

The American Presbyterian.

John A. Weir 16 July 68

New Series, Vol. V, No. 17.

\$3 00 By Mail. \$3 50 By Carrier.
50cts Additional after three months.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1868.

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1144.

Ministers \$2.50 H. Miss. \$2.00.
Address:—1334 Chestnut Street.

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1868.

THE IRISH ESTABLISHED CHURCH— PAST AND FUTURE.

THE FUTURE.—As there is a tendency to exaggerate the responsibility of English Protestantism for the unfortunate state of Irish affairs, so also is there a tendency to exaggerate the importance of the action taken by the English Parliament in its bearing on the future of the Irish Church. The Irish Church will indeed be thrown back on the voluntary contributions of its membership, while its large endowments will most probably be devoted to promoting the Irish National Education scheme. But it is to be remembered that the whole landed property of Ireland, a small percentage excepted, is in the hands of the members of that Church; and that they evince an excessive—often a fanatical—loyalty to her. It is not the Established, but the Presbyterian Church which will suffer severely by the withdrawal of endowments, for, except in the linen-manufacturing districts, Irish Presbyterians are not wealthy; and there is little doubt that the English Parliament will soon cease to vote the annual *Regium Donum*. And while, for the Episcopal Church, in a monetary point of view, the change will not be so great, it will certainly be gradual. The respect for proprietary rights—real or supposed—which has always characterized English legislation, will undoubtedly prevent any individual dignitary of the Irish Church being deprived of his endowments during his own lifetime, and the work of disendowment will therefore be slow and gradual, and the necessity for new modes of support will probably be met as they arise. On the other hand, a more equitable adjustment of salaries will doubtless be made in the future; and the bishop will no longer roll in luxury at the expense of the church.

II. But there are still greater advantages than these. The report in which the two great Protestant Churches of Ireland will be presented to the Irish people, when the stumbling-blocks of State endowment and the *Regium Donum* are taken away, will be far more favorable than it has been. They will no longer be mere badges of foreign domination, and the priest will no longer be able to rouse sectarian hatred by appealing to national prejudices. The Celt will be more open to the advances of a purer faith when it comes in the meekness of Christ—a King yet riding on a colt the foal of an ass—than when it came as a conqueror. Which of the two forms of Protestantism will appeal most powerfully to the Celtic intellect may seem doubtful. To a superficial observer it might seem that any want of a purer and more Scriptural creed that might arise in his mind, would naturally be better satisfied in the Church that corresponds most closely in outward form to his own—in the Church that appeals most to his love of the external and the formal. But history does not sustain the judgment. The Calvinistic Theology and the Presbyterian order were established at the Reformation by the Celts of France and Switzerland. The keen Celtic intellect of Calvin and the clear precision of the Celtic mind in general mark every line of the system of Geneva, and have been rather a hindrance, than a help to its progress among Germans, Norse and Anglo Saxons, who love the mysterious and the indefinite. Of all the English-speaking theologians, the one most to the mind of Calvin, bears the Celtic name—Owen. A Calvinistic Presbyterianism is the leading faith among the Celts of Wales, and the Baptist Calvinists rank second in that Principality. The Celts of the Highlands are the most intensely Calvinistic, and Presbyterian members of the two Scottish Assemblies. And in the Romish Church itself, no teaching ever took such a powerful hold of the Celtic French intellect, as did the Augustinian teaching of Jansen, Pascal and Arnauld. It is not, therefore, impossible that the disendowed Irish Presbyterian Church may have a noble, a national future, when the disruption, long threatened and always imminent, between Irish and Ultramontane aspirations shall have taken place.

