

# CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

Whole No. 81.

RICHMOND, VA., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1867.

Vol. 2.—No. 29.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

## TWO MITES.

"Two mites!" Alas,—the paltry sum!  
And yet it was his all;  
A feeble woman, widowed too,  
With many a farthing's call.  
'Tis true the temple had its claim,  
But surely such as she,  
By Providence were quite exempt  
From Israel's treasury.  
Not so the pious widow thought,  
And her two mites were given,  
All unobserved save by one eye,  
And that the eye of Heaven.  
Her after lot no record tells,  
But O we cannot think,  
That "neath a sooty plucking want,  
God suffered her to sink.  
Approvest thou? Then, do likewise,  
That widow's spirit seek,  
And thou shalt have, Ah! surely have,  
The blessing of the meek.  
Nay, if thy store, time, talents, strength,  
Be but two mites in all,—  
Go cast in God's treasury,  
And precious fruit shall fall.

Montgomery, Va., Jan. 1867.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

## Pulpit Manner.

BY A LAYMAN.

NO. V.

Your manner in Prayer, now comes to be considered. Two prayers are required by our Directory, one before and one after the sermon, one full and comprehensive, the other briefer and more special. This latter, by some preachers, I have known to be omitted; by what authority, I am at a loss to say. I think I never but once knew the first prayer to be left out. I suppose that the minister forgot it. I dare say he was afterwards as much mortified, as his congregation at the time was surprised.

As to the manner in prayer, not much can be said. The characteristic sentiment of prayer is reverential earnestness, and this feeling is so simple, and at the same time so controlling, that nature dictates what is appropriate in manner. Yet some things may be noted. I think that it is well to introduce the service by the words, solemnly uttered, before the eyes are closed: "Let us pray." The uplifting of the hands is the universal token of prayer. Again I remind you that both hands ought to be used. To raise but one has an incomplete, careless look, and is also ungraceful. As your hands cannot be kept in this position during the whole time of prayer, it is well to close them in front of your breast, or to rest them on the cushion, before you begin to speak. To do this subsequently, suggests weariness. Make but little change afterwards, if any, in the disposition of your hands. Do not during prayer fumble with the Bible, the hymn book or the cushion. Do not thrust one hand into your breast, much less into your pocket, and do not draw out your handkerchief. A slight gesture is not inappropriate occasionally, but only such a one as belongs to supplication, never one of a demonstrative character.

There must be allowed some change of attitude, and some play of features, but the natural tendency to this is to be checked, rather than encouraged. I have seen a minister so throw his head backward and forward, so dart forward and lean over the desk, and so direct his face to the different portions of the audience, as to impress one with the thought that he had forgotten the direction in which the throne of grace is usually supposed, figuratively at least, to be.

I may be allowed to refer to some things not exactly of manner, nor yet altogether of matter, belonging to prayer from the pulpit. Complaint is frequently made that our ministers make their first prayer unduly long. There is foundation for this criticism upon some ministers. Yet I would counsel you not to be controlled as to the length of any part of your services by the notions of others. If you do, you will presently find yourself curtailed to a profitless brevity. A large part of your congregation will always wish your prayers and your sermon to be shortened. And if to please them you begin to cut off, they will presently be just as desirous of another curtail. Fix in your own mind how long the whole service ought to be, and assign to each part its just proportion, and as nearly as you can, conform to it. Habit will presently make you surprisingly accurate in this respect. It is part of your business to train your people to remain patiently in the house of God for a suitable length of time.

The first prayer ought not to be short. Our Directory requires that it should be full and comprehensive, and to be still well occupied some time.

The constituents of this prayer as set forth in our Book, are: Adoration, Thanksgiving, Confession, Supplication and Intercession. Pleading is also added but this seems not to be distinct from Supplication and Intercession. It is not to be supposed that each of these topics is to be of necessity introduced into every prayer—and yet which would we omit? Nor that all are to be treated with equal fulness, or each with the same fulness upon every occasion, but that this is to be the general scheme of the full and comprehensive prayer provided for in every complete act of public worship on the Lord's-day. As these topics are to occur regularly, would it not be well for each minister to introduce them in regular order, and preparing what seems to him, the best phrasing, not to vary very widely from it, Sabbath after Sabbath? Your prayers will not be made by this method either formal or monotonous. For there is yet another portion of the prayer which will be continually varied.

This is the adaptation of it to the particular occasions of each Sabbath. The regular vicissitudes of this kind are quite numerous. You will have at least four communion sabbaths in the year. Each of these gives three special occasions; the Sabbath preceding, the Sabbath of communion, and the Sabbath succeeding. The topics appropriate to each of these ought to be made respectively, the subject of prayer. Then there are four meetings of important ecclesiastical bodies, four seasons of the year, the first and the last Sabbath of the year, with public fasts and thanksgiving, and other distinctive occasions occurring annually. Those I have mentioned cover nearly half the Sabbaths of the year.

If the whole should be concluded with the Lord's Prayer, it would be agreeable to many, and not displeasing I think to any. If you do so use the Lord's Prayer, you are not required to determine what shall be the form of words with which you will close. If you do not, then adopt two or three of the appropriate formulas, and use no others. And let me advise you to give the formula verbatim, without any expansion. For example: if you use the Doxological form, render praise simply to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and not to The Father, our Almighty Creator, The Son, our Divine and Compassionate Saviour, and The blessed Spirit, our gracious Sanctifier and Comforter. Or if you use the Mediatorial form, do not say: "for the sake of Jesus Christ, for whom we praise Thee, in whom we trust, and in whom we hope, living and dying, to be found." Will you think it too petty in me to refer to the manner in which you pronounce the last word, Amen? Remember that I have undertaken at your request, to note very minute things which more able writers would consider unworthy of notice, and yet they are not unimportant, since they are connected with the worship of God. Try and not be peculiar in your utterance of this last word. Do not mutter it, nor yet be explosive. Give it its customary pronunciation and accent; that is, each of the two syllables should have the same stress laid on it.

The last prayer differs from the first mainly in two respects. It is much shorter. It is, nevertheless, a real prayer, and therefore ought not to be curtailed, as is sometimes the case, into a mere formula. Undue brevity suggests the thought, that you feel when your sermon is done, all is done. It also should be adapted to the sermon which it immediately follows. Let this adaptation consist however rather in continuing the general sentiment, than in resuming any of its topics. If you have to follow the sermon of a brother minister, do not go over the heads of his discourse, nor try to improve upon it, and above all, avoid complimenting him. I think that it is not often expedient even to make special supplication for a man before his face. I may add here, though not just in place, that I do not think it appropriate to repeat poetry, even a verse of a hymn, in prayer.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

## A Few Exceptions to "S. L. C."

Dear Brother Brown,—Will you allow me to take a few exceptions to some of the generally good observations of "S. L. C." on Pulpit Manner? The reason why I make them will appear from the exceptions themselves. The subject is important, and I think a great deal too much overlooked in our Seminaries and by our preachers, and I am glad that Dr. Hodge has addressed the ministers of the Gospel on this theme. I hope a deeper and wider interest may be awakened on this subject.

The Spirit of God, through St. Paul, has thought it of sufficient importance to give special and general directions as to the mode of conducting public worship. Such passages as, "Let all things be done decently and in order," i. e. becomingly, or rather decorously, beautifully; and each part of the public service at the proper time and in the proper way. Dr. Hodge says: "The exhortation is, so to conduct the worship that it may be beautiful; so as to make a pleasing impression on all who are right minded." Now this divine direction is, to a very sad extent, by a great many ministers overlooked. I have seen the public service conducted in just the opposite way—such blundering, confusion, irregularity and awkwardness in giving notices, in administering the Lord's Supper, in baptizing persons, especially infants, in postures, tones of the voice, nasal reading, mispronunciation, &c., &c., as to be exactly contrary to the apostolic direction of "beautifully and in order."

