

American Presbyterian

Vol. VII, No. 28.—Whole No. 340.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1863.

GENESEE EVANGELIST.—Whole No. 877.

Poetry.

Lethe.

"A SLEEP and a forgetting" is this birth?
Then what is life but a forgetting too?
Where are our playmates of the early earth,
Our childhood's love, our faith in heaven's blue?
Year after year dark Lethe's wave
Washes us onward to the grave.

Thief of the priceless Past, relentless stream,
Thy rising mists obscure the morning light,
The cloud-banks of thy whirling currents seem
To steal the stars of memory from the night.
As one by one they slumber,
Like music dying from the ear.

If death, indeed, be a profounder sleep,
A deeper plunge in thy effacing tide,
What hope is there on yonder bank to keep
A recollection of the other side?
If all things are made new, I ween,
We cease to know that we have been.

Give me another creed, and let me dream
That old days with me pass away,
Roll back, dull Lethe, let me see the gleam
Of the returning glories of the day.
Let the old loves, behind the veil,
And the old fancies, never fail.

It may be so: for, with their drowsing men,
Who strive with agonies of reviving sense,
And, in a moment, live their lives again,
So death may bring a vision more intense
Of what we were and may attain
Beyond the world-enclosing main.

It must be so: the form alone can change;
Hidden beneath the crust of Lethe's foam,
The heart awakens to a wider range,
And brings the Past from echoing caverns home.
Roll on, thou scornful river, roll,
Thou art not wash away the soul.
—Spectator. J. N.

Correspondence.

ESCAPING FROM SLAVERY.

NUMBER FOUR.

The prevalent spirit of the nation is also to be compared with the spirit of the Bible. Much allowance is to be made for the fact that the nation has found itself obligated by a definite provision in its fundamental law, which could not be repealed, though found in practice to work a degree of hardship and cruelty which cannot be anticipated by the framers of that admirable instrument. But can we even claim that the people, as a whole, have felt that cruelty, or cared for it, as they should?

There has been a degree of earnestness, on the part of multitudes, in demanding the extreme rigor in executing the provisions of the Fugitive Slave law, which many of the same persons have not shown for the enforcement of laws designed to preserve order, and protect virtue and good morals, in their own communities. The escape or rescue of a fugitive from servitude, has by many been accounted far worse than the escape or rescue of a criminal. Communities in which the execution of no other law ever meets serious resistance, in which life, and property, and feeble innocence are more safe, with less police force, than anywhere else in the world, have been loudly denounced as lawless and rebellious, because they have made it odious for any among them to accept the extraordinary offices established for the execution of this law; and have endeavored by the exercise of their local authority, to protect their own residents from seizure under false claims, which the *ex parte* procedure under this law rendered so probable.

Worst of all, there has been extensive acquiescence in the demand that fugitives from slavery shall be regarded, and treated, and delivered up, not simply, as the Constitution requires, as "persons held to service or labor, under the laws" of the State from which they have fled, but absolutely as property, like stray animals!

God be praised that the nation was not fully and irreversibly committed to this wicked exaggeration of the constitutional provision; and that there has been so much of kind and humane feeling towards the victims of oppression, even where that feeling has agonized with the conviction that there was no lawful way to help them. Still, it must, we think, be admitted that, throughout all our communities, (the non-slaveholding as well as the slaveholding,) there is, and has always been, a great lack of that sympathizing regard for these unhappy persons, which would naturally arise from the full recognition of their human brotherhood with us. In no way is this more offensively shown, in northern communities, than in the insane horror, lest some of the people escaping from slavery, should come, and dwell among them, "in the place which they shall choose," according to the Mosaic statute, "where it liketh [or suits] them best." How humiliating it is to see that northern editors, and northern advocates of emancipation, and even the President, in his persuasive and paternal appeals to the people, feel themselves obliged to insist that there is no danger of the colored people migrating northward! One would almost think that the northern people, though freely offering all their wealth and all their blood, for the preservation of the National Union, would hesitate to accept its salvation, by means of the enfranchisement of four million slaves, unless first they had security that none of these freed people will ever exercise their liberty, in lawful compliance with their labor, or by choosing peaceably to reside in their neighborhoods. Can it be that this is the prevailing disposition of the northern people? I will not believe it. The violent haters of the colored people multiply their voices, in their noisy outcry. The quiet men and gentle women, who reflect that liberty is the same to colored people as to white, are more numerous than the politicians think; and God's merciful providence has not allowed his powerful chastisement, and His sublime providence are rapidly increasing their number. There is reason to hope that the national mind is feeling the beginning of repentance; that the national heart is changing.

H. A. N.

There hold gift of assurance is the reward, as an holy divine expresses it, of "exact walking."

