

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, JULY 15, 1869.

REV. JOHN W. NEARS, D. D., Editor. No. 1334 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

- Rev. Z. M. Humphrey, D. D., Pastor of Calvary Church. Rev. Herriek 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.

Our Office will be open, till further notice from 9 A. M., till 3 P. M.

REV. A. M. STEWART'S LETTERS.—No. XXXVII.

SALT LAKE CITY, June, 1869.

This Capital City and sacred headquarters of the Latter-Day Saints numbers about twenty-five thousand inhabitants, fifteen hundred of whom are Gentiles—that is, not Mormons. This foreign population is composed of Government officials, Military agents, Indian agents, Wells & Fargo agents, Merchants, Bankers, &c. Many of these are with their families. An effective Protestant Church should long ere this have been organized, in this centre of the Latter-Day Kingdom. The Congregationalists attempted this some time since, but failed, (if my information be correct,) rather from the character of the agent than the nature and conditions of the enterprise. The Episcopalians are now making efforts to obtain a foothold, but do not seem to draw very effectively the anti-Mormon element. The time seems to have come when Protestantism must ignore High Churchism as distinctly, and for the same general reasons, that it now does Papacy.

PRESBYTERIANISM AMONG THE SAINTS. I went to the source of civil and ecclesiastical authority among these fanatics, and had a long, curious and interesting talk concerning the establishment of a Presbyterian Church in Salt Lake City.

"What," it was inquired, "would be the Mormon views and feelings towards such an enterprise?"

"You have the right to carry out such an effort."

"Certainly; as a minister of Christ and an American citizen, I, or any other Missionary of our Church, have the right to come and gather not only all the Gentile population into a Presbyterian community, but also to convert all you Mormons;—yet, what would be your feelings and actions towards such an one, were he here?"

"We would throw no obstructions in his way, provided he minded his own business."

"That is, you mean, if he did not preach against, nor in any way interfere with, Mormonism?"

"Yes."

"But a Presbyterian minister faithful to his Master would not, likely, be so passive. Again, could a lot for a church building be procured within the city?"

"Yes, provided any of the Saints would sell."

"But would they?"

"We think not."

"Then, the minister and his people would have to squat on some vacant place as you Mormons did."

UNCLE SAM'S OFFICIALS.

Their situation here is certainly pitiable and degrading. It seems difficult to understand how any man cherishing the feelings becoming an American citizen could accept an official position here. Nominally they are sent to judge of and administer the laws of the United States; while Mormon authorities enact and execute laws to suit themselves. Our authorities at Washington should act with more dignity. Either send no officials or support them to the last extremity in their authority.

POLYGAMY.

This crowning abomination among the members of the Latter-Day Kingdom, is much more complicated in theory, and more cunningly devised in practice, in order to delude, than seems generally to be supposed.

It is moreover an interesting fact and very instructive, that many of the leading and successful semi-religious errors in the world's history, have rested largely for their advancement upon perversions and abuses of the marriage relation. Mahomet's heaven of "Women and Wine;" Swedenborg's "Affinities;" and Brigham Young's "Sealed Wives for the other world;" are all of a piece! All appeal to and seize upon the lower passions of our fallen nature, and connect them as religious tenets, with the idea of full gratification in another world. All these systems are too gross, to draw and hold deluded followers, with a proposed resting and final settlement in the present state.

In a late printed speech of Brigham, now before me, he vulgarly boasts in this wise; "People ask how many wives I have. Well, I don't know. I have fifteen which I care for, how

many more belong to me I cannot tell." Now this, according to Mormon tenets, may all be true enough. The President may not know how many wives he has. Fifteen certainly in his household for whom he provides. But he may have besides, fifty, a hundred, or even Solomon's number of "Sealed Wives." This Sealing and Endowing of wives among these rectorious saints seem to be terms unexplained to outsiders. Like other secret associations, these appear to be among their unrevealed mysteries. And my impressions are they are made to cover a multitude of abominations.

The uniting of the Atlantic and Pacific sides of our continent—the minglings and surrounding of Utah by an antagonistic population must ere long compel a revolution of matters in this community so antagonistic to modern civilization and to Christianity. Yet how this is to be accomplished without some blood-letting your correspondent is at present unable to understand.

A. M. STEWART.

THE SABBATH A SOCIAL NECESSITY.