III. But the disendowment of the Irish Established Church will be an universal benefit to that Church itself. The old saying "there never was an endowment but there was a drone to eat it," has been largely exemplified in her case. The Irish Episcopalian Rector will be a Home Missionary under the new state of things by the very necessity of his position. The Church will be compelled to put forth all her strength to maintain for herself a position which she has hitherto regarded as her own by right. The wonderful activity and energy which has characterized the Free Church of Scotland will find its coun-

terpart in her. Indeed the very prospect of such a change as this, has aroused a degree of activity in Church Extension and Home Mission work in the past few years, that has no parallel in any former period of her history. And we rejoice to say that it is of a kind that we can heartily sympathize with. As compared with the sister Church of England, the Irish Church is marked by a high degree of doctrinal soundness. Puseyism would be ridiculous in a country where "the real thing" is abundant, and whatever the sins of Irish Churchmen, sympathy with Rome, in the nature of things, cannot be reckoned among them.

IV. The bearings of this Parliamentary vote on other Irish questions is important. The great Irish grievance is the Land Tenure. Free Trade with England has done for three provinces of Ireland what it would speedily do for us—has left agriculture the only employment open to the people, and has thus made the Land Question all-important, a question of life and death often. The English system of indefeasible and unlimited property in land which is neutralized in England by the abundance of manufactures, and in this country by the abundance of land, has neither palliative in Ireland—the tenant is at the mercy of the landlord; he must work on the land-owner's terms, or starve, if he cannot emigrate. And this system is all the more unjust in that it is an innovation in Ireland. In old times the land was the property of the clan; but consolidation has not merely taken away the rights of the head of the clan, but those of the people also; giving the clan a new head, and making him that what the old head never was, an absolute feudal landlord. This same blunder and injustice has been done over again in the Scottish Highlands and in India. Now, this touching the rights of the Church will be a precedent for striking at the deeper wrong, and touching the rights of the landlord also, so limiting them that he shall not possess absolute control as to either the terms or times of leases, and making it more easy for tenants to become proprietors, and more easy to improve their farms.

Surely in many ways the justice of the Lord is establishing itself on the face of the earth.

LICENSES REFUSED.

Among the many encouraging statements made in the Narrative of Religion in the Churches of the Third Presbytery, were those in reference to successful efforts made in the bounds of two of our rural congregations (East Whiteland and West Nantmeal) to prevent the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating drinks. The pastors, Rev. A. M. Stewart and D. C. Meeker, with members of their flocks, acted with great energy, and secured such an array of respectable signatures to the necessary remonstrances, that the courts having the power to grant the licenses, felt it their duty to refuse, when the usual applications were made. Thanks to the efforts of these brethren, the two townships named have not, and cannot have, for a year, a licensed drinking place within their boundaries. Who will go and do likewise?

THE ORGAN IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

The power of music alone, without the aid of words, to soothe, tranquillize and exalt the mind, and unconsciously prepare it for the more specific acts of worship, is no doubt, felt every Sabbath Day, by those who frequent a sanctuary where a good and well-managed organ is one of the accessories. The organist may minister as truly to the spiritual wants of the worshippers by his voluntaries as the poet whose words are sung, or even as the preacher himself. Or, by his utter disregard of the proprieties of the place, or the mismanagement of his noble instrument, he may largely aid the great enemy of souls in counteracting and dissipating the impression for good made by other parts of the service. The organist needs to be devout man, entering with all his heart into the spirit of the services, and using the great capacities of his instrument to give voice to his own spiritual aspirations and to reach the deepest recesses of the spiritual nature of the hearers. How even the approaches to the impenitent heart may be carried by the appeals of music, is beautifully shown in the following remarks of Krumphacher, upon David's playing before Saul:—

"It was a song without words whose soothing melody then fell upon the ear of the king. Words corresponding to the music would have effected the contrary result, to that which was aimed at, and might even have increased the ill-sense of the king. There are even yet men enough of this sort,—persons without faith, yet at variance both with God and the world,—whom solemn music is able most powerfully to delight, and in whom it awakens, at least for the time, dispositions which border on devotion and piety, while yet the words which correspond to the sacred melody, would produce in them the very opposite effects. What is manifest from this, but that in the soul of such persons, the last point at which they may be touched by that which is feared, has not yet wholly decayed away. Let them be on their guard, however, lest by constant striving against the thoughts which, unspoken, echo forth from the harmonies with which they are delighted and refreshed, the last strings in their soul, which the heavenly breath gently sounds may at length break asunder, and their aversion to the heavenly message finally terminate in a decided and incurable opposition to all that comes down from above."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

