

PRESBYTERIAN BANNER & ADVOCATE.

Presbyterian Banner, Vol. VI, No. 19, Published on Saturday, January 9, 1858. "ONE THING IS NEEDFUL:" "ONE THING HAVE I DESIRED OF THE LORD:" "THIS ONE THING I DO." WHOLE NO. 276

DAVID MCKINNEY, Editor and Proprietor. PUBLICATION OFFICE, GAZETTE BUILDING, FIFTH STREET, ABOVE SMITHFIELD, PITTSBURGH, PA. Philadelphia, 111 South Tenth Street, below Chestnut

TERMS.—IN ADVANCE. FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, JANUARY 9, 1858. By Mail, or at the Office, \$1.50 per Year, in Advance. Delivered in the City, 1.75

Original Poetry.

Sunrise and Sunset.

BY L. OLDFORD WALKER.

On this terrestrial sphere of ours,
Among the gifts which God has given,
Two which charm my eye the most,
Are placed on either side of heaven.

Sunrise and sunset! glorious scenes,
Which painters, truly, paint as poetry,
Which make the peasant's soul to bleed,
Compared with Nature's grand display.

Painted by Nature's skillful hand—
That glorious artist who has spread
Unfading fame from pole to pole,
Far as the sun his rays doth shed.

How, sunrise! portal of the day!
All hail Aurora's golden dawn!
Which, breaking o'er my mountain's brow,
Illuminates the dewy lawn.

'Tis then I love to walk abroad,
To inhale the fragrant breeze of flowers,
Which throw out on the morning air,
Perfume to sweeten laborer's bowers.

At sunrise, much I love to roam
O'er hill and dale, and through leafy dell;
To hear the songs of woodland birds,
As on the morning air they swell.

From them, at dawn, I love to learn
This peep, with holy wisdom fraught;
Give praise to God, whose love and power
Assigns to each his pleasant lot.

At sunrise, much I love to think
Of where that shining sun has been;
Of Eastern lands where he has looked—
Of glorious scenes which he has seen.

And when the sun has run his course,
And sinks down in the distant West,
I love to meditate upon
The sunset of the Christian's rest.

Three-score and ten! life's term is span!
How short, to us, the time doth seem;
But oh! a blessed prospect looms,
When on the heart Christ's love doth beam.

I love to look upon the sun,
When sinking in the distant West,
And think, that when my life is o'er,
I, too like him, may sink to rest.

That I, like him, shall rise again,
When Christ shall come to claim his own,
And, with the ransomed of the earth,
Shall stand beside the Jewell'd throne.

Oh, happy is the evening hour,
When I sit down in quietude,
Reflecting on God's love and power—
His gifts in richest measure sent.

How happy! how sublime the thought!
Our Father made this beautiful earth!
His awe extends o'er all his works,
And to the sparrows, from our birth.

And shall we fear to put our trust
In Christ, who came our sins to bear?
Who died upon the cruel cross,
That we might crown of glory wear?

I love, at evening hour, to think,
That in my Father's house above,
So many mansions are prepared
For those who do their Saviour love.

Sunrise and sunset, thus are given,
To us happy thoughts, and calm
A foretaste of the joys of heaven,
That never o'er the works of time.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

The Seminary, North-West Seminary,
AND "J. M. L."

Mr. Editor:—We have read with interest, the lengthy article of "J. M. L." touching the above named institution. He argues, with much ability, the general subject of control, and concludes that our Seminary should be under the exclusive charge of the Synods. He has, no doubt, presented the strong points.

While, however, we are willing to concede to his argument all the force that is justly due to it, still we think that both as respects the question in its general bearings, and in its particular application to the Seminary mentioned, there is another side. As to the question in its general bearings, we will make but one or two observations.

