

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1844.

No. IV.

Edwin Hall.

ART. I.—*The School: its objects, relations and uses. With a sketch of the education most needed in the United States, the present state of Common Schools, the best means of improving them, and the consequent duties of parents, trustees, inspectors, &c.* By Alonzo Potter, D. D.. Professor of Moral Philosophy in Union College. New York: Harpers. 1842.

THE world is full of good theories and excellent proverbs; and were the sentiments that are universally acknowledged to be just, and which have descended from age to age with the approbation of each, to be condensed in one mass, we should have a volume which the book of inspiration alone would excel. But if this record should appear in the shape of a mercantile account-book, with the practices of men entered on the page which contains their principles, we should in striking the balance, discover a fearful preponderance of the obligations over the credits.

To take a single caption of this imaginary ledger, what maxim is more common-place and threadbare than that the mind is the better part of man, and that the cultivation of its faculties is a higher and nobler object than any that relates to the body alone? Yet when we look at men in society, or catch their conversation, or observe the occupa-

slopes, exposures, soils, &c. of the several sections of the county. So that on inspecting the register and maps of the chemical department of this principal county school, the agricultural capabilities of every part of the county might be seen. And regular courses of lectures should be delivered on agricultural chemistry in this institution. Affiliated agricultural societies should also be formed throughout the various neighbourhoods of the county; and should hold regular periodical meetings, by delegates from each society in the chemical department of the County Institution. By this means, the subject can be made a practical one even to those unacquainted with the principles of the science.

J. A. Alexander

ART. V.—*Vindication of the Rev. Horatio Southgate: A Letter to the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, from the Rev. Horatio Southgate, their Missionary at Constantinople.* New York: Stanford & Swords. 1844. 8vo. pp. 39.

By Prof. J. A. Alexander

THIS publication owes its origin indirectly to the late Nestorian massacre. Soon after that event, a letter from the east appeared in a London journal and was extensively copied in Europe and America, ascribing the catastrophe to the rivalry of Popish and Protestant missionaries. The Rev. Mr. Badger, a Puseyite from England, was represented as siding with the Papists against the American Congregationalists. At the annual meeting of the American Board in 1843, Dr. Anderson, one of the Secretaries, is reported to have said that Mr. Southgate, the American Episcopal missionary at Constantinople, had co-operated with Badger in all his opposition to the missions of the Board, and so far as his influence had gone, coincided with the Papal emissaries. The accuracy of this report Dr. Anderson has called in question. He does not think he made any reference to Papal missionaries in speaking of Mr. Southgate. The latter has nevertheless thought it necessary to vindicate himself from all these charges. The points which he attempts to establish are chiefly these: that the Nestorian massacre had nothing to do with the missionaries or their quarrels; that he himself has not united either with Papists or with Badger in opposition to the American mis-

sions; and finally that he has not by himself committed any acts of hostility against them. Under the first head, he alleges that the connexion of the massacre with the missionary quarrels was a mere conjecture or surmise of an anonymous letter-writer in the east, which had no foundation in fact, and which its author now does not pretend to vindicate; that the massacre was the fruit of an ambitious project on the part of Kurdish chieftains, who knew and cared nothing about the differences of missionaries, and even took Dr. Grant for an Englishman; and that Badger did not arrive in Mossoul until the series of events, which led to this calamitous result, had nearly reached its consummation.

Under the second head, while he admits that Badger assumed at once an attitude of open opposition to the Congregational missionaries, he professes to regret that course as much as any one, and to think it deserving of censure. Nay, he represents it as contrary to his own earnest and oft-repeated advice. With respect to the papists, he indignantly disclaims any affinity in sentiment, or co-operation in action, any leaning towards the Church of Rome or tenderness for it, and professes his attachment to his own church, not only as Episcopal, but as Protestant and Reformed.

Under the third and most important head, he denies that he has ever, in word or deed, been guilty of any hostile opposition to the Congregational missions. The only specific charge alleged against him, that of causing the breaking up of Mr. Dwight's American meeting in Constantinople, by reading in Turkish, to a native Christian, an imprudent letter in an old number of the *Missionary Herald*, he explains at length in an appendix to the pamphlet. He professes to have borne in silence many provocations, to have stood aloof from all combinations to oppose the American missions, to have cherished a kindly feeling in his intercourse with them, and to have taken pains to say and do nothing against them.

We have given this outline of Mr. Southgate's statement, with a view to allow him every advantage in relation to the charges brought against him. Some of his facts, we know, have been denied, and some explained in a very different manner, by the congregational missionaries. Into this judicial or historical inquiry we have no design to enter. The subject of our present article is neither the cause of the Nestorian massacre, nor the conduct of Mr. Badger, nor the

conduct of the Papists, nor the conduct of the Congregational missionaries, but something of more permanent and general interest, as will soon appear. In taking up this subject, and discussing it, we are anxious to avoid all dispute as to the facts of the case. We therefore choose to take Mr. Southgate's own testimony as to these, without even subjecting it to cross-examination. We grant, *pro hac vice*, that every allegation in the pamphlet, of a purely historical nature, is correct. We admit that Mr. Southgate is innocent of all co-operation with Papists and all tendency to Popery, as well as of all open hostility to his missionary countrymen, either alone or in conjunction with the Puseyite Badger. Granting all this, to the furthest extent that Mr. S. himself could ask, we now propose to fasten, for a little, on the principle by which his conduct towards the non-episcopal missionaries was regulated, not as they say, but as he says himself. All the facts involved shall be of his own showing, and in this one pamphlet. If convicted of any thing erroneous or blameworthy, he shall be convicted out of his own mouth.