MR. EDITOR:—With your permission I propose to present to your readers the results of some reflection on the subject of Reunion, which is now before our Church in a form so immediately, practical and demanding, as it seems to me, a more thorough consideration than it has yet received. The importance of the great question before us is on all hands acknowledged, and no doubt deeply felt. But there is not reason to suspect that the attention of our ministers and people has of late been called chiefly to a view of this subject respecting which there is but little diversity of sentiment, and little need of inquiry? I refer to the desirableness of Reunion, abstractly considered, or regarded in its relations to the efficiency and power of Presbyterianism in this country, assuming that it is practicable on grounds that promise permanent harmony in the united body. It seems to be extensively taken for granted that if the reunion can be once accomplished, all difficulties will immediately vanish, and that the great thing to be done is, therefore, to bring all the moral force of popular conventions and other like demonstrations bear in favor of the union, so as to "overwhelm the anxieties of doubtful minds" and rush the matter through to a speedy consummation. Hence there is but little said in any public way respecting the possible consequences of a reunion rashly entered into, or the necessity of boldly facing the obstacles that are to be disposed of in order to a cordial, practical union that will honor Christ and constitute in fact an answer to his prayer for the oneness of his disciples. Is it wise to assume that two bodies that really represent two parties in the history of a Church that has been already twice divided on substantially the same issues, only need to "hush into each other's arms" to find that there has been nothing but a slight misunderstanding and a mere war of words between them? Is it not well to exercise patience enough to look on all the practical sides of this subject before we take such steps as we cannot retract? I cannot but feel deeply and painfully that a sad mistake has been made by many of our brethren on both sides, who have seemed to frown upon all efforts to secure a frank and careful comparison of views such as would be likely to reveal the precise points of difference and the extent of the diversities between us and our "Old School" brethren. If it does appear to me, after "honest" anxious inquiry, that nothing approaching a thorough understanding of each other's position, has yet been reached by the two parties that are proposing to unite, and yet there is apparently a strong determination to press the question to a final decision under the urgency of a popular clamor for union at all hazards. Our fathers continued their negotiations through eight or ten years before they consummated the reunion of 1758. A reunion, which after all precaution was followed by a worse schism than the former in less than 80 years. Moral causes work more rapidly now than ever before; and if we patch up an union on a hollow agreement it will not take a third of eighty years to add another to the characteristic divisions of Presbyterianism. And another great division would seal the fate of our Church in this land.

Before I close this preliminary article suffer me to ask our lay-brethren who are so anxious for immediate reunion, if they have considered that if we, as a minority, unite with our O. S. brethren, who will constitute a majority of the united body, our institutions and Church property will pass out of our power, or at least be chiefly lost to us; in case we shall find it necessary to make another exodus from the house of bondage! The bare possibility of being compelled to go out stripped and single-handed again after having spent thirty years in reconstructing our ecclesiastical fortunes, affords a reason why some of us wish to "know of a surety" what we are doing, before we enter into a partnership in which we shall be the weaker party. The fair-minded men among our brethren will honor us the more for desiring and demanding such an explicit understanding between us and them before we actually unite, as will be followed by no bitter repentance when it shall be too late.

I am not one of those who believe that an organic union between the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in this country on safe grounds is out of the question. On the contrary, I think that such an union will after a time be practicable; while I do not believe that the way is fully prepared for it in the present condition of things. In two or three future articles I will, if Providence permit, endeavor to set forth clearly the grounds of these convictions. Yours for the REAL UNION.