1. It does not in the least interfere with Synodical labors, or influence, in behalf of a Seminary to entrust them to the Seminary itself. It does not interfere with, and we cheerfully concede them, which "J. M. L." claims for Synodical control may just as readily be conferred upon, and be enjoyed by, a Theological Seminary under the supervision of the Assembly as though that supervision were denied. The whole of J. M. L.'s reasoning, so far as Princeton, Allegheny and Danville are concerned, goes to prove this point. These institutions are under the control of the Assembly, yet they do not contract upon themselves the efforts and the prayers of Presbyterians in their immediate neighborhood. We are informed, likewise, that the funds by which these are sustained, are derived from the Synods more immediately interested. This we believe and are glad to hear. The fact that the Assembly has supervision, does not interfere with the proper work of the Synods immediately concerned. This is as it should be, and we hope as it always will be, and we trust your readers will bear it in mind. Whatever there is to be said in favor of Assembly control, will be free from all detraction, on the ground that such control interferes with the proper duty of Synods toward the Seminary in their love. The policy of the Church is now so well known, that no one can rightfully claim exemption from obligation to do all in his power for his Seminary because the Assembly has the general supervision. This is well understood, as seen by J. M. L.'s argument. But,

2. We do claim, in opposition to J. M. L., that General Assembly control does not, it should, contribute to the pecuniary advantage of the institution enjoying it. We were surprised to find him noticing the fact of the mission of Dr. Humphrey and Hill to New York, where some \$10,000 were secured for Danville, and ascribing it to the influence of the fraternal feeling pervading and which compelled by a sense of duty to make a plain statement of facts, we do not prevail, were it not that we cherish a spirit

of union and co-operation in all our great enterprises to aid forward the Lord's cause. Let us, so far as it is possible for us to do, withdraw from every other portion of the Church's conduct within ourselves our Theological Schools, our benevolent enterprises, having a sectional Board of Home and Foreign Missions; a sectional scheme of church extension, and for publication and general circulation, and how long would fraternal feeling continue as a basis of general contribution to any object presented? Why it would very soon die out; and if Danville sent her Professors to New York for aid, they would meet with but little encouragement. Now, they can say to Presbyterians in all parts of the land, "this is your institution as well as ours. You have the right to investigate its affairs. You give character to the theology taught there. We claim to be doing a work for the whole Church; to be educating a ministry for all parts of the land, and it is not only your privilege but your duty to contribute to its support." Under Assembly control would not this plea be legitimate? Would not such an appeal be more of an eye to the Seminary?

It is not to be expected, of course, that those portions of the Church farthest away will contribute as those nearest by; but the principle should be enforced, and the duty insisted upon until it is felt that the Institution belongs to the Church and not to a fragment of it.

Dr. Humphrey and Hill did procure funds in New York upon some such plea; but let us ask how much could Dr. Thorneycroft procure on the basis of "fraternal feeling," the subject of alvery entirely aside, in J. M. L.'s neighborhood or church? We venture to say not much, and we believe that it would be a sufficient excuse for not giving, that the institution he represents, is so far as he can make it, sectional in its character, and wanting the control and supervision of the Church.

3. We do regard it as essential to the success of our Theological Seminaries that they have the endorsement of the whole Church, through the General Assembly. This may not be required by "J. M. L." or by those occupying similar positions in the Church; but it is becoming to be regarded as important by the membership of our churches, and by the vast body of our ministry. It is, in fact, a general endorsement that our Seminaries should be more thoroughly supervised, even than they now are, and it does not require a long or labored argument to prove to our excellent common sense, that the Seminary which is under the watch and care of Synods and Assembly, too. It does not invalidate our argument to say that the Assembly is so composed that it is a single eye to the Seminary; we know our churches know, that it is so composed, that in regard to the chief thing desirable it may be a check upon Synods. When there is such a demand for guards upon all hands as at present, that we maintain the form of sound words, and as a Church remain pure, our people would far rather see an additional watchman placed over our Seminaries, than shut a single eye to their welfare.

And we differ with "J. M. L." who seems to think that the tendency in the Church is rather toward Synodical control, exclusively. We think if the whole Church could speak out to-day, it would say, "give us the control of the Assembly, also." And here is an idea which does not seem to be taken into account by those who argue for exclusive Synodical control. They seem to think that we take the Seminary out of the hands of the Synods, altogether. This is not the case. The Synods have a control in conjunction with the Assembly. There is a joint care and supervision. You may, if you please, say that the Assembly's supervision amounts to nothing; but you cannot say that it withdraws the Institution from the hands of the Synods. It is a step in the wrong direction, at the present time, to propose, in behalf of our Seminaries, to withdraw them from the hands of the Assembly, inasmuch as there is, if we mistake not, a growing desire in the Church to see the checks and guards increased rather than diminished; and we firmly believe that any institution which is withdrawn from the Assembly control, will be wanting in one of the elements of ultimate success. But,

4. There seems to be an eminent propriety and reasonableness in a general supervision over those institutions whose special duty it is to do a general work. It will not be necessary, we are satisfied, to argue this point. If we are to have a ministry who will be united with pleasure in every part of the land—who will be received by our people without suspicion—they must come, not from an institution which South Carolina establishes and maintains, carefully guarded from General Assembly control, but from such institutions as Princeton, Allegheny, or Danville. And when we remember the peculiar tendencies of the times to "alienation and separation," to "disunion and sectionalism," we cannot but regard a movement, in the Church of Christ, particularly in that Church with which we are connected, looking in that direction, as especially unfortunate.

