rev. David Wills, principal; and the Rev. D. McNeill Turner, D. D., alternate.

To the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church—The Rev. G. D. Armstrong, D. D., principal; and the Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D., alternate.

To the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church—The Rev. R. B. McMullen, D. D., principal; and the Rev. John Hunter, alternate.

To the Convention of Independent Presbyterians—The Rev. Wm. Banks, principal; and the Rev. A. A. James, alternate.

To the German Reformed Church—The Rev. Dr. R. H. Morrison, principal; and the Rev. D. A. Penick, alternate.

There were two days during the Sessions of the Assembly that were termed, *par excellence*, the “Lawyers’ days,” as the subjects of discussion on those days were such as to draw out the legal skill and learning of several of the Ruling Elders in the body. And in nothing was the excellence of our Church polity, which provides for such an element in all our Church courts, more clearly demonstrated than in the discussions that took place on the occasions referred to. The one was, the debate that arose on the offering of the following resolution by Rev. R. McInnis:

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed, and instructed to take the proper steps to secure a legal title to all property within the Confederate States to which, in their judgment, the Presbyterian Church in these States possess an equitable claim.

The other was, the discussion that took place, in a subsequent stage of the proceedings, on the adoption of the report of the Committee on Charters. It was manifest to every one, that the aid rendered, on these occasions, by the legal gentlemen on the floor, was absolutely indispensable to the successful action of the House. The truth is, that although the Church is, and ought to be, entirely separate from the world, yet, at the same time, it is conterminous with the world; and, accordingly, the polity of our Church admits into its official management men who are acquainted, as it were, with the landmarks separating the Church from the world.

The Church, being “the body of Christ,” is the representative of Christ on the earth. And as Christ, whilst on the earth, went about doing good, and preaching the Gospel, so the true mission of the organized Church in the

world is to spread the Gospel, until the whole world is evangelized. Consequently, the organized Church is not simply a fold, into which the people of God are to be gathered, for their individual comfort and safety; nor yet a stronghold, a fortress, to which they may fly for protection; but it is, also, and mainly, an aggressive agency—a barracks of soldiers, and of the munitions of war, from whose gates invading armies are to issue, covered with the Gospel panoply, and go forth, conquering and to conquer. “Ye are the light of the world;” “ye are the salt of the earth; a city set on a hill, that can not be hid;” a light upon a candle-stick, that “giveth light to all that are in the house;” “leaven,” to diffuse itself throughout the whole world. As the individual member of Christ’s kingdom can not fold his hands and sit still, no more can the Church. The true mission, therefore, of the organized and visible Church is, to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. Accordingly, the Assembly seemed to regard the organization, and the setting in operation evangelical agencies for the diffusion of religious truth, and the spread of the Gospel amongst men, as its great work. The reconstruction of our Missionary and benevolent schemes engaged the early and earnest attention of the body. By common consent, the old system of “Boards” was abandoned. They never served any other purpose than that of being a kind of “upper room” in the Church—a sort of “Moses’ seat,” to which, in some cases, ambitious and vain men aspired, in order that their names, with their titles, might be published, from year to year, in the reports of the Boards, as the distinguished and titled gentlemen of the Church! They answered no good end, but were productive of evil. They were no honour, and became a disgrace, to religion. The Assembly did not discuss the propriety of readopting them. They were not even mentioned, with the view of reconstructing them. But it was, with entire unanimity, determined to prosecute

the evangelical work of the Church in the simplest and most effective manner possible. Therefore, as the Assembly could not, from the nature of the case, remain always in session, nor meet oftener than once a year, to do its own work, it was resolved to appoint, from year to year, small, efficient "Executive Committees" (*ad interim*) to represent and to do the work of the Assembly—consisting of nine ministers, or other members of the Church, besides a Secretary and Treasurer, all appointed annually by the Assembly. These Committees are to keep a faithful record of all their transactions, which, together with a report of their proceedings, they are to send up each year to the Assembly, for its review and control, as in the case of the Synodical records. The House was unanimous in the construction of these Committees, but not entirely so in their location, and in the manner in which their respective Secretaries should be appointed. There was no difference of opinion as to the location of the Executive Committees of Foreign and Domestic Missions; the seat of the former being Columbia, South Carolina, and the city of New Orleans that of the latter. But there was a decided difference of opinion as to the location of the Executive Committee of Publication. Richmond, Virginia, and Nashville, Tennessee, were both put in nomination. In favour of the former, the main considerations urged were: *First*, That from Richmond books and other publications could be shipped by sea, to the various centres of trade in the Confederacy, cheaper than they could be forwarded by railroad; and, *secondly*, that Richmond, being an older place than Nashville, and surrounded by a denser Presbyterian population, there would never be any difficulty in procuring an efficient and well officered Committee at that place. In favour of Nashville, it was urged: *First*, That the great design of publishing religious books, and other publications, was, that they might, in some degree, serve as a substitute for the living ministry, and, therefore, this evangelical agency should be

placed in the centre of the region where it was most needed. *Secondly*, That the marine insurance, and the greater length of time that would attend transportation by sea, would balance the increased expense of forwarding by rail. And, *thirdly*, and mainly, that Nashville was already a great publishing mart; that it was the seat of the Methodist Book Concern, South, and, also, the seat of the Baptist publishing operations; and that the experience of different trades has long since decided, that it is to the advantage of different crafts to be located in the same immediate vicinity, so as to draw to the same common centre common material, common skill, common capital, labour, competition, etc., etc. But, notwithstanding these potent reasons in favour of Nashville, the Assembly decided, erroneously, we think, in favour of Richmond, by a majority of sixteen votes. We still believe that it would be to the interest of that exceedingly important and responsible arm of the Church, to be yet located at Nashville. The Executive Committee of Education, which, we think, should be located at Richmond, was located at Memphis, Tennessee. And the work of Church extension was, for the present, committed to the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions.

