

The American Presbyterian.

New Series, Vol. VI, No. 42.

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1222.

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

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1869.

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

—Rev. Charles Lawson, hitherto known as John A. Weir, Father Hyacinthe, has reached New York. The evangelical ministers of Boston have appointed a delegation to bid him welcome. G. P. Putnam & Son announce a volume of his "Sermons and Speeches" translated by Rev. J. W. Bacon.

—A prominent divine in our body, high in the esteem of both branches of the Church, writes as follows:

"I am very glad of that article in your last No. on the 'A. B. C. F. M. and Reunion.' I believe that its suggestions deserve to be seriously pondered. The policy of the A. B. C. F. M. in leaving its mission churches in full ecclesiastical liberty, has my hearty assent and approval—more and more, the more I observe its workings, and the more I study the unhappy tendency to over-rigid ecclesiasticism from which we have suffered so much, and which we must still watch against with 'eternal vigilance.'"

—The largest and most enthusiastic meeting of the Irish Presbyterian laity ever held, has been in session at Belfast. Resolutions were adopted urging the ministry to "commute," and thereby secure a permanent endowment for the churches, while the laity pledge themselves to raise a sustentation fund of £30,000, per annum and bring all salaries up to £150 per year. The ministry have their flocks at their mercy now, as by refusing to commute, they can secure all their old *Regium Donum* incomes for life, while at their death the Church gets nothing more. This fact seems to have brightened the ideas of the laity wonderfully.

—Readers of Charles Dickens' "Nicholas Nickleby," will remember the gushing portrait given of the benevolent Cheeryble brothers. Like many of his characterizations, the picture was drawn from life, two Scotchmen named Grant, engaged in manufactures in Lancashire, being the originals. One of them built a Presbyterian church for a congregation in Ramsbottom, as a memorial of his gratitude to God for his success in business, and the edifice has been thus used for thirty-five years. His nephew and heir, however, has become a Ritualistic Episcopalian, and taking advantage of the absence of any formal investiture of the property, has forcibly excluded the congregation from the church. Their venerable pastor, Rev. Dr. McLean, is very ill and much harassed in mind by this act, as he is Mr. Grant's relative by marriage. The congregation intend to sue for the property.

—Rev. Jos. T. Cooper celebrated the 30th anniversary of his ordination a few Sabbaths ago. Dr. Cooper has had an eventful pastorate; one item being a prosecution for heresy, and the division of his presbytery upon his acquittal. He has also seen the union of his own denomination—the Associate—effected with another—the Associate Reformed. For many years he has been Stated Clerk of the U. P. Assembly. He may live to see another division and another union. As the leader of the moderate party in the Church, he might have a great future if he wisely discerned the signs of the times.

—Twenty-five German prelates have met in Conference, and after enumerating the fears entertained by liberal Catholics in regard to the doings of the Ecumenical Council, as to the proclamation of doctrines adverse to civil liberty, the State, and the local independence of the bishops,—they go on to say, that they have pledges from Rome, that none of these things will be attempted, and also confidence in the apostolic see itself. Their manifesto is constructed rather to warn the Pope than to reassure good Catholics. It is also, however, a valuable assurance that the Ultramontane and Jesuit party will not have everything their own way in the Council. A leading article in the recent *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* congratulates its readers on the stand made by the German prelates against the new dogmas. "Although," observes the writer, "the German bishops are too few in number to exercise a preponderating influence in the Council (there being but twenty-five in an assemblage of from 400 to 500), still, should these twenty-five prelates remain firm in their resolution, the fact that they are the religious representatives of a great nation, with a population comprising nearly 18,000,000 of Catholics, is a sufficient guarantee that none of the obnoxious dogmas will be carried triumphantly through the Council, the more especially as it is confidently believed that a considerable number of both of the French and Austrian episcopacy present at the Council, will unite with their German brethren in resisting to the utmost, the introduction of any new doctrines into the Roman Catholic religion."

1 Jan 70 PENNSYLVANIA.

The collegiate institutions of our commonwealth are numerous enough to meet all the demands made upon their facilities. Almost every principal town of our State contains a college in connection with some Protestant denomination. Presbyterians have Easton in the East and Washington in the West, although they have long abandoned Carlisle to the Methodists. The latter, besides Carlisle, have a Western hold at Meadville. Meadville is decapitated by the Unitarians, also. The High Church Lutherans have begun a college at Allentown, breaking off from the Low Church, who retain Gettysburg. The Baptists have a University (so-called) at Lewisburg. The Episcopalians, by Asa Packer's well-meant but ill-directed benevolence, have a technological institute at Bethlehem, which is also a "University" by name. The German Reformed have colleges at Lancaster, Mercersburg, and somewhere in Westmoreland county, while the Low Church wing of the same Church have started Ursinus College near our own city. The Romanists have several training schools called colleges in various parts of the State, but as Romanist institutions labor not to evoke intellectual life, but only to instill correct opinions, from their own point of view, they have no place among institutions devoted to liberal education.