CHURCH CHOIRS AND SINGING.

Lam persuaded that to have appropriate and effective music in the sanctuary, one of the most difficult matters with which the church and ministry are called to contend. No one seems to doubt or deny that to praise God in Zion, with the voice of melody, is a most solemn and delightful part of religious worship. It is especially emphasized in the history both of the Jewish and Christian Church. One of the most delightful portions of the Word, is made up of the "Psalms," once familiar in the courts of the Lord, and poured forth in strains of liquid melody by the thousands of the sweet singers of Israel. But while all are ready to confess the value and power of church music, there are many who are not so able to realize it in their particular churches.

Good singing is an admirable part of religious worship, but how to secure it, is, at least, a very difficult thing. Probably there is no part of the services of the sanctuary so uniformly defective and poorly rendered as praise to God in sacred song. Perhaps there is no part about which so different opinions prevail as to the manner and style in which it should be performed. Complaint is often made that the pulpit is dull and prosy. But if it is dull it may still be in harmony with truth, which is far more than can always be said of the organ and the choir.

The clergyman who has a grain of music or musical taste in his composition, and who can preach eloquently and effectively, against the influence of ill-timed, inharmonious, screaming from the opposite extremity of the sanctuary, must be regarded as a very remarkable man. And he who, after preaching the Gospel of Salvation with all the energy of his nature, sits down to hear the jarring and discordant strains of the choir, as they well might neutralize the effect of his sermon, is, to say the least, a very patient man if he does not go home wishing the choir instituted abandoned.

If I were to specify any reasons why we hear so little really good church music, I should say the radical one is that there is generally a very feeble and defective idea of what sacred music ought to be, and what place it is designed to fill. A very common and yet grossly wrong view is, that choir performances are for attractive exhibition, to bring the crowd, fill the pews, and make the church service popular.

Another and almost insuperable obstacle in the way of good church music, is that the church in general have seemingly very little interest in the subject further than to complain if the singing is not to their taste. Singers are proverbially sensitive, and hence to find fault with them is to derange or "break up" the choir.

Parents have too little care that their children be trained to sing, and hence the material of which to make a good choir, is not to be found. All this is surely an evil under the sun. I am often provoked, as others doubtless are, with the thought that so important and delightful a part of the services of Zion is so greatly neglected throughout our church. It is an element of power that we fail to use.

PASTOR.

Selections.

REV. EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D., LL.D.

ANY careful reader of our college catalogues and biographical dictionaries must be aware that according to the common order of nature, we are near a memorable term of our literary history, and that a large number of notable scholars and statesmen are reaching the threescore and ten years which are set forth as the allotted period of human life. Dr. Robinson was just upon the threshold of this term, and we are startled at the thought of how many noted men, whose names are household words throughout the land, must ere long follow him. We will not darken our page by anticipating these obituaries, but will record, as simply and truthfully as we can, our tribute to his life, labors, and worth.

Dr. Robinson was born at Southington, Conn., April 10, 1794, and left Hamilton College, New York, in 1816, to serve as tutor there for a year after his graduation. He remained at Clinton, prosecuting his studies, till 1821, when he went to Andover, Mass., to publish an edition of the *Iliad* which he had edited. Whilst at Andover, he studied Hebrew, and corrected the proof-sheets of Prof. Stuart's Hebrew Grammar. He thus became acquainted with Prof. Stuart, who had so much to do with his subsequent career; joined him in translating some text-books from the German, took charge of his class in his absence, and was finally appointed assistant instructor. He remained at Andover till 1826, when he sailed for Europe, and spent four years in travel and study—mainly in Germany. In 1830 he returned to Andover, and held until 1833 the office of professor extraordinary of sacred literature and librarian, which he then resigned to reside in Boston. In 1837 he was appointed professor of Biblical literature in the Union Theological Seminary of the city of New York, and before entering upon this office, he made his memorable voyage to Palestine with Rev. Dr. Eli Smith, and began the survey which has given him such fame. He was at his new post in New York in 1840, and continued there till his death, with few interruptions from ill health, and from a second visit to Palestine in 1852. His work has been many, but far more marked by value than number, and some of them have made an era in sacred literature. His translation of Buttmann's Greek Grammar, his Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, his Harmony of the Four Gospels, in Greek and in English, his edition of Calmer's Biblical Dictionary, and his translation of Gesenius's Hebrew Lexicon, in addition to his noted Biblical Researches in Palestine and the adjacent countries, amply attest the amount of labor unsurpassed in our age, and not allow his scholastic studies to shut him out of the world, but was in constant and active relations with the men and affairs of the age, as is fully shown in his connection with the American Oriental, Geographical, Ethnological, and Historical Societies, and his supervision of *The Biblical Repository*, the well-known theological quarterly, edited by him from 1831 to 1834, and afterwards united by him with *The Bibliotheca Sacra* and edited for a year in New York by him.

