

CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN

Whole No. 557.

RICHMOND, VA., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1876.

Vol. 11.—No. 37.

TRANSVERSE AND PARALLEL.

My will, dear Lord, from Thine doth run
Too oft a different way;
'Tis hard to say "Thy will be done,"
In every darkened day!
My heart grows chill
To see Thy will
Turn all life's gold to gray.

My will is set to gather flowers,
Thine blights them in my hand;
Mine reaches for life's sunny hours,
Thine leads through shadow-land:
And all my days
Go on in ways
I cannot understand.

Yet more and more this truth doth shine
From failure and from loss,
The will that runs transverse to Thine
Doth thereby make its cross:
Thine upright will
Cuts straight and true
Through pride and dream and dross.

But if in parallel to Thine
My will doth meekly run,
All things in heaven and earth are mine
My will is crossed by none:
Thou art in me
And I am in Thee—
Thy will—and mine—are done.

Churchman

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

Response of the Presbyteries to the Action of the last General Assembly in regard to Systematic Benevolence; the Favorable Promise; what Remains to be Done.

At least two thirds of the Presbyteries have taken favorable action, looking to the carrying out of the regulations of the last General Assembly; many of them with a vim and a will, indicating a determination to abate the evil of such a large proportion of failures to solicit the contributions of the people. From few Presbyteries we have no information whether or not anything was done. Four of them seem to have acted upon the mistaken supposition that the assessment plan, as proposed for examination by the Assembly of 1874, was still before the church. In several cases nothing was done, because of the failure of the committees of review appointed on the Minutes of the Assembly, to call attention to the subject. A very few deferred action till spring. Only two Presbyteries, so far as known, declined to comply with the rules—on constitutional grounds. But the large majority having conceded their constitutionality, these dissenting Presbyteries will of course waive their scruples. And such as have not yet acted, it may reasonably be expected, will this spring take favorable action. This is as good a result as could have been anticipated. We thank God and take courage. The movement is onward, and the promise fair of ultimate success, at no distant day.

Nevertheless much remains to be done.—No rules will work themselves. They must be worked by those who feel an interest in their success. We would therefore respectfully suggest to every friend of Systematic Benevolence, who approves of these rules, to resolve that it shall not be his fault if his Presbytery fails to give due attention to them. We would also, with great deference and respect, suggest to every stated Clerk who may chance to read this, to enter upon the docket of business for the spring meeting the matter of these rules, (see Minutes of the last Assembly, page 40,) to the end that they may be duly observed, both as to the sessions of the churches, and as to the General Assembly.

We must not be discouraged if great results do not appear in the reports this spring. It is too soon. The great body of the Church has not yet become cognizant of the existence of these rules. Many of the sessions, consequently, will fail to send up the required reports. It will then devolve upon the Presbyteries to take steps to inform the ignorant, and to rule delinquent sessions up to the performance of what is required of them; always remembering that to secure six thousand additional collections will, in money, be worth all the trouble it may cost; besides the higher gain of educating the people affected thereby in the grace of giving, and training the whole Church to a beautiful and real systematic beneficence, in the dutiful worship of God with their substance.

But suppose all the Presbyteries to have determined to carry out these reasonable and necessary rules; it remains to guard one point, which could not at the outset be provided for; because the ground could not be broadly taken, that the case of failure to secure a collection can be justified. It is only assumed that such failures need rarely occur. The congregation to which the writer ministers has not in now nearly twenty years failed to take up any collection ordered by the General Assembly, or by Presbytery. No matter what the pressure and exigencies of its own expenses, it has regularly contributed to all the Church's schemes, ordinary and extraordinary. But acknowledging, as the regulations in question do, that there may occur justifiable cases of failure to solicit contributions, it is obvious that the door is thus left ajar, and there is a chance afforded for flimsy and insufficient excuses to gain admission. Just here, therefore, at this door, which cannot be absolutely closed, it will be for the Presbyteries to set a wise, watchful, and firm guard. "If, for example, a session should report that they judged the people to be too poor and straitened to give much, or anything; or that they feared so many collections would be unpopular, and might lessen the attendance upon preaching; or that the congregation had some special matter on hand—the building of a house of worship, or repairs; or that not being able to raise money enough for their minister, they could not ask the people to give to other objects; and such excuses as are accepted as valid and sufficient, then the regulations will be largely emptied

of their value." (Extract from report adopted by the Synod of Virginia.)

The rules, as applicable to vacant churches, and to the supplies sent to them, will perhaps be most difficult to carry out successfully. Yet a judicious firmness and perseverance cannot fail to meet the case. The sessions of vacant congregations are too apt to feel utterly helpless and irresponsible in this matter. The fact of having no minister seems to them an all-sufficient excuse for doing nothing. Whereas, their not being charged with the support of a pastor, leaves the more wherewith to help forward the cause of the Master elsewhere. The Assembly's rules in this case afford the Presbyteries an opportunity to train the sessions of vacant churches to greater activity and efficiency, in the absence of pastoral leadership; and abundantly fortify any minister sent to supply them, who otherwise might feel some delicacy about taking up a collection.

The regulations make provision to secure proper attention to them by successive General Assemblies. Of course they are liable to modification or repeal. But the judgment of the Church seems to be that they are constitutional, practicable, and demanded by the circumstances, viz: the enormous proportion of omissions heretofore to solicit the gifts of the people, and the consequent lamentable embarrassments in carrying forward the work of the Church. For these reasons any fears would seem to be groundless, that the coming, or any succeeding Assembly will take a step backward in this matter, or fail to give effect to the rules adopted at St. Louis.

H. A. B.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

THE LITERARY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE "SONGS OF DEBORAH."

"Then sang Deborah and Barak, son of Abinadab, on that day," &c.—Judges v. 1.

It was a great and memorable day in the annals of Israel. The chariots of Sisera, even nine hundred chariots of iron, and all his vast idolatrous host had been discomfited by the Lord with the edge of the sword.—Barak had burst from Mt. Tabor with his band of ten thousand men upon that mighty host encamped on the plain of Esdraelon below, and had routed them with signal overthrow. Multitudes had perished in the swollen waters of the river Kishon. The criminal neglect of Merod to strike the fugitives at the critical moment, had alone saved the Canaanitish army from utter annihilation.—Among the spoils of victory was the trunkless head of his boastful leader, who had been ignominiously slain. That leader had been compelled, in the disastrous day of battle, to light down off his splendid chariot, and flee away on his feet to the tent of Jael, and she had pierced and stricken him through his temples, whilst overcome with sleep, that she might present to Israel this brilliant trophy of their triumph. It was the day when Jehovah's favor returned to his chosen people—when twenty years of bondage ceased, and forty years of rest began. It was the day of a nation's deliverance and a nation's thanksgiving.

Three thousand years and more have fled since that great day. What changes has not the world beheld since then, of dynasties, and races, and nations, and languages! Yet, who is not, even at our immense distance of time, and manners, and speech, stirred within him by the Song of Deborah? Who does not feel a sympathetic glow of emotion and transport awakened by its strains, though wafted to us at such disadvantage through the medium of successive translations into different tongues of mankind? Why does this song then so arouse admiration and kindle enthusiasm; why, so powerfully, does it delight the taste and touch the heart?

It is, we answer, because it is a poem, and a lyric poem; a lyric poem of rare excellence and beauty, if not unsurpassed in any language, ancient or modern. What is a lyric poem? It will be interesting to inquire, since the larger portion of the poetry of the Hebrews, whether didactic, pastoral, elegiac or strictly lyrical, belongs to this class. We believe they had no dramatic poetry, and that the Book of Job is their only epic.—The lyric is that species of poetry in which the poet directly expresses his own feelings.