But the manner in which the Secretaries of these several Committees should be appointed—whether by the Assembly, or the Committees themselves—gave occasion to one of the warmest discussions had on the floor of the House. The substance of what was said in favour of the former method was embodied, for the most part, in the remarks of the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, who said: “My convictions of the importance of this officer being elected by the Assembly, are very decided. I think, however, that we are likely to get into a misapprehension of the whole subject at the outset, by definitions. If properly stated, both Secretary and Treasurer would be members of the Committee, and just as much parts of that Committee

as any body else. I hold that there is not an office in the whole Presbyterian Church more responsible or important than the Secretaryship of these Committees—the responsibility of this office is almost too great to be laid on any one man. I know its trials and responsibilities, and such a work ought not to be committed to the hands of individuals. This office is fully as important as that of a Theological Professor in your Seminaries, and I ask you, would you commit the election of this officer to a Committee? Why, then, the election of a man to fill this equally important office? Besides, he ought to be called to this office by the voice of this whole Church, and, unless so called, I don't see how any one can take upon himself such an office. And I would state here, that, after having filled this office for seven or eight years, I came to the conclusion that I could not fill it any longer, because I felt that it was the duty of the Assembly to call me to it, and my duty not to serve unless so called. I think that the voice of the whole Church is necessary to call me to this very important place.”

On the other side, in favour of the Committees electing their own officers, it was maintained: *First*, That, as the Committee was the representative of the Assembly, in fact, as it were a little Assembly (*ad interim*), to transact business in the name and behalf of the Assembly, whilst that body was not, and could not be, in session; that it should have, for the time being, certain specified rights and prerogatives of the larger body, at least so far as the election of its own officers were concerned. This, in the *second* place, would insure homogeneity to the Committee, which was a very important consideration in the operations of all executive bodies, since without this its parts would only clog and embarrass one another. In the *third* place, it would be an effectual safeguard against interruptions in the operations of the Committee from one meeting of the Assembly to the other, in case of the non-acceptance of

the Secretary elect, or of his resignation, failure of health, death, or other cause, since the Committee could immediately fill the vacancy. There would be a reasonable guarantee of permanency in the office so filled; as local considerations would induce the Assembly to appoint substantially the same Committee from year to year; and, accordingly, in view of the position being permanent, the best talent and ability available could be obtained by the Committee to fill such vacancy, which might not be the case, if the old Secretary was liable to be dropped, and a new one elected in his place every year. The next Assembly may be of a very different mind from this, and they may come up with their favorite. A king may arise that knows not Joseph—and a new Secretary may be put in office. And so it may, and in all probability will be, from year to year. This may lead to electioneering and log-rolling at every meeting of the Assembly, which will soon result in our best qualified men refusing to be candidates for the office—all which would be, in a great measure, avoided, by leaving the election to the Committees. Again: there is almost a necessity, said the Rev. Mr. Smylie, that the *salary* of the Secretary shall be fixed by the Committee, and this gives the Committee a power equal to a veto power upon the Assembly. Why not, then, make the Committee wholly responsible for the Secretary? Moreover, will it not be invidious to place over the Committee an officer, not of their own choosing, who shall be a kind of Archbishop over, but irresponsible to, them. Nay, will there not be a manifest awkwardness in the working, wheel within wheel, of two separate and independent agencies, neither responsible to the other? It will not do to force a Secretary upon a Committee; instead of facilitating, they would only impede, the operations of one another.

The Rev. R. McInnis “admitted that it might be a pleasant thing to be elected by the whole Church, but that it would

not be so pleasant for a brother nominated for the position of Secretary to have his claims and qualifications canvassed in open Assembly, and his defects or want of fitness for the place published to the world. He thought that it would be a very delicate thing, and that no one would feel free to canvass the qualifications of a nominee. This might be done by the Committee, and they, feeling the importance of an efficient Secretary, and being responsible to the Assembly for their fidelity, would be far more likely to make a wise and judicious choice; and if they are to be held, as they are, responsible to this body, they should have the privilege of selecting this officer. The Assembly might elect, as Secretary, a man of reputation, an able preacher, and yet he might be totally unfit for the duties of the office. It was not talents, but *peculiar* talents—a fitness for the work to be done—that was needed in a Secretary. The Assembly, he contended, could not judge of this as well as the Committee. What could such a body as this know, personally, of the qualifications of almost any one nominated? I need not answer. And, besides, there should be harmony between the Committee and Secretary in their feelings, views, and action. They must work cordially together. Yet this Assembly may not only elect an inefficient Secretary, but one between whom and the Committee there will be no harmony.”

The Assembly, nevertheless, decided, by a small majority, adversely to the Committees being allowed to choose their own officers. The appointment, therefore, of the Secretaries and Treasurers of the several Executive Committees devolves, from year to year, upon the Assembly. Accordingly, they proceeded to elect the Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D., Secretary of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, the Rev. John Leyburn, D. D., Secretary of the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions, the Rev. John H. Gray, D. D., Secretary of Education, and Rev. Wm. Brown, D. D., of Publication—all able and efficient men,

every way qualified to discharge faithfully the delicate and responsible duties committed to them.

The only other subject about which there was a decided difference of opinion, after discussion, related to the manner in which the Church should prosecute its work of Domestic Missions, as set forth in the sixth article of the report of the Standing Committee on that subject, of which the Rev. Dr. C. C. Jones was the Chairman. The debate was on the motion to strike out the article, which reads as follows :

“That Presbyteries be enjoined to raise funds, in the manner most approved by them, for the support of Domestic Missions, and be recommended, in conducting the work within their own bounds, to employ the agency of the Assembly’s Committee for the purpose.”

On this subject, there was more feeling evinced on the part of the speakers than any other. Indeed, it was the only debate in which there was any deep feeling manifested. The discussion was participated in by the Rev. Messrs. Adger, Thornwell, DuBose, Bocoock, McFarland, Lacy, Moore, White, Welch, Pryor, Chapman, Gillespie, McInnis, Houston, Lyon, Stewart, Phillips, Loughridge, and others. The pivot on which the debate turned was, the latter part of the article, viz : And that the Presbyteries “be recommended, in conducting the work within their own bounds, to employ the agency of the Assembly’s Committee for the purpose.” In the course of the debate, Dr. Adger offered the following substitute for the article objected to, which was received with great favour by many, although the Assembly never reached a decisive vote upon it :

Whereas the work of Domestic Missions is a two-fold work, a work within the bounds of our established Presbyteries, and a work also on our frontiers, and in our feeble Presbyteries ; and whereas the former ought to be conducted by every strong and able Presbytery for itself, it being their right and their duty to take care of themselves without

burdening the Assembly's Committee; and whereas the other part of the work of Domestic Missions must be devolved upon the central agency, and carried on through that Committee, by the coöperation of all the Presbyteries; this Assembly does, therefore, enjoin upon all the Presbyteries to aim, not only at overtaking their own destitutions, but also at carrying forward the general and frontier work, by means of the Committee now organized. There ought to be special and constant collections in every Presbytery in aid of this Committee's work, as herein defined. They are charged with the care of all our Missions on the frontier, and also with the duty of aiding all our weak Presbyteries, by means of the contributions of the strong. And it is hereby ordered that all the funds collected for Domestic Missions, whether dispensed by the Presbyteries themselves, or transmitted to the Committee, together with its Missionary operations, be fully and accurately reported by each Presbytery to the General Assembly, through this Committee, and that this report be made in time to be incorporated in the Committee's Report.

