

PRESBYTERIAN BANNER & ADVOCATE.

Presbyterian Banner, Vol. VII, No. 2.
Presbyterian Advocate, Vol. XX, No. 40.

"ONE THING IS NEEDFUL." "ONE THING HAVE I DESIRED OF THE LORD." "THIS ONE THING I DO."

WHOLE NO. 814

DAVID MCKINNEY, Editor and Proprietor.

PUBLICATION OFFICE, GAZETTE BUILDING, FIFTH STREET, ABOVE SMITHFIELD, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Philadelphia, 111 South Union Street, below Chestnut

TERMS.—IN ADVANCE.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

College Endowment.

MR EDITOR.—In the present communication, it is intended merely to present a few suggestions, additional to what has been said by your correspondent, "John," in reference, especially, to the union of Colleges. The importance of a union between Jefferson and Washington Colleges cannot readily be overrated, as many friends of both institutions see and acknowledge. The amount of endowment proposed, (\$500,000), is by no means too much, for such an Institution as ought to be had, and might be had, provided a plan of union, which will secure the cordial co-operation of the friends of both Colleges, can be devised. But without such a plan, "John" is undoubtedly right in saying, that "but little can be done, and perhaps nothing should be attempted," toward securing such an endowment. He then proposes a plan of union; yet is evidently not wedded to that, or to any plan; but in common with many other good and far seeing men, earnestly wishes to have the proposed union effected on some plan. He adds: "Probably no plan can be devised that will be free from difficulties." Special attention is called to this statement; for it is very evident, that if, in the present condition of our College affairs, we wait till all difficulties disappear, there will never be a union. A real union in sentiment, feeling, and interest, as masters now stand, implies, in the very nature of the case, a choice of inconveniences, as compared with what might be, in an enterprise entirely new, and on ground not occupied. All that can be reasonably even hoped for, in the present case, is a plan attained by only such inconveniences as shall not be deemed insuperable by either party. In looking round for such a plan, let us first determine what may be assumed as postulates, in the solution of the problem before us. Such appear to be the following propositions:

1. That, as matters now stand, each College can continue to live along, as it has of late been doing, without union; that neither will, consequently, submit to being absorbed by the other; that, in view of a union, each possesses some advantages which the other does not; and that each would bring "into the firm," an average amount of advantages, about equal to those of the other.

2. That there is no use in attempting a union except on principles fair, just, and honorable to both parties.

3. That the local interests of the two towns are the chief hindrances in the way of union; and that no plan is practicable, which would sacrifice the interests of either, or both.

4. That a plan of union which will secure the cordial co-operation of the management, and the friends of both colleges, must honestly and fairly divide both the advantages of profit between the towns, and of honor between the colleges.

To all familiar with the ground; and with this College subject, it is believed that these propositions will need no proof. In the light of these, as postulates, then, let us pass briefly in review the various plans of union, which have been at different times, suggested.

1. The plan suggested by your recent correspondent, "John," viz: the united College removed to one place—Female Seminary instituted as a substitute in the other.

2. To take the College proper to one of the places, leaving the preparatory department, with a Law School, and perhaps a Scientific School attached, at the other.

3. An extension of the second, viz: To unite the Colleges on the University method; divide the University into two Schools, one at Canonsburg, the other at Washington; one of these Schools to consist of the Preparatory Department, Freshman and Senior Class; the other of the Sophomore and Junior Class, together with a Scientific School of a high order, embracing also an English Department, in which should be thoroughly taught, Grammar, (in its higher applications,) Belles Lettres, Rhetoric, Logic and Elocution; the studies to be so arranged that the studies of the Scientific and English School would be included, (so far as required,) in the Sophomore and Junior years of the regular class, and thus far avoid the necessity of employing two sets of Professors.

If the place for each School cannot be agreed on, let the matter be determined by umpires, or by lot.