In order to accomplish our design, it will be necessary to advert, for a moment, to Mr. Southgate's history, as briefly given by himself, with the exception of the fact, which he perhaps saw no reason to record, that he is not a native Episcopalian, but a naturalized proselyte, educated at Andover. Having received episcopal ordination, he went forth, commissioned by the Foreign Board of the Episcopal Church, to explore the condition of Mohammedanism in Turkey and Persia. In this work he continued during the years 1836-39. In the course of his inquiries, his attention was drawn to the state of the oriental churches, and especially to the numerous points of affinity between them and his own church. The result was a conviction that Episcopal churches are under peculiar obligations to seek the good of their oriental brethren, and possess peculiar advantages for doing so. He was also convinced that their usefulness in this work must depend, under God, mainly on their giving prominence to their Episcopal peculiarities. To this work he devoted himself, and was settled as an Episcopal missionary in Constantinople. It thus became necessary to determine what relation he should sustain, and what course of conduct he should pursue, towards the Congregational missions, which had been established long before, in the same region. His

first determination, and one for which we give him ample credit, without disputing any of his facts, was to avoid all open opposition and hostility. His next determination was to let them alone, to say nothing about them, to make no allusion to them. His third was, by clearly disclosing his own episcopal peculiarities, to disclaim all ecclesiastical connexion with these people, and all responsibility for their proceedings. This seems reasonable enough when generally stated; but now we come to the principle or reason upon which he acted, and which we are solicitous to state distinctly, and as far as may be, in his own expressions.

It appears, then, in the first place, that 'episcopacy, the creed, a liturgy, appointed feasts and fasts, &c.' 'are universally regarded by the eastern Christians as outward and visible signs of a church of Christ.' 'These are to an eastern Christian the *prima facie* evidence of a duly organized church, the signs of it which appear at first view. If these are wanting he will not inquire farther before he rejects, for the simple reason that he never heard or dreamed of a church without them.' 'The Oriental Christians can no more conceive of a church without a Bishop than a man without a head. Most of them never heard of such an anomaly; and if it should appear in plain sight, they would see in it nothing to desire.'

In the next place, the grand advantage supposed to be possessed by the Episcopal churches, in seeking the good of the oriental churches, is, that they can consistently avail themselves of these 'views and prepossessions with regard to the nature and character of the Christian Church.' Mr. Southgate was instructed to take advantage of them. He actually did take advantage of them. He repeatedly states it as the principle on which his missionary operations were to be conducted. That is to say, the Episcopal mission was to gain access to the oriental churches by taking advantage of the doctrine universally held by the latter, that episcopacy and its usages are *prima facie* evidence of a church, in default of which no further inquiry need be made; nay, that there can no more be a church without a bishop than a man without a head.

Now Mr. Southgate must believe this oriental doctrine to be either true or false. After what he has said and done, he cannot without absurdity take refuge in the plea of uncertainty or indecision. We have no idea that he would choose to do so. The pamphlet before us affords evidence

of a clear head and a strong will. We have no doubt at all that the writer has a settled opinion of his own as to the truth or falsehood of the doctrine. If, then, he holds it to be incorrect, if he believes that the orientals have received by tradition from their fathers, a criterion of the true church, not laid down in scripture, in what a position does he place himself? In that of one who wilfully connives at error, to his own advantage, and the disadvantage of his neighbours. The oriental Christians can no more conceive of a church without a bishop than of a man without a head. They never heard or dreamed of such a church. Two bodies of Christians send missionaries among them. One of these regards prelatival episcopacy as unscriptural and has rejected it. The other thinks it lawful and expedient though not necessary, and has retained it. Finding, however, that the people to be influenced have a false idea of the value of these institutions, the second body mentioned, instead of correcting that idea, seizes on it as a means of obtaining exclusive access or at least prevailing influence. Let us see how such a course would look in other circumstances and under other names. A white man and a black man are sent into the heart of Africa as missionaries by distinct societies. They find a tribe of negroes so ignorant as to imagine that none but a black man has a right to act as a religious teacher. What would be thought of the negro missionary if he should avail himself of this "prepossession," and of his own resemblance to the people, to exclude his white associate altogether? And what would be thought of his defence if when accused he should reply that he had not said a word against the white man, or against his complexion, but had merely shown himself in his true colours, and availed himself of the legitimate advantages which his Maker gave him, by asserting his own African extraction? We need scarcely say that no offence is meant in the choice of these similitudes. The illustration is as perfect if the venue be laid in Asia, and the superstitious notion be that no man has a right to speak in God's name who has not red hair or a flowing beard. The truth set forth in either case is this, that such a use of such an error is dishonest, and that to excuse it by disclaiming positive hostility is futile. All the harm that can be done has been done, by claiming precedence on the ground of distinctions which the claimant knows to be factitious or imaginary. A whole vocabulary of abuse, or a whole campaign of hostile

movements, would add nothing to the falsehood of the false position, or to the *mala fides* and the *malus animus* of him who holds it. To justify what is done in such a case by what is not done, is like apologising to a man whom you have slandered by reminding him that you did not strike him or spit in his face. To the futility of such excuses we shall have occasion to advert again, and need not therefore dwell upon it any longer here.