In the drama, the poet deals with the actions and character and feelings of others; in the epic, he exhibits to us, as contemplated by himself, a series of such actions and characters. But alike in the drama and the epic, the feelings of others, not those of the poet, form the predominate characteristic. In the lyric department, on the other hand, the poet's own feelings are directly poured forth in song. His admiration, love, hatred, or revenge; his adoration of a hero or a God; his love of nature, of country, or of woman, it is of these master feelings that the lyric form of poetry is the vehicle of expression and relief. The lyric is, in other words, the outburst from the heart, and out of the abundance of the heart it does not speak, but sings.

It is therefore most warm and impassioned when called forth by present circumstances. Its first requisites are intense and overpowering feeling, such as will not admit of silence, lest the full heart should break. But it is also necessary, besides this, that the feeling should itself be poetical. The lyric disdains prosaic or common-place themes. The exploits of the hero, the self-sacrifice of the patriot, the devotion of the martyr, the good man struggling with his fate, the battle "lost and won," "the earthquake shout of victory," the exile's lament, the sorrows of the unfortunate, the rescue of the oppressed and the downfall of the tyrant, the charms of woman in her loveliness, the wonders of the universe, the beauties of the landscape, the roar of the

waters, the might and majesty of God, these, or kindred themes, must inspire the poet's muse, in order that his song should live forever.

How strikingly is this intense and poetical feeling displayed in the national anthem of Deborah! How fresh, warm, and impassioned is the emotion that runs through this grand hymn of joy, exultation, triumph, praise, and adoration, composed on that day, in the very flush of victory and deliverance! We hear the victor's shout, the patriot's exultation, but above all the believer's praise. The Almighty is indeed the hero of the song. The key-note is the same that had inspired Moses. "I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea. Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods?—Who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders? The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is his name." It is He that has avenged Israel. It was He that went out of Seir, and out of the field of Edom. It was He that before Him the mountains melted, even that Sinai from before the Lord God of Israel; that the earth trembled and the heavens dropped; the clouds also dropped water. It was to His help that Merod came not up against the mighty. It is His enemies that have perished. The whole poem is, in truth, an ode in honor of Jehovah. The profound reverence and adoration for Him, the glad homage of praise to Him, the giving of the glory to Him, constitute the master feeling that forced Deborah to pour forth her soul in this bold and animated lyric; that compelled her to exclaim to herself: "Awake, awake; utter a song."

But there are other requisites still of the lyric art. The poet may feel deeply, and his feeling may be poetical too, yet he needs other aids besides. His poem must be happily constructed; his ideas must possess novelty, impressiveness, and variety; he must command the powers of style to convince the understanding, the mysterious charm of verse or rhythm to please the ear, the beauty and sublimity of imagery to strike the imagination and captivate the taste. Does the song of Deborah possess any or all of these excellencies? How well, or how ill, is the poem constructed, what happy transition of ideas and scenes characterizes it—in what vigor of style, under what imagery, with what power of description, has her genius arrayed itself? Let us briefly consider these literary characteristics of the poem before us.

Its construction seems to us highly artistic. There is, first, the solemn commencement; then the woful and sad picture of the country's desolation, idolatry, and enervation before the great battle; then the sweet and grateful picture of the blessings of peace and independence, that have returned to the land; then the description of the gathering of the tribes by whose courage these blessings were achieved, the eulogy of those who responded to the appeal to arms, the sarcasm against those who proved recreant on the grand occasion; then the shock of battle, and its "life, fire, and energy," then the withering curse upon the inhabitants of Merod, then the encomium upon Jael, blessed above women in the tent, then the graphic story of Sisera's ignominious end, the "bitter pathos" over his mother's grief and disappointment, and finally the closing prayer.

The style is concise and simple. It was the fashion of the old Hebrew poets to deal in "words of learned length and thundering sound." Brief, nervous, perceptive, the style and diction of this poem are powerful from their very simplicity and conciseness. What meaning is compressed within a few monosyllables! How vividly are scenes depicted by one or two master-strokes of the pen! There is no redundancy of expression. The reader is hurried along by rapid transition from one part of the poem to the other. The plainness and simplicity of the words place it within the understanding of a child.

(TO BE CONCLUDED)

"I Can Do That Too."

The Rev. Dr. Daryes thus beautifully concluded his address at the funeral of the late Baxter Dickinson, D. D., in Brooklyn: "When last I conversed with him—it was the Sabbath, just as the evening was bringing its shadows over his couch—I shall never forget. May I never lose the inspiration he gave to my own life and hope. Looking upon his features, with traces of his smile still lingering upon his face, in response to my last words, 'The anchor is cast within the veil; it will hold, it cannot drag.' "I was forced to exclaim to those who were around him, viewing his peaceful departure into life, 'I can do that too.' And so I can. And I will. 'Thanks be unto God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.'"

"Christian brethren, we know not how near we may now be to the end. Sure I am some of us are very near. Let us enter the kingdom of heaven even as a little child, put our hands into the hands of the Man of Nazareth, our hearts against the heart of the Son of God, and pray the prayer we so often sing in that sweet hymn,

"Father, whither'er of earth or bliss
Thy sovereign will denies—
Let the sweet hope that I am Thine—
As the Christian, as by an instinct so often
Makes the text, and then returns to it again,
Saying,

"Let the sweet hope that Thou art mine,
My life and death attend;
Thy presence through my journey shine
And crown my journey's end."

PROFESSION.—The public profession of religion, or confession of Christ, is an indispensable duty. Christ loved us openly and bore reproach and death for us.

From the Southern Presbyterian Review.

THE PAN-PRESBYTERIAN ALLIANCE.

(CONCLUDED.)

5 Another fatal objection is, that this Alliance will only expose our Church to additional peril, from that which is the great evil of the times, the spread of a latitudinarian spirit. The leading bodies with which we are invited to ally ourselves are all tainted with Broad Churchism. That this charge is true as to the Radical Presbyterian Church of America, none among us can deny. The fusion of the two branches made it avowedly a Broad Church, as was demonstrated, not by our writers, but by the Rev. Drs. Hodges and Van Dyke, and the Rev. Samuel Miller. As to another leading denomination represented in the Presbyterian Alliance, it was the fortune of the writer to hear of its following sentiments publicly uttered by one of its prominent ministers, and applauded to the echo: "We have no right to require uniformity of doctrine or ritual within any of our own borders. We are bound to recognize all the variety in our own Church, that we recognize in others." That the same latitudinarianism is reigning in the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain, is but too plain from their church journals. They no longer have the true ring of orthodoxy.—The Presbyterian Church of France has lately been rent into two bodies. One is Rationalistic and Socinian; the other, the comparatively sound one, did not dare to re-adopt the Gallican Confession, and enforce its teachings upon all its officers, but only adopted, in general terms, an evangelical creed. The Broad Churchism of the Alliance itself is clearly disclosed by its ambiguous doctrinal basis. This is the "consensus of the Reformed Churches." Who shall state this consensus? Does it include the sense in which Dr. Beman and Barnes professed to hold the Westminster Confession? This is to be supposed. Again, according to the uniform classification of church history, the Congregational Churches of New England belong to the Reformed branch of Protestant Christendom. Lately, the highest convention known to this body of Christians formally cast away their doctrinal standards. Drs. N. Taylor and Bachelier are probably the accepted exponents of the larger part of the ministers. We presume that this consensus may embrace this type of the Reformed theology also. We repeat, the associations into which this Alliance will introduce us, will be found Broad Church. Now, as long as the words of Scripture hold true, that "evil communications corrupt good manners," the association will inevitably be found unwholesome to our own soundness in the faith and doctrinal unity. But that watchman upon the walls of Zion, who "has knowledge of the times, to know what Israel ought to do," is aware that the peril to truth and righteousness, from this latitudinarian spirit, is so fearful, that to expose our beloved Church to it carelessly, is little short of madness.