4. To withdraw both Colleges from the places where they now are, and locate the United College elsewhere.

All who receive our postulates, as such, will see, at once, that the first, second, and fourth of these plans are impracticable. Attention is therefore called to the third—yet with due deference to the opinions of others—by one who has had the opportunity of becoming familiar with "the pros and cons" of both sides of this union question, as the only plan, in its outline features at least, on which union can be secured at all. True, it is open to objections, such as the want of complete unity in the system of instruction and government, &c. Perhaps such objections might not be found in practice so great as some apprehend. At any rate, "a choice of inconveniences" is all that any plan can present, under existing circumstances. Does this one present the fewest and the least of any practicable plan? It is believed so; and further believed that its adoption would secure advantages many and great, which the continued existence of two separate Colleges will never secure.

These advantages will not now be pointed out. The intention is, to suggest, not to argue. If the public mind is ripe for union, suggestion is all that is needed; if not, no argument would be available.

The Indian ecclesiastical basis—the method of appointing Trustees, and of managing the affairs of the College generally, (either those methods presented by "John," or some modification thereof)—the method of securing the funds—the propriety of inviting the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church to co-operate, as a co-ordinate Synod, if its members should be disposed so to do—are passed over for the sake of brevity. If "the main question" of union can be carried, on the plan above suggested or any other plan, it is confidently believed that all questions connected therewith, can be satisfactorily settled.

"An humble contribution," to use the language of "John," has thus been made toward the union of our two Colleges. May the friends of each "a mind to the work!" If so, the work can be done; if

not, it cannot be done. Some inconvenience must be expected and endured. We do not expect to gain both power and velocity; but like the engineers, who are accomplishing such mighty material results in the present day, we may gain power at the expense of velocity—power mightier, far, than that secured by any mechanical combination—a power which shall be felt in increasing degree, to the end of time.

Have the friends of each College a mind to the work? If so, let them approach it in the genuine spirit of frankness and Christian forbearance—each party "doing as it would be done by." An opportunity of presenting the Golden Rule—such an opportunity, and with such important results, presents itself to the friends of both Colleges, as can be devised. But without such a plan, "John" is undoubtedly right in saying, that "but little can be done, and perhaps nothing should be attempted," toward securing such an endowment. He then proposes a plan of union; yet is evidently not wedded to that, or to any plan; but in common with many other good and far seeing men, earnestly wishes to have the proposed union effected on some plan. He adds: "Probably no plan can be devised that will be free from difficulties." Special attention is called to this statement; for it is very evident, that if, in the present condition of our College affairs, we wait till all difficulties disappear, there will never be a union. A real union in sentiment, feeling, and interest, as masters now stand, implies, in the very nature of the case, a choice of inconveniences, as compared with what might be, in an enterprise entirely new, and on ground not occupied. All that can be reasonably even hoped for, in the present case, is a plan attained by only such inconveniences as shall not be deemed insuperable by either party. In looking round for such a plan, let us first determine what may be assumed as postulates, in the solution of the problem before us. Such appear to be the following propositions:

CARISTIAN BRETHREN.—It was your privilege to meet to adopt a Testimony as to doctrinal belief and religious worship. But in doing so, did you have frequently referred to other bodies of Presbyterians, and adopted measures to exclude them from communion in sealing ordinances, courtesy, &c., rather requires some notice of your declarations and arguments. Those to whom you have alluded do not wish to treat you as unworthy of regard, especially since your Testimony is to be a permanent document, intended, in part, to testify against others for successive generations, and to present them as in error.

In your united counsel and legislation on the Article "Of Communion," you refer to some outside of your communion "who profess an adherence to the Confession of Faith;" and then again to "many who profess the Presbyterian name;" and then in your Article on Psalms you speak of your "opposition" to "those who profess an adherence to the Confession of Faith." All this is consistent with your assumption to be "The Church," and "The United Presbyterian Church." But when in your "Conclusion" you speak kindly of "our brethren of the Presbyterian family" from whom we [you] are in a state of separation?" you relinquish the idea of being the whole united Presbyterian Church, and your better feelings are in opposition to your Article on Communion. Notwithstanding that article has become a part of your Testimony, contrary to the Scripture, contrary to the twenty-sixth chapter of your Confession, contrary to the spirit of this Christian age, and the indications of duty by Providence, there is reason to believe that hundreds now in your Church would depart from its restrictions, and that thousands eventually under the teachings of the Holy Spirit, in Christian love, will break down this separating wall, and extend communion "unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus." Brethren, it is a vain thing, with such a "Decree," "argument" and "illustration" as you make, or with any other human power to perpetuate divisions, which began in opposition to God's will, but will and must, with his power, be healed, not by your present favorite principle of "uniformity," but through your less favored ones—of "harmony" and "co-operation" which will secure the ends for which these bodies shall retain their present relative proportions; and a basis would be secured for harmonious and efficient co-operation in sustaining a great Presbyterian Institution, worthy of the times, and of the vast population belonging to the Presbyterian family in this region.