We have given this brief and dry catalogue of his works rather in order to make our reader acquainted with the depth and breadth of his labors, than to do justice to his character, which only a careful inspection of his labors can begin to do. For a man of scholastic habits, his career was considerably diversified in the fields of his study and the breadth of his social experience. The recluse student went from his quiet home in a Connecticut village to the great centers of literary and historic interest, and in Palestine and Germany he carried out the studies which he began at Clinton, Andover, and Boston, and completed at New York. He was twice married, first at Clinton to a daughter of the missionary, Rev. S. Kirkland, who died in 1819, and the second time to Miss Theresa A. J. von Jacob of Halle, who has joined her own literary honors to her husband's. His recent visit to Germany, unavailing as it was, for the recovery of his health and the restoration of his eyesight, was full of tributes to his fame and comfort to his affections. Many words, and made no secret of his dislike to take him by the hand, and even the venerable Lepsius departed from his fixed rule of seclusion, and day after day sought the American scholar's society; whilst other renowned Orientalists, such as Kiepert, Wetstein, and the like, seemed to revel in his presence. Charming evening hour of a life that was so soon to set in the night shadows! Let us not say that the faithful scholar is without his reward, nor that that they only are sought and aimed at, nor that he leaves or rank to bestow.

Dr. Robinson was a marked and original man, yet he did not open readily the fullness of his mind or heart either to strangers or friends. He had a reserve in his manner that seemed more in his temperament than his purpose, and he seldom gave full flow to his feelings or even to his convictions. A man of war, he was somewhat impatient of many words, and he was not one of those like of persons who are everlastingly talking, and expecting the public to hang upon their lips. Yet he had decided opinions upon all subjects, and in a few sentences he brought his massive common sense to bear upon the matter in question. He was undoubtedly the less communicative because he took little interest in extreme opinions on any subject, and seemed to put almost out of his mind the intricacies of fancy and subtleties of speculation that fill so large a place in the popular literature, and even in the prevailing theology. Thus, in Biblical criticism, he had little to say of conflicting opinions, but went directly to the real meaning of the text, and was far more pleased with commentators like Dr. Wetze and Meyer, who try to show what the author really meant, than with such theologians as Hengstenberg and Olshausen, who are bent upon showing what he ought to mean.

As a philologist and lexicographer he belonged to the critical, realistic school of Ernesti and Gesenius, and he studied Greek and Hebrew, just as he would study French or German, to know what were the roots of the words, what their changes and ultimate meaning, and what their grammatical connection. As a theologian, he was little given to speculating or even to philosophizing, and even on a subject so central and controverted as the nature of God, he preferred to stand upon the New Testament position, to something upon the words of the Athanasian Creed.

He paid supreme worship to God in Christ, but, like Moses Stuart, he regarded Christ as Son of God from the incarnation of the Word or Logos in him, and not from any theory of the eternal generation of the Son. He employed the usual language of the prevailing theology in speaking of the depravity of man and the need of divine grace, but loved rather to rest in the words of the New Testament that dispute in the arena of controversial divinity. He treated the lands of the Bible very much as he treated its language, and took a somber satisfaction in brushing away the rubbish of tradition from the Holy Land as he had brushed away the cobwebs of superstition and cant from the Holy Book. The monks and ecclesiologists owe him a great grudge, therefore, for his geographical labors; whilst the lovers of truth and honesty respect him as the great reformer of Scripture geography. His substantial new movement to rescue the country of Isaiah and David, our Lord and his disciples, from priestcraft, and to bring the lands and the language of the Bible home to the heart of the Christian and the keeping of the universal church. There was a great deal of New England pluck in the idea and the execution of his work on Palestine, and no Yankee adventurer ever ventured upon a bolder deed in a manly spirit, or in a search for the North Pole was a more complete enterprise in comparison with the daring of the reserved American scholar who set his face toward Jerusalem to let daylight in upon its hallowed places, and to put to flight the specters that had so long haunted the sacred walls, vales, and hills, frightened mailed knights out of their senses, and learned professors out of their wits. How much is thought of Dr. Robinson's marches in Palestine is obvious enough from the fact that his substantial letters quote him; and they who assail him most bitterly, honor him more by their fears of his power than they could possibly do by admiration of his service.