Upon these general considerations, however, we cannot dwell. They will find in others more able defenders—as they find in the present condition of Princeton, Allegheny and Danville, glowing illustrations of their truth—and we pass to notice a few facts, touching the North-Western Theological Seminary, rendering, in its case, Assembly control especially important.

"J. M. L." although designing his general principles to apply to this institution, does not present the facts and circumstances which have been regarded as a bar to their application, in this instance. Certain conditions, in special cases, may exist, which would render it not only inexpedient, but absolutely fatal to apply general principles, which, in themselves, considered, are admitted to be just. This we conceive to be the case in regard to this institution. Even if the plan of exclusive Synodical control, in general, were such that we by no means admit, still in this instance we should not be, under the circumstances, insisted upon.

In presenting reasons for the above conclusion, Mr. Editor, we wish to be regarded as doing so with the kindest feelings to all concerned. We have no other feelings; and we will be compelled by a sense of duty to make a plain statement of facts, we do not prevail, were it not that we cherish a spirit

of union and co-operation in all our great enterprises to aid forward the Lord's cause. Let us, so far as it is possible for us to do, withdraw from every other portion of the Church's conduct within ourselves our Theological Schools, our benevolent enterprises, having a sectional Board of Home and Foreign Missions; a sectional scheme of church extension, and for publication and general circulation, and how long would fraternal feeling continue as a basis of general contribution to any object presented? Why it would very soon die out; and if Danville sent her Professors to New York for aid, they would meet with but little encouragement. Now, they can say to Presbyterians in all parts of the land, "this is your institution as well as ours. You have the right to investigate its affairs. You give character to the theology taught there. We claim to be doing a work for the whole Church; to be educating a ministry for all parts of the land, and it is not only your privilege but your duty to contribute to its support." Under Assembly control would not this plea be legitimate? Would not such an appeal be more of an eye to the Seminary?

It is not to be expected, of course, that those portions of the Church farthest away will contribute as those nearest by; but the principle should be enforced, and the duty insisted upon until it is felt that the Institution belongs to the Church and not to a fragment of it.

Dr. Humphrey and Hill did procure funds in New York upon some such plea; but let us ask how much could Dr. Thorneycroft procure on the basis of "fraternal feeling," the subject of alvery entirely aside, in J. M. L.'s neighborhood or church? We venture to say not much, and we believe that it would be a sufficient excuse for not giving, that the institution he represents, is so far as he can make it, sectional in its character, and wanting the control and supervision of the Church.

3. We do regard it as essential to the success of our Theological Seminaries that they have the endorsement of the whole Church, through the General Assembly. This may not be required by "J. M. L." or by those occupying similar positions in the Church; but it is becoming to be regarded as important by the membership of our churches, and by the vast body of our ministry. It is, in fact, a general endorsement that our Seminaries should be more thoroughly supervised, even than they now are, and it does not require a long or labored argument to prove to our excellent common sense, that the Seminary which is under the watch and care of Synods and Assembly, too. It does not invalidate our argument to say that the Assembly is so composed that it is a single eye to the Seminary; we know our churches know, that it is so composed, that in regard to the chief thing desirable it may be a check upon Synods. When there is such a demand for guards upon all hands as at present, that we maintain the form of sound words, and as a Church remain pure, our people would far rather see an additional watchman placed over our Seminaries, than shut a single eye to their welfare.