In St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy and Titus, he uses such language as this, "Let no man despise thy youth, but make thyself a pattern of the faithful, in word, in life, in love, in faith, in purity. Until I come apply thyself to public reading, exhortation, and teaching. Let these things be thy care; give thyself wholly to them; that thy improvement may be manifest to all men. Give heed to thyself and to thy teaching." (Corybeare and Howson's Translation). To Titus he says also, "Let no man despise thee." I remember hearing Dr. Sampson expound this verse to the students of Divinity more than twenty years ago, and he argued that a minister should study to acquire such intelligence, character and manners as would everywhere and at all times command regard, respect or influence. Let no man despise thee for want of piety, for want of Bible knowledge, for want of common information, for want of good taste, good manners, common sense, &c., &c.

All I have to say with reference to "S. L. C.'s" hints and strictures, is

chiefly that he does not seem to me to occupy a sufficiently central and Scriptural standpoint. Hundreds of our ministers, young and old, will not, and cannot, be benefited by much that he says, because he seems to contemplate regular churches, with aisles and pews, and galleries and choirs, and vestibles, &c. Where shall the missionary or young preacher deposit his overcoat, and leggings, and spurs, and whip, &c., when he comes miles in the mud and cold, and enters a cold barn, or school house? Many a time to dispose of these things in the way suggested, is impossible, and would require not only a vestry, but a ewer and basin, and towel and mirror, &c. When the minister comes to his church he often finds no fire but in the stove in the church; may he not pause to warm himself, and may he not salute the persons standing around it? Is there anything unedifying, unscriptural, irreverent in kind and Christian salutation in God's house, among the members of Christ's family? I am satisfied that more good would be done, if there were a little more of this saluting.

What possible objection can there be to putting the hymn-book, or a neat and clean handkerchief under the lid of the Bible, especially when reading or preaching from the first or last portion of the Bible? It makes the leaves lie easy and horizontal. As to the overcoat and gloves, &c., I think many and many a time they ought to be worn, and kept on until the moment of commencing the service.

If "S. L. C." would go off into a remote and cold pulpit, immediately from his horse or buggy, he would find and feel it was the next thing to absolute necessity to keep them on. I have found it necessary to put them on, after divesting myself of them. The awkwardness of taking off an overcoat or overshoes in the pulpit, is certainly overstated, and I trust that now, after years of sacred and delightful worship of God, he and I could be profited and enjoy a prayer meeting, where the minister stood at the table, though he had on leggings and spurs, and his whip lying beside him; surely at least as much as if he conducted the service and lectured on horseback.

I fully agree with him, as to tearing out the blank leaves of his hymn book on which to mark down the number of hymns to be sent to the choir. The same as to water, unless he is really thirsty and needs it, and so especially as to the indecent and hideous practice of chewing tobacco, in the church, defiling either pulpit or pew.

As to looking around upon his congregation, it may often be exceedingly desirable to know if such and such persons are present; their presence or absence may very materially modify his discourse or his prayer, may very materially encourage or discourage him. To see that his people old and young, communicants and non-communicants are present, cannot be inappropriate, provided it is done quietly, without peeping, peering or rudely gazing about. If it is a prayer meeting, and he rises to call upon an elder, or deacon, or church member to pray, it is surely better to know that they are present and where seated, than to stand and hunt about for them at such a moment.

As to talking with a brother minister it depends altogether upon circumstances; it is frequently and generally wrong, but to lay down to ministers such an iron rule as "S. L. C." does when he says: "If you have a brother minister in the pulpit do not talk to him, nor let him talk to you," is wholly improper. Often there are facts and circumstances only known to the pastor after entering his pulpit. A Saturday audience, a Sabbath night audience is not alike in all places, nor composed of the same elements. The visiting brother may have talked over to the pastor the themes of one or two or three sermons,—the character of the audience,—most decide which he had better preach. Is this profane or irreverent in the sight of that God and Saviour, whose glorious Gospel of grace they are about to proclaim?

I am no advocate for "vestries;" the name and necessity of such things arose far away from apostolic and primitive, New Testament preachers and preaching. Nor for "the Geneva gown and band;" but I would have the minister dress with scrupulous neatness and propriety. As to moustache, whiskers, &c., some men are greatly improved by them; some few are disgraced. So too as to the length of a man's whiskers. I am afraid that "S. L. C." violates his own rules of "ne nimis." Some men in moustaches and sparse whiskers look like apes; they ought to shave; and others ought to wear both moustache and whiskers. The question of gown and bands, and the Lord's Prayer, once repeated, and Invocation, draws deeper, and I have not space here to discuss them; but surely it would be no economy to the poor preacher to have to provide an extra gown and bands and carry them about with him in his saddle-bags over the country and through the wild forests. Where and when shall he don and doff them? Black kid gloves are certainly very neat and comfortable and convenient at times.

I have felt in reading over "S. L. C.'s" hints, that his standpoint is not altogether the right one, and that his suggestions are not sufficiently adapted to the times, places and circumstances in which hundreds of ministers preach, and thousands and tens of thousands assemble to hear the glorious Gospel of the blessed God. As to all his suggestions referring to neatness, gravity, dignity, deliberation, to thorough and careful study to conduct himself and the public worship of God impressively, in all its parts, always and every where,—to every thing that will make our forms and modes Scriptural, (i. e. so far as externals are concerned,) pleasing, impres-

sive, beautiful and well ordered, I heartily and fully agree. M. K. W.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

## Ministerial Support.

The course which the discussion of this subject has taken in our ecclesiastical bodies, and in the papers, is a source of deep mortification to some interested parties. If called upon from a definition of the phrase, from some of the speeches made at the last meeting of the Synod of Virginia, the following would approximate the true idea set forth—

"Ministerial support is that pittance which the preacher of the gospel is enabled to wheedle out of his congregation by making himself an 'everybody's body.' Or, 'It is the alms bestowed by kindly disposed persons, on a class of men who having taken a vow of perpetual poverty, ought to be well satisfied to be fed with the crumbs that fall from the tables of others.'"

That there were higher and more honorable views taken by some is freely conceded. And that every speaker would concede this to be his own view, might be conceded also. But that this represents the view presented, is true beyond doubt. If not, why is the minister required to visit his people, in order to get the support due to him? Or, why is he required to give to the subject of ministerial support a prominence in his pulpit ministrations, which the Scriptures do not give to it? If as a class, ministers fail in any part of their pastoral work, let them be admonished; but never put their support as the motive to urge diligence; never degrade the work of Christ to the level of a business pursued for the sake of a living.

We need to go back to first principles on this subject, and settle definitely the question—On what ground does the minister of the gospel claim a competent support? Is he an object of charity—a beggar? and is his support to be dependent on the whims and caprices of the men for whom, and among whom he labors? Or, has he a right to claim compensation for his services, as other men rendering service under contract claim?

