

The American Presbyterian.

John A Weir

15 July 69

New Series, Vol. V, No. 47.

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1174.

Strictly in Advance \$2.50, Otherwise \$3.
City Delivery 20cts, to be paid at this Office.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1868.

Home & Foreign Miss. \$2.00.
Address—1334 Chestnut Street.

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1868.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE EDITORIAL CORPS.

Among the measures designed to increase the efficiency and attractiveness of our paper at this time, our readers will welcome the new arrangement by which a large and distinguished corps of writers is added to the Editorial Department. As the designation of these brethren has met the cordial approval of the Pastors' Association of this city, they will be known as

THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

Their contributions will be generally accompanied with the initials of the writers. Their names are as follows:—

Rev. Z. M. Humphrey, D.D., Pastor of Calvary Church.
Rev. Herick Johnson, D.D., Pastor of the First Church.
Rev. Danl. March, D.D., Pastor of Clinton St. Church.
Rev. Peter Stryker, D.D., Pastor of N. Broad St. Church.
Rev. George F. Wiswell, D.D., Pastor of Green Hill Church.
Rev. E. E. Adams, D. D., Prof. in Lincoln University.

Rev. Samuel W. Duffield, Special Correspondent.

Mr. Robert E. Thompson will continue to act as Editor of the News Department.

Correspondents in every Presbytery and Synod will promptly furnish us with fresh items of news from their respective fields.

THANKSGIVING, A HOME FESTIVAL.

The Festival of Thanksgiving has now become National. It can no longer be regarded as a festival of the church. It was scarcely that in the days of the Puritans, for the Puritans who established it, were stout reformers and cleared the church of all that appeared to savor of Romish observance. Yet it was a religious festival, though appointed by a civil governor. It is a spot of sun-light on every year's record of Puritan history. It is in human nature to have and to celebrate anniversaries—those which call out joyful feeling, as well as those which make us think of sackcloth and ashes. And we are glad that those to whom our country owes so much, had their Feast-day as well as their Fast-day.

Thanksgiving day is in New England, as it has always been, a day for family reunion. In November, every true New Englander feels the instinct of the bird of passage, and yields to it, if he can. During the days immediately preceding and those immediately following the 26th of November, this year, the lines of travel to and from New England will be crowded with migrating men and women. Many an old home will be cheered by the presence of those whom it sheltered in infancy and dismissed in manhood. The rafters will ring again. Familiar faces changed by a shade, will be reflected once more from the polished andirons in parlors, which, for the most of the year, are too quiet. There will once more be some perspective to tables, for the most of the year too short. There will be joyful greetings, and then precious benedictions.

Perhaps it is because of a New England training; but Thanksgiving should, as we judge, be always observed as a Festival of the Family. The fact that it is national should not destroy its domestic character. The causes of National gratitude need not be forgotten at the family altar, but every interest of the day should centre on the home. We deprecate the habit, gaining strength in many places, of devoting the day to public social gatherings. The sanctuary should be a place of general resort, for we are to hallow the day by giving of thanks in the usual places of worship. But when home is reached again, after such solemn service, home should be honored by all that makes it lovely. By no promiscuous "parties," by no matinees, or other public entertainments should this day be violated. We are driven away from home, or led away from it, too much, during the ordinary days of the year. This day should be given, as much as possible, to the indulgence of domestic happiness, to the recounting of domestic joys, though some soft shadows of domestic griefs should temper those joys and so render them more tender.

We are in a measure losing the old idea of home. Life in boarding-houses and hotels is destructive to all true domestic feeling. The growing habit of seeking happiness in places of public resort makes a nominal home less sacred than it ought to be. For one day, at least, in all the year, we should surround ourselves to all that makes home sweet.

This year we have all the ordinary causes of gratitude in sunshine, rain, harvest—in national peace and prosperity and material progress. We have extraordinary occasion for rejoicing in God's "remembrance of the world" through such Providential movements as that observed in Spain. None of these would we forget; yet after recounting these, we would have the thought run with most care along the lines of domestic history. We shall lose nothing of our love for

country, or our interest in the world, for making more of home than of country or globe; for in the home are the strongest roots of national life, and from it go some of the most powerful forces for the world's subjection to our blessed Lord.
Z. M. H.