Dr. Palmer, in his unanswerable argument at St. Louis, foreshadowed another influence which must make this Alliance a Broad Church one. Its creed, as to doctrine and order, must be the result of concessions.—Whatever is obnoxious to the convictions of any of the constituent bodies, must be eliminated from the common platform. One point must be conceded to one party, and another to another, until there is left, as the common doctrine taught by the Alliance, only the most emasculated Presbyterianism.

6 But there are more grave objections to this movement than those already unfolded. It contains the egg of a monster. The principle on which it is demanded is anti-Protestant and anti-Presbyterian. The first development may appear but harmless and trivial,—indeed, the first organization is so trivial as to be nugatory and useless—but the principle which dictates the alliance will be sure to unfold itself with logical consistency, and the "King Log," which is now tendered to us sily frogs by this Jupiter Tonans of Nassau Hall, will in due time be replaced by the "King Sork." Dr. Blaikie, of Scotland, may be accepted as a good exponent of the movement. He tells us that the need of this alliance is to supply a defect of Presbyterianism, which is an ecumenical presbyterianism, which is the apex of our constitutional system of Presbyteries and Synods. He declares that without such a visible centre of unity, our system is incomplete and weak; that Christ evidently did not design it to remain so; and that the true significance of this Alliance is, that it is the germ of that ecumenical church having supreme jurisdiction over all the churches in the earth. Do they propose to claim such jurisdiction for it? Oh no, not now. This, says Dr. Blaikie, "would wreck the whole scheme." But yet he is discontented with the Evangelical Alliance, because its meetings "have avowedly been meetings, not of church representatives, but of individuals associated only in a private capacity." He desires that the delegates to the Pan-Presbyterian Council shall be representatives appointed by the Assemblies of the several Churches, either directly or through committees. He says that we are as yet "anaprie," indeed, for such a council as would have authoritative jurisdiction. "But the idea is of course not excluded." "Whether the council proposed will work towards such a result," is a question which he does not decide. But that it ought to work towards it, he very obviously believes and expects; since he declares it the "natural crown of an edifice which has never yet been brought to completion."

Such are the desires and theories which underlie and prompt this alliance. They involve one of the essential elements of Popery. The cardinal doctrine of the R-formers concerning the Church was, that only the spiritual and invisible Church could be Catholic or Ecumenical. They taught that the only unity designed by Christ among the several branches of his people on this earth was the spiritual unity. It was only on these premises that they were able to refute the pretensions of Popery. If the edifice "is not brought to completion" until this visible ecumenical bond is provided, then it is still incomplete until a universal unity of the whole visible Church, Reformed, Lutheran, Episcopal, is formed—that is to say, a pope, either singular or plural. That such a papal head will need infallibility, and all other papal attributes, to decide correctly all the multifarious interests and differences of the Christian world, is very evident. Citations might easily be made from the standard Reformed divines, proving this point. Turbidity of doctrine such as an external unity in a visible centre is any mark of the true Church. Principal Cunningham (Hist. Theol., page

24, of Vol. 1) says there is "no warrant in Scripture for supposing that the unity there predicated of the Church of Christ necessarily implies that all the societies claiming to be churches of Christ must be included in one external visible communion, and subject to one external visible government." As in other places he intimates his view, that this demand contains, in very well; then they are private and voluntary meetings of Christians. From this point of view, the Assembly has neither power nor business touching an appointment to them. And precedents show that the Assembly has always understood its powers, as well as the properties of the matter, thus. The Assembly approves the Temperance cause. Has she ever condescended to appoint a commissioner to represent her in a Temperance convention? If such a thing were moved, any Assembly would rise up as one man and resist. But we have a case still more in point; The Assembly never consented by her authority to appoint a commissioner to the Evangelical Alliance. If any of her ministers went, they went on their own responsibility as private individuals.—When the Alliance was about to meet in New York, and the Yankee heavens and earth were moved about it, our Assembly at Little Rock was not jostled from its course one minute—not a vote was cast in favor of its prostituting its authority to such an appointment. Now, this case is exactly parallel—this Presbyterian Alliance, according to this second branch of the dilemma, is precisely an Evangelical Alliance of smaller extent.

We may be reminded of the clause in the Form of Government which clothes the Assembly with the power of "corresponding with foreign churches on such terms as may be agreed upon by the Assembly and the corresponding body," and of our Assembly delegates annually sent to the (Dutch) Reformed and the Associate Reformed Churches in America. We reply with the question: Is this Pan-Presbyterian Alliance a Church? Is it ecclesiastical powers? If so, let it be spoken out. Again, the correspondence to be lawful, must be between the Assembly and the Churches represented in the Alliance. Is this so, or not? When Dr. Girardeau charged that our appearance in this Alliance brought us into correspondence with the detractors and injurers, the Radical American Church, with whom we had so solemnly said we would not correspond, gentlemen said, Oh, no! Now, which is it? If we do not, in this Alliance, correspond with the Churches represented in it, and that directly, including this one with which we refuse to correspond, then the correspondence is arranged between the Churches corresponding—not with a nondescript tertium quid.—When Alexander of Macedon was asked to run a race at the Olympian games, he answered: "Yes, provided kings are my competitors." So, our Assembly deigns to treat, provided spiritual queens treat with her: she does not stoop to place herself on a level with any voluntary association of private persons which offers itself. Her acts are and must be authoritative and responsible. She demands a responsible party to treat with, and that not a superior, but an equal. Finally, who dreams that, under the modest word, "correspondence," the framers of our Constitution ever designed to confer all these vague legislative powers? Their meaning in the Constitution is the Constitution. They doubtless chose the word correspondence, because correspondence is not alliance. My correspondent is not my business partner.—The relation which our Assembly assigned to itself as to "foreign Churches," was carefully chosen so as to repudiate that common visible centre of unity at which this Alliance aims, and to leave the manifestation of Christian unity, where the Bible leaves it, community of principles, spirit and affections.

It was with good reason, then, that Dr. Palmer warned Dr. Robinson, in the last Assembly, that in going into this Alliance, he was launching into a disastrous revolution. The step which the Assembly has been betrayed into is but as "the letting out of waters." If the chasm be not speedily closed, we shall find ourselves upon a flood, which will strand us far from our proper moorings, and amidst the wreck of the precious interests which the Head of the Church has committed to our care.

Lifting Up the Standard.

The enemy is coming in like a flood, but the Spirit of the Lord has lifted up a standard against him. Not only in the great cities but throughout the country and in many lands, are there powerful revivals of religion. These are strictly in the line of a great series of mighty religious movements, which have been in progress for years past, and are the forerunners of still greater spiritual events. Satan rages; "the kingdoms are moved," but God works. Old truths, and new agencies and remarkable combinations of means, opportunities and providences, characterize the period. The old and the new worlds "clap their hands together before the Lord," and "distant nations catch the flying joy."