And we differ with "J. M. L." who seems to think that the tendency in the Church is rather toward Synodical control, exclusively. We think if the whole Church could speak out to-day, it would say, "give us the control of the Assembly, also." And here is an idea which does not seem to be taken into account by those who argue for exclusive Synodical control. They seem to think that we take the Seminary out of the hands of the Synods, altogether. This is not the case. The Synods have a control in conjunction with the Assembly. There is a joint care and supervision. You may, if you please, say that the Assembly's supervision amounts to nothing; but you cannot say that it withdraws the Institution from the hands of the Synods. It is a step in the wrong direction, at the present time, to propose, in behalf of our Seminaries, to withdraw them from the hands of the Assembly, inasmuch as there is, if we mistake not, a growing desire in the Church to see the checks and guards increased rather than diminished; and we firmly believe that any institution which is withdrawn from the Assembly control, will be wanting in one of the elements of ultimate success. But,

4. There seems to be an eminent propriety and reasonableness in a general supervision over those institutions whose special duty it is to do a general work. It will not be necessary, we are satisfied, to argue this point. If we are to have a ministry who will be united with pleasure in every part of the land—who will be received by our people without suspicion—they must come, not from an institution which South Carolina establishes and maintains, carefully guarded from General Assembly control, but from such institutions as Princeton, Allegheny, or Danville. And when we remember the peculiar tendencies of the times to "alienation and separation," to "disunion and sectionalism," we cannot but regard a movement, in the Church of Christ, particularly in that Church with which we are connected, looking in that direction, as especially unfortunate.

Upon these general considerations, however, we cannot dwell. They will find in others more able defenders—as they find in the present condition of Princeton, Allegheny and Danville, glowing illustrations of their truth—and we pass to notice a few facts, touching the North-Western Theological Seminary, rendering, in its case, Assembly control especially important.

"J. M. L." although designing his general principles to apply to this institution, does not present the facts and circumstances which have been regarded as a bar to their application, in this instance. Certain conditions, in special cases, may exist, which would render it not only inexpedient, but absolutely fatal to apply general principles, which, in themselves, considered, are admitted to be just. This we conceive to be the case in regard to this institution. Even if the plan of exclusive Synodical control, in general, were such that we by no means admit, still in this instance we should not be, under the circumstances, insisted upon.

In presenting reasons for the above conclusion, Mr. Editor, we wish to be regarded as doing so with the kindest feelings to all concerned. We have no other feelings; and we will be compelled by a sense of duty to make a plain statement of facts, we do not prevail, were it not that we cherish a spirit

of union and co-operation in all our great enterprises to aid forward the Lord's cause. Let us, so far as it is possible for us to do, withdraw from every other portion of the Church's conduct within ourselves our Theological Schools, our benevolent enterprises, having a sectional Board of Home and Foreign Missions; a sectional scheme of church extension, and for publication and general circulation, and how long would fraternal feeling continue as a basis of general contribution to any object presented? Why it would very soon die out; and if Danville sent her Professors to New York for aid, they would meet with but little encouragement. Now, they can say to Presbyterians in all parts of the land, "this is your institution as well as ours. You have the right to investigate its affairs. You give character to the theology taught there. We claim to be doing a work for the whole Church; to be educating a ministry for all parts of the land, and it is not only your privilege but your duty to contribute to its support." Under Assembly control would not this plea be legitimate? Would not such an appeal be more of an eye to the Seminary?

It is not to be expected, of course, that those portions of the Church farthest away will contribute as those nearest by; but the principle should be enforced, and the duty insisted upon until it is felt that the Institution belongs to the Church and not to a fragment of it.

Dr. Humphrey and Hill did procure funds in New York upon some such plea; but let us ask how much could Dr. Thorneycroft procure on the basis of "fraternal feeling," the subject of alvery entirely aside, in J. M. L.'s neighborhood or church? We venture to say not much, and we believe that it would be a sufficient excuse for not giving, that the institution he represents, is so far as he can make it, sectional in its character, and wanting the control and supervision of the Church.

3. We do regard it as essential to the success of our Theological Seminaries that they have the endorsement of the whole Church, through the General Assembly. This may not be required by "J. M. L." or by those occupying similar positions in the Church; but it is becoming to be regarded as important by the membership of our churches, and by the vast body of our ministry. It is, in fact, a general endorsement that our Seminaries should be more thoroughly supervised, even than they now are, and it does not require a long or labored argument to prove to our excellent common sense, that the Seminary which is under the watch and care of Synods and Assembly, too. It does not invalidate our argument to say that the Assembly is so composed that it is a single eye to the Seminary; we know our churches know, that it is so composed, that in regard to the chief thing desirable it may be a check upon Synods. When there is such a demand for guards upon all hands as at present, that we maintain the form of sound words, and as a Church remain pure, our people would far rather see an additional watchman placed over our Seminaries, than shut a single eye to their welfare.