In favour of the motion to strike out, and to adopt the substitute, the substance of what was said was embraced in Dr. Adger's remarks, as follows: "There is a principle endangered by this article of the Committee, which many of us consider to be important, and for which we must be allowed to contend. We think those Presbyteries which are strong have not only the right, but it is their duty, to manage for themselves the work of Domestic Missions in their own bounds. At the same time, it is clearly their duty to contribute for its support in the weaker Presbyteries, and on the frontiers. We are very unwilling that you should enjoin it upon the able Presbyteries to do their own peculiar work through this central Committee; but we are equally anxious that you should enjoin upon those strong Presbyteries to take up special and constant collections for that Committee. We desire, not only that these older Presbyteries should send the Committee their *surplus* Domestic Missionary funds (as some of them have always done), but that they should regularly and specifically contribute to the cause, as it is to be carried on upon the frontiers and in the weak Presbyteries, just as they contribute for the cause of Foreign Missions. The true plan for

making Domestic Missions important in the eyes of the people is, to *objectify* it, holding it up before the Presbyteries as some thing *outside of themselves*, just as we do the work of Foreign Missions. Thus shall we *call forth* the charity of the Church. But, on the other hand, there are two objections to the old plan, of requiring the Presbyteries to cultivate their own peculiar field through the agency of this Committee. The one is, that it is bad policy, for people will naturally take a greater interest in their own work than in that of others; and the other is, that it will bring upon the Committee a vast amount of useless office-work, about matters which each Presbytery is more familiar with, and can manage better, than the Committee. Besides these things, it is well known that there was serious opposition excited against the old Board, because it sought to bring the Presbyteries under its power. It said hard things of those who did not carry on their own home-work through its agency. It endeavoured, at Lexington, to have the Assembly declare that every Church and Presbytery must *lose caste* which would not use the agency of the Board. This caused ill feeling and opposition. The Presbyteries thought the Board aimed to swallow them up, as the Government at Washington is trying to swallow up the States. Now, then, as we are beginning a new concern, is it wise to load it down with old difficulties and causes of trouble? Ought we not rather to aim at setting it up free of all causes of odium and prejudice? I speak of these things as a true and earnest friend of the cause of Domestic Missions in every one of our Presbyteries, and in the whole frontier country. We all desire to do that which is best for the cause; and, for one, I fear that if we adopt this sixth article we shall do that cause much harm. Still further: it came to be the settled conviction of many of the best and wisest friends of the old Board (our respected brother, Dr. C. C. Jones, once Secretary of the Board, included), that there is naturally a constant tendency in the churches and Presby-

teries which receive such aid to hang on too long in dependence upon the central Committee. Many churches, Dr. Jones found, when he entered on the office of Secretary, had been sucking the paps of the old Board for twenty years, and could not possibly be shaken off. Now, our paper strikes at this evil. We desire to encourage self-reliance in the Presbyteries. It is the duty of every Presbytery, as it is of every church, to do its own work, if it possibly can. And in no other way can the whole Church ever be brought up to the right standard of action in this matter, until the principle is adopted, and acted on, that each Session and Presbytery must take care of its own field, and must, also, send forth their energies to the weak and the needy who are beyond."

In opposition to striking out, it was argued that the Church was a unit—that the General Assembly, *mutatis mutandis*, was only a big Presbytery, and that the Presbytery was a little General Assembly—that each one of the several Executive Committees represented the Church—the whole Church—that they were, as it were, miniature Assemblies (*ad interim*), to do the work of the Assembly proper; and, that, therefore, the very genius and spirit of our Church polity required unity of action in all our schemes*—that, as the whole Church acted, at least, *pro*

* With reference to the genius and spirit of our polity, it may be observed that, undoubtedly, the principle pervades our whole Constitution, that the higher Courts are not to engage in doing any thing which the Courts below can do as well. The higher Courts have, essentially, all the powers which belong to any of the lower Courts; but the Constitution provides that whatever the lower Courts can themselves do perfectly well, shall be done by them, and that only that which they can not so well attend to, shall devolve upon the Courts above. Thus, the Session takes the oversight of the affairs of its own church, and the Presbytery does not meddle with those matters, except in the way of review. And thus the Synod leaves each Presbytery to review the proceedings of its own Sessions, and to examine, license, ordain, judge, and depose its own Ministers, and, also, to unite or divide congregations, at the request of the people,

forma, through the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, and through the Executive Committee of Publication, so, in like manner, there was a consistency and a beauty in carrying out the same principle through all our benevolent enterprises and general schemes of Christian charity—that there was a manifest incongruity in appointing an Executive Committee to do a certain work, and then enjoining it upon the Presbyteries to do the same work, wholly independent of the Committee. Moreover, even suppose that the strong Presbyteries should do their own work, in fact, there was no good reason why they should not use the Committee as the channel of their operations, which would require only the writing of a few letters, the

etc.; the Synod does not review or control Sessions, except through Presbyteries. Just so the General Assembly reviews the records and proceedings of the Synods, and not, directly, of the Presbyteries, and takes the oversight of what concerns the whole Church. The principle is embodied in the eighth paragraph of Section II. of the Book of Discipline, thus: "References are generally to be carried to the judicatory immediately superior." No burden shall be laid on the higher Court, which the Court below it can as well bear.