We have thus far proceeded on the supposition, that Mr. Southgate regards the opinion of the oriental churches, with respect to the necessity of episcopal institutions, as an error. Let us now invert the hypothesis and suppose that he believes it to be true. If so, the Congregational missionaries cannot be regarded by him as lawful ministers, or the churches which they organize, as true Christian churches. What right, then, has he to abstain from opposition and denunciation? Why does he choose to appear in disguise, and to suppress his real sentiments? How is he to clear himself from the charge, which he brings against his neighbours, of unmanly timidity, uncandid evasion, and unchristian double dealing? He urges his silence and forbearance as a proof of his right spirit. But in this there is no merit, if he really believes the Congregational missionaries to have no authority, no divine warrant. Would he boast of like forbearance with respect to Socinians or other flagrant heretics? Would he not think it meritorious to expose their false pretensions to the Christian name and the authority of Christian teachers? On the supposition that Mr. Southgate believes the oriental doctrine to be true, we may exhort him, almost in his own words, to consent to appear as he really is, to practise no disguise of his true character, to be High Church or Low Church, in profession and practice; and consent to meet the disadvantages of his true position.

In thus alluding to the old distinction between High Church and Low Church we shall probably expose ourselves to pity or contempt, as not knowing how to discern the signs of the times. But we cannot avail ourselves of the plea of ignorance. We happen to know that a great change has taken place in the party divisions of American episcopacy. We know the pains that have been taken to obliterate the old line of distinction and to draw a new one. We know the motives that have led to the attempt, and the means used to promote it. We have long wished and intended to lay the true state of the

case before our readers. For this Mr. Southgate has afforded an occasion by assuming the very ground to which we have alluded. We shall first assist him to define his own position, and then proceed to show that he is not the only one who holds it. We have spoken of it as a position distinct from those of the old fashioned High and Low Church parties. Let us now state more distinctly wherein the difference consists. The point at which the two old parties separate is the recognition of non-episcopal societies as churches. This is, and always has been, the true shibboleth. The genuine High Churchmen of England have always denied, and the genuine Low Churchmen have always admitted, the ecclesiastical character of other denominations. It would be easy to show, by historical evidence, that this is the only intelligible test of High and Low Churchmanship. Now Mr. Southgate can stand neither test. He will neither admit with the Low nor deny with the High Church. His cue is to stand mute, so far as testimony in behalf of others is concerned; to say every thing for himself, and nothing for any body else. He is not a High Churchman, for he does not deny that there may be a church without a bishop. He is not a Low Churchman, for he does not assert it. The characteristic peculiarity of this *tertium quid*, this *tiers état*, this new and improved form of episcopalianism, is, that it asserts the positive part of the High Church doctrine and lets the negative part alone. It is willing to say what is a church, but unwilling to say what is not one. The logical peculiarity of the system is, that it assumes the possibility of laying down an affirmative proposition without including the negation of its opposite. The practical convenience of the method is that he who uses it is armed at all points, not on one side only. Is he accused of being a lax Churchman? He washes his hands of all dissent, and declares that he has nothing to do with non-episcopalians. Is he reproached as uncharitable and exclusive? He says nothing of his neighbours. He makes no allusion to them. Non-interference is his maxim. The system is indeed eclectic. High Church and Low Church have been sifted to produce it; but alas, the sieve has been too coarse to retain the liberality of the one or the honest independence of the other. What the residuum is worth let every man determine for himself.

But perhaps we are precipitate in thus assuming that Mr. Southgate would prefer the second part of the alternative

which we have stated. Let us first see whether there are sufficient reasons for concluding that his own views, as to the necessity of episcopal institutions, coincide with those of the oriental Christians. We say their *necessity*, because a mere belief in their expediency and lawfulness is nothing to the purpose. Such a belief could give no permanent advantage to episcopal missionaries over others. It is because the oriental never heard or dreamed of a church without a bishop, and can no more conceive of such a church than of a man without a head, that Mr. Southgate thinks Episcopalians bound to 'use the advantages which they possess,' to 'avail themselves of their proper advantages,' to 'show their own character,' to 'use their gifts as the Lord has given to them,' by 'a distinct setting forth of the Episcopal Church before the Eastern Christians.'

The question is whether he regards the oriental notion above stated to be false or true. We think the last most probable, first, because the other supposition is at variance with the view which we desire to take of Mr. Southgate's character as an honest and a Christian man. With such a character we cannot reconcile wilful connivance at a superstitious error as a stroke of policy. It is true the other hypothesis also puts him in a very equivocal position, but not one which so seriously compromises moral and religious principle. If he believes the doctrine to be true, he is chargeable with grievous want of candour and consistency, but not with jesuitical deception, or with deliberately doing evil that good may come. As a court of justice, therefore, when a prisoner stands mute, orders the plea of Not Guilty to be entered, so we, in the absence of our author, give him the advantage of that supposition which is least irreconcilable with Christian character and common honesty.