There are some principles, fundamental to this whole discussion, which seem to be lost sight of by many. The relation of pastor and church is two-fold. 1st. There is a spiritual relationship established, by which the pastor is bound to seek the religious interests of his congregation, and to use all diligence in all proper ways to promote their salvation. And the congregation are bound to give him due honor and co-operation. Thus far the relation has no reference to pay or support. It may be established where no pay is given or required. Or, it may be established between one minister and several congregations, when the breaking up of his relation to one, or the failure to receive pecuniary compensation from one does not affect his relations to it, or to the others. But—

2d. There is a civil contract entered into between the pastor and people, the very animus of which is that he shall devote all his time and all his energies to the pastoral work, and cut himself off from all the ordinary means of living. And the congregation bind themselves to furnish that support which in their judgment, and his, is necessary to free him from all "worldly cares." This is simply a civil contract, nothing more, nothing less—based on what the Church regards as necessary to the successful performance of the pastoral duties. Now "Ministerial Support" is just the fulfillment of this part of this contract by the congregation—the payment of their just and honest debts—a compensation agreed upon for services rendered. Are we then to understand that Christian people are less honest than others? that because their pastor does not require this contract to be put into a legal form, they are at liberty to violate it at pleasure? Or, on the other hand, must the pastor play toady to his people, and demean himself to the arts of a low politician looking for office, to secure the payment of his just and contracted dues? Or, must he continually ring in the ears of his congregation the fact that God has ordained that they that preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel, in order to secure what every honest man knows to be justly his? It does seem to me, that the Church of Christ places herself in a most pitiable position before the world when she demands continual prompting, and pleading and scolding, as the condition of her honesty.

It is a most astonishing thing, that after a Christian congregation have bound themselves by formal pledge, to pay a specified compensation for a specified work, that this pledge is not regarded as binding like a similar pledge binds an individual, but only as a quasi promise, to be met if perfectly convenient, provided that some member of the congregation don't find some fault or defect in the minister, or the ministers wife, or his children, or his servants, or his ox, or his ass, or something that is his—before pay day comes.

This whole subject needs ventilation—plain, common sense discussion. If ministers are to be beggars, and to sink their sense of self respect and personal independence in the vain effort to get support enough to keep body and soul together, let us know it at once. For my part, I will preach the Gospel henceforth to the end of life without charge, rather than sink to the position of a beggar for what I earn.

It should be demanded as a condition of settlement by every minister, and by every Presbytery, that a competent worldly support be raised and paid promptly. And this support should be in proportion to the means of the congregation. No man does justice to himself, or to his

congregation, who does not require a salary equal to the average income of the families of that congregation. If he lives among poor people—he would be unworthy of his office if not willing to share their poverty. But if among a rich people, he has no right to be poor; and his congregation sin in suffering him to be poor. It is a remarkable fact, that in times of pecuniary pressure or distress, the congregation is very ready to let their pastor share that, but when prosperity comes there is rarely any great eagerness to have him share in that. But the rule ought to work both ways—or not work in either. Does the lawyer work for nothing because his clients have suffered pecuniary embarrassment? Does the doctor practise for half price because his patients have lost their negroes, or had their barns or fences burnt by the enemy? Does the farmer ask less for his corn, or wheat, or butter, or eggs, because money is scarce? Why then, because the obligation of the contract with the preacher? Or, why make a different law for him? CRAMER.

TO BE CONCLUDED.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

## The Great Struggles.

The struggle in which our people are now engaged is a hard one. It is a life-struggle calling forth their whole strength, their best energies. The rule of law did not cease its pitiless blows until they were laid prostrate in the dust. Cities, towns, villages, houses, fields, left in ruins and desolate tell the story with an eloquence more powerful than words. What did they not suffer? Of what were they not deprived? So great was their impoverishment that it became a question of serious import, "What shall we eat? what shall we drink? and wherewithal shall we be clothed?" But this question is answered, though many seem not to know it. True, great numbers are enduring want and privation in greater measure than ever before. Yet the general state of the case is, that somehow or other our people have had, to this hour, food and raiment. It is not to be denied that they are in great straits. Nevertheless, when actual want dressed in the garments of "things seen and temporal," knocks at their doors, do they not in some way manage to meet its demands? They eat, they are clothed, they live; and some are even able to minister to "the lusts of the eyes, and the pride of life," besides attending to "the lusts of the flesh." So we are not far wrong in saying that the above named necessities of life, to this extent, that in the majority of cases when a man is really obliged to have anything, he finds or makes the means of getting it, notwithstanding his sad plight of poverty.

In all this the truth is being proved, "Where there is a will there is a way." Now cannot Christians apply this same rule in the struggle to meet the wants of the Church? What though it seem a great and arduous work to sustain her? Will a man see his mother starve while he stops to count the cost of giving her nourishment? No more should the child of the Church see her in her present condition, and allow her to remain thus while he is debating a question upon which neither God nor natural affection allows any debate. Our dear mother goes mourning and faint by the wayside. And will her children neglect her wants? Will they suffer her cry for help to go unheard, or if heard, unheeded? Surely if there is a will, there is a way of helping her.

Let Christians consider this well. Let them remember that every want of the Church is a want of Christ; that every call from the Church is a call from Christ, who died that they might live. It seems scarcely possible that there can be a neglect of the Church in which there is not a denial of Christ, for Christ and His Church are one. Therefore, when the Church is made to stand knocking and waiting at our doors until her "locks are wet with the dews of the night," are we stretch Christ, enduring such treatment. When we see the Church lying weak and suffering by the way, and yet pass by on the other side, this is as if we were passing unheeded, the crucified body of Christ, but for the flames of hell would forever dwell in his form or soul. And when in the feverish race after the things of this world, we trample the body of Christ under foot also. Is it not so, brethren? Here then are the two great struggles—one, that we may supply the wants of the body; the other, that we may not dishonor Him who died to redeem us. If the gaining of worldly ease is worthy of sacrifices and self-denials, is not Christ much more worthy? To the world we owe nothing; it is but the servant which our Father has provided to supply our wants through the pilgrimage to our blessed home. But what do we owe to Christ—what have we that Christ did not purchase for us by His precious blood? "I beseech you, therefore brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." H. H. H.

CONDITION OF THE HEATHEN.—Rightly said Dr. John Owen, in his sermon before the English Parliament, two hundred years ago: "No men in the world will help like them that want the gospel. Of all distresses, want of the gospel cries loudest for relief. A man may want liberty, and yet be happy, and Joseph was a man who wanted peace, and yet be happy, as David was; a man may want plenty, and yet be full of contentment, as Micah was; but he that wants the gospel, wants everything that can do him good."

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

To the Grand-children of Rev. James H. C. Leach, D. D.

## LETTER IV.

Your grand-father had for his co-peers in the ministry and neighbors, as ministers count neighbors whose congregations are wide spread, Dr. Hill of Winchester, who had lost little of his fire and energy, though age began to show its impress; Matthews, of Shepherdstown, in the merit of his mental power, and demonstrating with increasing clearness his fitness for any position to which he might be called, and for that one to which he was finally called, in the Theological Institution in Indiana; in Martinsburg, John B. Hoge, who stood the most popular preacher in the county, with the great mass of intelligent people; Walton, his fellow-student in the vicinity of Charlestown, and Glass, his predecessor in Gerardstown, with his warm heart and metaphysical mind; in the neighbor town of Winchester, and across the Blue Ridge, the energetic Scotchman, Williamson, at Middleburg, who may be called the Presbyterian apostle of Fauquier; and down on the Rappahannock, the successful Wilson at Fredericksburg, now professor in the Union Theological Seminary; and among the Western ridges, Mr. Black, the kind and faithful minister in Hampshire, and Scott, the amiable teacher in Martinsburg. These were men to meet with in Presbytery; and to be in esteem with them was an honor. This honor Mr. Leach enjoyed, for his strict attention to his pastoral and Presbyterial duties, and his correct knowledge and appreciation of the Confession of Faith and Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Leach was a good member of Presbytery. Tenacious of order and etiquette, he strenuously defended the dignity of Presbytery; and to careless innovations he was a troublesome opponent. "Mr. Moderator," is that according to the rules of order?" sounded an alarm to any hasty mover of a doubtful proposition. In any position, he believed, like John Randolph, that there might be too much legislation in all governments, and like him opposed a multiplication of laws.