Some are inclined to regret the great number of these various colleges, as far in excess of the demand. They say our Pennsylvania failing has always been to try to "bore auger holes with gimlets." All these little institutions are incompetent to do the work of one great central University, fully endowed with funds, equipped with apparatus, and furnished with able teachers. To this it might be answered, that the question of supply depends on demand, and that these varied institutions help to create a demand for their own services. They largely incite people to give their children a liberal training. Their very presence is a training power in the community. College is not a thing far away and little thought of. It is at their own doors, familiar to sight and thought. They appeal also to men's self-love. Our college, the college in our place, the college of our Church has an especial claim. As to the matter of apparatus and professors, it is a great mistake to suppose that the former must be elaborate, the latter men of genius. It is the books and the course of study upon which the ablest minds of many ages have been employed, that furnish the true incitements to mental growth. The best college professors are men of no very marked ability, but they have tact and sympathy; they have mastered their subject and know how to make their students think about it. Every college chair does not need a genius to fill it well, as Ithaca will discover. Plato and Whewell, Butler and Carey, Hamilton and Legendre will teach, if the professor knows his work. Our country colleges may be very effective without these attractive adjuncts, if they will but avoid novelties and sensations.

While these denominational institutions are scattered so freely over the interior of the State, it is notable that no Protestant body has a college in either of the cities which form its Eastern and Western centres—Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Provisionally—we think—all churches have been led to leave these most promising fields clear for institutions of unsectarian character, which can offer only the most Catholic culture, and can appeal to the public by urging unsectarian motives. These are dedicated purely to fostering a love of liberal learning in the people, and imparting that learning to their graduates. Not that in either the great truths, upon which Reformed Christendom agrees, are ignored. The truths and the evidences of Christianity, as related to practical life, social science and ethics are discussed and enforced as part of the curriculum, while the opinions which divide Christian men are kept in the background.

While our commonwealth is quite competent to support all these local and general colleges, it is not able to do much more. If our Pennsylvania patronage is carried away to other states, our home institutions must languish. In a commercial point of view, it is poor policy to buy abroad what we can get at home. At least, our Pennsylvania doctrine has always been to that effect. We have judged it not best—nor even cheapest, to buy in the cheapest market, when that is a foreign one. Even in a monetary point of view, it is a loss to our state to support our young men in New England and other cities, while the loss is a double loss, in that the same money is not expended at home and on home institutions. What wonder if our colleges languish while the yearly catalogues of Yale and Harvard are swelled with the names of Philadelphians; and how illogical to plead in excuse that these colleges are ahead of our own; when

it is by this very practice they are kept ahead. Such complaints are as unjust as the demand of Pharaoh that the Israelites should make the usual tale of bricks when the necessary straw was not furnished, and did not grow on the pasture lands of Goshen. And our state colleges lose far more indirectly than directly. They do not command the support of all our cultivated classes, since so many have their allegiance fixed elsewhere. When they are ready to give to such objects, their gifts again go out of the commonwealth; when they are ready to speak they have nothing to say for our home institutions.

There is another view of this matter, which our readers can take for what it is worth, and which we believe originated with Dr. John W. Nevin, of Lancaster. Our commonwealth is composite in origin, and unites three types of civilization, and social life, inherited from Europe. The English in the East; the German in the East and the centre; the Scotch-Irish somewhat in the East and still more in the West. All three are being moulded by influences and forces common to all parts of the nation into a new type (nationally one, locally various in its forms), as yet not fully developed—the American. But their progress in this direction must be a growth from within, and not a mere mechanical change brought about by influences from without. The importation of the culture and modes of thought locally favored in other parts of the nation, will not help, but hinder, the gradual uplifting of all classes to a new and higher life of freedom and power, such as should belong to the Republic. The mass of the people will always be suspicious of a foreign influence and "outlandish" modes of thought. Hence the development of unfortunate suspicions and antagonisms, and the opening of breaches between the educated and uneducated classes. It is claimed that these bad effects have already begun to be felt, and that in no city is the distrust of the educated classes greater among the common people than in our own.

"A GREAT DUTY ACCOMPLISHED."