The plan thus modified, would be recommended by its being a sort of compromise between the friends of communion in any ordinance of worship to be held under such circumstances as would be in all such control. The Board thus appointed would be just as independent in its action as is the present Board of Jefferson, and yet sufficiently ecclesiastical in its relations to satisfy all reasonable demands on that score. Indeed it is only some such plan of joint representation that would be likely to meet with any favorable consideration from the friends of Jefferson. They will not, and ought not, to be willing to alienate friends themselves such worthy and efficient friends as the brethren of the old psalm singing bodies.

That such a plan would not be unacceptable to the Jefferson Board, might be inferred from a declaration of that Board in their response to the application of the Synod of Pittsburgh, in 1853, having reference to an ecclesiastical connexion between that Synod and Jefferson College. Although for weighty reasons most respectfully declining the proposed Synodical supervision, the Board say that, "in order to satisfy those who think that the Church is the safest depositary for funds, we are perfectly willing, and would propose, that any funds which the Synod may see proper to raise for the endowment of a professorship or for scholarships in this Institution, shall be held under the care and control of the Synod, and be subject to withdrawal whenever applied for in a way that does not meet the approval of that body. We are likewise willing to enter into a similar engagement with the other ecclesiastical bodies represented in this Board."

I would only add that the proposed plan, thus modified, would also open the way, if desirable, for the absorption of Mrs. Hanna, at Washington, into the great "Female College," to be established in that place.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

Washington and Jefferson Colleges.

Several articles have appeared in the *Banner* on the subject of the union of the two named Colleges. No doubt two Colleges are not needed in the same County; but they exist, and that not by the act of the present generation. They are both said to be flourishing. They are carrying on their education in a way that is most creditable to the respective Female Seminary of Mrs. Hanna, at Washington, into the great "Female College," to be established in that place.

A PRESBYTERIAN.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

Thames Regatta at E.—Regattas are frequent every Summer, both "above bridge" (London Bridge, and its mates, as far as Putney Bridge,) and below it. "Above bridge," if you go up by steamer to Kew Gardens, a farther still, to Richmond and Hampton Court, a somewhat starting vision meets your sight. It is a long, narrow skiff, whose gunnels are almost equally sharp, and in the centre of which sits, on one cross-bench, with feet thrust through a kind of self-willed plow-like openings, made for the purpose, like human fingers, with close-fitting cap and suit of blue, or yellow, or pink, or flesh-colored, fitting tightly to the frame, bands, now forward, and now backward, pulling every light pair of oars, with such glee, as will to make the skin glide swiftly along the silver Thames, and past the sedgy, willowy bank, and shooting by your pluming steamer, going right up against the stream, like a fairy-bark—on, and on, and downward and onward still, in a few moments, it and its elfin, sprite-like master, are clear out of sight! You wonder why it is not upset.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

IMITATION RELIGION.—There is an enormous amount of imitation religion amongst us. If there were as great a proportion of counterfeit coins circulating in the kingdom, we would be all on the alert to detect and destroy it. We would feel the danger of being ourselves deceived, and losing the riches for which we care.

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural to extend our Christian fellowship beyond the limits of our own Church? Is it right to use any other than a literal version of David's Psalms in the public praise of God?

When I inform you that it has been customary, on Sacramental occasions, to hear those anathematized who would dare to believe the affirmative on either of these points, you will be prepared to understand

that the "tradition of the elders." There are three bones of contention which have already been often picked, but yet are not likely to be laid aside till some of our fathers are removed to the land of silence, viz.: Is it lawful to omit the observance of a fast preparatory to the Lord's Supper? Is it Scriptural