

American Presbyterian

New Series, Vol. II, No. 29.

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1000.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, JULY 20, 1865.

TERMS. Per annum in advance, \$3.00. Single copies, 10 cents. Clubs—Ten or more papers, sent to one address, payable strictly in advance and in one remittance.

American Presbyterian

THURSDAY, JULY 20, 1865.

CONTENTS OF INSIDE PAGES.

SECOND PAGE—THE FAMILY CIRCLE: God in all, and all in God—The Clouded Intellect—A Singular but Good Report—Eva—The Singing-Master's Explanation—Christ—Cheerfulness—Three Friends—A Little Child's Prayer—Family Worship—The Blessing of Sorrows—Rural Economy: Over-work—How to Kill Weeds—The Japan Plink.

HIGH AND LOW CHURCH EPISCOPACY: WHICH IS LEGITIMATE?

The Episcopal Church, both in England and in this country, seems doomed to incessant agitation. There is such an amount both of truth and error of the most radical sort included in its comprehensive pale, that such agitation must be expected.

Never were Low churchmen more bold, or more demonstrative; never, we think, in a generation, have they, in such prominent places, gone so far in their advances towards other denominations; or so fully ignored the barriers of prelatic exclusivism, as in the proceedings of their clergy in and around New York city, during the past fall and winter.

Mr. Barnes could not make this statement after what has happened during the fall and winter in and about New York city. On the occasion of the opening of a new Episcopal church in Brooklyn, the Church of the Messiah, March 30, clergy-

men of no less than five different denominations, by invitation of the rector, Mr. Thrall, took part in the services. Other instances upon which we cannot now lay our fingers, quite as significant of the length to which these Low churchmen are prepared to go, occurred about the same time, and declarations were frequently heard like that made by Rev. John Cotton Smith, at a meeting of denominations for the promotion of Christian Union in New York city, viz: that he regarded his Episcopal ordination as essentially that of a church, and that he considered Presbyterian ordination as perfectly valid.

On the other hand, as if not to be outdone by the evangelical party, the High churchmen took the opportunity of the appearance of an official of the Greek church in New York, to show the strength of their regard for the hierarchical and prelatic bodies from which they are so slightly separated. This Greek priest was allowed the use of Trinity church, in which to perform the entire ritual of that semi-pagan body to which he belonged.

These movements, on both sides, show a great advance beyond anything previously seen in the Episcopal church of this country. The Low church party especially distinguished themselves by an unwonted degree of boldness and persistency.

silence, there was buried a world of consultation and preparation, and now the air of the Episcopal church resounds with its ripe results. There is not the remotest idea of submission, but, on the contrary, a sturdy, manful, outspoken defence of the course pursued, and a vigorous effort right over the head of the Bishop, to prove that course better Episcopacy than his own. Rev. Dr. Tyng, now, as twenty years ago, a leader in the movement, having written a personal letter in defence of his course to the bishop, has been requested by forty of his fellow-clergymen in the vicinity of New York, constituting the "Protestant Episcopal Clerical Association," to publish the letter, which has been done; and it now stands as the declaration of the entire body.

A RICHMOND RELIGIOUS PAPER.

The Christian Observer is being issued in Richmond every other week, on a small dingy single sheet, at \$4 in advance, "payable in Federal currency." The change to a regular weekly issue is promised "as soon as we can find means of circulating the paper." The tone of the last number, July 6, is somewhat more careful, but not less artful and perverse than before.

For men who voluntarily put themselves under the dominion of rebel leaders, who left the scene of legitimate authority, and volunteered the aid of the religious press to promote rebellion, to plead that they were only following Paul's command of obedience to the powers that be, is a degree of mendacity, of perversion of the Scripture, and of cool impudence which can only be looked for among those who justify the starvation of rebel prisoners, and who leave their own Northern relations to die, unheeded and uncared for, in rebel dungeons, branding them, when in their fresh graves, as outlaws, and worthy only of the burial of an ass!

This argument on Duty to Civil Rulers, contains sentences like the following:—"The duty of the citizen then, is not changed, even if the Government be the worst the world ever had." "The apostle commands obedience to it [the Roman government] even after it became a miserable abortion, and had forfeited every claim to respect," &c. What such language means, all understand. If, however, it is true now, was it not true in 1861? Has Dr. Converse got light on the passage in Scripture, which he had not then? Was the authority of our government less tolerable then than now? Is submission any more a duty now than it was then?

"The English Church has never received this scheme, from the Reformation down to this day. Its introduction has always been opposed and contended with, as a novelty which the church had never received. The character of the Archbishops of Canterbury in the whole line of their testimony from the Reformation, has been the solemn witness and token of the opposite decision. From Cranmer down to Sumner, they have transmitted no such scheme to their successors. The only conspicuous name among them adopting the scheme is the ill-fated Laod. While all whose names have given honor to their station, like those whom I have mentioned, and Wake, and Reeve, and Tenison, and Tillotson, and Secker, and others like them, have presented no such doctrine as the doctrine of the church over which they so honorably presided."