The application is plain. When we come to equip the Church for her work of propagating the faith, we must devolve upon the General Assembly, acting through its Executive Committee, the work of Foreign Missions and of Publication; because, clearly, no Presbytery or Synod could so well undertake that work. We must, also, devolve upon the Assembly, in some of their aspects, the work of Education and Domestic Missions: so far, for example, as concerns the great South-West—the frontier field, which our Church must enter and cultivate for the Lord—that is for the General Assembly, just as necessarily as is Foreign Missions. And surely that is a work large enough, and responsible enough, to rouse the energies of any Committee that rightly conceives of it. So, also, the General Assembly is the proper body to be an organ for *communicating* between all the strong and all the weak Presbyteries. But, surely, on the other hand, it is not in the spirit of the Constitution to impose on the Assembly, through its Committee, the Domestic Missionary work within the bounds of each particular Presbytery, wherever that Presbytery is able itself to carry it forward. If the domestic work in each Presbytery must be devolved on the Assembly, shall the work, also, of each Session be devolved upon it?—EDS. S. P. R.

filling up and signing of a few commissions, and the making up of a brief report to be sent to the Assembly's Committee once a year. This would accord, at least, with our *theory* of unity, and present, every year, a succinct view of the benevolent operations of the whole Church, for the encouragement and gratification of all its members.

Mr. Stewart said: "I see no reason why the Presbyteries should object to communicating through the Committees. I am deeply convinced that a fatal stroke will be given to this Committee, if you allow this. It will make this Committee a *one-horse concern*. But my principal objection is, it dissolves the bond of union between the Presbyteries and this Committee; and this is vital to the responsibility and effectiveness of this scheme. As a friend of it, I do protest, most earnestly, against this great discrimination between it and the others."

Dr. White said: "But if it goes to the ears of the Presbyteries, that you have stricken out this resolution, four-fifths of the Presbyteries will begin this work for themselves, and where will the funds come from to support this Committee? Then, how will this Committee act efficiently, even on the frontiers of the Church? The Committee will become *contemptible*. But, if the Presbyteries are allowed to sustain the work in their own bounds, many churches, who might sustain themselves, will be left to linger on the alms of the Church, because the Presbyteries can't refuse their aid when it is asked of them, whereas the Committee would have no undue bias in favour of them."

Professor Phillips said: "It is inconsistent to establish an agency, and then decline to recommend it to the Presbyteries. What the agency of this Committee is, has not yet been settled. If a Presbytery is an established and rich Presbytery, is it to be independent, while the weak Presbyteries must work through the Committee?"

Dr. Thornwell said: "I do not intend to detain the Assembly long, but there are a few things which I feel bound to utter. It is said this article leaves the Presbyteries as absolutely at liberty as before—it does not interfere with their rights, their present modes of operation—it leaves them just where they stand now. Then, what is gained by the article? If these rights are to be guaranteed by the resolution, then let them be clearly acknowledged, as in Dr. Adger's paper. You say, that to you, they are clearly expressed in that article; in other words, that you will guarantee our rights, but yet you refuse to put them down in black and white.

"In this debate, two things that ought to be kept distinct, are put together; the grandeur of the *Committee*, and the grandeur of the *work*. If, you say—if the Presbyteries supply the destitutions in their own limits, it detracts from the grandeur of the Committee! Oh! my brethren, *if the work be done*, is not that all we have in view? It is our aim, not to promote the grandeur of the Committee, but to promote the cause of God. It is our aim to supply the waste places—to evangelize our own destitutions—to build up the walls of Jerusalem—to carry forward the glorious Gospel. Brethren seem frankly to admit that, if the Presbyteries are allowed this privilege, *the work will be done*, but *the Committee's glory will suffer*. I care nothing for the glory of the Committee, as long as I detract nothing from the glory of God and the Church. The course which these brethren pursue, is most extraordinary. They admit that the work will be done, and done effectually. Is not the work the great matter? Why, then, scramble over the question *how it is done?*

"So much for the argument on the other side. They talk about a liberty of the Presbyteries, which their zeal for this article shows that they do not fairly and squarely acknowledge; because Dr. Adger's resolution adds nothing to that liberty. We believe the resolution of the report

takes some thing away, and if our brethren persist that it takes away nothing, then why not remove the obnoxious language?

“As to Dr. Adger’s paper, a single word. The work of Domestic Missions is, clearly—*first*, a work falling on the Presbyteries within their own bounds—and, *secondly*, a work which transcends the power of feeble Presbyteries, and which extends to our frontier. In this joint work, all Presbyteries, whether old or young, rich or poor, should put their shoulders to the wheel to carry it forward. We do not give a single Presbytery the power of saying ‘I will not aid.’ This Committee shall be the organ of communication with the waste places, with the vacancies on our frontier, and also between the strong and the weak Presbyteries. Is not that work enough? Must you allow the Committee to go into an old Presbytery and say: ‘Here is A. B., whom you have settled as a Pastor, with a salary of so much, but we will not allow him to work, unless you allow us to call your settled Pastor our Missionary, so that the Assembly may know that he works under our commission;’ thus, you make him have a double commission—from the Presbytery, as a *Pastor*, and from the Committee, as a Missionary. We want no such complicated work, no such wheel within a wheel, as that.

“We have thus far acted wisely, Moderator; we have acted judiciously, and so as to gain the commendation of God and our Church, in the organization of every other Committee. I want the Assembly to be unanimous on the organization of this Committee, which is destined to achieve the most important work. But, I do solemnly assure brethren that, if they pass that resolution, they will give a fatal blow to this Committee, at its very inception. The Synods and Presbyteries will be alienated from it; and there are liberal churches, that have given with a princely hand, that will be alienated from it. Is it wise, is it judicious, at the inauguration of such a project, to put it in

opposition to the feelings of any portion of our Church? If you do pass that resolution, you do violate the consciences of some in this Assembly, and the deep and settled convictions of some of our largest ecclesiastical bodies—of some of our Synods, as well as Presbyteries. I beg you earnestly to consider before you do this.

“Every thing here has been in such perfect harmony, we have felt the presence of God so clearly, that, if the matter is to be a disputed question, I had rather adjourn than to press it now. Our Church, now, requires every shoulder to be put to the wheel. Let us stand shoulder to shoulder. Whatever divides us, let us give to the winds.”

Dr. White then spoke, to the effect that, as no *principle* was involved in yielding what had been advocated by the majority of the Assembly, that in order to secure harmony in all our proceedings, he hoped that the objectionable article would be stricken out, which was accordingly done; after which, on motion of Judge Forward, the various Presbyteries were ordered to send up to the Executive Committee of Missions an annual report of their Missionary operations within their respective bounds. Thus ended one of the most earnest and exciting discussions had on the floor of the Assembly.