Another reason for concluding that he holds the oriental doctrine is, that if he did not he could scarcely have avoided saying so in this defence. Whatever policy he might adopt in Asia, where the prejudices of the native Christians must be humoured and conciliated, surely in a vindication written for America and circulated only here, he must of necessity have said, if it could be said with truth, that appearances had done him injustice, that although he had availed himself of eastern prejudice in seeming to admit that there could not be a church without a bishop, he had no such opinion of his own, and was ready on suitable occasions to disclaim it. If Mr. Southgate had shaved his head, nourished his

beard, and worn an oriental dress, in condescension to the foolish notion of some oriental tribe or church, that these external badges were essential to the ministerial character, and if he had been charged with thereby casting suspicion on other Episcopal missionaries, who retained the Frank costume, could he have hesitated, could he have failed, in a studied vindication of himself, to say that he had no belief in any such absurdity, and attached no sanctity to any cut of coat or style of head-dress? Would not the omission of such a disclaimer, in the case supposed, be looked upon as monstrous? And is not a similar omission, in the real case before us, a convincing proof that what he does not say he could not say?

Our only fear is that we may not state the case as simply and clearly as we wish. The question is whether Mr. Southgate thinks the orientals right in rejecting without further inquiry the claims of any church which has not episcopal institutions. We say he does, because by his conduct he encouraged that belief, and because in a pamphlet of near forty pages, written expressly to repel the charge of opposition to his non-episcopal brethren, he nowhere disavows this opinion, as he not only might have done but must have done, on any ordinary principles of action, if he did not think it true. For these two reasons we think it most just and generous to conclude that Mr. Southgate, whatever he may have professed to think when he left Andover to take orders, now regards episcopal institutions as not only scriptural, apostolical, and useful, but obligatory and essential. And let it be remembered that from this conclusion the only escape is in the supposition that he knowingly fostered a false prejudice, humoured an odious superstition, fatal to the communion of saints and the unity of Christ's body, with a view to the promotion of his own designs at the expense of others; a conclusion so revolting that we choose, so long as an alternative is offered, to believe that he was honest in his folly.

We have described Mr. Southgate as holding a position different from those of the two great parties in the Church of England, agreeing with the High Church in its exclusive doctrines, but refusing like the High Church to avow them with their necessary consequences. The point of agreement we have just established. The point of difference we shall now illustrate from the language of the pamphlet before us. We have seen that Mr. Southgate availed him-

self of the universal oriental notion that episcopacy and its peculiar usages are necessary signs of the true church, or, to use his own words, 'inseparable from a Christian Church.' Mr. Badger did the same; but in so doing, he 'assumed a position of hostility to the Congregational missionaries, and, in a measure, made his work antagonist to theirs.' This was the natural course for a consistent High Churchman, whether Puseyite or not. It was nothing more than an expression, in action, of the doctrine which he no doubt taught in words, viz. that the Congregational missionaries were neither ministers nor members of the Church. But here Mr. Southgate differs from him, and agrees with others 'in thinking that his hostile bearing towards the American missionaries is deserving of censure.' 'No one regrets it more.' 'The position of hostility which he has assumed toward the Congregational missionaries, in the country itself, was contrary to my earnest and oft-repeated advice.' Now this 'hostile bearing' and 'position of hostility' must either refer to the manifestation of malignant feelings and to acts of open violence towards the missionaries, or to a public and explicit denial of their ministerial character and rights. If the former only had been meant, it would surely have been needless for Mr. Southgate to disclaim all participation in such wickedness, and he would no doubt have been ashamed to own his fellowship and general coincidence of judgment with a persecuting bigot. From the pains which he takes repeatedly to signify his disapproval of Badger's 'hostility,' it must have been something in which from Mr. Southgate's principles, he might have been expected to take part; and this could only be a doctrinal and practical hostility to the claims of the Congregationalists as ministers and members of the Church. The principle of such an opposition was, as we have seen, involved in the oriental doctrine of which he conscientiously availed himself. All then that he could disapprove in Badger was the distinct enunciation of the doctrine which they held in common, and the consistent application of the principle in practice. Here then is the difference between a High Churchman of the Old School and a High Low Churchman of the New. Both exclude non-episcopalians from the pale of their communion; but the one thrusts them out of the door, while the other merely shuts it in their face, affecting not to see them, and at the same time regretting and censuring the 'hostile bearing' and 'position of hostility' assumed by his associate in the process of exclusion.

It may be thought, however, that we make too much of a mere negative circumstance, a mere omission, upon Mr. Southgate's part, to say what he may nevertheless have believed and felt. But nothing can be further from the true state of the case. What we complain of is indeed a negative proceeding, an omission; but we do not infer it from the writer's silence. He asserts it over and over as the very principle on which he acted, and evidently rests upon it as his chosen ground of self-justification. 'During my two weeks residence with the Syrian Patriarch, I do not remember that I ever alluded to the American Board or its missionaries.' 'In my communications with the Patriarchs, I have never so much as alluded to them, excepting when their names were brought up by others, and then have said no more of them than that they were not agents of the church which I represented,' [nor of any church, he might have added, possessing those marks which these Patriarchs regarded as 'inseparable from a Christian church.'] 'I have seen many things in the doings of the missionaries, which seemed to me of a most injurious tendency to the great interests of truth and piety, but I have never opposed even these.' [His neutrality was therefore perfectly compatible with the strongest disapprobation and severest condemnation. How then is it any answer to the charge of exclusiveness or want of charity?] 'My rule has been non-interference. I have regarded my work as standing by itself, and have felt that my instructions would be answered by doing that well. But I have maintained in my work the great principle with which I began, and this has been a rock of offence and ever will be.' [Yea verily! It must needs be that offences come; but woe to the man by whom the offence cometh!] 'My object was not to make it antagonist to theirs, but to do good *in our own way*.' 'I had not proposed to myself to oppose them, but simply to *do the whole work committed to me*.' 'I had avoided a position of hostility hitherto and intended still to avoid it.'

