

The American Presbyterian.

New Series, Vol. XXXIV, No. 15

15 July 69

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1209.

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

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1869.

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

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1869.

—Three of the ten young men, who went from Union Seminary last year, appeal to the students to give them immediate reinforcements.

—A Deaconess Institution has been founded at Tottenham, England, by the dissenters after the model of that at Kaiserswerth. The members are to be called "sisters," and will wear a simple uniform.

—Both the Rector and the congregation of the Episcopal Church at Put-in-bay, Lake Erie, (Jay Cooke's summer home), have formally withdrawn from the Episcopal body, on account of its exclusivism. They retain the liturgy. Thus the hands of the Low-Church men are weakened in the already unequal struggle they are waging for Evangelical principles in their Church.

—During the recent unprecedented tightness of the money market in New York City as high as one per cent. a day, or three hundred per cent. a year was demanded and given for the use of money, and it is claimed that some of the banks actively aided in keeping up the price of money and used their funds in these monstrous and illegal transactions. The courts have taken the matter in hand, though in all probability a thorough and impartial enforcement of the laws would disorganize nearly the entire banking and brokering system of New York City.

HOW PRINCETON VIEWS RE-UNION.

The opinion which we have deliberately expressed, that the present form of the Re-union movement involves, by the fairest implication, the entire surrender of the exclusive spirit which one branch had notoriously exercised towards the other, is confirmed in an important quarter. *The Princeton Review* is demoralized. Its senior editor, Dr. Hodge, and its junior editor, Dr. Atwater, present a divided front. The former believes that the Ark of the Covenant has been surrendered, since no provision is made for maintaining the Shibboleths of Princeton. "The New School Church," which Dr. Hodge contrasts pointedly with what he calls "The Presbyterian church in this country," (meaning the Old School branch), he declares to be tolerant or liberal, in its historical character. And while some of the Old School, according to Dr. Hodge, will vote for Re-union on the supposition that it leaves the doctrinal situation of their branch unaltered, others "will vote for it because the time has come to adopt a more tolerant principle. They admit that the Old School Church dies with the union; and that a more tolerant church takes its place. They believe that this course is indicated by the providence of God, and that it is best, not only for the outward prosperity of the Church, but for the cause of religion and of sound doctrine itself." In this remarkable language, he it noted that Dr. Hodge is speaking of members of his own branch of the church. Coming to those with whose views he sympathizes, he says:—

"Others of us will be constrained to vote against the union, not because blind to its advantages . . . but because we regard 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, which we are bound to preserve, and on the preservation of which our safety and usefulness as a church ultimately depends; and because we consider that principle 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."

Dr. Hodge clearly believes that the danger to the precious principle of Old School rigidity is so great that all the admitted great advantages of Re-union on "the standards, pure and simple," are not to be weighed against it. Evidently, he does not count on a numerical preponderance of stiff Old School men in the United Church, but concedes that when it came to a question of majorities, the liberal men would carry the day. Dr. Hodge and ourselves are of one mind on this point.

Dr. Atwater, in his treatment of the subject is exceedingly cautious, yet he comes to opposite conclusions from those of Dr. Hodge on the expediency of Re-union, for reasons which, with immaterial exceptions, will prove satisfactory to all fair-minded men. He frankly admits that the *ipsisima verba* mode of subscription is shut out. He takes pains to show—a wonderful and unheard-of thing in the *Princeton Re-*

view—that the hearty endorsement of Mr. Barnes, of which so much was heard in the last N. S. Assembly, by no means necessarily implies heretical views! He refers to the fact that Dr. Junkin, his prosecutor, offered to withdraw his charges against Mr. Barnes, on seeing the representation made of his views by Mr. Barnes himself. The claim made for freedom for these views must not, he shows, be regarded as a claim for views charged against him. Mr. Barnes, he says, is inconsistent with himself; a declaration which matters little to us. For if Mr. Barnes' statement of his own views is recognized as orthodox, New School men are prepared to stand or fall by that recognition.

Dr. Atwater also refers to the origin and character of the Auburn Declaration. "On many of the points," he says, "and these leading points of Calvinism, such as election and decrees, it is quite satisfactory." Finally, Dr. A. classifies "the great body of our ministers" in two divisions. The first, or stricter sort, he says, would accept the doctrines of the standards, without qualification, as stated in the Shorter Catechism, and, with very few and slight if any, qualifications, as stated in the Confession of Faith and Larger Catechism—yet even they might differ "from us" [Princeton] as to the manner of "implication, and might not accept the extreme notion of a limited atonement. These, in his view, are the strictest in our body; and of them there is not a hint of any thing wrong in his remarks. The great body of those who do not go these lengths, he nevertheless believes to be "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, and here—let it be ever memorable—Princeton appropriates familiar and distinctively New School language; "we think the common use of terms among all Christians would pronounce this Calvinistic and opposed to Arminianism and Pelagianism." Verily Re-union does mean progress. The ashes of a hundred controversies are inurned in this sentence. The bold catch-words: Arminian and Pelagian, which have adorned so many indictments of men; firmly holding the above-named great Calvinistic doctrines, are now pronounced irrelevant, and are stricken out. And that, too, before the writer proceeds to credit this class, as he immediately does, with substantially sound (though not Princetonian) views on the atonement and the fall! "All outside of these two classes, in our body, he regards as exceptional cases, and he is right."