What is to be the issue of this struggle does not appear. We cannot but admire the spirit and ability shown by these evangelical brethren in maintaining a position so honorable to their catholicity and their piety. Twenty years ago, Mr. Barnes declared that the evangelical part of the Episcopal church must succumb to the High Church, as alone truly consistent with the standards and spirit of the body, or must abandon it. Since that time, the struggle has gone forward with varying indications. Just before the war, High Churchism gave some evidences of power, which we miss at present.

In an article on the action of the two Assemblies, the editor repudiates them both, and says both Assemblies are determined there shall be no union between them and the Southern Churches. Of the East Tennessee Presbyteries lately incorporated in our body, and of the proposed visit of ten Northern ministers, he says: "In two or

struggle? Is the Low Church now reaping the benefits of its hearty sympathy with the government and the great moral interests at stake in the war? We do not know, but it is certain they are acting like men conscious of strength, if not fully masters of the situation. No less than forty of their clergy in New York city and vicinity, have applauded and sustained their patriarch in his bold rejoinder to his bishop. There is little appearance of succumbing to the High church, or of shaking off the dust from the soles of their feet, and leaving the old Church. Claiming, as Low churchmen, truly to represent it, and endeavoring to conform its practice to their views, they seem much more likely just now to make the church too hot for the exclusives. We have no doubt great good will result from the agitation.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW AS A MALIGNANT.

For the third time, this would-be oracle and judge of literary merit, comes to the attack of Dr. Gillett's noble and invaluable monument of ecclesiastical biography, THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN HUSS. The pertinacity of these attacks is something unheard-of in the higher walks of American criticism, and furnishes good ground for suspicion that it is not merely in the interest of honest and impartial criticism that they are written.

Yes, that is the cry in the last article. Plagiarism! If anything was wanting to show the animus of the attacks, we have it in this assault, involving the moral character of the author of John Huss. Any one acquainted with the characteristic frankness, truthfulness and simplicity of Dr. Gillett, will know at once how to estimate such a charge. It is one easily made and one to which almost every great work in literature has been subjected.

Professor Tayler Lewis has come forward as a champion of the equal right of the freed people to full citizenship in our country. He thus writes to the Christian Intelligencer in answer to the objection that "suffrage is not a natural right." "But 'suffrage is not a natural right.' Admit it, we say. The objection is not to the position, but to such an application of it. It

three Presbyteries in East Tennessee, there are small minorities, who, in the absence of most of their members, have assumed the names and powers of the judicatories to which they belonged. These minorities invited the General Assembly to send men to that field. We do not know of any other Presbytery or even a congregation which this Committee can divide in all the South."

THE RELIGIOUS PRESS.

The Congregationalist, answering some inquiries of a correspondent as to the meaning of the phrase, "Substance of Doctrine," gives a column of explanation from which we quote the following sentences:—"In Congregational usage, the phrase 'substance of doctrine' always has this meaning: that the doctrines of the Confession are asserted to substantially as therein set forth, and not that the Confession itself is subscribed verbatim et literatim, as though it embodied the substance of all Scripture."

In a word, then, the phrase "substance of doctrine" has been used in New England theology from the beginning as a declaration of Congregational liberty. It is not a modern evasion of the old confessions; it expresses the spirit and intent of the fathers at Cambridge, at the Savoy, and at Saybrook. The imposition of a creed, the subscription of articles verbatim et literatim, begets dishonesty, and tends to demoralization. But our fathers were called upon to impose upon others a form of words, or to exact a literal subscription to article of faith. "We do not assume to ourselves," said the Synod at Saybrook, "that anything be taken upon trust from us."

In a recent letter of Mr. John Stuart Mill, he says:—"I defy any one to point out in my writings a single passage that conflicts with that of the best religious minds of our age except as Christianity." This is a very strange sound to one who has read Mr. Mill's article on Comte, in the January number of the Westminster Review. So far as we remember, he expressed no dissent from the theological bearings of Positivism, and in one place hinted that the prominence given to Satan in the ordinary faith of the Church assimilates Christianity to Polytheism. But, in truth, Mr. Mill's challenge, bold as it seems, amounts to nothing. Who are "the best religious minds" of our age? If they be such as the late Theodore Parker, or Mr. Maurice, or Baden Powell, or the Westminster Reviewers, then Mr. Mill is quite safe. But this is simply one hearsay or errorist bolstering up another. If our recollection of Mr. Mill's views be correct, he rejects creation, incarnation, miracle, providence, atonement, special grace, and final retribution, as these points have been held by the great body of Christians from the beginning. If this be so, Mr. Mill's claim to be a Christian is a case of false pretence wholly unworthy of a philosopher.

We call attention to the statement of facts in regard to the financial condition of the American Board, in another part of the paper. The deficiency, even upon the most economical basis of calculation, is very large. The churches can meet it; we think they will meet it, but it is matter of regret that the deficiency has been allowed to reach such a height and that such an embarrassment has been suffered to hang upon the plans and measures of the executive officers. They have a trying position, and deserve the admiration, the thanks, and the prayerful and liberal sympathy of the church for standing in their lot so faithfully.