In *The Evangelist* for Feb. 20th, we stated what seemed to us to be the result of the discussion, so far as the doctrinal basis was concerned, viz: that both Schools were ready to adopt the Confession in its proper historical or Reformed sense; and also, that "in respect to allowable explanations and interpretations of the system, no liberty was asked for on either side, inconsistent with the above principle, none that interferes with the integrity of the system and its specific doctrines. But as much liberty is conceded as is allowed by this same principle." And we then quoted the *Princeton Review* to the effect, that "the ministry are not required to adopt every proposition contained in our standards"; and that different explanations are allowable, provided the doctrines themselves are not "rejected."

As the *Evangelist* now publishes the above a second time, we suppose it regards the statement as comprising everything essential in a doctrinal basis of union. Perhaps it does. And yet a few questions arise in regard to its possible interpretation, to which we invite the attention of our respected cotemporary.

1. Who is to judge of the consistency of the various interpretations with the Calvinistic or Reformed sense of the Confession?

If it be answered, The united Church, then we ask again, What if the united Church choose to take a more rigid view of the Reformed sense, and extended it to a greater number of specific doctrines or opinions than it is now supposed, in some parts of the Church, to cover? What, on the *Evangelist's* basis, is to hinder them? To whom, against the possible penalties of such a decision, could there lie an appeal? If it be answered that the great majority in the united Church can be relied on as certain to show a degree of toleration equal to that now allowed in the most advanced portions of the Church; we answer: (1.) This is probable, but not demonstrable. It is a significant fact that no organ of opinion on the other branch justifies, demands or promises such toleration. (2.) An intolerant minority, supposing it to be a minority, would be capable of doing enough mischief to neutralize all the benefits of Reunion. (3.) The vast majority in both branches are in favor of perpetuating the degree of toleration allowed in any part of the Church; why should there be any hesitation to express it now in the most explicit manner?

2. Does the *Evangelist* wish us to understand that it would be content, and that the united Church should be content with the degree of toleration which the editor of the *Princeton Review* is inclined to allow?

3. On the whole, is the *Evangelist* so desirous for Reunion that it would prefer to have the doctrinal lines drawn closer than they now are, rather than the scheme of Reunion should fail?

4. Are there no doctrines in our extended Confession that are not fundamental, and that might be rejected without injuring the integrity of the Calvinistic system?

ONE OF THE NEW YORK DAILIES created a great sensation a few days ago by warning Jefferson Davis to take himself off, in view of the fact, that by the first of May, Andrew Johnson would be removed from the Presidential chair, and "Old Ben Wade" would be occupying his place. That stern Radical, in the judgment of the *Herald*, would not be deterred by the small technical difficulties which have hitherto interposed between the arch rebel and his just doom, but would "quickly find a way to meet out to him his deserts." We trust the prognostications of the *Herald* may turn out to be something more than mere matter for an stirring paragraph. With a proper example made of two such men as Andrew Johnson and Jefferson Davis, who does not see that the now rapid moral sense of the whole country would be astonishingly quickened? Who doubts that the secret assassination clubs of the South would vanish on the instant that such an act of justice in high places was announced, who would not expect every flaming arrogant rebel of the South to subside into the most exemplary meekness, or be found ready to swear that he had never been anything but a radical at heart? The ship of the republic, now almost on her beam's ends, would be righted in a moment by such a favorable gale. Nine-tenths of the obstructions to the reconstruction of the South on principles of loyalty and equal rights would vanish. Rascality in all places of public trust would hasten to the nearest hiding place, in a panic at the rising sentiment of justice all over the land.

Senators! It rests with you to say whether morals, politics, finances, personal rights and personal safety in our country shall enjoy this great relief.

Hon. W. E. Dodge, President of the National Temperance Society, says of a recent interview with General Grant:—

"I left him with the conviction that neither we nor the friends of temperance have any cause for anxiety in this respect."

The N. Y. Sun, edited by Chas. Dana, late assistant Secretary of War, adds:

"The truth is, that the practice of General Grant is total abstinence. In camp he—almost alone, among all the prominent officers of the army—never tolerated liquor or wine either at his table or about his tent. Fatiguing marches and the excitement and exhaustion of battles did not make him break over his rule, not to touch or taste anything alcoholic. Again and again we have seen wine offered him at public and private dinners; only to be steadily refused. We are assured that now in time of peace, and in the society of Washington, he still maintains the same custom."