Were it not for the coolness and the air of conscious innocence, with which these statements are made, we could not think it necessary to point out the fallacy by which they are rendered null and void as grounds of justification. Lest any should, however, be imposed upon by the quiet assurance of the author's manner, we may just direct attention to the absurdity of his disclaiming all hostility, and professing to do his own work in his own way, when that way of doing it,

if not the nature of the work itself, involved the worst hostility. When the Prince de Joinville bombarded Tangier, he is said to have spared the European quarter of the town. If, instead of doing this, he had opened an indiscriminate discharge upon the whole, the European consuls would no doubt have expostulated with him on his thus confounding friends and foes. Let us imagine, if we can, the Prince replying gravely to the deputation, that he had not alluded to the European residents in his directions for the cannonade; that he regarded his work as standing by itself, and felt that his instructions would be answered by doing that well; that his object was to do good in his own way; that he did not propose to himself to injure the Europeans but simply to do the work committed to him; that he had avoided a position of hostility to them and intended to avoid it still. If the messengers did not laugh in his face, it would be because they felt grape-shot and bomb-shells to be no laughing matter. It would be easy to pick flaws in this comparison by showing how the cases differ as to points which were not meant to correspond. But in the main point, the illustration is complete. The cases are alike in this, if nothing else, that the course of conduct placed in opposition to hostility is really a hostile one, and therefore the excuse is a mere quibble. If the leader of a besieging army, during an armistice, should try to effect an entrance by stratagem, or to undermine the walls, he would scarcely be permitted to defend himself by saying that his batteries were silent and his troops resting on their arms.

But lest we should obscure a clear case by excessive or untimely or unskilful illustration, we will state in plain terms the fatal defect of Mr. Southgate's plea. He alleges that he shunned a position of hostility to the other missionaries, and simply sought to do his own work in his own way. Now what was his own work, and what his way of doing it? His work was to gain access to the oriental Christians (no doubt for a good end) such as non-episcopalians could not possibly attain. His way of doing it was by letting the oriental Christians see that he possessed, and that the other missionaries did not possess, those institutions which the orientals look upon as 'inseparable from a Christian church.' Supposing this attempt to be successful, what must its effect be? To exclude non-episcopalians altogether. If it did not lead to this result, where would be the boasted advantage of episcopacy? If the

oriental Christians were as willing to receive the one class as the other, or could be as easily benefitted by the one class as the other, then the one would be just as well qualified to labour among them as the other. If, on the other hand, the possession of episcopal peculiarities gives readier access and a better hope of usefulness than the want of them, then the success and utility of the missionary's labours must bear some proportion to the degree in which all other forms of Christianity are kept out of view. Just so far then as Mr. Southgate can succeed in doing 'good in his own way,' just so far it must be difficult if not impossible for the Congregational missionaries to do good to the same objects in their own way. When he says, therefore, that his object was not to make his mission antagonist to theirs, but to do good in his own way, is it not really tantamount to saying that he never meant to oppose their work, but only to defeat it, that he had no thought of fighting them, but only of driving them from the field, or if you please, and this perhaps is nearer to the truth, that he never intended to oppose them openly, but only to get the advantage in a quiet, peaceable, and underhanded way. If this is not the plain English of his multiplied excuses, they are Greek to us. If it is, let him and his defenders make the most of it.

If our readers are as weary as we are ourselves of Mr. Southgate and his sophisms, his esoteric and exoteric doctrine of the church, his tears shed over Badger's most impolitic 'hostility' to that which he himself expected to dispose of without any 'hostility' at all, they will be glad to leave this part of the subject and get on to something else. We shall gratify this natural and reasonable wish, after briefly recapitulating Mr. Southgate's character and standing as a Churchman. We hold him then to be, by his own showing, one of two things, a Jesuitical Low Churchman, who can humour the superstitious notions of the east, for the purpose of excluding men whom he knows to be clothed with as much ministerial authority as himself; or a crypto-hierarchist, a pseudo-high-churchman, a believer in the exclusive *jus divinum* of episcopacy; but one ashamed or afraid to avow it and to look its consequences in the face, one who is willing to apply the match or to use cold steel in secret, while at the same time he begs hard that he may not be regarded as an enemy, and bitterly complains of not being suffered to do his own work in his own way, like

the madman who scatters firebrands, arrows and death, and says, am I not in sport?