And we differ with "J. M. L." who seems to think that the tendency in the Church is rather toward Synodical control, exclusively. We think if the whole Church could speak out to-day, it would say, "give us the control of the Assembly, also." And here is an idea which does not seem to be taken into account by those who argue for exclusive Synodical control. They seem to think that we take the Seminary out of the hands of the Synods, altogether. This is not the case. The Synods have a control in conjunction with the Assembly. There is a joint care and supervision. You may, if you please, say that the Assembly's supervision amounts to nothing; but you cannot say that it withdraws the Institution from the hands of the Synods. It is a step in the wrong direction, at the present time, to propose, in behalf of our Seminaries, to withdraw them from the hands of the Assembly, inasmuch as there is, if we mistake not, a growing desire in the Church to see the checks and guards increased rather than diminished; and we firmly believe that any institution which is withdrawn from the Assembly control, will be wanting in one of the elements of ultimate success. But,

4. There seems to be an eminent propriety and reasonableness in a general supervision over those institutions whose special duty it is to do a general work. It will not be necessary, we are satisfied, to argue this point. If we are to have a ministry who will be united with pleasure in every part of the land—who will be received by our people without suspicion—they must come, not from an institution which South Carolina establishes and maintains, carefully guarded from General Assembly control, but from such institutions as Princeton, Allegheny, or Danville. And when we remember the peculiar tendencies of the times to "alienation and separation," to "disunion and sectionalism," we cannot but regard a movement, in the Church of Christ, particularly in that Church with which we are connected, looking in that direction, as especially unfortunate.

Upon these general considerations, however, we cannot dwell. They will find in others more able defenders—as they find in the present condition of Princeton, Allegheny and Danville, glowing illustrations of their truth—and we pass to notice a few facts, touching the North-Western Theological Seminary, rendering, in its case, Assembly control especially important.

"J. M. L." although designing his general principles to apply to this institution, does not present the facts and circumstances which have been regarded as a bar to their application, in this instance. Certain conditions, in special cases, may exist, which would render it not only inexpedient, but absolutely fatal to apply general principles, which, in themselves, considered, are admitted to be just. This we conceive to be the case in regard to this institution. Even if the plan of exclusive Synodical control, in general, were such that we by no means admit, still in this instance we should not be, under the circumstances, insisted upon.

In presenting reasons for the above conclusion, Mr. Editor, we wish to be regarded as doing so with the kindest feelings to all concerned. We have no other feelings; and we will be compelled by a sense of duty to make a plain statement of facts, we do not prevail, were it not that we cherish a spirit

of union and co-operation in all our great enterprises to aid forward the Lord's cause. Let us, so far as it is possible for us to do, withdraw from every other portion of the Church's conduct within ourselves our Theological Schools, our benevolent enterprises, having a sectional Board of Home and Foreign Missions; a sectional scheme of church extension, and for publication and general circulation, and how long would fraternal feeling continue as a basis of general contribution to any object presented? Why it would very soon die out; and if Danville sent her Professors to New York for aid, they would meet with but little encouragement. Now, they can say to Presbyterians in all parts of the land, "this is your institution as well as ours. You have the right to investigate its affairs. You give character to the theology taught there. We claim to be doing a work for the whole Church; to be educating a ministry for all parts of the land, and it is not only your privilege but your duty to contribute to its support." Under Assembly control would not this plea be legitimate? Would not such an appeal be more of an eye to the Seminary?

It is not to be expected, of course, that those portions of the Church farthest away will contribute as those nearest by; but the principle should be enforced, and the duty insisted upon until it is felt that the Institution belongs to the Church and not to a fragment of it.

Dr. Humphrey and Hill did procure funds in New York upon some such plea; but let us ask how much could Dr. Thorneycroft procure on the basis of "fraternal feeling," the subject of alvery entirely aside, in J. M. L.'s neighborhood or church? We venture to say not much, and we believe that it would be a sufficient excuse for not giving, that the institution he represents, is so far as he can make it, sectional in its character, and wanting the control and supervision of the Church.