In addition to the ordinary means of grace, and the increasing activity of pastors, evangelists are preaching the gospel to great multitudes, and meetings for prayer and praise are thronged in Europe, Asia and Australia. Missions are more successful than ever in heathen and semi-evangelized lands. The Bible is more widely diffused and in more tongues, and it is more thoroughly studied and taught in Sabbath Schools throughout Christendom. The pulpit speaks out more powerfully the saving and sanctifying truths of the gospel, and takes a bolder stand against the unrighteousness and the ungodliness of men. Even the secular press has been made the common reporter of the gospel and of the news of the kingdom—Sunday Schools and Bible schools are springing up in large numbers in Germany, France, Italy, and other countries where they are comparative novelties. There is a singular readiness among the people to hear the gospel in its most simple form. Converts are number by tens of thousands. Churches are revived, strengthened, enlarged, and prepared for more extensive Christian influence.

Out of these movements will undoubtedly come large accessions to the lay agencies of the prospective ministry, and the working

moral truth can be plainer than this: that, if it is right for us to be represented in these councils, then the imperative step for us to take beforehand, is to procure an amendment (or rather a revolution) in our own Constitution, by an orderly reference to the Presbyteries. But gentlemen will take the other horn of the dilemma; they say the councils of this Alliance are not to be church courts, in very well; then they are private and voluntary meetings of Christians. From this point of view, the Assembly has neither power nor business touching an appointment to them. And precedents show that the Assembly has always understood its powers, as well as the properties of the matter, thus. The Assembly approves the Temperance cause. Has she ever condescended to appoint a commissioner to represent her in a Temperance convention? If such a thing were moved, any Assembly would rise up as one man and resist. But we have a case still more in point; The Assembly never consented by her authority to appoint a commissioner to the Evangelical Alliance. If any of her ministers went, they went on their own responsibility as private individuals.—When the Alliance was about to meet in New York, and the Yankee heavens and earth were moved about it, our Assembly at Little Rock was not jostled from its course one minute—not a vote was cast in favor of its prostituting its authority to such an appointment. Now, this case is exactly parallel—this Presbyterian Alliance, according to this second branch of the dilemma, is precisely an Evangelical Alliance of smaller extent.

From the Missionary for April.

LETTER FROM REV. G. L. LEYBURN.

ATHENS, GREECE, JAN. 22, 1876.

Since our last letter, everything has been going on quietly, and during this time we have had some interesting services. As I believe, one of us mentioned in a former letter, we determined to have our "annual meeting" the first of January, so our brethren from Salonika, Volos and Patras, Messara, Michalides, Antonides and Laroutsee, all came here about the first of the year, and were with us for some two weeks or more. Services were held every evening during the "week of prayer," in the church between 4 and 5 P. M. The attendance upon these services was very good, better, a good deal, than I had expected; there were upon an average some forty persons in attendance every day, and the numbers rather increased that otherwise as the meeting progressed.—The services consisted—as in our own country—of reading the Scriptures, singing, prayers and short addresses. It was a very pleasant time to us all, and made the more so by the presence of the brethren mentioned above. During their stay here, we had frequent conferences with these, our co-laborers, hearing reports from their various fields, giving instruction and advice as to the best methods, &c., &c. We have also a good man at Patras, but as he has very recently gone there, and is engaged chiefly in the Bible work, we did not think it best yet to speak of Patras as a station occupied by our mission. Mr. Laroutsee, who is there, has not yet thought it best to attempt any regular public service, though we urged him to do so as soon as it seemed possible. And we hope that ere long we can speak of that as one of our fields, and that Mr. Laroutsee will be able gradually to give himself, if the way open, more and more to the evangelistic work.

As I sat from day to day with these five Greek brethren (Kalopothakes and Kazacos besides the three mentioned), I could but think how good the Lord has been in raising up from among this people so many men of such character and ability. May they all be "filled with the Spirit," and be kept faithful even unto the end.

After full consultation and deliberation we thought it best to order Messrs. Kazacos and Michalides, so brother Kalopothakes and I examined them, going over very much the same ground as in similar examinations in our Presbyteries, and I was gratified, as well as almost surprised, to find how well posted "these brethren were," and it only convinced me the more of the value and importance of studying the Scriptures; for, so far as theological learning was concerned, the Bible had been their chief, if not exclusive "text-book." After these examinations were concluded, on last Sabbath evening we solemnly ordained these brethren to the full work of the gospel ministry, "by the laying on of hands." Dr. K. of course, conducted most of the services, I only gave the charge to "the newly ordained bishop;" this I did in English, and Dr. K. afterwards read a translation of it in Greek. On the morning of the same day—the first Sabbath of the Greek year—we had our communion. All these services, concluding as they did with the communion and the ordination, were very pleasant, and we hope all were "profitable thereby." We are all well and unite our kindest regards.

SQUARE SERMONS.—The Vermont Chronicle, borrowing an idea from Spurgeon's "Talks to My People," says: "There is much to be made just now about the proper length of sermons. The rule seems to be, as deduced from a vast number of particular facts and opinions, that the length of a sermon should be equal to its breadth and depth. It should be, in fact, the square thing. It ought not to be measured by the linear foot, as men measure tape and ribbons; but by the cubic foot, as men measure wheat and other grain. If it has no depth, it ought to have no length."

DR. VINCENT says in the Sunday School Journal: "If you are a Bible class teacher, don't be a lecturer. Don't be a preacher. Don't be an exhorter. Don't be a declaimer. Be a teacher. A teacher gets work out of his scholars—gets questions, gets answers, gets hints, gets a good chance to keep his mouth shut a good part of the time, and the mouths of his scholars open and their brains busy, and their hearts excited. Teach! teach!"

PERHAPS there has been no simpler definition of faith than the one given by the late Dr. Bushnell, that "it is that act whereby one person—a sinner—commits himself to another person—a Saviour."

Central Presbyterian.

REV. WILLIAM BROWN, D. D., Editor.

Richmond, Va., Wednesday, April 5, 1876.

LOOK AT YOUR LABEL.—Our subscribers are urged to examine their accounts, as presented on the label attached to their papers. Where a remittance is due, please help it this way, and hinder it not.

PREMIUMS FOR 1876.—

It has never been according to our views of propriety to go into a sort of general commission business of things good, bad and indifferent, to offer enticements for new subscribers. The only premiums given are in money, or in the paper itself. For 1876 we present the following:

1. Any person sending the name of a subscriber, other than his own and who has not taken the paper heretofore, and sending payment, may retain 75 cents as his commission. Or,

2. Any person sending three subscribers, of the description above, and also sending \$9 payment, may receive the *Central Presbyterian* for one year.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Will meet in the First Presbyterian Church of Savannah, Ga., on the third Thursday (18th day) of May, 1876, at 11 A. M. The opening sermon will be preached by the Rev. M. D. Hook, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly.

The undersigned, Committee on Commissions, will be present in the Lecture room of said church, at 8 P. M. of the 17th of May, to enroll the names of Commissioners.

The special attention of Presbyteries is called to the action touching the Assembly's Contingent and Commissioners' Fund, recorded on pages 35 and 36 of Minutes of 1875.

JOSEPH R. WILSON, Stated Clerk.
WILLIAM BROWN, Permanent Clerk.

Spring Presbyteries.—Sessions of churches will send up reports on—1. Sabbath Schools; 2. Systematic Benevolence; 3. Statistics; 4. Written Narratives; 5. Records; 6. Quota of Presbyterial Fund.

THE PAN-PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.