Dr. Robinson was an incessant student; he burned no midnight oil, but studied by the morning lamp, unwilling to wait for the tardy sun to rise, and firm in the faith that the early hours of the day bring the scholar his best strength, and the thinker his freest inspirations. He has studied his tasks not for himself alone, but for us all, and the whole church of Christ. When least they think it, coming students and devotees will use his labors, as they who worship in a temple use, though they may know it not, the foundation-stones that long ago were hidden under ground out of sight of the painted window and the carved screen that so fascinated the gaze. Edward Robinson has placed a solid rock under the temple of sacred learning that shall stand through all time.

He was a plain man in speech and bearing, and not fond of grand generalizations, nor given to ambitious vision, yet his unostentatious labors have connected him with the drama of ages, and written his name on the pathway of civilization in its Western career from Asia through Europe to us. Modern history is the record of the union between Shem and Japhet, or the piety of the ethnic race with the science and vigor of the Indo-Germanic race. Perhaps Cyrus prepared the way when he stormed the gates of Babylon with his Aryan or Indo-Germanic semitar; and the handwriting on the wall of

Belshazzar foreboded not only that despot's doom, but the emancipation of the Jewish mind by contact with the Europe which Alexander, the follower of Cyrus, under God's providence, and the great Indo-Germanic conqueror, was soon to throw open to Asia and Egypt. Paul the apostle opened the alliance, and his Gospel has mated the Greek and the Hebrew languages together forever, and made Japhet to dwell in the tents of Shem, the faith of Asia to quicken and exalt the intellect of Europe. Shall we now ascribe to our great Orientalist some share in carrying out in our New World this great design of Providence, and in-nurturing the rising mind of America upon the riches of Hebrew piety and Greek science, by opening the treasures of the lands and the languages of the Bible to us all? He has helped on the alliance between the Oriental and Hebrew mind in America; nor has he scorned the hope, nor so strong in many of us, that slighted Africa may have her part in the great scholar's march by adding to our temper the heart of love, the ready charity without which all faith and knowledge are vanity. Habitually conservative in his thought and speech, averse to popular agitation, the Oriental scholar started to his feet with the people when the nation was assailed by a banded despotism, and he crowned the catholicity of his devout thoughts and ethnological studies by advocating the abolition of slavery as the only safeguard of our liberty and our honor. In Asia, Europe, and America combine to bless and strengthen America, and make her the Old World's queenly heir, his name should not be forgotten.—*Independent.*

THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON THE PROCLAMATION.

From the article on the war in the last number of the Princeton Review we extract the most of what is said on the Emancipation Proclamation—perhaps we go a little further than the reviewer intended, but we believe it to be both immoral and absurd to restrict the President's military or civil authority to the districts only in which it is acknowledged. That authority extends, in the sight of God, over the whole country of which he is the rightful ruler. Mr. Lincoln and he alone is the rightful President of the unsubdued parts of South Carolina, as well as of Pennsylvania; as well as of the conquered portions of Arkansas, North and South Carolina and Georgia, Florida and Louisiana. Hence we regard his edicts as equally valid in one as in another of these sections of the country, whatever difficulties there may be in carrying them into effect; or even though the possible success of the rebellion may render them utterly unavailing in the unconquered section. With these qualifications, we must express our gratification at the favorable attitude of this important organ of the press towards the Proclamation. We give place to the extract.

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION.

The above principles apply to the emancipation of slaves. If the President, as commander-in-chief, has the power, in time of war, and in case of pressing necessity, to appropriate the property of the enemies of the country, why not their property in slaves? They claim slaves as property; they have a recognized and legal title to their labor; on the proceeds of that labor they live; by it they are enabled to carry on this war for the overthrow of the government. There seems to be no reason why this peculiar kind of property should be exempt from the operation of the laws of war. If the rebels confiscate or sequester, without any pretense of military necessity, not only hundreds of millions of mercantile debts due to northern men, but the immense amount owned by them in southern banks and railroads, they at least should not complain of the application of strictly war principles to themselves. As, however, this emancipation of the slaves is declared to be a war measure, founded on "military necessity," it must, as before said, be limited to the case of pressing necessity, and to the President's authority as commander-in-chief. Both of these limitations are essential. The President has no authority to liberate a single slave, except on the ground of military necessity. If that necessity exists, the right exists, and to the extent and no further, that the exigency demands. This is conceded. Men may differ as to what "military necessity," in this matter, means, but no sane man can deny that they must admit that nothing can be done which the present emergency does not demand. The right to emancipate slaves cannot extend beyond the military necessity for such emancipation. This we understand to be the President's doctrine. The other limitation is no less important. The President's power to emancipate is a military power. It belongs to him as the head of the army. But the authority of a general is executive, and not legislative; he has no power to make laws, or to permanently bind. He acts for the present, and for pressing emergencies. The President does not pretend to be a dictator. He does not assume the right to enact new laws, or to overturn the institutions of the country. He speaks in his character of military officer, and assumes to do only what lies legitimately within his military authority.