3. We do regard it as essential to the success of our Theological Seminaries that they have the endorsement of the whole Church, through the General Assembly. This may not be required by "J. M. L." or by those occupying similar positions in the Church; but it is becoming to be regarded as important by the membership of our churches, and by the vast body of our ministry. It is, in fact, a general endorsement that our Seminaries should be more thoroughly supervised, even than they now are, and it does not require a long or labored argument to prove to our excellent common sense, that the Seminary which is under the watch and care of Synods and Assembly, too. It does not invalidate our argument to say that the Assembly is so composed that it is a single eye to the Seminary; we know our churches know, that it is so composed, that in regard to the chief thing desirable it may be a check upon Synods. When there is such a demand for guards upon all hands as at present, that we maintain the form of sound words, and as a Church remain pure, our people would far rather see an additional watchman placed over our Seminaries, than shut a single eye to their welfare.

And we differ with "J. M. L." who seems to think that the tendency in the Church is rather toward Synodical control, exclusively. We think if the whole Church could speak out to-day, it would say, "give us the control of the Assembly, also." And here is an idea which does not seem to be taken into account by those who argue for exclusive Synodical control. They seem to think that we take the Seminary out of the hands of the Synods, altogether. This is not the case. The Synods have a control in conjunction with the Assembly. There is a joint care and supervision. You may, if you please, say that the Assembly's supervision amounts to nothing; but you cannot say that it withdraws the Institution from the hands of the Synods. It is a step in the wrong direction, at the present time, to propose, in behalf of our Seminaries, to withdraw them from the hands of the Assembly, inasmuch as there is, if we mistake not, a growing desire in the Church to see the checks and guards increased rather than diminished; and we firmly believe that any institution which is withdrawn from the Assembly control, will be wanting in one of the elements of ultimate success. But,

4. There seems to be an eminent propriety and reasonableness in a general supervision over those institutions whose special duty it is to do a general work. It will not be necessary, we are satisfied, to argue this point. If we are to have a ministry who will be united with pleasure in every part of the land—who will be received by our people without suspicion—they must come, not from an institution which South Carolina establishes and maintains, carefully guarded from General Assembly control, but from such institutions as Princeton, Allegheny, or Danville. And when we remember the peculiar tendencies of the times to "alienation and separation," to "disunion and sectionalism," we cannot but regard a movement, in the Church of Christ, particularly in that Church with which we are connected, looking in that direction, as especially unfortunate.

Upon these general considerations, however, we cannot dwell. They will find in others more able defenders—as they find in the present condition of Princeton, Allegheny and Danville, glowing illustrations of their truth—and we pass to notice a few facts, touching the North-Western Theological Seminary, rendering, in its case, Assembly control especially important.

"J. M. L." although designing his general principles to apply to this institution, does not present the facts and circumstances which have been regarded as a bar to their application, in this instance. Certain conditions, in special cases, may exist, which would render it not only inexpedient, but absolutely fatal to apply general principles, which, in themselves, considered, are admitted to be just. This we conceive to be the case in regard to this institution. Even if the plan of exclusive Synodical control, in general, were such that we by no means admit, still in this instance we should not be, under the circumstances, insisted upon.

In presenting reasons for the above conclusion, Mr. Editor, we wish to be regarded as doing so with the kindest feelings to all concerned. We have no other feelings; and we will be compelled by a sense of duty to make a plain statement of facts, we do not prevail, were it not that we cherish a spirit

of union and co-operation in all our great enterprises to aid forward the Lord's cause. Let us, so far as it is possible for us to do, withdraw from every other portion of the Church's conduct within ourselves our Theological Schools, our benevolent enterprises, having a sectional Board of Home and Foreign Missions; a sectional scheme of church extension, and for publication and general circulation, and how long would fraternal feeling continue as a basis of general contribution to any object presented? Why it would very soon die out; and if Danville sent her Professors to New York for aid, they would meet with but little encouragement. Now, they can say to Presbyterians in all parts of the land, "this is your institution as well as ours. You have the right to investigate its affairs. You give character to the theology taught there. We claim to be doing a work for the whole Church; to be educating a ministry for all parts of the land, and it is not only your privilege but your duty to contribute to its support." Under Assembly control would not this plea be legitimate? Would not such an appeal be more of an eye to the Seminary?

It is not to be expected, of course, that those portions of the Church farthest away will contribute as those nearest by; but the principle should be enforced, and the duty insisted upon until it is felt that the Institution belongs to the Church and not to a fragment of it.