AFFAIRS AT THE CAPITAL.

A notable event of the past week at the Capital has been the dedication, on the anniversary of his death, of a monument to the memory of Lincoln. Washington claims with no little pride the honor of being the first city that has raised such a memorial to the martyred President. The location is at the junction of Louisiana and Indiana Avenues and G Street, and directly in front of the City Hall. The monument itself is simple in design, consisting of a circular shaft resting upon an octagonal base, and crowned with a moulded capital, upon which stands a statue of Lincoln in the attitude of making an address.

The freedmen of the District and its vicinity celebrated on Thursday the anniversary of the proclamation of Pres. Lincoln, emancipating the slaves of this District, by a large procession of military, masonic and temperance orders, and ward delegations. In the procession was a printing press from which were issued and distributed along the route copies of the message of Mr. Lincoln approving the bill of Emancipation of April 16th 1862, to which was appended in reverent gratitude: "We the recently emancipated slaves of the District of Columbia thank God for that glorious act of Justice towards poor down-trodden humanity."

Another important step towards the completion of the impeachment trial was made on Saturday by the announcement of the President's counsel, that the evidence for the defense was closed. The closing day was one of discomfiture to the defense. The whole Cabinet, with the exception of Stanton, was in Court to testify in regard to the discussion of the constitutionality of the Tenure of Office Act in Cabinet, and of the decision reached and the conformity of the President's conduct to that decision. Their testimony was ruled out, but not till after Messrs. Evans and Curtis had made many efforts to introduce it. These gentlemen showed much chagrin and even anger at this failure, and abruptly closed the case.

There is of course much speculation as to the final vote. This will be reached, after discussion in secret session, by action upon the separate articles with open doors. Any one article, if sustained by the vote will be sufficient to bring conviction. The action upon the principal charges is foreshadowed by the vote of the 14th of January re-instating Stanton when thirty-five Republicans voted in favor of re-instatement. By this was settled three things: that Mr. Stanton's case came under the Civil Tenure act; that there was no adequate reason for his suspension; and third, that it was not in the President's Constitutional power to remove him. Thirty-five Senators voted in the affirmative, whilst only thirty-six are required to convict. On that vote Henderson was paired with Hendricks, and Grimes, Sherman, Sprague, Willey, and Ross were absent. No one supposes that all these men are to vote for acquittal.

Again, when the President notified the Senate of the removal of Mr. Stanton and the appointment of Gen. Thomas *ad interim*, the Senate passed the resolution: "That under the Constitution and laws of the United States, the President has no power to remove the Secretary of War and designate any other officer to perform the duties of that office *ad interim*." All the Republicans present, twenty-nine in all, voted for this resolution. Of the thirteen absent Republicans, there are nine, at least, whom wild rumor has not taken the liberty to count as in favor of acquittal.

It is felt here that the President has made a weak and ineffective defense, and the Republicans are confident of his conviction. At the same time it cannot be denied that there is much feverish anxiety concerning certain Senators. Stories of one declaring over the card-table, that he expected to give a vote soon that would make him unpopular; of another visiting the President at night of another declaring "a dozen times" that the President is innocent; of another proclaiming in the street-car, that he knew of six Republicans who would vote for acquittal—these are current and find ready belief; but take any one of these stories and attempt to trace it to a reliable source, and it resolves into the thinnest air of gossip.

A gentleman who conversed with the Chief Justice last Friday evening came away with the impression that the Chief Justice expected the President would be acquitted; but it must be borne in mind that Judge Chase is not in full sympathy with the majority of the Senate, and also that this gentleman may not have rightly interpreted his cautious utterances.

"I believe, in spite of all the rumors which are so industriously started and blown all over the land, that there is as good reason to expect that forty Republican Senators will be found voting for impeachment on some of the articles, as that every Democratic Senator has already made up in mind to vote against impeachment."

April 20th, 1868. FENWICK.