Had Mr. Southgate's been the only instance of this new kind of episcopacy, we should still have thought it entitled to attention, on account of its connexion with the great work of missions in the east. But the interest of the subject is vastly heightened, when we find that this is but a single case of a disease which eats as doth a canker. We are painfully apprehensive that this new phase of churchmanship already threatens to become predominant in the Episcopal Church of this country. Some intimation of this fact is afforded by the pamphlet before us, in the fact which it discloses or recalls to mind, that Mr. Southgate, far from acting on his own advice, has been consistently obeying the instructions of his superiors at home. He quotes in this pamphlet three passages, one from the Instructions of the Foreign Committee, and two from the Instructions of the Presiding Bishop (Griswold), all which had been objected to, as having an unfriendly bearing on the Congregational missions. The first merely speaks of the integrity of the oriental churches as threatened by 'dangers from without and the unguarded zeal of religious inquiry within,' a vague expression which admits great latitude of explanation. But in Bishop Griswold's charge, he directs Mr. Southgate to inform the authorities of the eastern churches that 'many of those called Protestants have rejected and are still so opposed to Episcopacy and Confirmation and the use of Liturgies, that an intimate fellowship and connection with them is at present impracticable.' Mr. Southgate's comment upon this is characteristic and significant. 'Is not this a plain matter of fact?' Yes, it is a plain matter of fact that Protestant Episcopalians refuse to hold 'intimate fellowship and connection' with those who do not share in their external peculiarities. It is also a plain matter of fact, that the persons who were to be thus informed, universally regard these very peculiarities, as 'inseparable from a Christian church.' The meaning of the message therefore is and must be, you regard certain usages as necessary signs of a true church: so do we: we have them: these people have them not: we do not therefore recognize them: neither should you. If this be not the meaning, or if no allusion was intended to the Congregational missions, there was no more occasion for the mention of this plain matter of fact than of any other fact whatever. And this being the case, it is a ques-

tion of no moment whether Mr. Southgate, in using the passage during two weeks residence with the Syrian Patriarch, alluded to the American Board and its missions, or not. Silence in such a case was far more eloquent than speech. It was much more convenient to let the Patriarch draw the inference and make the application for himself, than officiously to do it for him. Again, Bishop Griswold tells the Syrian Patriarch that Mr. Southgate 'will make it clearly understood that the American church has no ecclesiastical connection with the followers of Luther and Calvin, and takes no part in their plans or operations to diffuse the principles of their sects.' Mr. Southgate explains this extraordinary passage by saying that by a 'follower of Luther or Calvin,' is universally understood in the East an 'infidel, a man destitute of all religion and a profaner of it.' He adds that 'the missionaries of the American Board are careful enough to evade the application of these terms to themselves.' Of this improbable assertion he offers no proof, and it seems to be contradicted by the very complaint which they have made of the passage, as referring to themselves. But we have bargained not to question Mr. S.'s veracity, and must therefore leave the missionaries to defend themselves. But even if they have disclaimed and trampled on these venerable names that cannot justify a Christian prelate of eminent station in assenting to such shameful prostitution. Should the word American become a nick-name, as its enemies have tried to make it, for a swindler, would a Webster or a Clay dare to assert his honesty by saying he was no American? Observe too the distinction drawn between the 'American Church' and the Lutheran and Calvinistic 'sects.' Knowing what is regarded by these oriental Christians as the criterion of 'sects' and 'churches,' can we doubt the application which would instantly be made of Bishop Griswold's disavowal? If so applied, it would have all the practical effect of the most exclusive High Church bigotry, and the want of any direct allusion to the missionaries only seems to complete the hybrid mixture of timidity and arrogance, which is characteristic of the High Low Church.

It is not the least extraordinary part of this affair, that these offensive passages bear the name of the late Bishop Griswold, whom we have always been accustomed to regard with great respect as a truly evangelical and useful man. His diocese has also been considered as among the most liberal and evangelical in the church. From these

considerations we should be happy to infer, that the sentences in question can have no such meaning as they seem to bear at first sight. But when we recall to mind the venerable Bishop's violent attempt to find the details of episcopal organization in certain parts of scripture, where even High Churchmen had never before seen them, and couple with this the proofs already given, or about to be given, of a growing tendency among evangelical Episcopalians to the false position of a middle ground between the High and Low Church doctrines, we are forced to conclude that, unless he merely put his name to what he neither wrote nor understood, he was himself a victim of this new delusion. This is a melancholy supposition, and we would state it with all possible respect for the memory of so good a man; but let his juniors and successors be admonished, that neither evangelical sentiment nor episcopal office can protect even good men from the natural effects of a false position as to the relative importance of external forms and the essential constitution of the Christian Church.

Having intimated a suspicion that this new kind of episcopalianism has begun to spread and is likely to prevail, we feel bound to give the grounds of our belief. The startling fact that such instructions could be given by an evangelical Bishop, and acted on by an evangelical missionary, has already been alleged as symptomatic of a change of policy if not of principle among the moderate Episcopalians. Another indication, more extensive but less tangible, because of a negative kind, is the growing reserve of the Low Church party in acknowledging the rights of other churches. The quiet submission of that party to a system, which precludes all ministerial communion with other bodies of Christians, was as much as they could well explain in accordance with their principles, and needed all the professions of charity, respect, and confidence, once made so freely, to render it tolerable. So that when these professions and acknowledgments are silently but generally intermitted, the exclusive nature of the system becomes more offensively apparent.