Bravely said, Père Hyacinthe: "What you qualify as a great fault committed, I call a great duty accomplished." Decidedly difference this, thrusting wide and irrecoverably apart, the protesting Carmelite and the expostulating Bishop. Between the two, what a great gulf it fixes. Thanks for that many word, O Protestant of the Nineteenth Century! It is done. It is sealed. It is down in the catalogue of things to which this heroic soul has made unalterable commitment. The sandals of the cloister are off forever. It was no passionate protest, to be followed by as passionate a penitence. It was no sudden swoop of feeling that carried away the royally tenanted nature, chafed and fretted by nettling provocation. "You have suffered, I know," confesses the Bishop. But "I have prayed, and waited, and reflected as well," says the Priest.

And there has been time for reflection since. There has been opportunity for recoil and recall. It is a solid week since this Friar's burning words fell on the air. He has seen the great grief they caused all the friends of the Church, his mother. He has been amidst the surges of it. He has heard the jubilant shout of all her enemies. He has been consoled by his Bishop to pause on the declivity on which he now stands, and return, and throw himself at the feet of the Holy Father, and give the Catholic world a great consolation and a striking example. But he answers, "I cannot accept either your reproaches or your counsels. What you qualify as a great fault committed, I call a great duty accomplished." When the prison-doors of that spirit swung on their hinges, they were nailed open. It is Luther back again—"Here I take my stand, I can do no otherwise, so help me God."

The "Holy Father" wrote nearer the truth than he knew, when he prepared his call for the Ecumenical Council. He said then, "A horrible tempest agitates the Church." What does he think of the tumult of the waters now? He said then, "The supreme authority of the Apostolic See is opposed and set at naught." What does he think of this last arraignment? Little dreamed he, that out of the very bosom of the Church would come such throbs of indignant rebuke. He is charged with the sacrilegious perversion of the Word of the Son of God. He is charged with an attack upon human nature in its holiest and most indestructible aspirations. The most eloquent son of the Church flings aside his clerical robes, steps forth from Notre Dame and thus arraigns the Holy Father. This is the Apostle's *πολλή παρηγορία*—much outspokenness, or "great plainness of speech." What next?

The Encyclical and Syllabus of '64, endorsed by the coming Ecumenical Council: what then? What is the Syllabus? It is an epitome of that

which Pope Pius IXth calls, "the detestable, pestilential, and dreadfully and lamentably mischievous heresies of our time," among which are liberty of conscience, and of worship, free Bible and free schools, and separation of Church and State. It is a sweeping condemnation of the nineteenth century. It is war without truce, and without armistice, between the Papacy and modern civilization. No wonder such a spirit as Père Hyacinthe's broke silence, and in reverence to conscience and to God, dared avow the right and the duty of disobedience to monastic rule, rather than be a party to putting all that into the realm of infallible dogma! Who shall tell through how many other restive and imprisoned Priests' hearts, the blood has gone leaping with electric thrill and throb, at these words! Who shall tell how many other hitherto silent and loyal sons of the "Holy Catholic Church" will flame out their protest; too, if, for the royal liberty of Christ's Gospel, they shall be proffered these chains of the middle ages! We must wait and see.

Meanwhile, what an inspiring word for America—for Protestantism—for the Higher Law: It shall nerve the brave heralds of the truth to a braver deliverance. It shall stay all heroes of heavenly commission, holding the law of conscience to be higher than the law of the Monastery or the Church. It shall be most helpful to men of God, daring to speak the truth for the hour, under convictions of their duty to the times, and "the society of the nineteenth century." And how it must mantle the cheeks of the pulpit trimmers, who, through all our war, said never a word for their country; who through all these years, have had for the slave no generous thought that they possessed courage to put in public speech; who now, in punctilious carefulness, mutilate by silence the Gospel of *Temperance and Chastity and Honesty and Brotherhood*, and lay on men's hearts only the lines of law that shall put them in love with their smooth tongued prophecies. Welcome the day, God speed it, when no pulpit in all Christendom, "shall speak a language, or preserve a silence, not the entire and loyal expression of the conscience" behind it. H. J.

UNIVERSALIST HISTORY AND LOGIC.

The preachers of the doctrine of the final salvation of all men have varied their teaching a great deal in the course of a century. The doctrine was held in the Primitive Church by the eccentric Origen of Alexandria, and by one or two theologians during the Middle Ages. In modern times it was revived by some of the numerous sectaries in the days of the Reformation. They seem to have imported it into England, as one of the old "xliii Articles of the Church of England" expressly condemns the opinion. During the excited theological times of the Commonwealth it was again revived; one of Cromwell's chaplains, Jeremiah White—holding this view. The mystical sect of the Behmenists, and their Philadelphia Societies established in London, proclaimed it with great earnestness, and a book called "The Proclamation of the everlasting Gospel," by a Behmenist named Jane Leade, was translated into German, won many adherents, and led to a controversy on the subject which extended over many years. Other Behmenists—Freher, &c.—rejected the opinion, while yet others—Law, Walton, &c.—pronounce the problem insoluble.