Our readers will find in this paper, as was promised last week, the remaining part of the article from the *Southern Presbyterian Review*. They are requested to give it a careful inspection; this will obviate the necessity of quoting it to much extent. Then let them judge whether the following remarks present a satisfactory answer. The sections are taken according to their number, beginning with the—

5th. *Exposing our Church to peril from contact with the latitudinarian spirit prevailing in other Presbyterian bodies.* Concerning what is advanced throughout that section there is to be answered—

(1.) A general answer is, that the author's view would involve his church in a strange and lamentable inconsistency. Our Assembly must not send delegates to this Presbyterian Alliance because the leading bodies in it are "all tainted with Broad Churchism." And yet he knows perfectly well that this same Assembly actually has sent, or has signified its readiness to send, corresponding delegates to nearly all of them. His course of argument would make our Church stultify itself: We shall become tainted if we touch this concern as a whole, but it is altogether safe to be brought into contact with nearly all the parts of which it is composed! Why did not the objector drive his nail to the head while he was at it, and say, our Assembly ought to have nothing whatever to do with any of them. That might indeed comport with his own views, but not with the consistency, and, we trust, not with the fixed purpose of our Church. But for a more particular answer we remark—

(2.) That in general the Presbyterian bodies of the world are no more latitudinarian in doctrine now than formerly. The Old School Presbyterian Church is indeed an exception, to a certain extent, and to an extent we exceedingly regret. By its union in 1870 it became, not formally or avowedly, but really, and under the circumstances, of necessity, considerably broadened. The churches in Scotland are as orthodox as they have commonly been, and far more so than in the days of Dr. Witherspoon, and during the reign of Moderatism. So of the churches in Ireland and England. As to France we think the writer is far away from the record. Let the matter of their present Confession of Faith be as it may, all who have watched the history of the Reformed Church there for the last twenty years, know what a contest has been going on between the Evangelical and Rationalistic parties, which ended last year in the triumph of the former, and the secession of the latter. And why? Because the Evangelical party required the adoption of declarations so orthodox that they could not stand the test.

As to a certain remark heard by the writer and "applauded to the echo," if our impression is correct it was made in Canada two or three years ago. The several bodies of Presbyterians there, all orthodox, though unhappily divided upon very minor questions, were about to unite. The remark, under such circumstances, deserved all the applause it received.

(3.) The "Consensus of the Reformed Churches" we maintain, has a well defined meaning as to their doctrine and order. The volume, "Corpus Confessionum," is every where quoted when we wish to demonstrate their agreement in all essential things. That this Consensus would not define all minute points may be admitted. But the Alliance does not contemplate such discussions.

(4.) It is said that the " creed of the Alliance," as to doctrine and order, must be the result of concessions. This whole class of objections proceeds from the idea that this Alliance must not only be able to stand upon the general agreement of the Reformed Churches, but unless it can square itself upon

all the peculiar opinions belonging to the bodies composing it, then it must be, if not a deception, a snare.

5th. This objection the writer presents as one of much more grave importance. The Alliance, he declares, "contains the seed of a monster." "The desires and theories which underlie and prompt this Alliance," "involve one of the essential elements of Popery."

The announcement of such an alarming statement was almost enough to upset a man of excitable temperament and weak nerves; but after recovering a little such considerations as the following came to our relief.

(1.) It seemed strange that the writer should set out with the opinion that this Alliance was not "going to effect anything except talk," and then wind up by representing it as big with mischief and ruin. It is not yet developed, indeed, but the seed is there, and will be sure to grow into a baneful Uvas tree, spreading poison and death over the Church. Here, then, comes out at last an awful potentiality from what the reader had been given to understand was mere "wind that passeth away and cometh not again." But that is only the author's inconsistency: so in the second place—

(2.) Is it not marvellous in the extreme that all this should have escaped the detection of the whole Presbyterian Church in Europe and America.

After a careful examination of the subject they sent delegates to form this Alliance. If there is anything which Presbyterianism detests it is Popery, in its whole "seed, breed and generation." Is it likely that a principle, pregnant with this deadly evil, should escape their scrutiny? Which is the more likely to make a mistake here, they or our brother in the Review?

A review of all that is advanced in this section would far transcend our limits. Important as it is in the discussion of this subject, its fuller examination must be reserved for another time. If we understand the author rightly he maintains this: that the effort to make the outward and visible Church on earth correspond in extent to the spiritual and invisible, is of the very essence of Popery. This position we do emphatically controvert. We do not hold that the outward and visible unity of the Church, in its several parts, is essential to a complete unity which is mainly invisible and spiritual. But we hold with Dr. Thornwell that—

"The visible or professing Church approaches perfection, as it seeks to realize the invisible or spiritual. The two ought to coincide, and the purity of the outward is determined by its approach to the inward. A church, therefore, which cannot realize a visible unity, and thus aim to coincide with the invisible, is self-condemned; and any Constitution which does not recognize this fact is infected with heresy." This principle of the unity of the Church lies at the foundation of the Presbyterian polity, and all its peculiarities are designed to bring this out and give it formal expression. It is singular that the only two bodies which claim to realize this unity are in the deadliest antagonism—each charge the other with being Anti-Christ. They are the Church of Rome, and the Presbyterian Church. Rome does, in a certain sense, give unity to the Church. She compacts all its parts. There is no stronger outward representation of unity than is furnished in her system of government. There is, however, this marked difference between the two cases. The Church of Rome undertakes to exhibit the body in its unity with an earthly head, to exhibit Christ as well as his members; the Presbyterian Church exhibits in visible unity on earth the body only, and connects it with a heavenly head. The Bishop of Rome claims to be the head of the Church. (See Thornwell's Collected Writings; Vol. 4, p. 135-6.)

Dr. Thornwell goes on to the next "principle of the Presbyterian system," which is, "that this unity is realized by representative Assemblies." In connection with other most pertinent observations he proceeds to show that these representatives assembled in a parliament might be properly extended not only over a few churches, but "over the universal Church." He presents it thus:

"Suppose now two congregations to exist. They elect their representatives, who meet in common. The representative now covers two congregations. Enlarge these suppositions, and it will be perceived that the principle of representation is capable of embodying any number of believers. Whole continents may be made one body. The principle is susceptible of application to the whole human race, and may therefore embody the whole Church on earth in one grand parliament." (Vol. 4, p. 137.)

Now all this the writer in the Review must set down as "one of the essential elements of Popery." We leave to some future time the further discussion of this point, and without at present entering into what is said of the views of the Reformers, of Turretine, Dr. Cunningham and others, must be content at this time with the above quotation from a source which is well suited to give the reviewer and others some considerable "pause," as to their premises.

To the above we would be glad to add here, if it were not too long, an extract from the speech of our dear and honored brother, Rev. Dr. B. M. Palmer, in the last Assembly. In that speech, a verbatim report of which is now before us, he declares his approval of just such an idea as Dr. Thornwell presents, and reminds the body that at the Assembly in New Orleans in 1858, he "introduced this very idea and expressed the hope upon the floor of that body that I might yet live to sit in a General Assembly of the whole world." And one main ground of his dissatisfaction with the proposed Alliance was that it did not have "the checks and limitations upon its power which would attach to a properly organized Church Court."

So we see that the very thing which these eminent brethren set forth as the perfect idea of a complete Presbyterian Church, the reviewer pronounces to be the essence of Popery, against which he sounds the note of a most fearful alarm, and warning. Verily if this is Popery, there must be an abundance of that "spiritual wickedness in high places" over the whole Presbyterian Commonwealth; certainly our own Southern Church is more than tainted, it is utterly infected and infested with it.

(4.) The reviewer says that the "real theory of Presbyterianism is to extend the communion thus unified so far as hearty and thorough agreement upon doctrines and church order exists, and no further." If he means here "communion" in organic union, we agree. And if an organic union was

proposed in this Alliance (instead of being expressly disclaimed) its application here would be to the point. But the fact failing, it all fails.