He may, as commander-in-chief, issue orders to his subordinates in the navy and army to regard and treat as freemen all the slaves within their respective commands, or who may seek refuge within their lines. What is more than this, must be legally void, and practically inoperative. The President's authority, at the present time, is no more regarded in South Carolina than that of the governor of New Jersey. Until that State is occupied by our armies, a proclamation of emancipation from the former can have no more effect than one issued by the latter. * * * We have no idea that one intelligent man in ten, or the President himself, believes that he can legally ordain the permanent abolition of slavery throughout the United States. His proclamation can only operate as instructions to his subordinates to regard and treat all slaves who come within their power as freemen. This is a vast deal, and may produce a radical change in the state of the country. With this, consistent with our loyalty to the Constitution, ought to be contented. The right, in the long run, is always the most effective.

If we would have anything good or useful, we must earn it.

MUSIC.

Music is undoubtedly one of the symbols of thought; an art-symbol, possessing a power peculiar to itself. Its sphere is over the emotions. It is the natural vehicle of sentiment, and therefore of poetical ideas. Its scope is wide and free, though always within the rigid limitations of law. It is generally thought to be the most spiritual of all the arts, as entering, more than any other, into the purest spirit of worship. A good authority has pronounced it "the most sensuous of the arts." We conceive it to be both sensuous and spiritual. Its power over the tender, gentle, superficial feelings is greater than that of statuary or painting. Its impressions are probably as lasting; for sensation through the ear is more a unity than that produced through the eye. Music has also the advantage of utterance in words, and thus connects itself permanently with the thoughts and passions. It fans the flame of domestic love, kindles patriotic ardors, and excites through wretched works, become associated with memory, consciousness, affection, hope; bears the soul to high devotion, softens or enraptures the heart—

"Knit with the threads of life forever,
By those great powers that weave the woof;
Whose art the singer's spell can sever?
Whose breast has music for its proof?
So to the bard a wand of wonder give—
The soul he gives—
He sinks the soul the death-realm under,
Or lifts it breathless up to heaven—
He captives, half against, seeking its devotion
Upon the tremulous ladder of emotion!"

But it is for sculpture and painting, in their highest excellence, to speak most profoundly to the soul. We know there is music deeper than what we hear. It has its ideal, like the other arts. But its dominion is over the livelier emotions. Like painting, it may be comic as well as tragical. Sculpture deals best, we may say, only with the serious, calm, grand. It is, therefore, better fitted for memorials. Its material, like the past, is changeless. The hymn sung at the funeral of a child, will ever and anon recur to the family, causing the bosom to swell and the eyes to brim; but the marble bust of a little hand—offering the form of life with the hue of death—has a voice, silent, deep, mighty. The tender and the awful are blended there. We feel like touching the symbol of departed life, but are checked by the thought—"Thou art so near, and yet so far."—*Symbols of thought by Rev. E. E. Adams.*

WONDERFUL SELF-CONTROL.

The Church Journal says of the Episcopal denomination, that "with three trifling exceptions, there has been a total abstinence from the passing of political resolutions of any sort during the whole terrible fermentation of the Fall of Fort Sumter—an indomitable degree of self-control, the like of which it would be hard to find anywhere, and impossible to find in any other body of Christians as large and influential as [Protestant Episcopal] Church in this country."

Self-control, indeed! The country has been passing through the severest trial it could suffer, has been struggling for its life, has contended against the most formidable conspiracy the world has ever seen, has loaded itself down with an enormous debt, has shed the blood of hundreds and thousands of its best and bravest sons, has made sacrifices which two families out of three will feel for a generation; and yet in all this conflict of truth, right, law, honor, freedom, and civilization against treason, rebellion, perjury, fraud, slavery, and barbarism, a considerable body of Christians has been neutral, has shown no sympathy with the Government, has expressed no opinion on the subject, but stood as far off as the priest and Levite did from the robbed and beaten Jew; and the world is called to admire this as "self-control." It looks to us more like disloyalty, or potheriness, or a cold and selfish disregard of the sacred duties which men in all capacities owe to a rightful government.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

REVIVAL IN FALL RIVER, RHODE ISLAND.