A PHILADELPHIA PASTOR RETAINED.—The West Arch street Presbyterian Church of this city, (O. S.) occupying, on the corner of Eighteenth and Arch streets, one of the finest church edifices among us, has long been involved in difficulties, chiefly financial, under the discouragements of which its able and highly esteemed pastor, Rev. Dr. Edwards, was induced recently to offer his resignation. To prevent the disruption of the pastorate, a Committee of Presbytery came into counsel with the congregation. The result was so far successful as to prevent the dismissal of the pastor, and to furnish good hope that the church will be relieved of its embarrassments and enter upon an era of prosperity. Dr. Edwards is a gentleman whom we should greatly regret to spare from the ministry of Philadelphia.

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that

venient resource of all maligners who wish to put on the air of critics. They forget that there is a liberty accorded to all writers to use the materials accumulated in the past, to any degree not destructive of the claims of their own work to originality. All that the North American critic has proved in regard to the unacknowledged citations in "John Huss," is the due diligence with which the author has availed himself of such materials, while making the "Life and Times" the splendid monument of his own powers of thought, judgment, elucidation and style.

A GREAT ENTERPRISE SUFFERING.

We cannot find that the Boston Congregational Council took any notice of the Board in their proceedings, notwithstanding Dr. Anderson was a member. Why was this?

A PHILADELPHIA PASTOR RETAINED.—The West Arch street Presbyterian Church of this city, (O. S.) occupying, on the corner of Eighteenth and Arch streets, one of the finest church edifices among us, has long been involved in difficulties, chiefly financial, under the discouragements of which its able and highly esteemed pastor, Rev. Dr. Edwards, was induced recently to offer his resignation. To prevent the disruption of the pastorate, a Committee of Presbytery came into counsel with the congregation. The result was so far successful as to prevent the dismissal of the pastor, and to furnish good hope that the church will be relieved of its embarrassments and enter upon an era of prosperity. Dr. Edwards is a gentleman whom we should greatly regret to spare from the ministry of Philadelphia.

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that

proves nothing in respect to the great question now before this nation; it does not touch the real point in the case, any more than another proposition which we have seen lately presented as conclusive in this matter, namely, that citizenship does not involve the right of voting, and which is not so clear, if we take suffrage, in its widest sense, as denoting some measure and means of representation in the State. Is there any such thing as political equality in the broad sense of our Declaration of Independence? If there is, can the proposition that direct individual suffrage is not a natural right be reconciled with it? We think it can be, and in the simplest way. The colored man has not a natural right to vote, but every man has a natural right to become a voter. We mean by this, that every man, black or white, unconvicted of crime, and who holds any kind of membership in the State, by birth or otherwise, has a natural right, by virtue of such membership and implied representation, to obtain those conditions, be they easy or difficult, which the State, in its wisdom, may have connected with this or any other political franchise. He has a natural right to obtain them, if he can obtain them in the use of the natural powers that God has given him to be thus used. He has a natural right to be unhindered in such attainment by anything in the law laying class exclusions, or unsurmountable obstacles of any kind in his way, that are not thus laid in the way of every other man. Nothing for or against any that is not equally for or against all—nothing by law we mean—this is the natural birthright of every child born in a free State. This, and this alone, is political equality, however much we may distinguish it from natural or social equality. The denial of it is the denying of any possible sense to the famous assertion contained in our Declaration of Independence, or if that declaration be true, it is a denial of the proper humanity of those who are thus prevented by law in the attaining that which their natural powers are capable of attaining, and which is left attainable to other men born in no higher, no lower, condition of natural right. God may have made, or permitted, inequalities physical or mental; with that the law has nothing to do. There may be social rigidities, reasonable or unreasonable; these the law cannot well prevent. The way may be hard, harder for some than for others, but it should be an open way, as far as the law is concerned, for all humanity.

Suffrage should be made difficult, but there should be the same difficulty—the same legal difficulty, we mean—for all. The law may impose conditions, but there should be the same conditions for all. The right of voting may be made a high privilege instead of a right to be abused and contemned. We state may make it great by making it dear; it may demand knowledge; it may demand the acquisition of a certain amount of property, or of an interest in the soil, or anything which may be regarded as the means, however imperfect, of securing some degree of moral and social worth; but these should be demanded alike of all; the way should be left open to all, and when attained they should secure the precious right to every man whose unhindered natural powers have enabled him to reach the point thus offered to the free competition of all.

The Boston Recorder is in a mighty good humour over the action of the late Council, the enunciation of doctrinal principles being precisely after that journal's heart. It quotes from our notice of the Council, and comments as follows:—"We must notice the leading editorial of a valuable paper, differing from us much more in polity than in creed—the American Presbyterian, the central organ of the 'New School' Presbyterians in Philadelphia. Such words cheer us. Our steadfastness in the faith, our determination that the action of a Council shall be more than 'the resolves of a mass meeting'—may our intended aggressiveness, meet its approval. With the author of this we should love to contend till we die—contend which of us and whose forces shall quickest and widest spread the principles of our common ancestors. Let our Presbyterian brethren redouble their exertions or we shall beat them. We will if we can, and we hope we can."

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that

What has been the effect of this pastoral? At first, there was great silence; but if any thought it the silence of submission, they were greatly mistaken. Under that