HEART IN RELIGION.

From every quarter comes the call to Christians to work in the vineyard. The harvest is fully ripe and the reapers must thrust in the sickle or the precious souls all ready to be garnered, will perish. There is yet much land to be possessed and who, if not the people of God, will go up and possess it? Jesus looks with pitying eye upon the famishing and dying multitude—the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind, in the high-ways and bye-ways, the streets and lanes of the city, and right in the heart of this great moving, surging throng is the Christian church. And the word of the Master is clear and audible, "compel them to come in that my house may be full!"

Oh! for this gospel compulsion, this constraining love!

All true, successful Christian work must be the fruit of a heart deeply and solemnly impressed with the value and danger of perishing souls. All true work has heart in it. Fellow-Christian, if you expect to do much for Christ—if you mean to be of real service while you stay, you must put your heart into your work. It must be heard in the tender tones of your voice, in your prayers and praises and appeals; it must be seen in the pity and compassion of your eye, and your earnest and persevering labors for the salvation of souls must bear witness that your religion is heart-work.

To go about the Master's business in a cold formal way, as many do; to hear the preacher because it is quite proper; to go to prayer meeting because one's absence will excite comment; to live in the church and attend to all the external proprieties of a nominal believer, with no real heart in it, or sympathy with the high and glorious trusts committed to us—all this must be bondage indeed! The galley slave at the oar is nothing to this!

But to have one's heart inflamed with the love of Christ and love of souls; to go forth with an intense and glowing desire to win the unwary and careless to the cross; to make the cause of God the chief and absorbing subject of thought and feeling—this is a joyful life—this is liberty—this is rest in action. Oh! for more heart—more fervor—more consuming zeal and devotion in our religion. Could we feel, as a few years since, a great sweeping wave of divine influence coming over the heart of the church, calling Christians to prayer and praise and labor, and awakening the dead in sin to life in Christ, how should we sing for joy! The cold, formal tone of personal piety would give place to quick and warm hearted labors in season—out of season.

Christian brothers! there is work for you close at your hand; perhaps in your own families, your workshops, your counting houses. There are those close beside you for whom Christ died who are yet in impenitence. They call upon you for help. They need your prayers. But alas! perhaps you have no heart to do this kind of work. You say you would like to see a revival. You think the minister ought to try to promote or rather commence such a work. But the standing fact against you is, that you have no heart for any of these things. You do not go to the prayer meeting, you neglect the culture of your own immediate field, and others do the same. And by reason of this, Zion languishes and the dead in our houses and homes and congregations and the world's great high-ways are going to their dread account all unshrived.

Let it not longer be so! Pray for the spirit of the Master—pray for heart-searchings and re-consecration and then shall we go forth to a joyful harvest of souls.
G. F. W.

LIQUOR DEALERS AND THE DEMOCRACY—A NATURAL ALLIANCE.

During the last two or three years, the Republican party has in many instances sought to make up for the loss of its Conservative and doubtful elements, which the excitement of the war had rallied to its support, by coquetting with the rum interest—as deadly an enemy to the welfare and perpetuity of the country as slavery and rebellion. Whether they have accomplished anything anywhere by such an unpatriotic and immoral course we know not. One thing is certain: they have disgusted and estranged not a few of their staunchest adherents, who have been deeply wounded by a course which has seemed to them quite irreconcilable with the patriotic aims professed by the Republicans, and which has had too much the appearance of a purpose to hold on to power, solely for the sake of power; and

without regard to any high, moral ends to be achieved by it. When a party is on the high road to such a position, good men begin to feel that it is time for them to shake themselves loose from it. Another thing is certain, the Democracy, in the most important sections of the country, have utterly refused the proposed alliance. Here in Philadelphia they have succeeded in reversing the ancient supremacy of the Republican and cognate parties; a most significant rebuke to the half-hearted, unmanly policy of concession to the liquor interest, which has marked the execution of all laws bearing upon the traffic during the present Republican administration. We cannot as a party console ourselves in the hour of defeat by saying: All is lost—save honor! That is gone too.