(5.) The writer asserts that the Old School Presbyterians separated the New School from their communion in 1837, on account of errors "both of doctrine and order." They do indeed recognize the existence of erroneous doctrine, but the only separation they made was touching "the four Synods," and this (right or wrong) was grounded solely upon the unconstitutionality of the Plan of Union under which they were alleged to have been organized. Further, he asserts that they refused "fraternal relations" with the New School on account of these errors. If there is a syllable in point of fact to sustain this, it has escaped our careful reading for forty years.

(6.) Attention should be called to what seems a fundamental error pervading the whole of this article. The idea seems to be that our Church must keep itself entirely to itself, until we are satisfied there is a "real and hearty unity of doctrinal belief and church order," and then, (after all he has said before) the writer contends that as far as this agreement exists, "so far may a supreme Presbyterian court, and its jurisdiction." Very good; but the objection is that no "such real unity exists among the Presbyterian Churches of the world." Agreed; the extent of unity is not such as to make an organic union at all desirable. But this being so, does it follow there is no way left by which Presbyterians may make visible to the world the many and great points in which they do agree? There, we respectfully submit, is a grand mistake. We are not at all insensible to the fact that some of the Presbyterian bodies forming this Alliance have in various respects departed from the pure Presbyterian faith, and in its proper place we would contend against them with the utmost energy possible. At the same time it must be admitted that we hold far more truth in common with them than with any other churches upon earth. It is the best that is to be found; and these common truths are inestimably precious. The course which seems plainest before our Church is to compromise no truth of God whatever; we dare not; and therefore to have no organic union with any body of Christians where this would be the necessary result. But what then? Must we shut ourselves up from all kinds of intercourse, lest "evil communications should corrupt our good manners?" If so, we must "then needs go out of the world." The idea of such a policy is so contrary to the whole spirit and charity of the gospel, that the suggestion is a grief and burden. Is it not a clear and solemn duty to do all we righteously can to manifest to the world such a degree of unity as really does exist? If so, the only practical question is whether we can righteously and safely do this in such an association as the one contemplated. And right here we go back, for the answer, to what has been before remarked: If we can hold all manner of personal fellowship with brethren of other Presbyterian Churches: if we can hold ecclesiastical fellowship with those Churches themselves in many ways, sending and receiving delegates; even inviting ministers of the Northern Presbyterian Church to seats in our Presbyteries and Synods as corresponding members; (though not thereby compromising our rights as members of their General Assembly) if all this can be properly done, it must not be thought strange if many of us find ourselves puzzled to discover the immense danger of corruption and other terrible evils which some of our beloved brethren had lurking in this "gun powder Percy."

There is one ground indeed, if it can be established, upon which all that we have said so far for nothing. If there is no constitutional power in our Assembly to enter into this Alliance, then the case is at an end, at least until the Constitution is changed. That it is utterly unconstitutional is strongly urged by the reviewer as his last and "crowning objection." We are persuaded it is not; but this vital point must be left for another article.

HAMPDEN SIDNEY COLLEGE.

It is very gratifying to hear that the Rev. Dr. Atkinson, President of this venerable institution, is meeting with good success in the agency he has been prosecuting for an increase of its endowment. The noble generosity shown by the people in Halifax county was noticed some time ago. Our readers will now be glad to learn that in Norfolk and Petersburg the good work has been met with a like spirit of liberality, the subscriptions amounting in each place to about \$5,000. In the flush times of our young years this would not be considered large but in the depressed condition of affairs at present, even these amounts are raised only by a serious effort on the part of many. Dr. Atkinson went last week to Fredericksburg, where it is understood he has also had an encouraging success. When did good old Fredericksburg ever draw back? Who does not know, "How that in great trial of affliction, the abundance of their joy and deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." When it is considered how much money they give, (the banner church of the Synod of Virginia) and how profusely her sons and daughters have been given to other places, Hampden Sidney ought to honor her at its Centennial celebration next June, with this toast—"As poor yet making many rich."

Dr. Atkinson will in due time visit Richmond and other places in his noble undertaking and it is hoped that wherever he presents this question of endowment—its usefulness and indeed its absolute necessity—our Presbyterian people will rise to the "height of this great argument," and carry the scheme forward to a happy result. As success can hardly be looked for from a few large donations, let it be distinctly impressed upon all that it can be secured by

general co-operation (the greatest General in all the ages), and in this way only. In view of the fact that one hundred years have elapsed since the foundation of this College, its friends have taken measures to celebrate that event in a suitable manner. If the same spirit which was in the hearts of their fore-fathers now dwells in the hearts of their children, they will cordially join in this endowment as an appropriate memorial of the interest they feel in a college which has been behind no other in the State, either as to the renown of its origin, the sacrifices made to sustain it, or the character and usefulness of those who have been connected with it.

Answer to "Enquirer."
In the *Central* of last week "a mother" makes some inquiries and presents some points to which a reply was promised. It will be brief.

1. "Is giving to the cause of Christ an act of worship?" It is not recognized in our Confession of Faith among the "parts of the ordinary religious worship of God," nor among the extraordinary (see chap. 21, sec. 5.) Strictly speaking it is not an act of worship, any more than visiting the sick, or being a part of corn for the purpose of devoting it to the cause of Christ.

2. It does not follow from this that it is "wrong to practice it (such giving) on the Sabbath day." There are many good things besides worship which it is lawful to do then; and both the Scriptures and our Standards recognize the giving of money as among them. Why, therefore, not an act of worship, it may be, and ought to be connected with worship; but not restricted to it.

3. This may serve to relieve the perplexity of "a mother" and others about "fairs, festivals, and concerts." ("Theatrical exhibitions" we give over to a general condemnation.) Fairs are not wrong in themselves, if they are fairly conducted. Nor are "festivals and concerts." If only a reasonable profit is received for the article or service given, surely there is no sin in that. If evil practices are connected, let the condemnation be placed there, not upon the other.

4. While right in themselves, it may still be a question how far it is expedient and useful to employ them for church purposes. Here is a wide discussion for Christian casuistry to enter. It strikes our mind thus: (1.) The highest style of giving would be one separated from fairs and festivals. It should be purely from the constraining "love of Christ." Giving, where the giver expects to "receive as much again," is certainly not the highest order of benevolence. (2.) But it is a great principle in the moral government of God, that he does not influence people by one motive only. If they cannot be ruled by the highest, there are many of an inferior grade by which they may be moved. To take one example among thousands. It would be best that all men should attend public worship on the Sabbath mainly from the desire to please and honor God. But thousands who are dead to that sentiment, will go from deference to a good public opinion, or a desire to benefit their families. It is better to go from even such motives than not to go at all. Let that principle apply here. (3.) While all efforts should be used to train our people to give from the highest motives, and we should exclude all plans which are wrong in themselves, for raising money for church purposes, as well as all wrong practices from plans that are unobjectionable, we are far as can be from any sweeping measure. Our people are asked to give and do give at the collections in the churches. The amount is utterly insufficient. Our ladies every where exert themselves to make it up; some by sewing circles, (perhaps the best plan of all) others by fairs and festivals. Provided no unworthy devices are resorted to, our council is to "let them alone." No, not that; but let us rather adopt the good council of "such a one as Paul taught"—"Help those women which labored with me in the gospel, whose names are in the book of life."

Letter from the Rev. Dr. Blair.

[As it is represented by some that Southern Presbyterians would be rather tolerated than cordially welcomed in the General Presbyterian Alliance, the following letter from the Rev. Dr. Blair, Professor in the University of Edinburgh, has been put into our hands, and the best use we can make of it is to let it speak for itself.—ED. CEN. PRES.]