In the early days of "the Colony of Massachusetts Bay in New England," when its "General Court," or Legislature, took cognizance of everything, from pins and needles up to creeds and commandments, a tribe of Indians was once brought into court by these Puritan legislators, and questioned as to their willingness to keep the Ten Commandments. Many of their replies were shrewd enough, but the most suggestive was that in regard to the Fourth Commandment. They confessed that they were not much in the habit of working on any day of the week, but professed willingness to take special heed to that day as a day of rest.

On reading this answer it occurred to me that these old red heathen gave us a hint to the solution of the old question—"Did the Jewish Sabbath originate at the giving of the Law on Sinai?" The question has been discussed with the greatest energy by the friends and opponents of Sabbath observance, under the supposition that if it be answered negatively, then the Sabbath is proved to be only national in its design and obligation; not having been given to man as man, but to the Jew as a Jew. I think that the question must be answered negatively, but no such consequence can be deduced from the answer.

In the patriarchal age, society, as such, had no proper existence. The rapid "societary circulation," (as Mr. Carey calls it,) had no place in an age when the family (or its enlarged development, the tribe) was the highest form of social organization. Family negotiated with family; sheik with sheik. The precious metals were weighed out when one bought a piece of ground for a family place of burial, because no central authority existed to coin them and stamp them with their true value and the insignia of sovereign authority. Wealth was estimated by flocks and herds. Their employments were the tending of these; duties which involved a good deal of idleness and rest on all days, and which could not be neglected on any day. Under our own dispensation, work of this kind among the cattle (especially in grazing countries) is classed among works of necessity and mercy. The Sabbath of such a tribe could differ little, if at all, from other days. Life moved so uniformly, slowly, and quietly that no marked antithesis between days of work and a day of holy rest could exist. And the inspired word is as silent as we might have expected, on the subject of special seasons of religious rest. The commands given to Noah and to Abraham say nothing on the subject. The tribal stage of human progress—corresponding to that which we find among the Indians of our own country, is one on which man does comparatively so little on any day, that very special pains would have to be taken to distinguish one of them as a rest day.

Now, the patriarchal and tribal stage only ended for the Israelite at Sinai. In Egypt, Goshen was assigned them as especially suited for their mode of life. In the traditions of Egypt they were spoken of as the "Shepherd Kings," because they had in Egyptian eyes just these two characteristics, that they were not united under one national head, and their employment was the care of cattle. It was among the special cruelties of the Pharaoh "that knew not Joseph," that he took them away from their own work and set them to such work as brick-making, for which they were utterly unsuited, while the pasture fields of Goshen furnished no straw for the purpose.

At Sinai, their national existence began. The wonderful events which preceded and accompanied the giving of the law, were to impress upon them the truth, that the will of Jehovah was the ground and cause of their preservation in the past, and of their national existence and unity in the future. The minor laws given them were a series of instructions for their new condition of life, when they should become an agricultural community in the land which the Lord gave them. And now, at this point of transition, the Fourth Commandment is given as a new injunction. Six days they are to labor, rising to a higher degree of social activity and energy than that which they had hitherto been characterized by, and in so far being more like to the Lord, their God, who in six days had made all things of nothing. And as they were to share the divine activity, so must they, as men, made in the image and likeness of God, share the divine

rest also: "The Seventh day is the Sabbath (or Rest) of the Lord thy God."

The Sabbath, then, was not given to man as man, nor yet to the Jew as a Jew, but to society as society. It is the antidote and counteraction to the countless movement and circulation which is always threatening to make the individual nothing, and the mass everything; to set public opinion above conscience; work and gain above man. It is the intercalary space of masterly inactivity in which we seek to take our bearings with the facts of life and the universe, before plunging into the restless movement around us. It is the time to close our doors against business and take stock to see how it stands with us.

I have read somewhere of an Italian prisoner of State, who was confined to a dungeon for thirty years and then liberated. He went out into the world, but his own generation had passed away. The places, and the circles that had known him knew him no more. Every face was new and strange to him, and thirty years of solitude had left him so utterly unsocial that he had no hope of finding a new place for himself among men. The light and colors of nature were an offensive glare, her sounds a ceaseless, noisy din, when contrasted with the dim silence of his cell. The freedom which he had longed for was tasteless and wearisome when it came, and he went back and besought his jailors to restore him once more to his cell.