The following emphatic action of the New York Liquor Dealers' Association shows which party they regard as their natural Allies and warns the Republicans against such a direct abandonment of the fundamental principles of their party as is implied in the attempt to conciliate, the great drunkard-making, revenue-defrauding prison-populating party of the land. Read this latest Democratic manifesto:

A special meeting of the New York Liquor Dealers' Society was held at Metropolitan Hall, Hester street, Monday evening, the president, Mr. D. V. Freeman, presiding. After the regular business of the meeting the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously passed:

Whereas, The semi-prohibitory liquor-law previously called the "Metropolitan Excise law," still stands upon our statute books, and the rigor of its enforcement has been in no way mitigated; and

Whereas, The said "excise law" has drawn from us the sum of \$4,000,000, and in return therefor we have received only insult and oppression; therefore be it

Resolved, That this society rejoices in the opportunity of expressing its gratitude to the Hon. John T. Hoffman, for the course pursued by him as a judge on the bench, and as mayor of this city, with respect to the unjustness of the prohibitory and oppressive laws which seek to take from us, as citizens, our rights under the constitution of our State and country; and remembering those acts with respect, we pledge our association and its influence, to the support of Mr. Hoffman, as a candidate for the gubernatorial chair of the State knowing that his qualifications, in all respects, cannot be excelled; and we call upon all our State, who have been unjustly dealt with by those who would violate the constitution in order to destroy their rights, to join us in a determined effort to place John T. Hoffman at the head of the affairs of this State, to the end that our privileges as citizens may be assured and protected; remembering always that with Allen C. Beach as lieutenant-governor, presiding over the senate, and having the casting vote, we have double assurance that our rights will be protected.

Resolved, That our thanks are due, and are hereby tendered to the democratic members of the senate and late assembly, for their faithful adherence to that part of their platform relating to our interests; and that good faith displayed in so striking contrast to the infidelity of the other party, is the ground-work of our belief that the spirit of the resolution in the present platform will be the basis of action in the next legislature.

THE "CIRCULAR" MOVEMENT.

[From an Old School Contributor.]

DR. MEARS.—May I trespass, once more, on your good nature, courtesy and liberal Presbyterianism? I am afraid we are "drifting into a war," I hope of words only, though bad words have a strong tendency to become bad things. I think I can see that, in both churches, the idea of "the Standards," is gaining ground. It is equally clear that past discussions and disputes have gathered some misunderstandings about those simple words—the Standards. (1).

The adoption of these by both branches, at once disposes of the whole matter in dispute—of the Smith and Gurley explanations, and of the tenth article. (2). The common standards of our faith and order know no more of the one than they do of the other. This I understand to be the spirit of the qualified action in the few of the N. S. Presbyteries, and also in the many of the O. S. Presbyteries, which have expressed their preference for the Standards over the first and tenth articles. We do not affirm that this is the meaning which all attach to the action of the Circular party. We know it is not, but this is the meaning of the laity and of the great mass of the clergy.

"H. J." is certainly mistaken in speaking of the Reunion basis as being identical with the Standards, "and that upon just this, and no other, is it proposed to unite the two bodies." "The plan proposed by the Joint Committee demands the Standards as a basis, and admits of nothing else." (3) Now if this were so, if the Standards are "six," and the Joint Committee's plan is "half a dozen," why should "H. J." demur to the substitution? (4) except that the Standards are as much shorter than the Committee's plan, as six is shorter than half a dozen.

Now the Committee's plan not only demands the Standards, but also demands the Smith and Gurley amendments—it demands them as an explanation, modification or guarantee; and, in turn, other men demand the tenth article as an explanation, modification or guarantee. Thus these articles become the occasion of recriminations. Some Old School men suspect, insinuate and even charge looseness and heresy upon those who insist on these amendments of article first; and to preserve the balance of power, some New School men suspect, insinuate and also charge despotism and bigotry upon the upholders of the tenth article. Let us see that no man put a stumbling block in the way of his brother.