After the complete organization of the several Executive Committees, it still remained to devise some feasible plan for their election by the Assembly. To accomplish this, Dr. Thornwell offered the following resolution, viz:

Resolved, That the Chairmen of the Standing Committees on Foreign and Domestic Missions, Education, Publication, and Church Extension, be appointed a Joint Committee, to report a scheme for regulating the method of electing the Executive Committees.

In obedience to this resolution, the following standing rules were reported and adopted, viz:

I. “The Assembly’s Standing Committees shall, on making their respective reports, present nominations for

the members and officers for their respective Executive Committees for the ensuing year.

II. "The presentation of their respective nominations shall not preclude any additional nominations which the Assembly may choose to make.

III. "The election of said Committees shall not take place until at least one day after the nominations are made.

IV. "In all cases, a majority of the voters of the Assembly shall be necessary to an election."

The concluding part of the discussion, relative to Domestic Missions, was thrillingly interesting. The last article of the amended report of the Committee reads as follows :

IV. That the great field of Missionary operations among our colored population falls more immediately under the care of the Committee on Domestic Missions, and that Committee be urged to give it serious and constant attention, and the Presbyteries to coöperate with the Committee, in securing Pastors and Missionaries for this field.

The Rev. Dr. C. C. Jones, of Georgia, than whom no Minister of the Assembly wielded a greater moral influence, or was more revered by that body, was requested, by the unanimous voice of the Assembly, to deliver an address on the religious instruction of the slaves, in which work he himself had attained his eminent and deserved distinction. Accordingly, the evening session of the sixth day was devoted to the subject, when Dr. Jones delivered a faithful and powerful address on this emphatically great subject. "These people," said he, "were sent here from barbarism, from the kraals of Africa, to learn here a Saviour's love. Thousands, in these past two hundred years, have reached the Celestial City, to praise God for his wonderful providences. These people have always been with us; they teach us to walk, to talk; they wait about us, and labour for us; they follow us through life; they linger about us till death. Are they not nigh unto us? Are they the brutes that perish? Do we leave them to die unlamented? Every

body of them covers an immortal soul. They are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. They are joint heirs with us to immortality," etc. The Assembly, by resolution, requested Dr. Jones to prepare and publish the aforesaid address, in the form of a tract, for general circulation.

There was no subject that seemed to excite a more intense interest than that of evangelizing and elevating the black race in the midst of us. There was a deep and abiding impression resting upon the minds of all the brethren, that one of the great ends, if not the great mission, to be accomplished by our separate and independent existence, both as a Church and a State, was the conservation of negro slavery, and the more perfect developement and elevation of the African race amongst us—a noble and philanthropic consummation, which, owing to irremediable obstacles, never could have been successfully accomplished in our old relations, either of Church or State. But now, severed by the manifest interposition of the Almighty's holy and wise providence, there is nothing to hinder us from elevating negro slavery up to the Bible standard, which, when done, we can defend it against the argument, the sophistry, and the railing accusation of the whole world! Such was the interest felt on this, now the greatest of all subjects, that a Select Committee was appointed to elaborate and carefully prepare a manifesto, to be laid before the next General Assembly, for their adoption, in the form of a Pastoral Letter, on the subject of slavery, and the religious instruction of slaves, addressed to all the Ministers and all the members of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.

The report on Systematic Benevolence, by Dr. Adger, was able and comprehensive, setting forth, in a clear and felicitous light, the true views on that great and important subject—important on two accounts: *first*, as to its influence upon the spread of the Gospel amongst men; and, *secondly*, in its bearing upon the personal piety and growth

in grace of the individual Christian. Giving is a part of worship—it is Faith acting. Works without prayer, is Atheism; and prayer without works, is presumption—prayer for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, without giving, as the Lord has prospered us, or without exerting ourselves to effect the object of our prayer, is mockery. The Assembly ordered that the report should be printed by the Publication Committee, for general circulation.

Dr. Leland, the Chairman of the Committee on the Narrative, presented to the Assembly a very instructive and valuable paper; which, in these times of darkness and trial, in both Church and State, was exceedingly comforting, and well calculated to revive and strengthen the drooping hopes of the people of God.

The Rev. Peyton Harrison, Chairman of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, reported the following, and it was adopted, viz: "The Synods of Virginia and North Carolina request that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America will assume the same review and control over the Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia, which the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States heretofore exercised, according to the plan of the Seminary, and that the Seminary shall be called 'The Union Theological Seminary of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America,' and the Board of Directors shall report annually to the Assembly."

The following named gentlemen, in the several States, were appointed Trustees of the General Assembly, viz: In the State of Alabama—R. M. Patten and John Whiting. In Georgia—James B. Walker. In South Carolina—T. C. Perrin and Robert Adger. In North Carolina—J. H. Lindsay. In Virginia—S. McCorkle. In Mississippi—Thomas Henderson. In Tennessee—D. M. Kennedy, William T. Fleming, and W. S. Eakin. In Louisiana—B. M. Palmer,

M. Greenwood, William P. Campbell, and Joseph A. Maybin.

The following RESOLUTIONS were, at different times, passed by the Assembly, and became part of its regular proceedings, viz :

1. By Dr. Thornwell: "That it be submitted to the Presbyteries, to make the following provisions in regard to the Constitution. All changes in the Confession of Faith, or the Catechisms, in order to be valid, must be proposed by three-fourths of one Assembly, and confirmed by three-fourths of the two succeeding Assemblies. And all changes in the other books that make up the Constitution, must be proposed by two-thirds of one Assembly, and ratified by a majority of the next Assembly." This was referred to the next Assembly.

2. By Dr. Bailey: "That the General Assembly contemplates, with the highest satisfaction, the proposed organization of a National Bible Society for the Confederate States of America, and for which a meeting or Convention is proposed to be held in the city of Augusta, on the third Wednesday of March next. And we take the present suitable occasion to recommend that a work so important may receive the hearty and liberal support of all our people, Presbyteries and Churches."

3. By Dr. Bocock: "That this General Assembly heartily approves of that clause in the Constitution of the Confederate States, which forbids the Congress to enact any law in regard to a religious establishment, and that it understands that prohibition equally to restrain the Executive from preferring in the public service one branch of the Church above another."