That this revolution should have proceeded far before it was observed, is natural, not only because a mere omission or neglect makes less impression than a positive offence, but also because the former practice of the Low Church party had determined its character in the public judgment, and men took for granted, as un-

doubtedly existing, even that which had ceased to be expressed and manifested. There are but few cases of private alienation, not involving open quarrel, in which the proofs of friendship do not cease on one side long before the other party is aware of their cessation. To the fact of this mysterious reserve on the part of evangelical or Low Church Episcopalians, public attention has been called within a few months by the Rev. Mr. Barnes of Philadelphia, and in so doing he has done the cause of charity and truth good service. It is, therefore, the more to be regretted that in rendering this service, he has fallen, as we think and have endeavoured to point out,* into the serious error of confounding friends with foes, and of aiming his blows, however vigorous, at random, so as often to strike objects which they ought to have protected. This has arisen from the combination of a clear and strong impression of effects with indistinct perceptions of their causes. Mr. Barnes was well aware that the spirit of exclusiveness had spread and was still spreading in the Episcopal Church; but instead of perceiving in this a further departure from the principles and temper of that church as it was in its best days, he paradoxically represents the later corruption as the genuine essence, and treats the faithful followers of the Reformers as intruders, interlopers, and usurpers, in the heritage of their fathers. That the Church of England, even in its prime, was chargeable with sad defects and errors, it is needless for us, as Presbyterians, to say. But this cannot alter the historical fact, that the liberal and evangelical Episcopalians are the true representatives of the Church in its best days, and that the present predominance of formality and bigotry is a flagrant case of usurpation and perversion. The English Reformers no doubt erred in retaining so much of the Romish polity and ceremonial; but they did retain it, without being Hierarchists or High Churchmen, and so may their successors. It cannot be true therefore, that the Episcopal peculiarities, however objectionable we may think them, are wholly incompatible with spiritual religion or with Christian liberality. Because a new generation of mock Papists has arisen and is growing, shall the genuine Protestants, who adhere to the creed and the spirit of their fathers, be denounced as unfaithful, or reproached with holding a false position in the

* Vide supra, p. 319.

church which they prefer, and which they would gladly see restored to its former state of comparative purity. There may be strong reasons, both of a moral and prudential nature, why the truly evangelical Episcopalians should sever their connexion with a body which has lost so much of its original brightness. Let such reasons, if there be such, be urged upon the conscience of the parties concerned. But let them not be called upon to leave the church, upon the ground that they are not consistent members of it, when they are the only ones who have indeed held fast their integrity.

Some light may possibly be thrown upon the case by referring to another with which our readers have been recently familiar. During the course of the last century the Church of Scotland had become corrupted both by laxity of doctrine and by defection from the church principles of the Reformers. Against this corruption a considerable party struggled throughout the period in question and beyond it, but in vain. Some of the best men in the church considered themselves bound to leave it, and many looked upon it as the duty of the whole Evangelical party to follow their example. This they eventually did, when submission to the reigning power was no longer reconcileable with higher duties. But they came out under an express and solemn protestation, that they did so in adherence to the doctrines and the spirit of the ancient Church of Scotland, and because the body which they left behind had grievously departed from the same. The truth of this profession has been universally admitted by all impartial judges acquainted with the history of Scotland. Now what would have been thought of an attempt to show, before the disruption, that the orthodox clergy were bound to secede, not because they were the true Presbyterians of the Reformation, but because they were not, because they had no title to a place in the Church of Scotland, the only true members of that body being the Erastians and Arminians of the other party? Such reasoning would not be more palpably at variance with historical truth than the reasoning which seeks to drive the evangelical Episcopalians from their church, upon the ground that they are not Episcopalians, because they are not Puseyites or Hierarchists, a charge equally applicable to the whole body of the English clergy for a century after the Reformation.

A good deal of the error and confusion, which we think

we see in Mr. Barnes's argument, arises from the needless complication of the question with another as to the expediency and practical effect of liturgies and other peculiar practices of episcopacy. Because Mr. Barnes regards these as liable to dangerous abuse, he calls upon those who use without abusing them to give them up. But nothing can be better settled than the fact that successive generations of devout and godly men have clung to these peculiarities as valuable means of spiritual improvement. What right have we, then, to present the bare alternative of renouncing episcopacy or renouncing the name of evangelical Christians? Why may there not be a middle ground, where evangelical religion and episcopal institutions shall be found in combination? At any rate, what tribunal shall decide this question but the consciences of those concerned? And how can this right of decision be denied without intolerance? Mr. Barnes has no more right to say that evangelical Christians must not be Episcopalians, than Dr. Bacon has to say that they must not be Presbyterians. If Mr. Barnes may be a Presbyterian from conviction and on principle, though Dr. Bacon thinks the system inexpedient and liable to abuse, then Dr. Tyng may be an Episcopalian from conviction and on principle, though Mr. Barnes thinks that system still more inexpedient and still more liable to abuse. If there are evangelical Christians who must and will have Episcopal forms, as we know there are evangelical Christians who must and will have Presbyterian forms, let them have them, without molestation from Presbyterians in the one case or from Congregationalists in the other. Before the division of our own church, it was commonly charged upon the old school, that they attached too much importance to Presbyterian rules, and enforced them with excessive rigour. In this opinion Mr. Barnes, we doubt not, acquiesced; but would it for that reason have been fair in his New England brethren to have urged him to abandon Presbyterian institutions altogether and become an Independent? No, he felt it to be both his right and duty to retain those institutions which he looked upon as scriptural, and so to use them that they might not be abused. Now if this was a right of conscience in the case of Mr. Barnes, which no diversity of judgment on the part of Congregationalists could annul, even though the rigid form of Presbyterian polity was demonstrably the ancient one, much more is the same right of conscience indefeasibly possessed

