

The American Presbyterian.

New Series, Vol. V, No. 51.

John A. Weir

15 July 69

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1178.

Strictly in Advance \$2.50, Otherwise \$3.
Postage 20cts, to be paid where delivered.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1868.

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

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 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 writers 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. Herriek Johnson, D.D., Pastor of the First Church.
Rev. Daniel 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.

CHRISTIANITY THE TRUE RADICALISM.

Notwithstanding the odium attaching to the word in the minds of many pious people, there is nothing so radical as true piety. It goes far beneath the surface; it quite undermines the merely social and political radicalism of the day; it reaches down to the granite foundations of the Gospel. Radicalism professes to go to the root of evil, and aims to tear them up and out at any cost. But what strikes half so directly at the root of all evil, or what is so severe and sweeping as the declaration: "Ye must be born again"? All the revolutionary and progressive schemes which have threatened to convulse the world, are a mere scratching on the surface compared with this. Regeneration; the change of the individual nature from sin to holiness, from self and the world to God, from pride and indifference to humble faith in Christ, is the only true radical Reformation. The philosopher and social reformer work out their theories and use the technical terms of their science; but the truly pious man is alone engaged with the very roots of character and the foundations of things: God and the soul; sin and holiness; conscience, penitence, grace, Atonement. The reformer talks of legislation, of war, of suffrage, and it is well; but his radicalism does not reach half the depth of the Christian worker, who noiselessly toils to plant gratitude to God, consecration to Christ, and charity to man among the very springs of action, deep in the individual soul.

Indeed we have a right to say that there is nothing radical but the Bible and the systems which conform to it; there is nothing in all the world of such intense moral depth and earnestness; which makes holiness the prime attribute of its God and the vital element of its heaven; which abhors all sin as intrinsically hateful, and will hear nothing of expediency or of compromise, but confronts it with a perfect law and an eternal hell; which accepts no outward conformity to its rule of life, but requires truth in the inward part; which teaches us to pray: Search me, O God, and know my heart; which overwhelms us with such declarations as: "Thou hast set our iniquities before Thee, our secret sins in the light of Thy countenance;" or this: "The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Is not this radical enough?

And what one person in the universe is the true root of all progress, in whom we can feel that we have got down to the infinite substructure of all things; of man, of society, of history, of the past, of the future, of life, of growth, and of well-being; who is it but CHRIST? who came to earth to grapple with the very essence of evil in the unrepented, unforgiven sin of man; who led captivity captive; who was anointed to preach the Gospel to the poor, who was sent to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the blind, and recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord; who, by the blood of Gethsemane and of Calvary, the ascension gift of Olivet and the outpouring of His Holy Spirit, laid the foundations of the Kingdom of Heaven—the city of God on earth. A reform based upon theories and speculations and the experiences and expediences of life must be shallow compared with that which is based on a

LIVING DIVINE PERSON.

The grand difficulty about radicalism, and the reason of its being considered an ill omened name, is just because it is not radical enough. It is too often a hollow pretentious cheat. Radicalism, which is not deeply, earnestly moral, which does not go to the core of man's being in his spiritual nature, which sees in the adjustment of the mere frame-work of society, the panacea for all evils; is the merest quackery. True radicalism sees and admits that the ills of humanity are beyond mere human cure. It looks for help in the fearful struggle, to Him that is mighty to save. It flies to prayer. The sin of man, his estrangement from God, his rejection of Christ are a mighty burden, which it brings with groanings that cannot be uttered to the throne of infinite compassion. In the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh is its only hope.

Christian Radicalism! that is what we need to-day. May all our ministry and church members be baptized with it afresh, and we shall soon hear of its blessed fruits in multitudes turning from their sins to God.

And, Christian men and ministers; cherish no unworthy fear of the radicalism of moral reform. Grapple yourselves in the very spirit of Christ and your religion with every moral evil. Give it no quarter. Be cautious in many respects, but in none more so than to compromise such a precious a thing as principle. And take care always to be more radical than the noisy set who think the removal of a few outward evils will bring on the Millennium. You know better, and must work accordingly.

APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION.

We lately heard a young pastor at the close of a very interesting service, pronounce the following words as the benediction: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God our Heavenly Father, and the communion and fellowship of the Holy Spirit, be and remain with us, and with all the people of God; from this time forth and forevermore. Amen." Shades of our departed theologians, what say you to this? Should Chalmers, Cannon or Miller have heard one of their pupils thus conclude the worship of the sanctuary, would they not lift up their sainted hands in holy astonishment?