4. By Dr. Thornwell: "That the Trustees of the General Assembly, whenever funds, by way of gift, devise, or bequest, come to their hands, for either of the Assembly's established Committees, be directed to pay over said funds to the Treasurer of the Executive Committee which is

designated in the gift, devise, or bequest; and the release of the Treasurer of said Executive Committee, to the Treasurer of the Trustees, shall be sufficient to serve as a discharge for the Trustees.”

The following Committees were appointed to act in the interval, and to report to the next General Assembly, viz:

I. To memorialize Congress, in compliance with the following resolution offered by the Rev. R. McInnis, viz: “That a Committee be appointed and instructed to take the proper steps to secure a legal title to all property within the Confederate States to which, in their judgment, the Presbyterian Church in these States possess an equitable claim.”

Wm. P. Webb, of Alabama, Thomas C. Perrin, and Chancellor Job Johnston, of South Carolina, J. G. Shepherd, of North Carolina, W. L. Mitchell, of Georgia, and W. F. C. Gregory, of Virginia, were appointed that Committee.

II. Four several Committees were appointed to secure charters for the General Assembly in the States of Louisiana, Tennessee, Mississippi and Virginia, viz: For Tennessee—Alfred Robb, Jackson B. White, A. W. Putnam, and B. M. Estes. For Louisiana—James N. Lee, T. Allen Clarke, and B. M. Palmer. For Mississippi—J. W. C. Watson, Henry T. Ellett, J. W. Clapp, and T. J. Wharton. For Virginia—W. F. C. Gregory, R. D. Montague, A. D. Dickinson, and J. D. Armstrong.

III. On revision of the Book of Discipline, the Rev. John S. Wilson, D. D., offered the following paper, which was adopted, viz:

Whereas it will now become necessary, in the altered relations of our Church, to publish a new edition of the Confession of Faith, with such amendments as shall conform it to the style and title of the Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States of America; and whereas necessity has already been felt for the revision of the Book of Discipline, and it is highly proper that such revision should be made before another edition of the book is printed; therefore, be it

Resolved, That a Committee be now appointed, to whom shall be referred the work of revising the Book of Discipline and Form of Government; and that the said Committee be required to report at the next session of the General Assembly.

Whereupon a Committee of nine was appointed, consisting of Drs. J. H. Thornwell, R. L. Dabney, B. M. Smith, J. B. Adger, and E. T. Baird, Ministers; with Ruling Elders W. P. Webb, T. C. Perrin, W. L. Mitchell, and Job Johnston. To this Committee, Judge Shepherd was afterwards added, on motion of Dr. Thornwell.

IV. To prepare an address on the subject of slavery, and the religious instruction of slaves, in the form of a Pastoral Letter, addressed to all the Ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, to be reported to the next General Assembly, for their adoption. This Committee consists of Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D., Rev. Theodoric Pryor, D. D., and Rev. C. C. Jones, D. D.

V. On Psalmody. It was universally conceded that our Church Psalmody stood greatly in need of revision—that it could be much improved by a vigorous process of lopping off, condensing, expunging, shortening, adding some, and leaving out a great deal—(at least one-half)—changing antiquated phrases and forms of expression for terms in common use, etc., etc. To perform this exceedingly delicate and important work, a Committee was appointed, consisting of the Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,—(appointed Chairman by the Assembly)—Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., Rev. Thomas Smyth, D. D., Rev. J. B. Stratton, D. D., and Rev. John W. Pratt.

The work of the Assembly thus being complete, the Rev. Dr. McMullen arose and said: “Brethren, the Lord has blessed us in an extraordinary degree. The unanimity and cordiality with which every thing has been transacted, seems to me very remarkable, and it would be to me very gratifying if we could spend an hour this evening in devo-

tional exercises—it would be a delightful closing of this Assembly.”

The suggestion was adopted, and the Assembly came together at half-past seven o'clock in the evening, and spent a season in devotional exercises.

After which, Dr. Palmer, the Moderator, said: “My brethren, the fulness of this Assembly, drawn from all parts of our extended Confederacy, during a season of extraordinary peril and darkness, is sufficient proof that all our hearts were impressed with the importance of this convocation. The discussions through which we have passed during the Sessions of this Assembly, have opened the fundamental principles of our Government, and, to some extent, of our Faith. And, that we have been able to set this Church forward fully equipped, and, in doing so, to uncover all those principles, and to do it almost without a jar, is a sufficient proof that we have enjoyed the presence of God's blessed Spirit. The fact, too, that we have been led to open our hearts towards our brethren of the great Presbyterian family, who are not gathered under the same roof with ourselves—opening in the near future the prospect of reunion with those of like faith with ourselves—is an additional proof that our hearts have been moved by the Spirit of Grace. And now we are to part; and as we extend the hand of parting, there will be scarcely an eye that will not moisten—scarcely a heart that will not throb. We are made to feel, as we return to our several homes, that it has been, indeed, a privilege to come up here, as to a Mount of Ordinances. Our language will be the language of Peter on the Mount: ‘Lord, it is good for us to be here.’”

Dr. Pryor—“I rise, Moderator, to move that this Assembly be now dissolved. *We part to meet no more in this world.* But it is pleasant to feel that there is a land where we shall meet again—

“ There, on a green and flowery mount,
Our happy souls shall meet,
And with transporting joy recount
The labours of our feet.”

The three hundred and forty-second hymn was then sung, and, after a prayer and benediction by the Moderator, the Assembly was declared dissolved; and another Assembly, appointed in like manner, ordered to meet in the city of Memphis, Tennessee, at eleven o'clock, A. M., in the First Presbyterian Church, on the first Thursday of May, A. D. 1862.

P. S.—There was another very important subject that engaged the attention, not of the Assembly, as such, but of many of its leading members, which, though we could not properly notice it in the review of the proceedings of the Assembly, yet will not be out of place in a postscript. We refer to the *Educational Meeting*, that took place on Friday evening of the second week.