Dr. Humphrey and Hill did procure funds in New York upon some such plea; but let us ask how much could Dr. Thorneycroft procure on the basis of "fraternal feeling," the subject of alvery entirely aside, in J. M. L.'s neighborhood or church? We venture to say not much, and we believe that it would be a sufficient excuse for not giving, that the institution he represents, is so far as he can make it, sectional in its character, and wanting the control and supervision of the Church.

3. We do regard it as essential to the success of our Theological Seminaries that they have the endorsement of the whole Church, through the General Assembly. This may not be required by "J. M. L." or by those occupying similar positions in the Church; but it is becoming to be regarded as important by the membership of our churches, and by the vast body of our ministry. It is, in fact, a general endorsement that our Seminaries should be more thoroughly supervised, even than they now are, and it does not require a long or labored argument to prove to our excellent common sense, that the Seminary which is under the watch and care of Synods and Assembly, too. It does not invalidate our argument to say that the Assembly is so composed that it is a single eye to the Seminary; we know our churches know, that it is so composed, that in regard to the chief thing desirable it may be a check upon Synods. When there is such a demand for guards upon all hands as at present, that we maintain the form of sound words, and as a Church remain pure, our people would far rather see an additional watchman placed over our Seminaries, than shut a single eye to their welfare.

And we differ with "J. M. L." who seems to think that the tendency in the Church is rather toward Synodical control, exclusively. We think if the whole Church could speak out to-day, it would say, "give us the control of the Assembly, also." And here is an idea which does not seem to be taken into account by those who argue for exclusive Synodical control. They seem to think that we take the Seminary out of the hands of the Synods, altogether. This is not the case. The Synods have a control in conjunction with the Assembly. There is a joint care and supervision. You may, if you please, say that the Assembly's supervision amounts to nothing; but you cannot say that it withdraws the Institution from the hands of the Synods. It is a step in the wrong direction, at the present time, to propose, in behalf of our Seminaries, to withdraw them from the hands of the Assembly, inasmuch as there is, if we mistake not, a growing desire in the Church to see the checks and guards increased rather than diminished; and we firmly believe that any institution which is withdrawn from the Assembly control, will be wanting in one of the elements of ultimate success. But,

4. There seems to be an eminent propriety and reasonableness in a general supervision over those institutions whose special duty it is to do a general work. It will not be necessary, we are satisfied, to argue this point. If we are to have a ministry who will be united with pleasure in every part of the land—who will be received by our people without suspicion—they must come, not from an institution which South Carolina establishes and maintains, carefully guarded from General Assembly control, but from such institutions as Princeton, Allegheny, or Danville. And when we remember the peculiar tendencies of the times to "alienation and separation," to "disunion and sectionalism," we cannot but regard a movement, in the Church of Christ, particularly in that Church with which we are connected, looking in that direction, as especially unfortunate.

Upon these general considerations, however, we cannot dwell. They will find in others more able defenders—as they find in the present condition of Princeton, Allegheny and Danville, glowing illustrations of their truth—and we pass to notice a few facts, touching the North-Western Theological Seminary, rendering, in its case, Assembly control especially important.

"J. M. L." although designing his general principles to apply to this institution, does not present the facts and circumstances which have been regarded as a bar to their application, in this instance. Certain conditions, in special cases, may exist, which would render it not only inexpedient, but absolutely fatal to apply general principles, which, in themselves, considered, are admitted to be just. This we conceive to be the case in regard to this institution. Even if the plan of exclusive Synodical control, in general, were such that we by no means admit, still in this instance we should not be, under the circumstances, insisted upon.

In presenting reasons for the above conclusion, Mr. Editor, we wish to be regarded as doing so with the kindest feelings to all concerned. We have no other feelings; and we will be compelled by a sense of duty to make a plain statement of facts, we do not prevail, were it not that we cherish a spirit

of union and co-operation in all our great enterprises to aid forward the Lord's cause. Let us, so far as it is possible for us to do, withdraw from every other portion of the Church's conduct within ourselves our Theological Schools, our benevolent enterprises, having a sectional Board of Home and Foreign Missions; a sectional scheme of church extension, and for publication and general circulation, and how long would fraternal feeling continue as a basis of general contribution to any object presented? Why it would very soon die out; and if Danville sent her Professors to New York for aid, they would meet with but little encouragement. Now, they can say to Presbyterians in all parts of the land, "this is your institution as well as ours. You have the right to investigate its affairs. You give character to the theology taught there. We claim to be doing a work for the whole Church; to be educating a ministry for all parts of the land, and it is not only your privilege but your duty to contribute to its support." Under Assembly control would not this plea be legitimate? Would not such an appeal be more of an eye to the Seminary?