The Presbyterian Church in Virginia was, at this time, awaking to clearer views and greater efforts in the cause of her Lord. And the duties of ministers and people in all their Christian relations were fully discussed in the Presbyterial meetings duly weighed. The spirit, meaning, and application of the Confession of Discipline of the Presbyterian Church were subjects of deep feeling and practical enquiry. Mr. Leach, from his natural endowments and acquired capabilities, was prepared to be benefited by the earnest, yet friendly discussions of such men as were his co-Presbyters. And the few years he passed as minister to the church of Gerardstown, were full of usefulness among the people and improvement to himself. He was compelled to study, in order to hold his position among such brethren.

The older members of Presbytery related the revivals which God granted in their younger days, and the traditions of those of an earlier date, and pointed to the congregations in different parts of the State which were the fruits of those awakenings. And the great and serious enquiry was, what is the Church to do, that such blessings may descend again? And the first answer was: let her cleanse her heart and hands; "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." These embraced the doctrine and order of the Church, and the way of living, and the spirit and manners of the ministers. They often asked, "brethren, what shall we do?" They came together with warm hearts and earnest minds, and to act in the unity of the spirit found necessary to act with knowledge and according to well ascertained rules. To walk safely they must walk wisely. Discretion must join with earnestness, and the necessary consequences of a proposed course of action were to be carefully inquired for and considered, before a decision was formed.

The Synod of Virginia held its annual meeting in 1819 at Winchester, in October. Dr. Hoge met with his brethren in this Church court for the last time. He had been for years the pastor in Shepherdstown, had presided at the organization of Winchester Presbytery in 1794, in the same building in which the Synod was to meet, and with Hill, and Williamson, and Lyle, and LeGrand, formed the ministerial part of the Presbytery. In 1806 he accepted the Presidency of Hampden Sidney College in Prince Edward county, the Trustees appointing him their Professor of Divinity. His success in training young men for the ministry fastened the attention of Synod, and in 1812 he became the Synod's Professor of Theology. The College and Divinity school prospered under his care and supervision. But the price he paid for his usefulness was the wreck of his constitution and the loss of health. He went to the Synod worn down and depressed with his excessive labors. He was entertained at the house of Judge Tucker in Winchester.

The Theological school had become an interesting and important part of the business of Synod. At this meeting the age and feebleness of their Professor attracted attention, and in the discussion of the condition and prospects of the school, some inadvertent words fell upon the Professor's ears, which seemed to impel him to approach, or at least an intimation of that incompetency that follows imbecility or inattention. He passed a feverish, and sleepless night; and the words: "what do the brethren wish?" broke from his lips in the silent hours of night. An interview in the morning, with his noble son, John B. Hoge, and some other brethren, calmed his troubled mind. He was

slow to see what was plain to all others, that no man would dare to insinuate aught against his faithfulness and success; or if one was daring enough to do it, he could not bear the frowns of the Synod and the disapprobation of the Church. The old man, in his feebleness, was dearer than ever to the Synod and the Church. But his mortal career was run. He struggled through the winter with disease, and in Philadelphia, in the month of July, 1820, he passed away to meet his Saviour.

This event brought with it the necessity of electing a successor. The Synod could not agree upon which of the brethren to confer the honor and labor of the Professorship. She had in her bosom five that, in after years, were called to the Professor's chair; Baxter, Rice, Matthews, and the two Wilsons, together with others that appeared in merit equal to any position. But on no one at that time could the eyes of all be turned. After much consideration, at the meeting in Staunton in 1822, the whole subject of the Theological school was committed to Hanover Presbytery, which had raised, in years past, a small fund for a Theological school, and had laid the foundation for a Library by the purchase of some standard works in Theology. This Presbytery, on the 14th of November, met and accepted the transfer; drew the plan of a Seminary distinct from the College, and unanimously chose John H. Rice, D. D., then pastor in Richmond, for their Professor. It was not till the month of June, 1823, that Dr. Rice became satisfied of his duty in regard to his election. He accepted the Professorship. In deciding this question, Dr. Rice was called to decide another, viz.: a call to the Presidency of Nassau Hall, New Jersey. The reasons he gave Dr. Alexander for declining the one and accepting the other, reflect honor on his judgment and discretion.

The changes in the arrangement of Congregations in Prince Edward and Charlotte, connected with the separation of the College,—which furnished greatly under the successor of Dr. Hoge, Mr. Jonathan P. Cushing,—from the Theological school now committed to Dr. Rice, together with the increase of young ministers from the classes of Dr. Hoge, caused a remodeling of ministerial charges, and an enlargement of Sabbath services by lessening the area of the preachers' labors, and adding to the number of ministers. John B. Hoge was induced to leave Berkeley county and become pastor of the church on Shoccoe Hill, in Richmond; Kirkpatrick became pastor

Appomattox; Kilpatrick was at Boydton; Caldwell in Nelson county; Taylor was gathering a church in Halifax; John M. Fulton was in Buckingham; Silliman in Leaville; Brookes in Fluvanna; Curtis in Brunswick; Cochran at large, as missionary, and J. C. Hamner supplying Richmond for a time. All these but Taylor, had been pupils of Dr. Hoge. Paxton took charge of Greenfield, South of the Appomattox.

Mr. Leach was induced to remove from Berkeley and cast his lot in with the young brethren and young congregations in the counties around the College and Seminary. He hesitated long before his mind could become satisfied about removal. Against the removal, were a united and attached congregation, and undoubted evidence of great usefulness. For the removal, the prospect of usefulness among a population for whom he felt great sympathy, and the better prospect for means to rear an increasing family, and the solicitation of friends and relations. It was his desire to find his call to leave Berkeley as clear as his call to go there, and he therefore moved cautiously. The Presbytery reluctantly agreed to dissolve the pastoral relation, and transferred him to the Presbytery of Hanover in 1825.

He finally fixed his residence in Cumberland county, bordering Prince Edward, about a mile and a-half from Farmville. To meet the wants of rearing and educating his family, he applied himself to agriculture, in its most profitable form. The production most sure of a market and a remunerating price, was tobacco. Like the population around him, he became a planter as his father had been before him, and united labor in the soil with labor in the ministry.

Yours, very kindly,  
C. C. R.

THE COURSE OF LIFE of many a pious Christian affords few facts for a memoir. "One day telleth another" in the calm unexcited routine of daily duties. It does not require "some great thing" to make a saint. The commonest and simplest action of every day life, in one's usual trade or occupation, if done from the love of God and in his faith and fear, may assume the value of high virtue. "One may sweep the floor to God or to the devil." One may bargain or buy or sell, one may teach a school or conduct a law suit, or carry a weaver or bring up a family, or weave on domestic concerns, in such a way as may improve or injure one's own soul according to the motive. The elect of God have been hallowed in the most unassuming circumstances, with apparently every external influence against them. Men have been dunned in the midst of the highest spiritual privileges, with every outward circumstance ministering to their religious necessities. We have not to go out of ourselves, or beyond our daily circumstances, for the materials of our probation. We shall be saved or lost, according as we have served or neglected God in the common occupations of every-day life.