Many individuals have, for a long time past, felt that our Church, which has hitherto been the standard-bearer in the great work of education, in its highest forms, was not keeping pace with the progress of science, and was not maintaining her high position, as heretofore, as the chief educator of the land. Not that she was actually falling back from her old stand-point, but that she was *standing still*, whilst science, and art, and knowledge, were going forward; and other denominations were, in a praiseworthy manner, coming close up in her rear, and bidding fair soon to outstrip us, if we should not bestir ourselves, and start anew in the career in which we have, in times past, gained so much distinction. Such thoughts kindled a fire that began to burn in the breasts of some brethren in the South-West. They began, after a while, modestly to communicate with one another, and brought up their zeal on the subject to the General Assembly. Accordingly, there was a little,

timid meeting, of some half-dozen, held one night in the study of the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D. The result was, that a larger meeting, embracing some fifteen or more, was held the next evening in the Lecture Room. And the result of that was, the calling of a *convention* of all the members, on the Friday evening mentioned, when the whole subject was discussed by Drs. Waddel, Palmer, Thornwell, Adger, Foote, and others, and an impulse given to the cause, exceeding the most sanguine expectations of its friends.

Every thing must have a beginning. And a great scheme like this must creep before it walks. It can not be accomplished in a day, nor a year. But if a great Confederate University, such as is contemplated, fully up to the age and the progress of human knowledge, can be successfully accomplished in the present generation of the Southern Presbyterians, they will have done a great work, and marked the age in which they lived. All that is wanting to accomplish this grand enterprise, is sufficient interest and confidence in the Church and the friends of education, after which there will be no lack of means. To excite this interest, and create this confidence, will require some time and effort. This concentric wave, small in its beginning, must roll out, and extend to our Synods, and Presbyteries, and Sessions, and Pastors, and people! All must become interested. All must have faith and confidence in the success of the noble scheme, and then the work will be easy. Rich men are liberal when they believe their money will not be thrown away on visionary schemes, but will accomplish that for which it was given. Two millions can be raised easier, with confidence, than twenty thousand without it.

The following resolution was offered by Dr. Palmer, and unanimously adopted by the meeting, over which the Hon. Judge William A. Forward, of Florida, presided as Chairman, viz :

Resolved, That a Committee of ten be appointed, to draft a plan for the establishment of an Institution of the highest order, within the Confederate States; which Committee shall report to a Convention of the friends of Education, to be held at the city of Memphis, on the day preceding the meeting of the next General Assembly.

In response to this resolution, the following Committee was appointed by the Chair (Dr. Palmer nominating, and Dr. Waddel seconding, the Chairman), viz: James A. Lyon, D. D., B. M. Palmer, D. D., J. H. Thornwell, D. D., John N. Waddel, D. D., Theodoric Pryor, D. D., R. B. White, D. D., Prof. W. D. Moore, Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., R. B. McMullen, D. D., R. Hett Chapman, D. D.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XIV.

JULY, MDCCCLXI.

No. 2.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.

1861.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—THE SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE AND THE UNIVERSITY, IN RELATION TO ONE ANOTHER AND TO ACTIVE LIFE. By Professor JOSEPH LeCONTE, M. D., South Carolina College. - - - -	185
II.—THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - -	227
III.—GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE. Anonymous, - -	246
IV.—PULPIT ORATORY. By a Georgia Pastor, - -	275
V.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1861. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Theological Seminary, Colum- bia, S. C., - - - -	296
VI.—NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS, - -	349
VII.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - -	361

AGENTS.

Rev. A. W. Miller,	Petersburg, Virginia.
Rev. S. A. Stanfield,	Milton, North Carolina.
Rev. A. A. Morse,	Anderson C. H., South Carolina.
Mr. John Russell,	Charleston, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills,	Mt. Clio, Sumter, So. Carolina.
Rev. John R. Dow,	John's Island, South Carolina.
Rev. J. P. McMullen,	Pleasant Ridge, Alabama.
Rev. Wm. Flinn,	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting,	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney,	Aberdeen, Mississippi.
Nash & Woodhouse,	Richmond, Virginia.
Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D.,	San Francisco, California.
Mr. Joseph M. Wilson,	111 South 10th st., Phila.
Mr. James Armour,	Memphis, Tennessee.
Rev. J. M. Becton,	Larissa, Cherokee Co., Texas.
W. N. White & Brother,	Athens, Georgia.
J. D. Ghiselin, Jr.,	Norfolk, Virginia.
Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	New Orleans, Louisiana.
Rev. George McNeill,	Fayetteville, North Carolina.
Rev. T. A. Hoyt,	Louisville, Kentucky.
Rev. S. D. Campbell,	Geneva, Alabama.
Robt. Carter & Bros.,	530 Broadway, New York.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in April, July, October and January.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance. Five Dollars for two years, strictly in advance. Two Dollars per annum to Theological Students and Young Men's Christian Associations.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions taken for less than a year; and subscribers should remember that a subscription can not be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the April number, and not at the beginning of the year.

☞ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices, with the exception of Vol. I., the first No. of which can not be furnished. Fifty cents will be paid for any copies of this number, (Vol. I., No. 1,) which may be returned to our address.

☞ Subscribers in arrears will do us a great favor by remitting the amount due, as the necessities of our publication require prompt payment.

☞ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain five new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the Review for one year, or, if they so prefer, fifty cents for each new subscriber.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Editors, or their Review will be sent to their former office.

☞ The Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the Gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the Review worthy of the Southern Presbyterian Church—the representative of its views and of its literature—the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our Ministers and people.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XIV.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXI.

No. 3.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.

1861.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—THE BATTLE OF FORT SUMTER: ITS MYSTERY AND MIRACLE—GOD'S MASTERY AND MERCY. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C.,	365
II.—THE WALDENSES AND INFANT BAPTISM. By the Rev. J. L. KIRKPATRICK, D. D., Davidson College, N. C.,	399
III.—PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT. By the Rev. J. B. HILLHOUSE, S. C.,	431
IV.—ANALOGY BETWEEN THE FORMATION OF THE PHEL CONJUGATION IN HEBREW AND THE PERFECT TENSE IN LATIN. By Prof. E. L. ROCKWELL, Davidson College, N. C.,	444
V.—THE PERSONALITY OF GOD, AS AFFECTING SCIENCE AND RELIGION. Anonymous,	450
VI.—THE SCOTCH-IRISH, AND THEIR FIRST SETTLEMENTS ON TYGER RIVER AND OTHER NEIGHBORING PRECINCTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA. By the Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.,	472
VII.—EXPLANATORY NOTE. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.,	502

AGENTS.