A morning prayer-meeting has been sustained uninterruptedly for five years in Fall River, though the state of religion there has been low but now the city is blessed with a great refreshing from the Lord. The interest commenced with the "week of prayer," early in January. The meetings were continued, and the second and third weeks in the month witnessed a large number of conversions. Sunday, Feb. 1st, is spoken of as a day long to be remembered. A correspondent of the *Independent*, under date of Feb. 5th, writes:

A correspondent of the Providence Journal writes: "It is the most quiet, orderly, and unobtrusive, and at the same time the most deep, thorough and aggressive in its operation" of any religious interest, with whose history I have ever been acquainted. A very large proportion of the converts are males. All the male members of the high school, except eleven, are among those who give evidence of a change of heart, and of a new faithfulness and energy; such loving corrections are promised in his covenant, and without them we should be ruined.—*Ibid.*

"WHATSOEVER," says Sir James Stephen, "may have been the faults, or whatever the motives of the Protector, there can be no doubt that under his sway England witnessed a diffusion, till then unknown, of the purest influence of genuine religious principles."

THE BLIND CITY MISSIONARY IN CINCINNATI.

From the twentieth Annual Report of Rev. Horace Bushnell, the blind city missionary, sustained by the ladies of the Second Church, (Dr. Thompson's) the *Herald and Recorder* extracts the following incidents:

Leaving the omnibus one day, and feeling for the side-walk with my staff, a woman's voice inquired, "Are you blind, sir?" "Quite blind." "Well here's the side-walk; but can you guess where you are?" "Yes, at the corner of the measure, yet the allusions which naturally suggest this question imply doubts, or at least some degree of hesitation. The enemies of the Government spare no pains in exciting public prejudice against the war on the ground of the Proclamation. In the current slang of the day, they say that the war has become an Abolition war, a war to put down slavery, a war for the negro, and not for the Union. That this is utterly false they have the amplest means of knowing. The Government has not changed its ground as to the object of the war. It has adopted the principle of Emancipation in application to the rebellious States on the same theory and for the same purposes that it has raised an army and built a navy. The object is to conquer the rebellion; and emancipation is used simply as a war measure. So the President expressly says. His judgment, too, as 'Commander-in-Chief,' upon a war measure, is final. It is justified, also, by the usages of civilized warfare. Now the sermon of Mr. Barnes, not so much by what it says as by what it suggests, is, as we think, calculated to make an incorrect impression on this point. It is not true, as one might infer from the sermon, that the power of emancipation is absolutely, in all possible circumstance, limited to the action of the States where slavery exists. Whether the slaves be regarded as persons or property, the President, in conducting a war with slave States in rebellion, has the same right to seize their slaves that he would have to seize their horses, or anything else necessary to victory. This is the sole theory of the President's Proclamation; and we think it a great mistake, as to emphasize the doctrine of State rights, as to suggest, by even the remotest implication, that States in rebellion have any rights incompatible with the duties of the Government in their conduct. They cannot thus ignore the Constitution, and yet claim the protection of peaceful citizens. They are either belligerents, or traitors, or both; and under neither category can they claim any exemption from any necessary war measure. Not asking Mr. Barnes to adopt or reject this theory, we simply state it as the logical, and we think sufficient reply, as well to those who doubt, as to those who are now making not a little clamor against the Proclamation. Let the point be fairly put before the people; and we are content to abide the issue. . . . As to the sixth canon of peace, namely, 'The ultimate entire removal of slavery from our land,' we heartily agree with Mr. Barnes. We believe this necessary to anything like permanent harmony. We accept, too, his doctrine of compensated emancipation, and equally what he says in regard to the question of expatriation. We sincerely hope that the removal may not be too 'ultimately,' or so gradual that the evil will increase rather than lessen. As to the power of emancipation, we admit that this belongs to the State themselves in the time of peace, qualifying the admission, as Mr. Barnes does not, with the belligerent rights of the General Government to blast slavery or anything else in the rebel States, so far as this may be necessary to the conquest of this wicked rebellion. We do not believe in any State-rights, or any State institutions against the life of the nation in such a war as the Government is now compelled to wage. As to the evils likely to result from immediate emancipation, we do not at all sympathize with Mr. Barnes in the fears which he expresses. So great a change cannot, of course, be effected without some evils, greater or less, according to the course taken by the slave holding class; yet, as a matter of fact proved by history, the giving of freedom to the oppressed is by no means so great a calamity as some would have us believe. Mr. Barnes, we desire to say in conclusion, has by no means backed down from his anti-slavery position; yet we think that he has fallen into some errors in discussing the question of peace, and that his sermon, as to its whole impression, is not precisely what the public heart most needs in times like these. While it may be prevented and abused by sympathizers with the rebellion, it is liable to create some confusion in the thoughts of strictly loyal people.