(5.) "Is the Xth article found in the book?"

asks "H. J." Are the Smith and Gurley amendments found in the book? ask we. Now why this talking back, "this answering again?" Because of the spirit that dictated the tenth article and the amendments to the first. If article Xth is interpreted by New School men as the measure of Old School suspicion, and article 1st, is interpreted by O. S. men as the measure of N. S. unsoundness, then there is, not only, not yet enough confidence for a Reunion, but there is not enough religion to make it worth while to unite.

"Has anybody proposed anything else (than the Standards)," demands "H. J." Yes, we reply, everybody in either school, that prefers the Committee's basis to the Standards, pure and simple. The N. S. proposed the Smith and Gurley clauses, and the O. S. the Xth Article. To say that the former was added to guard liberty, and the latter to preserve orthodoxy, would be to say that the Standards had done neither, nor could they do it.

But you, Mr. Editor, demand these amendments as guarantees. Do you want guarantees of honest men? No! but "all men have not faith" you say. If you go into partnership with a thief and demand as a guarantee that he shall not pick your pocket, what is the value of that guarantee? Its value is the thief's honesty! But suppose he does pick your pocket, then what is your guarantee worth? It may prove that your pickpocket partner was not honest, (you knew that before, but it won't restore your money. (6) It is not guarantees that were needed, but either honesty, or no partnership.

MORAL.—Give us the Standards, pure and simple, because the beginning of comment "is as when one leleth out water."

We are glad to see these frank and manly words. There is no "fog" here. If we could have had anything like the same definiteness in connection with the action of those Presbyteries voting (thus far fifty-five to thirty-five) against the plan of the Joint Committee, and in favor of "the Standards pure and simple," we should all be in the "sunlight." The points involved are worthy of notice. In the interests of truth and for mutual understanding, let us briefly consider them.

1. "Past discussions and disputes have gathered some misunderstandings about those same words—the Standards." Exactly so. And desire for definiteness on this very point was what prompted our previous article. Do "those simple words" refer to the doctrinal basis simply, or to the basis entire?

2. "The adoption of these (the Standards) by both branches, at once disposes of the whole matter in dispute,—of the Smith and Gurley explanations and of the tenth article." Does it? This is the very point of doubt. Where is the official record of it in the other branch? Has not every O. S. Presbytery had its back towards the Xth article, and its face towards the 1st, when it has voted, Down with the basis; Up with the "Standards?" Do they mean to sweep away both articles by their vote? Or is the doctrinal part of the basis what they are aiming at, and what they wish to get rid of? This is asked in no captious spirit, but under the firm conviction that our misunderstanding is right here. The correspondent thinks the adoption of the Standards disposes of the whole matter. The Cincinnati Herald says, "Their Presbyteries (O. S.) want to throw aside as useless all the elaborate cabinet work of the Committee on the doctrinal part of the basis, and go back to the Standards pure and simple." That is, in the view of this authority, the action of the O. S. Presbyteries has reference to the 1st Article, and to that only. The Xth shall stand untouched.

Again, Marshall Presbytery is on record as commending the Xth Article as a wise provision. Commenting on this action, The Presbyterian (O. S.), says, "Undoubtedly, it is a wise provision. In a Church so large as the united Church will be, it will be a safeguard, of which we believe all will acknowledge the value when a few years shall have passed away." It will be a safeguard in the united church, will it? Then it is to be retained. Then the Presbyterian's loud and emphatic call for "the Standards pure and simple," isn't meant to touch the Xth Article. Is this the way their adoption is to "dispose of the whole matter in dispute?"