Rev. A. W. Miller,	Petersburg, Virginia.
Rev. S. A. Stanfield,	Milton, North Carolina.
Rev. A. A. Morse,	Anderson C. H., South Carolina.
Mr. John Russell,	Charleston, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills,	Mt. Lio, Sumter, So. Carolina.
Rev. John R. Dow,	Johns Island, South Carolina.
Rev. J. P. McMullen,	Pleasant Ridge, Alabama.
Rev. Wm. Flinn,	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting,	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney,	Aberdeen, Mississippi.
Nash & Woodhouse,	Richmond, Virginia.
Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D.,	San Francisco, California.
Mr. Joseph M. Wilson,	111 South 10th st., Phila.
Mr. James Armour,	Memphis, Tennessee.
Rev. J. M. Becton,	Larissa, Cherokee Co., Texas.
W. N. White & Brother,	Athens, Georgia.
J. D. Ghiselin, Jr.,	Norfolk, Virginia.
Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	New Orleans, Louisiana.
Rev. George McNeill,	Fayetteville, North Carolina.
Rev. T. A. Hoyt,	Louisville, Kentucky.
Rev. S. D. Campbell,	Geneva, Alabama.
Robt. Carter & Bros.,	530 Broadway, New York.

THE

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in April, July, October and January.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance. Five Dollars for two years, strictly in advance. Two Dollars per annum to Theological Students and Young Men's Christian Associations.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions taken for less than a year; and subscribers should remember that a subscription can not be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the April number, and not at the beginning of the year.

☞ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices, with the exception of Vol. I., the first No. of which can not be furnished. Fifty cents will be paid for any copies of this number, (Vol. I., No. 1,) which may be returned to our address.

☞ Subscribers in arrears will do us a great favor by remitting the amount due, as the necessities of our publication require prompt payment.

☞ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain five new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the Review for one year, or, if they so prefer, fifty cents for each new subscriber.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Editors, or their Review will be sent to their former office.

☞ The Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the Gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the Review worthy of the Southern Presbyterian Church—the representative of its views and of its literature, the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our Ministers and people.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XIV.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXII.

No. 4.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.

1862.

[FOR TABLE OF CONTENTS, SEE THIRD PAGE OF COVER.]

OUR FIFTEENTH VOLUME.

Our readers are, no doubt, fully awake to the grand and momentous changes which have occurred in the circumstances of our country, and, also, of our Church. The Editors of this Review feel their increased responsibility in these new circumstances. They wish to meet that responsibility. They enter hopefully on the fifteenth year of their labours. Through the darkness which has been, and still is, around us, by reason of the present cruel, unnatural, and wicked war, they look forward to a brighter day. We aspire to make this Review a worthy representative of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. And hence, anticipating confidently the glorious future that is before our country and our Church, we not only purpose to continue the publication of our work, amidst all the difficulties of the times, by which so many periodicals are forced to suspend, but we propose a measure which must tend to its improvement. Hitherto, we have depended entirely upon the gratuitous kindness of our brethren for contributions to our pages. With the next volume, we shall begin to make some pecuniary compensation to all our collaborators, and we will increase the rate of this compensation as soon, and as much, as our future prosperity shall warrant. One of the evident advantages of this, to our readers, will be that the Editors will naturally feel more free to select, from all the MSS. offered to them, only such as their readers would most desire to see.

Will not the Ministers, Elders, and members of our Church, aid us, at the commencement of this fifteenth year, to increase the circulation and usefulness of this work?

We do not send bills to our subscribers at this time, as we usually have done in the last number of the volume. This is not because we do not need the money. We do need it, more than ever, our expenses being greatly increased, as may be seen from the statement above. But, knowing the difficulty of procuring money in some sections of the country, we have felt unwilling to annoy with a dun, which must be disregarded, from sheer necessity. We earnestly hope, however, that all who know that they are in arrears will make immediate payment, if possible; and that payment in advance may be made, as far as at all convenient.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	Page
<p>I.—INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE REV. JAMES WOODROW, Ph. D., Perkins Professor Theological Seminary, Co- lumbia, S. C., - - - - -</p>	505
<p>II.—ADDRESS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA TO ALL THE CHURCHES OF JESUS CHRIST THROUGHOUT THE EARTH, - - - - -</p>	531
<p>III.—THE ART OF CONVERSATION. By the Rev. B. M. PALMER, D. D., of New Orleans, - - - - -</p>	550
<p>IV.—TIMOTHY'S OFFICE. By the Rev. THOMAS V. MOORE, D. D., of Richmond, Va., - - - - -</p>	569
<p>V.—THE VICTORY OF MANASSAS PLAINS. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., of Charleston, S. C., - - - - -</p>	593
<p>VI.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT AUGUSTA. By the Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D., of Columbus, Miss., - - - - -</p>	618

AGENTS.

Rev. A. W. Miller,	Petersburg, Virginia.
Rev. A. A. Morse,	Anderson C. H., South Carolina.
Mr. John Russell,	Charleston, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills,	Mt. Clio, Sumter, So. Carolina.
Rev. John R. Dow,	John's Island, South Carolina.
Rev. J. P. McMullen,	Pleasant Ridge, Alabama.
Rev. Wm. Flinn,	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting,	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney,	Aberdeen, Mississippi.
Rev. Wm. Brown, D. D.,	Richmond, Virginia.
Mr. James Armour,	Memphis, Tennessee.
J. D. Ghiselin, Jr.,	Norfolk, Virginia.
Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	New Orleans, Louisiana.
Rev. T. A. Hoyt,	Louisville, Kentucky.
Rev. S. D. Campbell,	Geneva, Alabama.
Rev. W. T. Richardson,	Waynesboro', Virginia.
Rev. James B. Ramsay, D. D.,	Lynchburg, Virginia.
Rev. J. C. Barr,	Lewisburg, Virginia.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in April, July, October and January.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance. Five Dollars for two years, strictly in advance. Two Dollars per annum to Theological Students and Young Men's Christian Associations.

✎ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions taken for less than a year; and subscribers should remember that a subscription can not be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the April number, and not at the beginning of the year.

✎ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at Two Dollars per volume, with the exception of Vols. I. and VIII., the first Nos. of which can not be furnished. One Dollar will be paid for any copies of these numbers, (Vol. I., No. 1, and Vol. VIII., No. 1.) which may be returned to our address.

✎ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain five new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the Review for one year, or, if they so prefer, fifty cents for each new subscriber.

✎ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Editors, or their Review will be sent to their former office.

✎ The Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the Gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the Review worthy of the Southern Presbyterian Church—the representative of its views and of its literature, the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our Ministers and people.