Dr. Atwater is confident of the prevalence of orthodox views in the United Church. We are happy to believe with him, seeing how far he is from limiting orthodoxy, as has been the wont of the Review, to a very narrow conventional type. His language, indeed, may be construed as expressing the expectation, that the union will strengthen the strict type of doctrine. His whole article, so novel in this Review, proves that it is materially weakened already. "This," he says, "is not a surrender to the New School or by the New School." Well, be it so; it is a complete surrender by the *Princeton Review*; and if the junior Editor is not conscious of it, we hand him over to the senior Editor to be convinced of the fact.

THE NATURAL ORATOR.

This was the theme of Dr. Cuyler in his recent address before the Adelpic Union of Williams College. The speaker illustrated his theme most happily and truthfully. With a voice by no means musical in its ordinary and less emphatic tones, and that comes rasping upon the ear as if a clarionet player were to scrape the reed of his instrument to unwonted thinness, there was a wonderful and complete triumph of real, electric, oratorical power. The address was finely conceived, industriously and carefully elaborated, and in all respects a most complete and successful production—a triumph of the true spirit of eloquence over natural impediments, and a model for the young men to whom it pointed out so plainly the way of success in their endeavors to persuade and control the minds of others. The address should be printed, and sent to every student of every college in the land—and if most of the professors of elocution were included in the distribution, it would do no harm. Be yourselves, and not the servile imitators of others, was the leading thought that was enforced with unusual power of argument and illustration—a thought either so far off or so near at hand that few men grasp it. Dr. Cuyler thinks that Henry Ward Beecher—whom he familiarly and lovingly called his Brooklyn neighbor—has very few peers, though there are many who manage to mimic those features of his oratory, which, if they suit his mode of presenting truth, are the very peculiarities that should be avoided by others. As

the scintillations of genius—the curious and brilliant forms in which it sparkles irrepressibly, they please intelligent and cultivated minds; as pyrotechnics, made of stolen powder, that leave nothing but an unsightly stick behind, they are to discriminating observers superlatively ridiculous. Dr. Cuyler is not responsible for the last remark—nor for this, that these imitators of his Brooklyn neighbor, it is said, are very apt to comb the hair back carefully over the ears, and allow it to grow somewhat long behind, while they studiously cultivate a roguish, fun-loving twinkle in the eye and around it.

What is the reason that the candidates for collegiate honors, for the most part, deliver their essays in a pompous, *ore profundo*, school-boy style, with a measured emphasis that is almost sure to hit the wrong word? "Be natural, young men, and old men, and men of every age—let your speech on the rostrum be as it would be if you were talking on the same theme to a friend in the street, only with such an increase of massiveness and majesty in your style of utterance as numbers will naturally inspire. Do not drop the conversational mode in the one case, if you would naturally adopt it in the other. In logical demonstration, in earnest appeal, masses of men love to be talked to in a familiar way, if for no other reason than that it imparts variety to your mode of address. Nothing can be more absurd, nothing less persuasive, than the tones of mock solemnity which some preachers carry with them into the pulpit, forgetting themselves in a most objectionable sense; in nasalized monotone rejecting all the elements of effective oratory, and sacrificing all the noble and momentous ends accomplished by it."

Be natural. This is the simple rule that embraces the system of Professor White of Philadelphia, a most competent and successful teacher of elocution. I once heard him read Addison's description of Westminster Abbey. The reading was prefaced by a few explanatory historical remarks of his own; and so true to nature was the transition from these, that I was fairly caught napping; for he reached the second or third sentence of the description before I was aware that he had passed from himself to his author. This distinguished elocutionist does not hesitate to take lessons from the humblest individual that walks the streets. If he sees two men talking earnestly, he is accustomed to stop at some store window near by, and pretending to examine the wares that are exposed for sale, listens to the emphasis and studies the gesticulation of the earnest talkers, and says he always learns something.

Every public speaker might profitably study himself, by watching the tones of his own voice when engaged in conversation or argument. And with equal profit might he study intonation, emphasis, and gesture, by listening to the conversation of others.