SOME one advised Alexander Logan, a witty Scotch advocate, to read a bombastic book on a good subject, saying: "Don't you like to expatiate in that field?" when he replied, "I can't get over the style."

Central Presbyterian

RICHMOND, VA., JANUARY 30, 1867.

REV. WM. BROWN, D. D., Editor.

"CHURCH UNION"—WITH A VENGEANCE.

"I thought where all the wiles would end."

Last week the first number of a new religious paper made its appearance in our office, with the title of "The Church Union."

It is a large double weekly sheet, published in Brooklyn, New York, and its outward appearance is quite attractive.

No names are given as editors or contributors, but we found a general statement that its contents are furnished by the hands of Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Reformed Dutch, and Lutherans.

It declares its aim to be the visible union of all Christians on the basis of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and to "secure, under God, an open communion, and the recognition of one evangelical ministry by the interchange of pulpits."

It says moreover that "Liberty and Union will be its watchword; Rationalism and Ritualism its antagonists."

"We are radicals for freedom, and for unity and for reform."

From intimations in the *Christian Intelligencer* and other journals, it may be gathered that this enterprise is set on foot by distinguished persons, and is supported by a good weight of capital.

Extracts from letters are published, among which we find one from "A Professor in Princeton," and another from "A very Distinguished Bishop," neither of whose names are given.

From all this "The Church Union" appears before the public under no small pretensions. The Christian world has always needed more harmony—more visible unity.

It needs these things now is a fact plain enough, and deeply to be deplored.

And after years of discussion at Evangelical alliances and elsewhere, it cannot be doubted that many valuable truths on this subject have been more deeply impressed upon thousands of good people over the world, and that there has been a greater yearning for the fulfillment of the Saviour's prayer for his followers—"that they all may be one."

The idea too of starting a paper specially devoted to the discussion of the many things connected with these vast interests, may be very praiseworthy.

These interests have not only wide but delicate relations also, and involve so many parties that no one can fail to perceive the difficulties of this undertaking, and the peculiar necessity of wisdom, forbearance and charity.

Any other mode of dealing with the question must, of course, work mischief.

Is there any hope of good from this new paper? If there is, we are unable to find it. The very first number had the favor of Radicalism, and now the second, we find, is perfectly rancorous with it.

It is therefore no misnomer when we say of themselves—"We are Radicals" &c., only they mean it in a good sense, but show it in a bad. It is not hard to give specimens.

As usual, with all the so-called Reformers of a certain school, they take their flings at ministers of the Gospel. But not as a class; that would not exactly answer, as yet.

Clergymen, as a class, are among the very best of men, and New York clergymen are no exception. We have a controversy.

As it is now, Secularian Christianity is a failure, and with it, of course, the Secularian pulpit.

And as to temperance, we are told that "The Church itself is class, and on the side of temperance." What this tone of speaking, or rather scoffing means, is easily understood; it is no novelty with us.

Perhaps some people might be disposed to draw a small inference from the fact that *Fury* selects this paper in which to advertise through a whole column—"Fury's Weekly Press," and that it is editorially recommended as an excellent paper!

But the following extracts from a furious outpouring upon President Davis and President Johnson, may more satisfactorily reveal the spirit of these new apostles of love. The article is headed—"Impaching a President."

"We are believers in the doctrine of retribution. Crimes against the State or Society in its organized capacity, are the highest crimes known in the criminal code. We believed, in common with a vast majority of this nation, that Jefferson Davis, when caught skulking away in the bushes of Georgia, in woman's attire, was the greatest criminal that this or any nation ever knew, guilty of a crime against the holiest cause any State can know.

We believe he should have been taken with a haste even greater than that of Proctor, our Philadelphia monitor, of last summer, and hurried to trial and to swift retribution. We believed that at the time of the murder of Abraham Lincoln; and though the public will has lost much of its force since this crime, we have never seen any reason to change our convictions.

Until this crime is atoned for, lesser criminals ought, we believe, to remain in *status quo*."

After this delightful taste of blood, such as might provoke the envy of a Feejee Islander, they next proceed to dispose of President Johnson after the following refined style—

"This crime of the Rebellion is the first in order on the calendar. Perhaps our sense of justice is obscured by the enormity of this great and overshadowing guilt of Jefferson Davis, so slow to be avenged. Perhaps our indignation is misdirected to discern a message of animosity or malfeasance in that humble individual, foolish Mr. Johnson, after these weighty matters were disposed of. But really, after reading over and over, our President's acts as recorded in public prints, and studying his remarkable doings, and more remarkable sayings, especially, during his late "swinging around the circle," we fall to find anything to identify so much as to call it a crime.

Stephen H. Branch, the immortal, the inevitable, and the inextinguishable, holds pretty much the same place in our esteem that our late President bears. We say, late President, for Mr. Johnson is impeached already, by the contempt of 20,000,000 of freemen, and by the secret disgust of the whole South.

"The Herald" presides over us now in his place. His votes are as harmless as the pronouncements of Daniel Pratt, the great American Traveller, and really we think Congress has about equal fears for each. We hope poor Mr. Johnson will be set upon no longer. "Speechless bird" that he is, "Why we haven't had a speech these three months!" In mercy to New York dials, friends in Congress, do not get "the great American Traveller" started again. *Requiescat in pace*.

With much that will be said in this "Church Union" against Ritualism, Rationalism and High Churchism, we shall probably agree. To expect any good results toward the promotion of true Christian unity is utterly vain. The spirit pervading the discussions is unmistakably of a low pitch—"the wisdom that is from beneath." One can readily account for the fact stated by the editors, that of 20,000 copies of the first number sent over the country, only two had been sent back.

These Reformers, whoever they may be, are false for Christian union, and love and fellowship, and seem to think their special mission is to denounce all who do not happen to agree with them. Good men, we think will turn away from them in disgust. They will soon be understood. It is now, as of old, the

spirit of a wolf under the wool of a sheep—and course at that.

Working with a Will.—The following extracts from a private letter received from the Rev. Dr. Ross, of Huntsville, Ala., present an example so good, and which ought to be so useful to others, that we must be allowed the privilege of putting them in print.

The energy of the Huntsville church presents a fine illustration of the proverb that in any good cause, if we only "get the will up, we shall always get the way open."

That noble church and its venerable pastor deserve the hearty congratulations of all in finding their efforts crowned with such complete success. May it be said of them too—"And your zeal hath provoked very many."

Where so many things arise in these days to provoke to wrath and strife, it is good to find some which provoke to love and good works. An extensive communication with brethren and churches brings the conviction that one of the serious dangers our people are now passing, is that of despondency—springing too much, we must think, from distrust. One of the most important duties Christians have to perform at the present juncture, is to encourage one another. A spirit of gloom and morbid apprehensions would work incalculable mischief. We must work for Christ's sake with a trustful spirit, and meet our trials and wants with a steadfast cheerful bearing. Difficulties vanish wonderfully when we face them with such a motto as—"Unmovable; always abounding in the work of the Lord."

In the Acts (the acts) of the Apostles, no small part of their work seems to have consisted in going about among the churches, "confirming the souls of the disciples." How they practised confirmation is known from the history. We feel inclined to say that as our venerable brother at Huntsville must find his own soul and the souls of his people a good deal confirmed just now, he is therefore in the right condition to travel around a little among his brethren and perform upon some of them true, Presbyterian, Apostolic confirmation, by "lifting up the hands that hang down and strengthening the feeble knees."

But we are keeping the reader from enjoying the pleasant facts stated in the letter.