Had that man been released one day in every seven, would he have found life so wretched when his final release came? So with us. Money-getting, work, and society are building up an unseen but real prison-house around us. We may become so used to it that we shall find no place of rest beyond it; our hearts may grow so close to the things of this life, that all our delight shall be in them. God comes with His blessed day of rest, and commands us to spend one day in seven outside of these; and so to save our human and spiritual freedom and independence of circumstances by cultivating life outside of them.

ON THE WING.

FROM OUR ROCHESTER CORRESPONDENT. ST. PETER'S CHURCH.

We suppose we do not need to say "Old School" now, inasmuch as these distinctions are virtually abolished. And your Rochester Correspondent must confess that it has already made quite a difference in his interest in churches of the "other branch," now that they are not to be regarded as of another denomination, but as a part of our own. Is this unnatural?

We had the pleasure of looking, for the first time, into the new St. Peter's last Sabbath. It is a great improvement, in our estimation, on the former building. The old walls were of the drab brick, one uniform drab, inside and out. Now the interior walls are beautifully lighted up and relieved by a mixture of red bricks, in pleasant and varied figures, with the drab. The effect is very pleasing, a perfect relief to the monotony of the former surface.

The devices and mottoes in the windows are also very fine. The painting is rich and agreeable. The church is also a perfect success in acoustics. The voice of the preacher easily fills every part. We are quite sure, at the same time, if we may judge from the sermon which we heard, that the preacher is trying to do the people good by his earnest, practical, evangelical discourses. We could but bid him a most hearty God-speed in his blessed work. May the church thrive and prosper under his ministry.

The organ is on one side, the face of it flush with the wall, at about the middle of the audience-room, with a little organ-loft, sufficient only to accommodate a quartette choir. In parts of the singing, however, the congregation are expected to join. Of course, we could not altogether fancy the semi-Episcopal service, which is peculiar to the church; but if others like it, we hope they may find a blessing in it.

WESTMINSTER CHURCH.

This young enterprise has enjoyed uninterrupted prosperity since its organization. And now it is thought the time has come for improvement and enlargement in their present substantial brick edifice. It was built for a chapel, and has not enough of the appearance of an independent church. It is proposed to put unequal towers on the two front corners, to raise the roof, to make it steep and finished with open work on the inside, to put in galleries, to enlarge the audience-room by taking in what has been cut off for the infant department of the Sabbath-school, and to build a new room on the rear for the infant department and for prayer meetings, so arranged as to open directly into the church.

These changes, it is thought, will cost about \$3,000; will make the church very pretty and attractive, and enable it to accommodate a congregation of six hundred, which will probably be all that is necessary for the present. The Central church are deeply interested in the prosperity of this enterprise, which they have already done so much to establish, and they will still lend a helping hand in the improvements proposed.

INSTALLATIONS.

On Wednesday evening, 30th June, Rev. E. N. Manley was installed, pastor of the new Presbyterian church of Camden. The sermon was preached by Rev. George S. Boardman, D. D.; charge to the pastor by Rev. B. F. Willoughby; charge to the people and installing prayer by Rev. Selden Haines.

Mr. Willoughby and Mr. Manley were classmates in the Seminary; and as the former is to be installed at Saquoit, next, Thursday, Mr. Manley is to have a chance to reciprocate all the kind and faithful words addressed to him, by giving the charge to the pastor on that occasion.

The charge to the people came very appropriately, from the lips of Rev. Mr. Haines, as he

was the founder of the church, and supplied it during the first three months of its existence. He congratulated the people on the prosperity so far given them, and gave them tender and affectionate advice for the future.

Mr. Manley has been twice settled before. He was installed at Oakfield ten years ago, and at Barnsville five years ago to-day. Mr. Willoughby's installation is to take place on the tenth anniversary of his ordination. These coincidences were not thought of until after the arrangements were all made.

The congregation at Camden are greatly enjoying their beautiful new church edifice. It is a gem of a building, tasteful and attractive. The people are united and happy in their faithful minister, and his settlement promises to be one of great usefulness.

[Later]

Rev. B. F. Willoughby was installed pastor of the Presbyterian church of Saquoit on the 6th inst. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Fisher; installing prayer by Rev. E. C. Pritchett; charge to the pastor by Rev. E. N. Manley; and charge to the people by the Rev. J. N. McGiffert, former pastor of the church.

Rev. Philander Barbour was installed pastor of the Presbyterian church of Augusta next day, July seventh, by the same Presbytery. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Fowler; installing prayer by Rev. E. C. Pritchett; charge to the pastor by the Rev. B. F. Willoughby; and charge to the people by the Rev. C. W. Hawley.