In America a Universalist book by Paul Siegvolek was translated from the German and published by Christopher Saur, probably for Rev. Jacob Duchè, an Episcopalian clergyman of mystical and Universalist tendencies, who at first acted as chaplain to the Continental Congress, but after the Declaration of Independence turned Tory. A club of Behmenists existed in Boston in 1775, but we know nothing of them except their existence.

John Murray, who founded the Universalist body in America, came from England in 1770. He had been one of Whitefield's Calvinistic Methodist preachers, and had come into contact with another named James Rely, who had left the Methodists and was preaching in a Universalist chapel in London. The Universalists have but three or four congregations now in the whole British Islands, but number a good many in the other denominations. Mr. Murray preached in New Jersey, in our own city, in the neighboring States, and especially in New England, and has left a curious autobiography. He was very generally admitted to the pulpits of orthodox churches, until the opposition to his views grew strong enough to exclude him. Among the principal men who embraced his view were Charles Chauncy and Elkhanah Winchester. These were all High Calvinists, uniting with their views on this subject, the most rigid orthodoxy on others, and teaching future but not endless punishment.

Moses Ballou changed all that. In his view, all evil ends at death, and "the souls of [men] at their death, being made perfect in holiness, do immediately pass into glory." For a long time this was the only type of Universalist doctrine, until the Restorationist party, who now embrace most Universalists, revived Murray's view of future punishment. They did not revive Murray's orthodoxy on other points, in which Ballou had departed from his teachings. They are Unitarians, and some few of them Rationalists also. They stoutly resist all attempts to unite them with Unitarians as "Liberal Christians."

In Philadelphia, Universalism began early and has done little. Their two or three feeble churches are all of ancient date, and although they periodically announce their purpose to rise up and possess the land, the orthodox air of our city seems too strong for them. They attract little attention, and make but little effort to disseminate their views. Universalism seems to have a miasmatic influence on its adherents, imbuing them with lassitude. They have a large share of the wealth of the nation, but they do little missionary work. "Indeed why should they if it is all right? Why take the trouble? Even if the heathen are to be 'beaten with few stripes,' their suffering will be but trifling and all will come right in the end."

Exactly what the Universalists do hold in regard to the future world, is not as generally known as it ought to be, by those who are called upon to combat them. It is very commonly supposed that they all hold with Ballou that sin and misery end at death. They, in fact, believe that there will be punishment for the wicked in the future world, but that it will always—sooner or later—end with the repentance of the sinner. What relation that repentance holds to the work of Christ they do not agree in saying.

That repentance will come to every depraved and evil will, they infer on purely *a priori* grounds. God (they argue) is a being of boundless love and of boundless power. He at once utterly desires the good of all men, and is fully able to secure it. Therefore it will be secured.

Had we had no experience of this present world; the reasoning would seem much stronger. But we happen to know that sin and misery do actually exist in this world, and God's boundless love and power must be just as much concerned to prevent sin before it exists, as to abolish it after it has come to exist. The Universalist asks, "Does God not love men enough to save them all, or is He not powerful enough to save them all?" We reply by a counter-question: "Did God not love men enough to save them from sinning, or was He not powerful enough to do so? Read me my riddle, and the answer will do for both."

The existence of evil is as irreconcilable with our abstract conceptions of God's infinite love and power, as is the endless punishment of the wicked.

If an answer is insisted on—and the Universalist has no right to insist on any—then the most probable and most Scriptural answer seems to be, that God's power is so circumscribed and directed in this matter by His own moral perfections, that the prevention of evil and of the endless punishment of endless sinners are morally impossible to Him. "But then how is His power infinite if a human will can thwart it?" God's infinite being does not preclude nor render impossible your existence; neither does His sovereignty and will preclude your will and freedom. Our abstract conception of God's infinitude would take us straight to pantheism, and merge all things in God's existence. Our abstract conception of God's power and sovereignty would in like manner land us in a denial of human freedom to choose between good and evil, light and darkness. We know that other things besides God exist, although His being is infinite. We know that other wills than His exist, and are free, although His is sovereign.

If limitation there be—though probably only our imperfection of conception leads us to suppose it—then it is self-imposed limitation. Had it seemed best to the infinite wisdom, the Only Wise would have continued forever the sole existence,—and the Sovereign Will the only will. It has seemed best to call other beings and wills into existence, and while all these are embraced in the divine foresight and included in the divine order, yet sin is resistance of the Will of God. Only he who knows his own heart can ever guess how long and bitterly that resistance may be protracted.

God grant us the wisdom to be wise in time, and to choose with all the power that He has given, that better part which shall not be taken away from us.

—Rev. R. G. Wilder left India for America, Sept. 14th. He hopes to return to Kolapore.