That was a "benediction"—a good saying—in the same sense in which the sermon, and each prayer and each hymn of praise was a benediction. But was it a benediction in the true sense in which that word is applied to the concluding service of the sanctuary? We are aware that in some Evangelical churches the benediction is pronounced as a prayer, and that the officiating minister says "us," not "you." But is there not a distinction? A prayer can be offered by any one, whether a layman or an ordained minister. But the benediction proper, we think, can only be pronounced legitimately by the ordained minister. We regard it as a ministerial act. The man of God standing in the sacred desk is invested with a holy power. He is a successor of the Apostles. He is the vicegerent of Jehovah. And solemnly, in the place of God, he does not properly pray—but he pronounces in the divine name a blessing upon the people. Have we not Bible authority for this opinion? Look at the priestly blessing with which Aaron and his sons were commanded to bless the children of Israel—Numbers vi. 24–26; "The Lord bless thee," &c. Not "O Lord, bless us. See also the patriarchal blessing, Gen. xxvii. 28, 29, and Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. Notice also the salutations and benedictions of Paul and of some of the other Apostles at the beginning and close of their Epistles.

There is another objection to the form used by this young pastor, and which is alas! too frequently used by older ministers. It was evidently intended as a quotation of 2 Cor. xiii. 14. But it was not repeated correctly. The words spoken did not agree in form or substance with the benediction of Paul. They contain a very apparent tautology. *Communion and Fellowship* as used in the Bible are synonymous. They both translate *Koinonia*. See 1 Cor. i. 9, and 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

Moreover there was a redundancy in the form employed which made us think the pastor liked Paul's words pretty well, but felt they ought to be explained, and so he amplified the inspired expression, either to bring it to the comprehension of his fellow worshippers, or to impress the truth more vividly upon their minds. Would it not be in good taste, more honoring to God, more pleasing to man, when we attempt to quote a benediction or any other portion of Scripture, to do it correctly? At a recent ecclesiastical meeting, the Moderator in concluding a solemn service pronounced a benediction in a manner similar to the above; and we could not but agree with a good brother by our side who whispered in our ear, "That was good, but he did not make it any

better by trying to improve the language of the Spirit."

We do not wish to sit in criticism upon our brethren whom we respect and love. But so often have we heard intelligent laymen express their dissatisfaction with the manner in which this closing exercise of the sanctuary service is performed that we cannot but throw out these hints to our fellow pastors, and especially to our young brethren. No part of the service can be more solemn than this, and as the conclusion of the whole it deserves attention. Deliberately, impressively, tenderly, with all the authority and affection of a pastor should the blessing be pronounced upon the flock; either in the pastor's own words or those of the Scripture. And when inspired language is employed let it be quoted correctly. P. S.

DR. McCOSH IN PHILADELPHIA.

For the sake of our city, quite as much as for the sake of the honored and gifted President of Princeton College, we rejoice in the reception given to Dr. McCosh in the Seventh church, on Tuesday evening of last week. The honoring of a literary celebrity of the elevated class to which Dr. McCosh belongs, is by no means a common event with us, who generally give over our College and High School Festivals to misses in their teens, with here and there a Doctor of Divinity, while we consider ourselves too busy to turn aside once a year to glance at the fountains of learning and culture in our city. An occasion for calling out the literary and philosophical interest of our people, so that at least two of the learned professions could take part in it, is something to be thankful for. The formation too, of a Philadelphia Alumni Society of one of our distinguished Literary Institutions, one of whose earliest acts was the highly successful reception, just alluded to, is a matter for sincere congratulation.

No matter if the practical purpose of the movement was financial. It is one of the most remarkable and encouraging features of the times that our moneyed men are taking such a generous interest in the literary institutions of the country, and enabling them to multiply so greatly the efficiency of their appliances, and to call to their professors' chairs, with cosmopolitan spirit, the ripest and most famous teachers of all lands. We hope the Philadelphia Alumni of Princeton College will go to work zealously, and do a handsome thing for their Alma Mater, who herself has found a sort of step-mother in the State of New Jersey, and is, perhaps, the most scantily endowed, by far, of all the older and more famous of our institutions. When inquired of as to her wealth, she can only point to her many distinguished sons, and say with the Roman matron, (as Mr. Alexander reminded us,) "*Hæc ornamenta mea.*"