From the twentieth Annual Report of Rev. Horace Bushnell, the blind city missionary, sustained by the ladies of the Second Church, (Dr. Thompson's) the *Herald and Recorder* extracts the following incidents:

Leaving the omnibus one day, and feeling for the side-walk with my staff, a woman's voice inquired, "Are you blind, sir?" "Quite blind." "Well here's the side-walk; but can you guess where you are?" "Yes, at the corner of the measure, yet the allusions which naturally suggest this question imply doubts, or at least some degree of hesitation. The enemies of the Government spare no pains in exciting public prejudice against the war on the ground of the Proclamation. In the current slang of the day, they say that the war has become an Abolition war, a war to put down slavery, a war for the negro, and not for the Union. That this is utterly false they have the amplest means of knowing. The Government has not changed its ground as to the object of the war. It has adopted the principle of Emancipation in application to the rebellious States on the same theory and for the same purposes that it has raised an army and built a navy. The object is to conquer the rebellion; and emancipation is used simply as a war measure. So the President expressly says. His judgment, too, as 'Commander-in-Chief,' upon a war measure, is final. It is justified, also, by the usages of civilized warfare. Now the sermon of Mr. Barnes, not so much by what it says as by what it suggests, is, as we think, calculated to make an incorrect impression on this point. It is not true, as one might infer from the sermon, that the power of emancipation is absolutely, in all possible circumstance, limited to the action of the States where slavery exists. Whether the slaves be regarded as persons or property, the President, in conducting a war with slave States in rebellion, has the same right to seize their slaves that he would have to seize their horses, or anything else necessary to victory. This is the sole theory of the President's Proclamation; and we think it a great mistake, as to emphasize the doctrine of State rights, as to suggest, by even the remotest implication, that States in rebellion have any rights incompatible with the duties of the Government in their conduct. They cannot thus ignore the Constitution, and yet claim the protection of peaceful citizens. They are either belligerents, or traitors, or both; and under neither category can they claim any exemption from any necessary war measure. Not asking Mr. Barnes to adopt or reject this theory, we simply state it as the logical, and we think sufficient reply, as well to those who doubt, as to those who are now making not a little clamor against the Proclamation. Let the point be fairly put before the people; and we are content to abide the issue. . . . As to the sixth canon of peace, namely, 'The ultimate entire removal of slavery from our land,' we heartily agree with Mr. Barnes. We believe this necessary to anything like permanent harmony. We accept, too, his doctrine of compensated emancipation, and equally what he says in regard to the question of expatriation. We sincerely hope that the removal may not be too 'ultimately,' or so gradual that the evil will increase rather than lessen. As to the power of emancipation, we admit that this belongs to the State themselves in the time of peace, qualifying the admission, as Mr. Barnes does not, with the belligerent rights of the General Government to blast slavery or anything else in the rebel States, so far as this may be necessary to the conquest of this wicked rebellion. We do not believe in any State-rights, or any State institutions against the life of the nation in such a war as the Government is now compelled to wage. As to the evils likely to result from immediate emancipation, we do not at all sympathize with Mr. Barnes in the fears which he expresses. So great a change cannot, of course, be effected without some evils, greater or less, according to the course taken by the slave holding class; yet, as a matter of fact proved by history, the giving of freedom to the oppressed is by no means so great a calamity as some would have us believe. Mr. Barnes, we desire to say in conclusion, has by no means backed down from his anti-slavery position; yet we think that he has fallen into some errors in discussing the question of peace, and that his sermon, as to its whole impression, is not precisely what the public heart most needs in times like these. While it may be prevented and abused by sympathizers with the rebellion, it is liable to create some confusion in the thoughts of strictly loyal people.