HUNTSVILLE, ALA., Jan. 21st, 1867.

Rev. and Dear Brother: \*\*\*\*\* I have very glad thing to say to you. You may recollect that in my official talk at the General Assembly, when the Missionary collection was taken, I told of our Huntsville church debt, and that I would have \$10,000 secured by Christmas. Well, giving me the margin of a month's sickness in delay of my promise, I have kept it, and done more. This is the 21st of January, and a week ago there was good paper and cash for more than \$11,000! And not a dollar was raised outside of my congregation. That congregation, too, is as much reduced by the war, as perhaps any other rich church community in the South. Moreover, we are not done with the effort. Our debt was \$22,000. In a few days, I think, we will have provided for \$14,000 of it, probably a larger sum. And before the year is out, our Lord's house, with His blessing, shall be His, without encumbrance of debt.

Mistake Corrected.—A venerable father in the Church, whose eye has long kept faithful watch over its orthodoxy and purity, sends some remarks concerning the office of Superintendent, which he supposes was introduced into our Form of Government lately revised by the General Assembly. He is mistaken as to the date of its introduction, and as to the name Superintendent being used, however, as synonymous with Evangelist, and not intended to designate a new office. But the word was stricken out by the Assembly. The *Christian Observer*, to whose editorial article, about a month ago, our correspondent refers, was probably led into its mistake by copying from a Memphis journal the paper as reported by the Committee of revision, instead of the one adopted by the Assembly. A part of this article containing the mistake referred to, was inadvertently copied into the *Central Presbyterian*, where the attention of our correspondent was first drawn to the matter. The fact now stated will obviate the necessity of inserting his criticisms.

Deferred.—A private note from Rev. Dr. Atkinson informs us of his desire to continue the important discussion he has on hand still further. No one has a better claim to the public ear, no one within our knowledge is better qualified to present the views which he advocates.

Having the impression last week that it was his purpose to bring his remarks to a conclusion with the present issue, the purpose of beginning a full reply was announced. It seems now due to a brother so highly esteemed, that we should defer this a little longer, so that his views may be more completely understood. It will hardly be necessary, however, to postpone the subject longer than another week.

A long article in the last New York *Observer*, as well as its former criticisms will be subjected, before we are done, to such tests as, under the circumstances, they may be thought to merit.

A Great Shame.—At a celebration of the Fourth Presbyterian church, Washington City, D. C. Sabbath School on Sunday evening, the 18th inst., of which the Rev. Dr. John C. Smith is pastor, the Hon. Samuel McKee, member of Congress from Kentucky, was speaking to the School and the teachers, and made an incidental allusion of a kind nature to the colored Sabbath School of the Fifteenth Street Presbyterian church, of which the Rev. Highland Garnet was lately pastor. A storm of hisses, immediately broke out, and was continued until Col. McKee left the pulpit.

This statement is taken from the *Pittsburgh Presbyterian Banner*. Had such a thing occurred in Richmond, or any city farther South, what a storm of denunciation we should have had in certain quarters from both pulpit and press; happy, indeed, if we might escape the Freedman's Bureau, or a Committee of Congress to investigate the outrage. But as it was all in a congregation whose pastor is devoted to both "loyalty and freedom," and right in the focus of liberty, the *Banner* passes it by without comment.

Correction.—In an editorial article of last week, in reference to recent arrangements effected for the interests of the Presbyterian Church in Rockingham county, the following statement was made—"The Rev. Mr. Irwin, it is understood, expects to devote his labors to an inviting missionary field lying East and South of the town," &c., &c.

We are requested to say that, while Mr. Irwin is one of a committee appointed by the Presbytery to organize a church East of Harrisonburg—for which a petition was presented yet the statement that he "expects to devote his labors" to that field, or any other in the county, is entirely unauthorised and incorrect.

The Paper on which the *Central Presbyterian* has appeared for some weeks is far from being satisfactory. After one or two issues, a better article will be used.

Dr. Newman's Analysis of parties in the Established Church of England, which may be found on the 4th page, should be carefully read by all persons who wish to understand the present posture of the great controversy now so deeply agitating that part of Christendom.

Subscribers in St. Louis, Missouri, will find their accounts with S. W. Barber, who has kindly consented to receive subscriptions.

Subscribers at Columbia, Tennessee, can pay to W. H. Engle, who has a list of the subscriptions now due.

PROOF-READING.

All printers and editors will appreciate the remarks of the *New York Watchman* on this subject, a part of which we insert. If the readers of newspapers understood one-half of the difficulties in procuring accuracy, instead of wandering and scolding at mistakes, they would be surprised that there are not more.

"How few persons appreciate the services of a proof-reader! He is one of the most important agents in the production of a correct literature, and the one of whom no reader seems ever to think. His is the most thankless of all the employments among men. Let him bring out a paper without a fault for weeks and weeks in succession, and nobody thinks of him, nobody thanks him. But let him allow a single error to go uncorrected, and immediately he is known only to be censured. He has no thanks for his laborious patience, but blame if he be not faultless. He is certain of one thing, forgetfulness or oversight. We take this occasion to give our cordial thanks to the proof-reader of this issue, for his conscientious satisfaction by saying that we now and here forgive all and singular the errors our proof-readers have failed to correct, and to thank them for all the accuracy they have secured in our journal during the year, and for the correction of all our own mistakes of carelessness or ignorance made by those vigilant gentlemen.

A general, human life is much after this fashion. A man goes on through years of blameless living and no one notices or thanks him; but an error, a mistake, a slip, will attract to him the attention of censurers. Not only his own life, but the lives of others, what watchfulness, have been necessary to secure the propriety which has marked his course for years, nor what circumstances of trial created the weakness which caused him to let go his hold for a moment. God is not unkindly; it is the blessed assurance of Holy Scripture.

Let us take the "proof" of the last year and compare it with the new edition of the next. Let us be "pitiful and forbearing toward the faults of others."

"What's done we partly may compute, But know not what's resisted."

Agents Wanted.—The proprietors of the *Richmond Eclectic Magazine*, with a view to the better qualification of agents to extend its circulation in all parts of the United States. To such, when suitably recommended, a liberal commission will be allowed. As this Magazine finds an open door among all classes and denominations of Christians, an agency may be made quite remunerative. Address Hope & Brown, Box 452, Richmond, Va.

Richmond Eclectic Magazine.—To Book-sellers and Newsdealers.—By an arrangement made with the Editors the whole or a part of the *Richmond Eclectic Magazine* will be sent to their orders direct to us instead of the Editors, with the assurance that they will be promptly attended to.

WHITE & HOWARD, Stationers, No. 1011 Main Street, Richmond, Va.

HOLLYWOOD MEMORIAL BAZAAR.—The Executive Committee of the Bazaar, in view of the advice of judicious friends in this city and elsewhere, to postpone the opening from February 4th, to April 23d. They have carefully considered the interests of the cause and the difficulties to be encountered in this inclement season with transportation and mail facilities even so much delayed in all parts of the South, and trust their friends will not relax their efforts in behalf of the Bazaar from this change, but only make the extension of time result in an advantage to it. Any boxes ready to be forwarded or now on the way, will be received by Beckham & Co., 1104 Cary street, Richmond.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

Samuel P. Hawes.

Within a few months the city of Richmond has been sorely bereaved by the deaths of several of its old and highly honored citizens. Among these was Mr. Samuel P. Hawes, whose long residence here and exemplary character in all the relations of life, gained for him the kind regards of the whole community, and whose sudden removal produced a general and profound impression of sorrow.