Williams College has all the appliances that are essential to a thorough physical, mental, and moral education. Goodrich Hall, as the Gymnasium is called, is a noble structure of stone, erected at a cost of fifty thousand dollars, and has an endowment sufficiently large to support a thoroughly qualified instructor. Some of the classes gave a very attractive public exhibition of their skill. We visited the field in which the Foreign Missionary Enterprise originated. A suitable monument marks the place of the hay stack around which the first missionaries consecrated themselves to their work. Grass is still growing in the meadow. We culled the wild strawberries that grew along the narrow well beaten foot-path, and stood reverently and thankfully on the spot linked with most sacred memories.

Near the Gymnasium and Chapel stands the monument that commemorates those sons of Williams who fell in battle during the late war. On the pedestal is the figure of a soldier cast in bronze. In front, on a bronze plate, are the names of the heroes. This tribute was erected at a cost of ten thousand dollars.

It is a fact worthy of record that one third of all the graduates of this school of learning have entered the Gospel ministry. The revival of the last winter was most decided in its results. A deep, religious interest comes with almost every year. How can it be otherwise when each class has a daily prayer meeting conducted by its own members.

On every hand, the everlasting hills sweep grandly and gracefully up towards the sky. Mountain-day, which occurs each spring, means the privilege of a tramp to the summit of Graylock. But it is said the attempt to scale the grand old mountain is confined to the Freshmen—the knowing ones prefer the rod, and a stroll along the river.

C. A. S.

—A young Episcopalian missionary from our own city, aided only by his wife, has in nine years admitted into the church by baptism, one thousand of the Santee Sioux.

"IN PERILS BY FALSE BRETHREN."

These words recur to us frequently while Mr. Parton was publishing in *The Atlantic Monthly* his articles on "Our Roman Catholic Brethren." Not that we applied them in the strong sense in which Paul used them,—not that we classed Romanists with the hypocrites and wolves in sheeps' clothing, who endangered his life by their treachery. Yet we could not help feeling that the brethren whom Mr. Parton was pressing on our attention were, in a very real sense of the words, false brethren. Many of them, we trust, in spite of the system in which they are trained, have "the root of the matter" in them. Many of them we hope to meet as brethren in the great hereafter. Many of them cherish the same hopes for Christians, who do not hold with them in regard to the "Papal See" and the "One Church." But they will be saved as Christians in spite of their being Romanists. Were they nothing more or better than the great system of doctrine and discipline devised by Rome could make them, our hope of them would be much less. The true cross may be borne by many a one that makes too much of the material crucifix.

All the perversions of Rome arise from a single mistaken principle—the putting of the means in the place of the end, the Church in the place of God. There is no more Protestant statement in our Standards than the first answer in the Shorter Catechism,—the answer that brings man face to face with God, as the End and the Reward of all service. Put the Church there in place of God, and the Romish foundation is substituted for the Protestant one. Give us the glory and the rewards of the Church as the end of man, and the whole system of the Jesuits—that is of consistent, thorough-going Romanists—follows of necessity. And when once that Jesuit idea takes possession of a man it makes him a false brother—who has neither the faith, the hope, nor the love of true Christian brotherhood. He has not the *faith*, for he is living, not for the unseen, but the visible,—not for things on the spiritual plane, but on the natural. The upbuilding of a great outward empire is his end, and to that he postpones all things else. He has not the *hope* of the true brotherhood, for he is not looking for the day when Christ shall reign in all hearts and in society, but for a day when all hearts and all society shall unite in glorifying Rome. He has not its *charity*, for the Church demands his love in preference to loving his brethren. And so he becomes a false brother, enslaved to a greater outward and unspiritual scheme of worldly conquest,—laboring not for a Church, but for a world which calls itself by the name of the Church, which uses the words of the Church, but seeks the ends of the world, acts on the maxims of the world, fights with the weapons of the world, lives the life of the world.

Our perils from these false brethren are not chiefly outward but inward. God will perfect His strength in the weakness of every Church that makes Him her End of being, her Centre of life. If the Protestant Church stands fast in the truth, she may be outvoted here or elsewhere, but she will never be outmastered. "The foolishness of God is wiser than men." Rome has everything that to the eye of sense should make her stronger than we. She has unity; we are divided. She has uniformity in discipline and organization; we are different. She has agreement in doctrine; we diversity. Her material resources, her hold on national governments and political parties, her venerable traditions, her command of suitable servants, her attractive and magnificent worship, are all outward advantages which we do not possess. But she is powerless against the truth, the life, and the faith of this divided Protestantism at which she sneers, and which is as Elisha and his servants amid the hosts of Syria.