It is thus that three pastors are settled over churches of the Utica Presbytery in as many weeks.

MORE IMPROVEMENTS.

The Holley church is in the hands of the workmen. It is raised up for a basement. Twenty-two feet are to be added to the length. The high and unsightly galleries are to come down. New pews, desk, carpets, etc.—all at a cost of about \$3,000—are to make the edifice modern and attractive. They expect to have it ready for the meeting of our Presbytery and installation of their new pastor in October.

The Independent Congregational church of Richmond, of which Rev. Samuel M. Day is pastor, are making some desirable improvements in their house of worship; adding sixteen feet to the length in front; putting up a tower; getting in a bell, which they have never yet had; building a lecture-room, and improving things generally. It is a good sign of life and enterprise in an old and staid parish.

Rochester, July 3, 1869. GENESSEE.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON REUNION.

The July number of this quarterly is unusually interesting as revealing a difference of sentiment on Reunion, between the Senior and Junior Editors, Drs. Hodge and Atwater. The former, although expressing satisfaction with the terms of the Plan, declares that he "will be constrained to vote against the union," because he regards "the strictness in interpreting the standards for which the Old School have always contended, to be the 'Ark of the Covenant' [!] committed to our trust"; and because he considers "that principle" (qu. strictness?) "to be endangered by consenting to the union, when those with whom we unite, and the public generally (so far as we can judge) consider that we surrender our palladium." The sentiments of the Junior Editor, Dr. Atwater, who, consistently with his course in the General Assembly, heartily advocates the Reunion in this number, are, on the whole, satisfactory and just. After rehearsing the history of previous negotiations, the writer proceeds to examine the declarations made by speakers in our Assembly in New York before the passage of the Plan of Reunion. We quote from this part of the article, as containing the essential points.

Be this as it may, it is right and wise, before it is too late, to face the facts just as they are, erasing nothing and disguising nothing, and see if they prove any formidable antagonism that will hereafter beget irreconcilable collisions, and rend the united church in twain. One divine, reputed eccentric and exceptional in his own church, expatiated on the merits of New England theology—a term in vogue to denote alike systems that have, as well as some which have not, been always freely tolerated in our church. We think it unreasonable to regard this as very serious, whatever we may think of its taste. Another had satisfied himself that the liberty he wanted, would not indeed, without some friction, be secured. But the main and significant thing was Dr. Johnson's statement, that, though himself Old School in his theology, if it was understood that the advocacy of the views of Albert Barnes would not be freely allowed in the united church, "the plan of union would not command the votes of a dozen members or a half-dozen Presbyteries." The first announcement of this, produced some misgiving among us, until it was further announced that he had been misreported, and until cool reflection satisfied us that it did not necessarily imply the toleration of errors heretofore deemed intolerable, or condemned by the Assembly.

For, 1. It is settled beyond a peradventure and in the understanding of all parties, that no one whom the united church shall judge a rejecter of the essentials of Calvinism, can shield himself by showing that, Messrs. Barnes, Beecher, Duffield, Junkin, Wilson, the Princeton Review, or any other person or authority, living or dead, has said the like of what is objected to.

2. The belief that the advocacy of Mr. Barnes's sentiments will be tolerated, is mere matter of inference and opinion from the ascertained or supposed state of opinion and practice in the two bodies, and is not claimed to be founded on the express or implied terms of the compact. But, however, it arises, or on whatever it is founded, it is simply the opinion of those who enter it. It may have arisen from extensive conference with ministers and members of our church, or from what is claimed to be its known present practice. We have heard a prominent orthodox member of the New School body say, that after hearing many ministers of both churches, he should need

a more latitudinarian basis to protect some from our body, whom he had heard, than any from his own. And we have seen enough to give at least a verisimilitude to the statement. If they judge that we now tolerate among us, what they expect will be tolerated in the united church, or even more, this is their own judgment, and unless they are wholly mistaken, the union will alter us little in this respect.