Mr. Hawes was born in Dorchester, Massachusetts, in 1799, and removed to Richmond when about eighteen years of age. He soon gained the friendship of Dr. John H. Rice, became a member of his church in 1822, and at once entered on a course of Christian activity which continued uninterrupted, with very change of residence, until the close of his life.

In 1827 he was united in marriage with Miss Judith A., daughter of William S. Smith, of Olney, and niece of Mrs. Drury Lacy, of Prince Edward, Va.

In 1827 he removed to Amelia county, then to Lunenburg, and afterwards to Powhatan. During his residence in each of these counties he made his influence felt as a member and office-bearer of the Church, and as a Sabbath School teacher and Superintendent. Indeed this was his favorite field of usefulness. His careful preparation of the lessons, his punctual attendance, his faithful instructions, his warm sympathy for the young, endeared him to his pupils, and made him greatly profitable to them.

He lived to see many of them grown up to be heads of families and consistent members of the church, who ascribed their first religious impressions to his kind fidelity as a Sabbath School teacher.

In 1845 he removed from Powhatan to Richmond, and connecting himself with the 2d Presbyterian church soon after its organization, he was made one of the building committee for the erection of its house of worship. With unremitting interest he watched its progress from the laying of the corner stone, to the placing of the cap-stone upon it at its completion. He was present at its dedication, and during all the years of his connection with it was one of its most regular attendants. Nothing kept him from the House of God but some providential interposition. He was as certain to be in his seat in the evening as that of his service, and was found in his accustomed place, twice, on the last day of his life. Dear to his descendants will be the House with which his memory is more associated than with any other on earth, save his own home.

One of the special mercies of God, for which he often expressed his gratitude, was that of permitting him to see all of his children members of the Church of Christ, and one of his sons a minister of the gospel.

The season at which the death occurred rendered the event touchingly impressive. His children had gathered to their old home to celebrate Christmas day once more together; but on the 24th of December he had a sudden stroke which rendered him insensible, was carried home, and in a short time expired. Those

who came to enjoy with him a season of social visitation remained to weep over his grave. But not to those who have no hope. Sully says: "We deplore his loss, we believe that to him to die was gain. And now that the earthly life has been broken, they anticipate the time, when as one after another follows, it will be to form a circle in Heaven—not one member of the household absent or missing."

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

The Action of our General Assembly Concerning Freedmen.

Hampden Silvey College, Jan. 25, '67.

It was shown in your last number, that by the admission of Freedmen into her ministry, the Church in the Southern States would not render herself justly liable to the charge of inconsistency. Another, and in the eyes of some, a more serious objection to the extension to colored men of the privilege of becoming rulers and teachers in the Church of God, is their supposed want, present and prospective, of qualifications for such a work. It is thought by some that the curse which condescended the posterity of Ham to servitude, impressed upon them such a character as must forever render them unfit to assume the sacred and awful responsibilities of the Christian ministry. They may indeed become the subjects of a curse, but never can they be qualified to take part in the government or instruction of the Church.

To all this it might be sufficiently replied that no one desires colored men, or any other men, of destitute of proper qualifications, to be advanced to any office of the Church. If the Church therefore assert the principle we advocate, and no colored person be found now, or hereafter, fit for the ministry, then not one would be ordained to the ministry, and so no evil would result.

But, not to insist on this point—it is certain that the curse of Noah did stamp upon the posterity of Ham, moral or intellectual inability? Egypt, Phenicia, Carthage, were all peopled by the descendants of Ham; how many countries of remote antiquity were made more illustrious than these through the energy, the intrepidity, and the intellectual endowments of their sons. Egypt was to Europe the mother of science and art. She was the preceptress of Greece herself. The monuments of her mechanic skill and industry are even now the wonder and reproach of modern civilization. Tyre and Sidon—the Venice and Genoa of the old world—made tributary to their commerce the most distant lands known to the ancients. Their marines were beyond all question or competition, the best, the most skilful, and the most successful navigators of antiquity. By learned men they are supposed indeed to have anticipated some of the splendid maritime discoveries which illustrated the earlier annals of modern history. Carthage, who for so many years contended for the mastery with proud Rome herself, produced perhaps the most splendid military genius the world has ever seen. Now if these were some of the children of Ham, can it be supposed that the curse of Noah entailed impotence and frivolity over the whole race so that not one of that family, though the subject of the blessed influences of God's spirit, can ever be worthy a place in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church?

There can indeed be no reasonable doubt that many illustrious preachers and divines in the Church of Christ, have sprung from the seats of Theological learning and influence were in Egypt and North Africa; we know that the bishops of those countries numbered many hundreds, and when there was not the slightest trace of the inclination to exclude men from any office in the Church on the ground of descent, it can hardly be doubted that very many of African blood were distinguished teachers and rulers of the Church.

But it may be said that though children of Ham, none of the persons to whom reference has been made were negroes, and that their possession of the highest qualities of mind and heart does not prove that the negro can ever become a fit depository of ministerial authority. This plea evidently involves the relinquishment of the ground that the curse of Noah produced the alleged incapacity of the negro. Why should that curse fall more heavily upon him than upon others of the race of Ham? Why especially should a curse which was pronounced immediately against Canaan inflict imbecility upon the negro who no one supposes to be a descendant of Canaan, when such high qualities were exhibited by the Phenicians and Carthaginians, who were his offspring.

Nor, when we call to mind the circumstances in which the negro has hitherto been placed, does there appear anything in his present condition, mental or moral, to forbid the hope that he may be qualified to exercise the functions of a Christian minister. Remember his state of slavery when brought to these shores; see how great his progress in civilization, and recollect how for thirty, or forty years, that progress has been impeded by restrictions—many of them necessarily consequent on the efforts of his false friends to sow discord between himself and his master. With all these drawbacks the progress of the negro has been wonderful, and to-day they are a better people than some from whom our missionaries do not hesitate to recruit the ranks of the Christian ministry. Learn the particulars of the life and character of Jack Stuart, of Nottingham county,—(the Uncle Jack of Dr. White's little work), or of Ex-President Roberts of Liberia, and ask yourself if the people from whom they sprang are so inferior in character to the Hoos or South Sea Islanders that they must be excluded from a ministry to which these latter may be preferred.

And in the future, the American negro may attain an elevation far superior to any that his race has ever reached. Enlightened self-interest, to mention no nobler motive, ought undoubtedly to lead the people of the South to favor his improvement. We cannot bear to have him hanging a moral corpse about the neck of our community—a burden and an offense. For our own sakes we must imbue him with right principles, train him to correct habits, and enlighten his intellect by suitable instruction. As far as we can, we must give him the life of knowledge, and of moral and religious principle. Now in these views the best and most enlightened men at the South are rapidly uniting. They declare their desire that the negro be educated; not merely that he be taught to read, but that he receive as thorough and extensive an education as circumstances will permit to be given him. We find, for example, Governor Orr, of South Carolina, thus recommending the work of the principal of one of the colored schools of Charleston: "I heartily approve of the scheme of Mr. Cardozo to educate thoroughly the colored children of Charleston." The Rev. Dr. Smyth, of Charleston, writes of the same person thus: "I can both cordially recommend Mr. Cardozo and his enterprise." Similar testimonials were furnished Mr. Cardozo

by a number of the most distinguished citizens of Charleston, including the Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, the Mayor of the city, Mr. Trenholm, late Secretary of the Treasury of the Confederate States, and the Secretary of Grace (Episcopal) Church.