Leaving the omnibus one day, and feeling for the side-walk with my staff, a woman's voice inquired, "Are you blind, sir?" "Quite blind." "Well here's the side-walk; but can you guess where you are?" "Yes, at the corner of the measure, yet the allusions which naturally suggest this question imply doubts, or at least some degree of hesitation. The enemies of the Government spare no pains in exciting public prejudice against the war on the ground of the Proclamation. In the current slang of the day, they say that the war has become an Abolition war, a war to put down slavery, a war for the negro, and not for the Union. That this is utterly false they have the amplest means of knowing. The Government has not changed its ground as to the object of the war. It has adopted the principle of Emancipation in application to the rebellious States on the same theory and for the same purposes that it has raised an army and built a navy. The object is to conquer the rebellion; and emancipation is used simply as a war measure. So the President expressly says. His judgment, too, as 'Commander-in-Chief,' upon a war measure, is final. It is justified, also, by the usages of civilized warfare. Now the sermon of Mr. Barnes, not so much by what it says as by what it suggests, is, as we think, calculated to make an incorrect impression on this point. It is not true, as one might infer from the sermon, that the power of emancipation is absolutely, in all possible circumstance, limited to the action of the States where slavery exists. Whether the slaves be regarded as persons or property, the President, in conducting a war with slave States in rebellion, has the same right to seize their slaves that he would have to seize their horses, or anything else necessary to victory. This is the sole theory of the President's Proclamation; and we think it a great mistake, as to emphasize the doctrine of State rights, as to suggest, by even the remotest implication, that States in rebellion have any rights incompatible with the duties of the Government in their conduct. They cannot thus ignore the Constitution, and yet claim the protection of peaceful citizens. They are either belligerents, or traitors, or both; and under neither category can they claim any exemption from any necessary war measure. Not asking Mr. Barnes to adopt or reject this theory, we simply state it as the logical, and we think sufficient reply, as well to those who doubt, as to those who are now making not a little clamor against the Proclamation. Let the point be fairly put before the people; and we are content to abide the issue. . . . As to the sixth canon of peace, namely, 'The ultimate entire removal of slavery from our land,' we heartily agree with Mr. Barnes. We believe this necessary to anything like permanent harmony. We accept, too, his doctrine of compensated emancipation, and equally what he says in regard to the question of expatriation. We sincerely hope that the removal may not be too 'ultimately,' or so gradual that the evil will increase rather than lessen. As to the power of emancipation, we admit that this belongs to the State themselves in the time of peace, qualifying the admission, as Mr. Barnes does not, with the belligerent rights of the General Government to blast slavery or anything else in the rebel States, so far as this may be necessary to the conquest of this wicked rebellion. We do not believe in any State-rights, or any State institutions against the life of the nation in such a war as the Government is now compelled to wage. As to the evils likely to result from immediate emancipation, we do not at all sympathize with Mr. Barnes in the fears which he expresses. So great a change cannot, of course, be effected without some evils, greater or less, according to the course taken by the slave holding class; yet, as a matter of fact proved by history, the giving of freedom to the oppressed is by no means so great a calamity as some would have us believe. Mr. Barnes, we desire to say in conclusion, has by no means backed down from his anti-slavery position; yet we think that he has fallen into some errors in discussing the question of peace, and that his sermon, as to its whole impression, is not precisely what the public heart most needs in times like these. While it may be prevented and abused by sympathizers with the rebellion, it is liable to create some confusion in the thoughts of strictly loyal people.

Leaving the omnibus one day, and feeling for the side-walk with my staff, a woman's voice inquired, "Are you blind, sir?" "Quite blind." "Well here's the side-walk; but can you guess where you are?" "Yes, at the corner of the measure, yet the allusions which naturally suggest this question imply doubts, or at least some degree of hesitation. The enemies of the Government spare no pains in exciting public prejudice against the war on the ground of the Proclamation. In the current slang of the day, they say that the war has become an Abolition war, a war to put down slavery, a war for the negro, and not for the Union. That this is utterly false they have the amplest means of knowing. The Government has not changed its ground as to the object of the war. It has adopted the principle of Emancipation in application to the rebellious States on the same theory and for the same purposes that it has raised an army and built a navy. The object is to conquer the rebellion; and emancipation is used simply as a war measure. So the President expressly says. His judgment, too, as 'Commander-in-Chief,' upon a war measure, is final. It is justified, also, by the usages of civilized warfare. Now the sermon of Mr. Barnes, not so much by what it says as by what it suggests, is, as we think, calculated to make an incorrect impression on this point. It is not true, as one might infer from the sermon, that the power of emancipation is absolutely, in all possible circumstance, limited to the action of the States where slavery exists. Whether the slaves be regarded as persons or property, the President, in conducting a war with slave States in rebellion, has the same right to seize their slaves that he would have to seize their horses, or anything else necessary to victory. This is the sole theory of the President's Proclamation; and we think it a great mistake, as to emphasize the doctrine of State rights, as to suggest, by even the remotest implication, that States in rebellion have any rights incompatible with the duties of the Government in their conduct. They cannot thus ignore the Constitution, and yet claim the protection of peaceful citizens. They are either belligerents, or traitors, or both; and under neither category can they claim any exemption from any necessary war measure. Not asking Mr. Barnes to adopt or reject this theory, we simply state it as the logical, and we think sufficient reply, as well to those who doubt, as to those who are now making not a little clamor against the Proclamation. Let the point be fairly put before the people; and we are content to abide the issue. . . . As to the sixth canon of peace, namely, 'The ultimate entire removal of slavery from our land,' we heartily agree with Mr. Barnes. We believe this necessary to anything like permanent harmony. We accept, too, his doctrine of compensated emancipation, and equally what he says in regard to the question of expatriation. We sincerely hope that the removal may not be too 'ultimately,' or so gradual that the evil will increase rather than lessen. As