Rich in her graduates, and rich in historic memories of revolutionary times, Princeton is poorly endowed, not only in money, but in those grander and fresher associations of loyalty to Union and to human rights, which have consecrated all our Northern Colleges of any importance. None of those talismanic words could be, or dared be, uttered at the reception of last week, which would have quickened the pulses and kindled the souls of a New England or a Western audience, on a similar occasion. Princeton, we believe, has erected no tablet to her martyrs in the new and broader contest for liberty; has no pean to float with undying sweetness through her halls like that of Lowell at Cambridge; and the rallying of her sons from afar to put the laurel crown upon her heroes living and dead, and to write her name with theirs high up before the world upon the new and bloodier and more glorious roll of liberty, union and justice in the nineteenth century, if such there was, does not seem to have left a deep impress upon the large body of her Alumni in Philadelphia. And it is, in this aspect, an act of self-sacrifice for a man who so thoroughly understands and so warmly sympathizes with the true American heart, to take the position which Dr. McCosh now holds. But it is with no surrender of his deeply grounded and matured principles that he comes to Princeton. His first utterance in his inaugural address, which we regret we have not yet found time carefully to examine, closed with the utterance of a sentiment radical enough to startle the very timbers of the College from their places. And the selection and emphatic reading of this sentence by Attorney General Brewster, with the thanks which he so warmly tendered to its author, and the applause with which it was received by the assembly, gives us ground to hope that the presence of the accomplished, ardent and genial Dr. McCosh in that institution may be, in every sense, as life from the dead. We quote the sentence as an appropriate close.

"But you will expect of one descended from

the old Covenanted stock, who fought so resolutely for the rights of conscience, and whose blood dyed the heather hills of Scotland; from one who was brought up in a district where there are martyrs' tombs in every church-yard; from one who was connected for so many years with the Irish system of national education, which allows no one to tamper with the religious convictions of pupils, that he shall take care that every one here shall have full freedom of thought; that whatever be his religious creed or political party, be he from the North, or be he from the South, be he of a white or a dark color, he shall have free access to all the benefits which this college can bestow; and that a minority, nay, even a single conscientious individual, shall be protected from the tyranny of the majority, and encouraged to pursue his studies without molestation, provided always that not being interfered with himself, he does not interfere with others."

MR. MILL'S DEFEAT.

The defeat of John Stuart Mill for Parliament in England, by the Westminster Constituency, is a significant and in some respects encouraging fact. In some respects, we say, for so far as it implies opposition to the righteous reform in suffrage, Church and State, and other political matters now in progress in England, it is to be deplored. Mr. Mill was one of the most prominent, intelligent, and able of the advocates of such reform; the one man, in fact, in all England, who by his brilliant and successful efforts to ground these reforms in the great principles of science, was in one aspect, most deserving of a seat in the first Parliament of the Reform Movement. So far, it must be admitted, Mr. Mill's defeat is a public calamity. So far, too, as it springs from sheer ignorance of the man, and incapacity to understand his views, from want of appreciation of real merit and fitness for public position, or from a blind bigotry which has become the pliant tool of prejudice and party, or finally, from a state of corruption which could only be managed by gross bribery and counter-corruption such as Mr. Mill has steadily refused to practice, his defeat is to be deplored by the friends of a free and a pure ballot box, all over the world.

All these causes, however, were in operation when Mr. Mill was a candidate and was elected to the Parliament now passing away. And it is not likely that in the advance made by the Reform movement since that time, they would have alone been sufficient to cause Mr. Mill's defeat for the new Parliament. Doubtless it was then as now, sufficiently well known that Mr. Mill was not "a religious man," stood committed to no creed, and in no sense represented the religious sentiment of the community. That much in a candidate, the mass of electors, including religious men, there and here, wisely or unwisely, are willing to let pass. Something far worse, more decided, especially in a candidate of unimpeachable moral character, is necessary to turn the masses of a nominally Christian country against him, and that something was furnished in the *Atheistic leanings and sympathies of Mr. Mill* as developed in the contest. Mr. Mill is not a positive and partisan Atheist, and has never classed himself with Atheists, but he holds to a philosophy called, "positive," just because it will have nothing to do with theology and metaphysics, and because it confines itself to sensation and perception, and their immediate mental results, scientifically treated. There is no room in it for either of the processes, *a priori*, or *a posteriori*, by which we arrive at the first principles of natural theology. True, the author, Comte, attempted to supply a form of worship, but there was no God, and no superhuman objects in it; and though Mr. Mill repudiates it with contempt, and though he is exceedingly reticent on this whole subject, he does say: "We venture to think that a religion may exist without a God!"