EDINBURGH 9 PALMERSTON ROAD, }
August 19th, 1875.
My Dear Dr. Hoge.—I had hoped to have the pleasure of sending you a copy of a document containing a list of the names of the members of the Edinburgh Presbyteries, held at London last month. It is not yet quite ready, but as soon as possible I shall send to you. You are probably aware that the Convention of the Southern Church was held in Edinburgh, beginning 4th July.

The next year to be appointed Convenor of the committee for making arrangements; and in that capacity I now write you. There are a few men connected with each Church whose presence would go far to make the meeting of Council a great success. Among them we would welcome Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans, and Dr. Stuart Robinson, of Louisville. We were all delighted to have Dr. Robinson in London. It was a great addition to us as every day. We do hope that the Southern Church will send its best men, and I am sure Edinburgh will give them a very cordial welcome.

Although it does not become us to boast, or to speak confidently, I think we may say that the foundation has been laid of an organization which with God's blessing, will serve to make the Presbyterian Church more visible, secure more attention to government, and to give an impulse in the direction of the great and holy ends which as a branch of Christ's Church it contemplates. And in this view, we do hope that those who are present at the Convention will be able to do so much for the cause of the Church, and what a lively time we had! No two of us agreed upon all points, but we all were agreed upon this, that we meant to think for ourselves in matters of Church policy.

Well, the story is too long to tell in full; but during the fight I had the most singular mental episode of my life. While spending a night with the late Major Robert Gratton, of Rockingham county—you remember his strong intellect—I was stating to him my objections to Church education. He replied, "your reasoning is perfectly sound, and it applies equally to 'National Education.' I never had thought so, but I was in a humor that night to be convinced, and I told the story to Robert Gratton, and he told the story to the Scotchman. Gratton was identical, and that it was my duty as then active warrior, to attack State Education as I was attacking Church Education, and to try to bring about the same result by individual effort, or nothing. I went home and immediately wrote out the arguments used by Mr. Gratton, and sent the piece as a contribution to the *Critic*. The article was anonymous, and perhaps nobody but Dr. Robinson ever knew the author. It would be greatly in my own interest to our generation, to be twitting his neighbor on inconsistency in regard to public affairs during the last twenty years; but I suspect if you had known I had done this thing you would have battered me with it before now. But maybe not. Somebody attacked the piece in the next number of the *Critic*, and I could not say a word in reply; for by that time I was back, or nearly back, to my old position, out of which I have never budged from that day to this.

In 1866 (I think it was) the question of having a public free-school system in Virginia was brought up for debate in the Franklin Society of Lexington. I prepared myself carefully, and made notes of my intended speech. Those notes I now have, and when I was elected to my present office four years afterward, they were of service in preparing the argument which I submitted in thirty days after my election. I was opposed to establishing a school system until the time people of the State should come into possession of the government; but the body of this speech was as strong in favor of public free education as I was capable of making it.

Anniversary Meeting of the Virginia Bible Society.—The 63rd Anniversary of the Society, for business, will be held in the Lecture room of St. Paul's church, on Tuesday, the 4th inst., at 8 o'clock.

The Anniversary Address will be delivered by the Rev. Dr. J. L. Burrows, of Louisville, Ky., in the Second Presbyterian church, (Dr. Hoge's) on Sabbath, April 9th, at 4 o'clock P. M.

Please Return.—Some person, we know not who, has possession of the bound volumes of the *Central Presbyterian* for 1861-1864, which belong to this office. Should this notice meet the eye of the borrower, he is requested to return them, if they are wanted for necessary uses.

Was it a Mistake?—The *Richmond Whip* says: "The Danville Border Express announces several performances in that city by 'Leo Wheat's Opera Troupe,' from Richmond. There must be some mistake in the title." My not refer to some Sunday Church Opera Troupe? There are more kinds of Opera Troupes than one now-a-days. At least this is a report commonly believed in Richmond.—CEN. PRES.

Letter from Dr. Wm H. Ruffner.

To the Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D.:
Dear Brother,—My general answer to your article in the *Planter and Farmer* is gone into the secular papers, but I wanted to say some things to you where it would be "all in the family." If I should say some unpalatable things, please remember that you "began it," as boys used to say. Remember also that our Lord, whom we so poorly obey, said, "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

I have, upon the subject, made public speeches in some twenty or thirty counties of the State, and on each of these occasions notices have been given of those speeches by newspaper writers, in all cases except three. Two of the disconcerting notices were by the resident Presbyterian ministers where I spoke. This struck me as unusual in our Church, and as surprising in other respects. These brethren had offered me their hospitality, and one of them spoke tenderly of our past associations. I did not seem to have forfeited their confidence; yet because they differed in opinion as to how education should be conducted, they felt at liberty to make petty and annoying criticisms on some alleged grammatical errors in the extemporaneous addresses of myself and some gentlemen who spoke with me. This seemed very strange in well-bred gentlemen and Christian ministers. But when I read your attack upon me, I immediately remembered that those young brethren had been your pupils.

Now I suppose that what I have said here and elsewhere will offend you; and I fear that it will prove a bitter reminder. I pray that it may not; but if it does, let God and the Church judge between us. I have written in sorrow, and not in anger; and our personal relations hereafter will be just what you choose to make them.

Dr. Brown has kindly given me leave to indicate to the readers of the *Central* some general sentiments I hold in respect to education, and which I freely express in my private intercourse. It will thus be seen that I am not a Robespierre or a Rochester. And I know of no way of introducing my views better than by sketching the history of my own mind on this subject; and inasmuch as the *Evo* is now fully out, there may be no indifference in telling a little more about him. I sometimes say that I have been a life long advocate of public schools; which is nearly true, but not quite my father, although a Virginian of the fourth generation, was, as you know, a German by blood, (not a "Yankee") and he brought me up in the faith of Fatherland—the faith of Luther and Zwingle, of Calvin and Knox, the faith of almost every Protestant sect and nation on both sides of the ocean, viz: that "for the soul to be without knowledge is not good," and that the kingdom of Christ on earth is to be built up by the education in the training of the young, that both should give it their ears and their money, as well as stir up parents—the original and responsible party. In this country the divores of the two kingdoms produced separate action, and I may now remark, produced antagonisms which have not yet been reconciled.

Until I became a minister my mind was turned chiefly to the public or civil importance of virtue and intelligence among the people, which for those days was constantly dwelt upon. When I entered the ministry in 1848, our famous Presbyterian pre-school system had possession of the Church, and like a good servant I at once became interested in ecclesiastical education; but my devotion to this system was very short, and never for one moment fully agreed with me. I was called to my pastoral charge in the Church of the Holy Trinity, in Philadelphia, which was then our ecclesiastical metropolis. My church, of 1,200 citizens, broke down my health, and I resigned in less than two years, and returned to Virginia in 1853. My old friends will remember, perhaps sorrowfully, that whilst in Philadelphia I began a war on what I then regarded as a narrow and bigoted oligarchy which was trying to exclude the clergy and secularize the Church; and this theory of Church education was one of the instrumentalities for doing the work. And you remember, brother Dabney, that about that time there was a pretty formidable "Southern Rebellion" against that centralization of Church power, and that soon after my return to Virginia, Dr. Stuart Robinson and your colleague, Dr. Peck, aided by Messrs. Breckinridge and Book, Dabney and Ruffner, &c., established the Latitudinarian *Critic*, in Baltimore, and what a lively time we had! No two of us agreed upon all points, but we all were agreed upon this, that we meant to think for ourselves in matters of Church policy.