So likewise at the meeting of the Educational Association of Virginia, held last July at the University of the State, and attended by a number of the Professors of the University of the Military Institute, of the colleges, academies and private schools of Virginia, the following resolution, offered by Mr. Hart, was adopted unanimously:

"That in the estimation of this Association it is a laudable enterprise on the part of any Southern man or woman, to engage in the instruction of the freedmen, with a view to elevate their character, and to adapt them to the successful discharge of the new duties imposed upon them by their changed condition."

But it is further objected that the ordination of colored men would necessarily introduce a social equality and intermingling with the whites, the very thought of which is revolting, and which if not in itself immoral, must prove demoralizing. It is difficult to discuss this argument without the suggestion of ideas which few Southern men can consider without intense disgust.

This much may be said however: In the first place, the objection as it has sometimes been urged, is founded on a total misapprehension of the authority conferred by ordination in the Presbyterian Church.

Ordination gives the minister authority to preach but in no pulpits except that of his own church and that of a church to which he shall be sent, or in which he may be invited by some ecclesiastical court, by the session or pastor to minister.

It gives no authority to go through the world, preaching to every congregation, willing or unwilling, that may lie in his way.

Still less does it oblige every member of a church into which he shall thrust himself to attend on his preaching.

Least of all does it oblige the minister or the people to admit as a social equal to their houses.

Should colored men be ordained, then their ministrations, in all ordinary cases, will be confined to churches that prefer to have them, and these I presume, will be churches composed of colored persons.

But should a white congregation invite such a minister to preach to them, the Presbytery ought certainly to oppose no obstacle to his performance of the service, but then it would not follow that he must be entertained as a social equal, by any white family of the church.

Some forty years ago, before the insurrection headed by the negro Nat Turner, and the growing and aggressive fanaticism of the North, had moved the Legislatures of the Southern States to prohibit the separate worship of the blacks, a colored minister named Esquire, who had been licensed, and perhaps ordained by a Presbytery in the South, preached repeatedly in churches of his own color and the adjoining counties. Large congregations of whites attended these services, but the preacher was entertained, as he expected to be, by people of his own color alone. Some fifteen years ago, President Roberts visited the town of Petersburg, in the neighborhood of which he had been brought up. He was treated respectfully of course, by his citizens of the place as happened to meet with him, or with whom he had business relations, but he neither expected to be entertained by them, nor did he seek entertainment at any of their houses. He was, however, entertained at the house of a colored woman, a person indeed of great respectability and a near connection of his own.

It is said that these things happened before the war, and before the blacks as a race were free? That now ministers of their blood would expect to mingle in the society of whites if they share the church privileges of whites? The reply is obvious. At the North these same ecclesiastical status as the whites, but they do not mingle socially with them? There are in Philadelphia, I believe, colored ministers of the Episcopal Church, do they meet in the familiarities of social intercourse with their white brethren? I presume not. There has long been a colored Presbyterian church in Princeton, and lately a colored pastor has taken charge of that church. Is he entertained on a footing of social equality by the citizens of Princeton? by the Professors, for example—radical though they be—of the College and Seminary?

In conclusion, it may be observed that the principle of this argument would present all attempts to raise the colored race from their present debased condition. Every degree in which they are elevated increases their respectability, and brings them nearer to the whites. If they are to be educated, if they are to be trained to habits of industry and self-reliance—if above all they are to be trained to habits of integrity, truth and moral purity, the probability will be just so far increased, of their finding their way into the society of the virtuous and refined of the white race.

But should this consideration induce us deliberately to consign them to ignorance, and destitution, and moral infamy? To that question I trust we all feel there can be but one reply.

J. M. P. ATKINSON.

American Colonization Society.

This Society has just held a semi-centennial Anniversary in Washington, D. C. The Annual Report showed the actual receipts during the year were:

From donations, \$10,795; from legacies, \$37,644; and from other sources, \$11,185; making a total of \$59,624. The disbursements for the same period were: For the support of emigrants on the passage, and six months after landing in Liberia, \$48,849; for the purchase and fitting out of the ship *Goletta*, \$18,000; for running expenses of the present voyage, \$6,000; and for other purposes, \$17,012; making a total of \$89,861, compelling the Society to realize invested funds to meet the difference of \$25,188. The Society now has a ship that can comfortably carry 650 emigrants at a time, and make two voyages a year.

The ship *Goletta* sailed from Charleston, South Carolina, November 21st, with exactly 600 emigrants on board, of whom 194 were from Mason, Georgia; 167 from Newberry, South Carolina; 141 from Knoxville, Tennessee; 52 from Charleston, South Carolina, and 43 from Columbia, South Carolina. Of these, 295 are colored, and 305 are white. The ship sailed from Cape Hope, at Cape Palmas, a large proportion of the emigrants are professors of religion, of whom it is known that 70 are Methodists, 56 are Baptists, 13 are Presbyterians, and two are Episcopalians. Among them is a regularly organized church, "THE MACON BAPTIST CHURCH OF SAINT COUNTY, LIBERIA"—consisting of pastor, two deacons, and twenty-six members.

A high degree of intelligence is shown in that 77 can read, 20 can both read and write, and two have had the advantages of a collegiate education.

The trades or callings are represented by 78 farmers, 22 laborers, 15 carpenters, 13 shoemakers, 9 bricklayers, 2 blacksmiths, 4 wheelwrights, 3 coopers, 3 tailors, 2 millers, 2 cooks, 1 iron-moulder, 1 silversmith, 1 gunmaker, 1 waterman, 1 gunsmith, 1 engineer, 1 goldsmith, 1 dentist, and 1 photographer.

Three emigrants sailed from Salem Decem-

ber 21st. Eighteen persons were sent to the Pennsylvania Colonization Society.

These 621 emigrants were the largest number sent in any one year since 1854.

Since the departure of the *Goletta*, nearly 650 applications have been received from various Southern points, for passage to Liberia. This country is growing in the elements of national stability. The planting of coffee and sugar, and the manufacture of iron, have increased during the past year. The natural richness of that region is enormous, and will sooner or later support a large commerce on that coast.

Several leading powers of the world have recently given evidence of their regard for Liberia. By order of the Emperor of Russia, a first-class Russian frigate made a complimentary visit to Monrovia. Sweden also sent a national vessel, the *Albatross*, to visit Liberia College is doing well, one student will graduate at the end of the collegiate year, and five from the Preparatory Department will be ready to enter.

The American Colonization Society was founded in Washington, D. C. Dec. 21st, 1820. It has had five Presidents, viz.: Hon. Bushrod Washington, Hon. Charles Carroll, ex-President James Madison, Hon. Henry Clay, and the Hon. John H. B. Latrobe, who still continues in office.

The whole amount of its receipts during the fifty years of its existence has been \$2,140,285, or including the amounts received by the State Colonization Societies, \$2,367,685. This Society has given passage to 11,995 persons of color sent in 147 vessels or voyages, and what is a remarkable providence, not one of the vessels with emigrants on board has been wrecked or lost.

The officers of the last year were re-elected. It was resolved, that in view of the great work to be accomplished, it was highly desirable and necessary that \$100,000 be raised during the current year, and that measures should be immediately taken by the Executive Committee to raise this sum.—*Presbyterian*.

Religious Intelligence.

FROM THE SOUTHERN STATES.

The Post Office address of the Rev. John H. Boccock D. D., is Halifax, Mass. He is a member of which place correspondents will please address him.

Rev. J. R. Dow's Post Office address is changed from Aiken, to Charleston, South Carolina, care of Roper & Storey.

The Post Office address of Rev. J. Y. Watson is changed from Rock Hill, S. Carolina, to Camden, Arkansas.