We will not undertake to defend the motives of the Tory opponents of Mr. Mill in Westminster, in addressing to him, during the recent Parliamentary canvass, questions in regard to his religious belief. It would require considerable evidence to show that they were animated with great zeal for the vital interests of religion in their proceedings; they wished to defeat Mr. Mill and carry the Tory candidate. They were politicians, and they used whatever method promised them success. But they made us acquainted with the facts. They brought out a characteristic letter from Mr. Mill, in which he declared, not that he was an Atheist, but that whether he were or not it could make no difference, and that it was a personal matter which voters had no right to know. In this position he was quite consistent with the spirit of his philosophy to, which it is a matter of indifference whether there be a God or not.

But Mr. Mill still further betrayed his leanings towards Atheism, by writing a letter in defense of an Atheist of the grossest and most offensive sort, named Bradlaugh, who we believe, like himself, was a candidate for a place in Parliament. This act was probably fatal to Mr. Mill's

prospects; at all events, Mr. Mill was defeated, and the result must be an unfolding to the popular mind, as it could never otherwise have been done, of the Atheistic leanings of Mr. Mill's philosophy, the branding of Mr. Mill as a sympathizer with the worst forms of Atheism, and the more extensive reprobation of the positive philosophy itself. And whatever less satisfactory features the case may present, we see that there is in the popular heart a horror of Atheism. The man who affects to treat it as a matter of indifference, goes in the face of the deepest human convictions. The heaven-daring impiety of denying God is a matter of indifference only to the most abandoned of characters or the most perverse of thinkers. An indifference to which God or no God, infinity or vacuity, a Universal Father or a Universal Abyss are all the same, is intolerable and monstrous. To try to be non-committal on such a question, is to try to be in and out of the universe at the same time. I have a right to suspect man or woman of incapacity to discharge rightly any duty in life who denies the being of a God and so destroys all the foundations of duty. And when the very highest and most responsible duties of life, those of government, are to be entrusted to my representative, I should consider myself unfit to choose a representative, if I were indifferent to his views on such a fundamental matter in all human relations as the being of a God. And the candidate that would persuade me that his views on that subject are personal matters, on which I should be indifferent, accuses me of incompetence to act the part of an elector, as well as confesses his unfitness to act the part of a legislator.

Atheism in government! that nearest of all human things to God; that which has nothing but expediency, association of ideas or force to sustain it, apart from divine sanctions? That which embodies the nation's past, and trains and moulds the whole nation for the future? Atheism in a free government! which rests upon personal rectitude, self-restraint and mutual confidence, and which needs for its permanence, to be vital in every part with a recognition of the being, the justice and the infinity of God? What is this but a deep and horrible delusion, or the morbid fancy of theorists who wish to experiment in the lives and well-being of millions of their fellow creatures, forgetting that religion is a fundamental principle of their being?

We believe the defeat of Mr. Mill is a sign of wholesome dread of his errors and of his indifference to the holiest of questions, and an encouraging proof of the soundness of the popular feeling. There have not been wanting indications of a similar kind in our recent municipal election, when two opposing candidates for a high office were contrasted as religious or irreligious men. Republicanism in Europe or America must set itself in undisguised antagonism to Atheism and infidelity.

We have been accustomed to regard the Editor of the *Independent* as a person of rare literary endowments and of enviable editorial abilities; as a writer of fine taste, and not wanting in the gift of poesy; his quiver well furnished with shafts to pierce error, but not more keen of edge than polished of surface. That there was hidden from public view, a side to his nature, coarse, malignant, envenomed, which could find utterance only in words of boundless vituperation, we had scarcely dreamed. Yet such is the fact. His personal assault upon one of the Editors of the *Evangelist* last week, is enough to make journalists, religious and secular, hang their heads in shame. We do not believe such paragraphs would be admitted to the editorial page of the *New York Herald*, or in any sheet above Brick Pomeroy's *Democrat*. Most unwise *Independent!* If you wished to pour scorn on Mr. Craighead, why make it patent to all the world that there is, at least, one Editor worse than he? We cannot soil our page with quotations from the article. Suffice it to say that it is in reply to an article in the *Evangelist*, sustaining the complaint of Western Congregationalists against the orthodoxy of the *Independent*, and which contains no line or word to justify such a style of reply.

We are pained beyond expression at the melancholy end, which has befallen one of our well-known, highly useful, honored and able young Episcopal ministers, Rev. Robert Parvin, burned in the recent steamboat disaster on the Ohio. His earnest, patriotic spirit, which was especially developed in connection with the Christian Commission, and deeply evangelical piety, for the spiritual and bodily wants of the soldiers, and his catholic spirit, rendered him more than a favorite with every denomination. We are informed that he had very opportunely insured his life for \$5,000, in an Accident Company, before he started.