3. "H. J." is certainly mistaken in speaking of the Reunion basis as 'demanding the Standards and admitting of nothing else.'" We need only reply to this in the very language of the 1st and leading Article of the proposed terms of Reunion, to wit, "The Reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards." There the words are, in the plan; and not an amendment, nor a modification; not the change of a word or a letter of the Standards is suggested or thought of. The Smith and Gurley amendments are not amendments of the Standards, but explanations of the manner in which they are accepted and adopted. And we think it wanting in fairness and an entire misconception of the fact, to represent the proposed plan of Reunion overture to the Presbyteries, as "abandoning the old foundations."

4. "If the standards are 'six' and the Joint Committee's plan is 'half a dozen,' why should 'H. J.' demur to the substitution?" "H. J." does not demur to the substitution, provided it be entire. But that is a sorry substitution which shows only one offender the door.

5. "Is the Xth Article found in the Book?" asks 'H. J.' Are the Smith and Gurley amendments found in the Book? ask we." Certainly not, we answer, to each question. Drop both, then; or neither. Sweep the field, or let it alone.

6. "It is not guarantees that are needed, but either honesty, or no partnership." True. We have felt, from the first, that if the union is not to be a misfortune and breeder of strife, underneath any formal act of union there must be a basis of mutual confidence. When the two bodies fairly stand on that, there will be no caviling about terms. Dr. Patterson, in his masterly speech on the floor of the Assembly at Harrisburgh, expressed our conviction concerning the Xth Article, when he said, "It would have been better to leave the matter where the book leaves it." We think the same concerning the explanatory clause of the 1st Article. We are ready for union with them, or without them. But a plan involving the rejection of the one and the retention of the other, seems to lack the vital element of mutual trust.
H. J.

As to "partnerships," let us suppose that I am approached by a person with an offer of partnership and a statement of terms. I examine the terms and find them satisfactory, and give my consent. Whereupon, the individual offering them turns away, saying they do not suit him. Presently he comes back, bearing other terms for my inspection. They are not so satisfactory to me as the first; yet on the whole, they will do, and I again give my assent. Again the other party falters and withdraws, and talks, as he goes away, about still another set of terms. Meanwhile it is clear that one party has shown all the confidence that could be asked, and the other little or none; and without the least question of honesty or self-respect being raised, common prudence raises the question, whether as partnership on any terms with the other party would, at present, be peaceful or profitable.

MORAL.—(Left to our correspondent to deduce.)

THE TRUE DOCTRINE.

While we notice in some quarters of our church a hesitating, halting policy, a disposition to change base again to accommodate the conservative portion of the Old School, it is quite refreshing to know that there are those who are firm in the conviction, that the largest Christian liberty must be demanded, in any union that may be effected.

One of the best pastors in the Synod of New York and New Jersey, in full sympathy with the Reunion movement on any just and honorable basis, thus expresses himself: "I am not prepared to speak on some aspects of the Reunion question, but one point is plain, and can never be less so, namely, that the Old School should understand two things, first, that we are as sound on the standards as they are, and yet are no more so than we ever have been. Secondly, that we shall continue to think, and preach, and write, and publish, in proper ways, with just as much freedom as we have done for the last thirty years. I hope we shall print much more. And if they do not wish to unite with us just as we are, let them say so plainly." We say Amen! to this, and with all due self-respect as a church of God let us stand by this doctrine to the end.

The Pope has, unfortunately for him, seized the opportunity of the approaching (Ecumenical Council to indite a very weak, prolix, and dreary sort of rigmarole to Protestant Christians, not, as was supposed and telegraphed, inviting them to attend the Council, but "improving the occasion" of a council of Catholics for their benefit, and pointing out to them how wicked it is not to submit to the Holy See. No address ever delivered, even to a Church Congress or International Association, could have been more rambling or devoid of matter and drift. If the poor old gentleman be declared the infallible organ of his Church, it will certainly be a striking proof of its faith in the supernatural guidance of faculties much below those of the average man. An insane Pope would not, we suppose, be accepted as the adequate official organ of the Holy Spirit, in spite of being individually of unsound mind.

Old subscribers who wish to get their papers for nothing, need only procure two new subscribers each, and send the pay, \$5, when all three will be credited for a year.