Our dangers are internal—dangers of imitation. We need to fear lest we lose our hold on the truths of which Rome professes herself the especial witness, but which she has done so much to obscure and hide.

I. Rome professes to be founded on the doctrine of the Incarnation—the great truth that in Christ God was reunited to our humanity, and the latter redeemed and purified by the union, so that a clean thing was brought out of an unclean. Her creeds teach this truth. Her practice denies it. She tramples under her feet the very things that belong to that humanity. If our manhood has been redeemed, are fatherhood and marriage among the profane—the only half holy things of the Kingdom of God? Are the nations of the earth to be cast under the feet of the Church as unclean things, or do they, by virtue of the Incarnation, become (equally with the Church) the rightful domain of our Lord and of His Christ? If humanity be indeed redeemed, why that ceaseless antithesis between the hu-

man and the divine, which runs through all her practice,—why are all the human relations and activities of life to be degraded as secular and tabooed as profane?

We need as Protestants to hold fast to this great truth, for it is a fundamental one with us. The Reformation was a revolt of nations against the Church, and whatever we may think of the opinions of the Reformers as to the right of nations and of princes in regard to the Church, we cannot let go their main principle—that nations as well as Churches have their place in the kingdom of God's grace, and are in very truth, equally with the Church, the domain of God and of His Christ. We need to carry this truth with us into our national life, that that life may not become unchristian and impure—that our duties may not become secular and profane to us through the blindness of our own hearts. We need to remember, also, that Protestant assertion of the sacredness of family ties and relations, in an age which would overthrow and ignore these.

Is there not a growing un-Protestant sentiment that a Christian as such has no business with these political matters,—that because his citizenship is in heaven he may let the kingdoms of earth go to wreck? Is there not also a growing indifference to the family as a social unit,—a perverse assertion of individuality, which would subvert the divine distinction between the sexes, and burst the bonds of social order.

II. We need to hold fast to the doctrine of the *Real Presence*, which Rome claims to especially uphold, but which she really obscures and denies ("Lo! I am with you always!" are the words of Christ, speaking of His kingdom among men. Rome says: "He has gone away! He is not with us as really as he was with the disciples, much less more really. He has not, indeed, forgotten us. His body and blood are present in the unbloody sacrifice of the altar, and He has left a Vicar who speaks for Him and supplies the loss of His teaching. This Vicar is the centre of the Church's unity. This human king, reigns instead of the King who is both divine and human." Thus does Rome proclaim, not the *Real Presence* but the *Real Absence*—yielding thus to the weakness of sinful human nature, with which "out of sight is out of mind."

Christ has indeed ascended, but it is to God's right hand that He might wield all power, might "fill all things." His ascension makes Him more really present to us than ever he was to His disciples. But do we realize the fact? Do we not rule Him out of His own Church often by our phrases, putting the power of "Christianity" and of "religion" for the presence and power of Christ? Do we not trust to institutions, creeds and endowments to do what only the power of Christ can do, in the perpetuation and the advancement of truth? Do we not trust too much to organization and machinery, and too little to the spiritual force of our Present King? Are we not falling into this second error of Rome?

III. Rome depreciates the Church, even while professing to uphold it. She sees no identity between its cause and the cause of truth and righteousness. She will lie and conceal in defence of the Church. She will use every unholiness to advance the Church. She will inflict suffering, destroy life, hide the living in loathsome dungeons, all for the sake of the Church. She will, for the sake of the Church, stoop to use every tool the devil has devised, and all because she has no faith in the Church.

If she had that faith, if she realized that the Church's victory always comes by passivity, sincerity and faith, that her triumph is in inaction, would she beg help for a temporal power, upheld by Chassepot rifles? Would she stoop to employing lotteries and uttering lies to raise funds? She is the successor of Peter forsooth, but it is of the unconverted Peter, of Peter before Pentecost, and of all that was left unchanged at Pentecost,—the Peter who drew his sword in his ignorance of the mightier spiritual powers that overhung his head; of the Peter whom the Devil desired to have that he might sift him as wheat; of the Peter who denied his Lord through fear; of the Peter whom Paul had to withstand to his face at Antioch, because of his time-serving, worldly policy.

Let us have more faith in the Church than Rome has, in the power that triumphs in weakness and sincerity over the mighty and the insincere,—in the power for which no sword need be drawn and no lies either told or sworn to,—in the power that is advanced by no politic concealment "for the good of the cause,"—in the power that needs no

Outward shows of gain

To bolster her.

—in the power that wins with a broken army as easily as with united hosts,—in the power that prevails fearlessly though hosts of "false brethren" outnumber and surround her. R. E. T.

—Rev. A. M. Stewart's address is Treasure-city, Nevada.