3. What is more important and decisive, however, on this head is, that Mr. Barnes has unconsciously but largely exercised the privilege of being inconsistent with himself. There are few topics on which he has uttered exceptional views, on which he has not also in some form spoken in a very satisfactory manner. We do not yield to his colleague in our estimate of him as a man, a Christian, and an eminent minister and author. But, we presume, no offence will be taken if we say that systematic theology is not his forte: that it was easy for his prosecutors, by one array of excerpts from his writings to table a formidable list of charges against him, and for his defenders to claim and prove from another set of excerpts, that his views were not fairly represented by the charges, and that judged by these, he held doctrines not hostile to the system of our confessions. The New School never admitted that the charges against Mr. Barnes, on his trial, truly or fairly represented his opinions. In claiming that his opinions are to be tolerated, they do not therefore claim that the opinions charged against him are to be tolerated. Mr. Barnes made such representation of his views before the Assembly, to which he appealed his case, that as we are credibly informed, Dr. Junkin told him if he (Mr. B.) would sign his name to it, he (Dr. J.) would withdraw his charges. If Mr. Barnes could thus set forth his views to Dr. Junkin, can they not be set in a light to the view of our New School brethren, at least, giving them a claim to be tolerated? Hence, on account of the want of system and harmony in Mr. Barnes's utterances, we have not referred to him or his writings, as a test, in our attempts to define and prove what has been held or tolerated in the New School body. And we can perfectly understand how, while one man in that body would say not a dozen among them would vote for a union which would not tolerate the advocacy of his sentiments, another should say it was equally true, that not a half dozen men among them would vote his theology to be representative for the body. We think, therefore, on closer consideration, that this statement of Dr. Johnson, whatever we may think of its taste or propriety in the circumstances, need not alarm us.

Are then the two bodies in such a relation to each other on these matters, that one is committed to tolerate a set of dogmas, which the other is committed not to tolerate? This brings us to the Hall resolution as the pivot on which the whole question turns. Here is a specific and determinate series of dogmas condemned by the Assembly of 1837, while the church was yet undivided, and by a nearly unanimous vote, to hold which we have unanimously and officially notified the New School Assembly, we should consider a bar to licensure and ordination in the united church. This action has not been revoked. Whatever may be said as to the degree or duration of its obligation, it may at all events be taken for a pretty fair revelation of the animus of our body, until evidence to the contrary appears. Does it then appear that the New School are on opposite ground in regard to that series of articles? Not certainly from any action of theirs since the adoption of the Hall resolution. And in the protest offered by some New School men at the time of their condemnation, they signify that, if these articles had been presented at a time and in a way to prevent false implications, all parties would have united to make this condemnation unanimous; and, further, to prevent misconception they take up each of the condemned errors in turn, and repudiating it, state what they conceive to be the true doctrine instead. This series of substituted articles was afterwards adopted by the entire body in convention at Auburn, and constitutes what is called the "Auburn Declaration." On many of the points, and these leading points of Calvinism, such as election and decrees, it is quite satisfactory. Its faults with an occasional exception are rather in the way of defect, than of positive unambiguous error. But without pursuing this matter further, we think it sufficiently proved that the Hall resolution does not evince any necessary or probable antagonism between the bodies. We do not believe that one Presbytery in twenty of the New School body, would license men professing the series of errors therein specified and condemned. We have lately heard of the rejection of two candidates for licensure or ordination in the region of the excoriated Synod, for unsoundness on some of the points there involved. Even the utmost latitude that we have heard of as being claimed by the extreme left in their body, is also claimed for some "form of Calvinism." Whether justly in every case may be a question. But, we believe, the great body of their ministers may be ranged theologically in two classes.

1. Those who accept the doctrines of the standards so fully, that they would take them as stated in the Shorter Catechism, without qualifying a single sentence, and with very few and slight, if any, qualifications, as stated in the Confession of Faith and larger catechisms; who would differ from us, if at all, only as theological teachers in our own church differ from us on the manner of the imputation of Adam's sin; and who, if chary of the phrases "definite or limited atonement," would cordially agree with us in regarding it as a true and proper satisfaction to the divine justice, "sufficient for the whole world, efficient only for the elect."

2. We believe that the great body of them who could not go this length are still firm and true on the great Calvinistic doctrines of Divine sovereignty, decrees, election, perseverance, the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and entire dependence on him for it. We think the common use of terms among all Christians would pronounce this Calvinistic and opposed to Arminianism and Pelagianism. We further believe they hold to justification by the substituted obedience and sufferings of Christ, and to the fall of the whole race in and through the fall of Adam into utter corruption and universal sinfulness—although they might not be able to hold with us, or the *ipissima verba* of all the standards here in every particular. We believe that all in the New School not included in these two classes are exceptional, whether persons or bodies.