Well, the story is too long to tell in full; but during the fight I had the most singular mental episode of my life. While spending a night with the late Major Robert Gratton, of Rockingham county—you remember his strong intellect—I was stating to him my objections to Church education. He replied, "your reasoning is perfectly sound, and it applies equally to 'National Education.' I never had thought so, but I was in a humor that night to be convinced, and I told the story to Robert Gratton, and he told the story to the Scotchman. Gratton was identical, and that it was my duty as then active warrior, to attack State Education as I was attacking Church Education, and to try to bring about the same result by individual effort, or nothing. I went home and immediately wrote out the arguments used by Mr. Gratton, and sent the piece as a contribution to the *Critic*. The article was anonymous, and perhaps nobody but Dr. Robinson ever knew the author. It would be greatly in my own interest to our generation, to be twitting his neighbor on inconsistency in regard to public affairs during the last twenty years; but I suspect if you had known I had done this thing you would have battered me with it before now. But maybe not. Somebody attacked the piece in the next number of the *Critic*, and I could not say a word in reply; for by that time I was back, or nearly back, to my old position, out of which I have never budged from that day to this.

In 1866 (I think it was) the question of having a public free-school system in Virginia was brought up for debate in the Franklin Society of Lexington. I prepared myself carefully, and made notes of my intended speech. Those notes I now have, and when I was elected to my present office four years afterward, they were of service in preparing the argument which I submitted in thirty days after my election. I was opposed to establishing a school system until the time people of the State should come into possession of the government; but the body of this speech was as strong in favor of public free education as I was capable of making it.

Centennial at Hampden Sidney, Va.—The craters of the occasion are taken, with one exception, from the Alumni of the college. Rev. Dr. M. D. Hoge, of Virginia, is the centennial orator; Rev. Dr. R. L. Dabney, of Virginia, the historical orator; Rev. Dr. R. L. Dabney, of Virginia, will deliver the Baccalaureate sermon; Rev. Mr. Murland, of Maryland, will address the literary societies; the Hon. Judge Stevenson, of North Carolina, and the Hon. the Alumni.

Union Theological Seminary.
EXAMINING COMMITTEE.—Rev. Dr. Brown, Bullock, and J. H. Smith, and Messrs. C. White and R. J. McDowell. The committee met at the Seminary on Thursday, April 6th.

An address to the Society of Inquiry will be delivered Tuesday, April 11th, 7 P. M., by Col. J. T. Preston, of Lexington, Va. The annual address to the Board, the Alumni, Faculty and students, will be delivered Wednesday, 12th, at 11 A. M., by Rev. Dr. C. R. Vaughan, of Raleigh, North Carolina.

I mention this for two reasons: One because you have doubted my sincerity, and another because, in the opening of that speech, I gave briefly the history of my mental operations in reference to the proper parties in education. I stated what I here wish to state, namely, my matured views in relation to the respective duties of the three great parties in education, namely, the parent, the Church, and the State.

My engagements may prevent me from continuing the subject immediately, but when I do so, it will be seen that this general narrative formed a fitting vestibule to the system of views I shall present.

W. H. RUFFNER.

Delegates to the General Assembly.

Presbyteries.	Ministers.	Elders.
Mecklenburg,	J. Douglas	H. K. Reid
	Wm. McDonald	D. H. Hill

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW for April—Published in Columbia, S. C. Conducted by an association of Ministers.

1. The Southern Seaboard of South Carolina.
2. Lay-Preaching.
3. The Royal Seed.
4. The Demission of the Ministry.
5. The Gratuitous Imputation of Sin.
6. The Professional Study of the Bible.
7. Ecclesiastical Status of Foreign Missionaries.
8. Critical Notices.

These are topics of much interest, and we anticipate a treat in the reading; after which there is more to be said.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE for March. Through the Leonard Scott Publishing Company, N. York.

Contents: The Dilemma—Part XI. Secondary Education in Scotland. Some Aspects of Friendship, is a rambling article, giving quotations from Jeremy Taylor, Lord Bacon, and others. To Maimey (M'Amey) Stanzas to a damsel of fifteen, who wishes to abbreviate herself to May. Ron College, an interesting account of the foundation of this old institution, by Henry VI., who planned, and watched over the building, and the chief feature of whose idea was "the college in disunion from the school—the religious corporation of provost and fellows, for whom he built his chapel, and to whom he secured various privileges of special indulgence from Rome." Little Bobby, a sketch in Paris. Some Gentlemen in the City is a sketch of the rise of the Goldenstrans, Conrad Lloyd, Emmanuel Bages, and others of the more prominent London financiers. Powers of the Air. The opening of Parliament.

THE FARMER AND PLANTER for April is on our table with its usual (or, rather, more than usual) variety of subjects. Among them is an extended communication from the Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., in which he discusses the question of free school education by the State, and especially in its connection with the negro population. The readers of this vigorous article will no doubt have different opinions concerning the views advanced. In some of them, at least in some aspects, they will probably be a general concurrence. As to others the public judgment will be divided; while some agree, others will strongly dissent.

As this subject, on various accounts, falls into the hands of Dr. Ruffner, Superintendent of Public Instruction, it will be seen from an article in this paper that it is his purpose not to have the discussion all on one side.

EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL.—The April number is out, and contains much matter of general interest and special value to teachers. Among the contents are original articles by Professor Charles D. Doolittle and Mary College, by Mr. W. Lee C. Stevens, Major R. W. Jones, president of Martha Washington College, and Mr. Samuel A. Wallis, besides an able article on "National Education," by Professor Max Muller, editorials, etc.

Religious Intelligence.

FROM THE SOUTHERN STATES.

Revel in Moorfield, West Virginia.—The pastor, Rev. George W. White, writes under date of March 27th, and though the letter was not prepared as a communication, we know not how to present the contents more appropriately than given by the writer. He says:

"We have been blessed with a gracious outpouring of the Spirit upon our congregation. It came gradually, yet gently but steadily and joyously, and still continues to refresh. The first evidence of its coming was in the large and attentive congregations, both on Sunday and at our weekly prayer meeting. Within the preceding month there had been time to time been added one or two to the church. This increased interest justified me in appointing special services which immediately followed a very deep and pervading spirit of inquiry. These special services were discontinued three weeks ago, but the spirit of religious inquiry did not cease. Yesterday our congregation was so large that we were unable to accommodate all. Being a man of very slender means he could afford to help very few by gift; but the money being returned to him he is enabled to continue his good work by helping others. And so by a judicious management of our means he has been able to supply with their contract in this particular. But it is something more than a matter of principle—it is a well conceived plan by which he accomplishes a benevolent work, he could not otherwise do. Being a man of very slender means he could afford to help very few by gift; but the money being returned to him he is enabled to continue his good work by helping others. And so by a judicious management of our means he has been able to supply with their contract in this particular. But it is something more than a matter of principle—it is a well conceived plan by which he accomplishes a benevolent work, he could not otherwise do. Being a man of very slender means he could afford to help very few by gift; but the money being returned to him he is enabled to continue his good work by helping others. And so by a judicious management of our means he has been able to supply with their contract in this particular. But it is something more than a matter of principle—it is a well conceived plan by which he accomplishes a benevolent work, he could not otherwise do. Being a man of very slender means he could afford to help very few by gift; but the money being returned to him he is enabled to continue his good work by helping others. And so by a judicious management of our means he has been able to supply with their contract in this particular. But it is something more than a matter of principle—it is a well conceived plan by which he accomplishes a benevolent work, he could not otherwise do. Being a man of very slender means he could afford to help very few by gift;