It is not to be expected, of course, that those portions of the Church farthest away will contribute as those nearest by; but the principle should be enforced, and the duty insisted upon until it is felt that the Institution belongs to the Church and not to a fragment of it.

Dr. Humphrey and Hill did procure funds in New York upon some such plea; but let us ask how much could Dr. Thorneycroft procure on the basis of "fraternal feeling," the subject of alvery entirely aside, in J. M. L.'s neighborhood or church? We venture to say not much, and we believe that it would be a sufficient excuse for not giving, that the institution he represents, is so far as he can make it, sectional in its character, and wanting the control and supervision of the Church.

3. We do regard it as essential to the success of our Theological Seminaries that they have the endorsement of the whole Church, through the General Assembly. This may not be required by "J. M. L." or by those occupying similar positions in the Church; but it is becoming to be regarded as important by the membership of our churches, and by the vast body of our ministry. It is, in fact, a general endorsement that our Seminaries should be more thoroughly supervised, even than they now are, and it does not require a long or labored argument to prove to our excellent common sense, that the Seminary which is under the watch and care of Synods and Assembly, too. It does not invalidate our argument to say that the Assembly is so composed that it is a single eye to the Seminary; we know our churches know, that it is so composed, that in regard to the chief thing desirable it may be a check upon Synods. When there is such a demand for guards upon all hands as at present, that we maintain the form of sound words, and as a Church remain pure, our people would far rather see an additional watchman placed over our Seminaries, than shut a single eye to their welfare.

And we differ with "J. M. L." who seems to think that the tendency in the Church is rather toward Synodical control, exclusively. We think if the whole Church could speak out to-day, it would say, "give us the control of the Assembly, also." And here is an idea which does not seem to be taken into account by those who argue for exclusive Synodical control. They seem to think that we take the Seminary out of the hands of the Synods, altogether. This is not the case. The Synods have a control in conjunction with the Assembly. There is a joint care and supervision. You may, if you please, say that the Assembly's supervision amounts to nothing; but you cannot say that it withdraws the Institution from the hands of the Synods. It is a step in the wrong direction, at the present time, to propose, in behalf of our Seminaries, to withdraw them from the hands of the Assembly, inasmuch as there is, if we mistake not, a growing desire in the Church to see the checks and guards increased rather than diminished; and we firmly believe that any institution which is withdrawn from the Assembly control, will be wanting in one of the elements of ultimate success. But,

4. There seems to be an eminent propriety and reasonableness in a general supervision over those institutions whose special duty it is to do a general work. It will not be necessary, we are satisfied, to argue this point. If we are to have a ministry who will be united with pleasure in every part of the land—who will be received by our people without suspicion—they must come, not from an institution which South Carolina establishes and maintains, carefully guarded from General Assembly control, but from such institutions as Princeton, Allegheny, or Danville. And when we remember the peculiar tendencies of the times to "alienation and separation," to "disunion and sectionalism," we cannot but regard a movement, in the Church of Christ, particularly in that Church with which we are connected, looking in that direction, as especially unfortunate.

Upon these general considerations, however, we cannot dwell. They will find in others more able defenders—as they find in the present condition of Princeton, Allegheny and Danville, glowing illustrations of their truth—and we pass to notice a few facts, touching the North-Western Theological Seminary, rendering, in its case, Assembly control especially important.

"J. M. L." although designing his general principles to apply to this institution, does not present the facts and circumstances which have been regarded as a bar to their application, in this instance. Certain conditions, in special cases, may exist, which would render it not only inexpedient, but absolutely fatal to apply general principles, which, in themselves, considered, are admitted to be just. This we conceive to be the case in regard to this institution. Even if the plan of exclusive Synodical control, in general, were such that we by no means admit, still in this instance we should not be, under the circumstances, insisted upon.

In presenting reasons for the above conclusion, Mr. Editor, we wish to be regarded as doing so with the kindest feelings to all concerned. We have no other feelings; and we will be compelled by a sense of duty to make a plain statement of facts, we do not prevail, were it not that we cherish a spirit