by evangelical Episcopalians, when the spirit and practice of the opposite party are no less demonstrably a palpable departure from the spirit and practice of the English Reformation. To drive these true successors of Cranmer and Jewell from the church which those men founded, on the pretext that they cannot be consistent members of it, is about as righteous as it would be to exhort a Trinitarian, who by some chance had been left among the fellows of Harvard College, to relinquish his position, as an interloper and intruder on the rights of the Socinians. His withdrawal might be proper and might properly be urged on other grounds, but never on the ground that the Socinians were the rightful owners of the soil, the true representatives of Harvard and of Hollis. You may think and justly think the old hereditary mansion of your neighbour to be highly inconvenient if not dangerous, and on that ground may urge him to forsake it. But if he choose to remain there, you have no right to dispute his title, much less to denounce him as a forcible intruder on a gang of rovers who have taken up their quarters in the same apartments. In all this we assume that there is no dispute as to the lawfulness of episcopal institutions. He who thinks them forbidden in the Bible stands on different ground; but this ground Mr. Barnes, we think, has never yet assumed. And we trust the day is still far off when Presbyterians, in their zeal against High Church Episcopalianism, shall fall into the very sin with which they charge their neighbours, by attempting to monopolise religious liberty, and by forcing that form of worship and government, which they have freely chosen, as an iron yoke upon the necks of others.

The sum of what we have been saying with respect to Mr. Barnes's argument is this, that it does injustice to the true Evangelical and Low Church party by treating them as mere intruders, and the High Church as the true Episcopalians. But now the very different question meets us, where is this Low Church party to be found? Who are the persons entitled to the benefit of those considerations which have just been presented? All who array themselves in opposition to the High Church, properly so called? Far from it. As we have said already, there is reason to believe that an extensive change has taken place in the principles and spirit of the body which still calls itself the Low Church, though the very name seems to be growing less acceptable to those who bear it. The change referred to may be easily defined. The Low Church party in the

Church of England has always admitted, as the High Church party has always denied, the claim of non-episcopal communions to be recognised as Churches. The new plan is neither to admit it nor deny it, to say nothing about it, to ignore the existence of any other churches, but without affirming that there are no other. This is what we have called the High Low Church, because it is an engrafting of High Church notions on the Low Church party. It is a High Church party in disguise. Its practical tendency is just as certainly to the exclusion of all Christians but Episcopalians from the Church, as that of old fashioned and avowed High Churchism. It only hides its head lest it should see the legitimate consequences of its own assumptions, or be forced to give a categorical answer to the question, whether other churches are true churches, and their ministers true ministers. This is the shibboleth by which these Ephraimites may be detected. Ask an admission of the rights of other Christians, and they cannot 'frame to pronounce it right.' They can evade, and quibble, and distinguish, and explain, and any thing but give a direct answer to the question. Now against the shafts of Mr. Barnes's argument we have no wish to shield such men as these. We only seek to ward them off from those who, like Bishop Meade in a recent address to the Virginia Convention, speaking of other denominations, 'love to call them sister churches.' Such men there are, as we can personally testify, and we protest against their being dealt with unfairly. But how many of them are there? Alas, we know not, for the practice of acknowledging their brethren has been going out of vogue among the Low Church, and we fear that it is not without a reason. This suspicion, in the absence of more positive evidence, may seem uncharitable. But it is not so, partly because a change has certainly occurred in this respect which calls for explanation, partly because any man can clear himself at once by simply acknowledging the fact which he may be suspected of denying. No good man who believes that there may be non-episcopal churches can have any reason to refuse to say so. And no man who believes that there cannot, ought to be afraid or ashamed to say so too. Let this be made the line of demarcation and division. Let the question be, do you acknowledge any but Episcopal churches? An affirmative answer will identify the Low Church, a negative answer the High Church, an evasive answer or silence, what for

want of any better name we must entitle the Low High or High Low church.

The existence and extent of this third party, and its gradual supplanting of the Low Church, as it once was in this country and is still in England, we have rested thus far on the negative but strong proof of a growing reserve in the acknowledgment of other churches. We shall now proceed to strengthen the conclusion, which we have thus reached, by positive and authoritative testimony. In a late number of the Episcopal Recorder, which has long been regarded as a leading organ of the Evangelical or Low Church party, we find a statement, on this very subject, so important and instructive that we cannot refuse room for a long extract.

‘We have not less than four different classes of Episcopalians amongst us, who differ with each other on some points, respecting which our Church allows a diversity of views. As a knowledge of the fact may prevent important misunderstanding, we shall proceed to name them.

They are, First. Those who maintain that all forms of ecclesiastical government are equally good; and that the communion to which they happen to be attached, has in no degree, an advantage over others. These are the *ULTRA LOW CHURCHMEN*; few in number, and feeble in influence. If there are any *clergymen* of this class, they are not of our acquaintance.

Secondly. Those who hold the great *facts* of Episcopacy, its apostolic origin and primitive establishment, but content with their own institutions, draw no *inferences* that would invalidate those of others. With the Bishop of London they consider Episcopacy essential not to the *being*, but only to the *well being* of a Church. These are the ‘*Moderate Churchmen*.’ The majority, we think, of our city ministers, and a much larger portion of our country clergy, and almost the entire mass of our laity, would be found to be according to the description just given, moderate Churchmen.

Thirdly. Those who hold the *facts* of Episcopacy, and who also draw *INFERENCES* from them that *do* utterly invalidate all ministerial orders that are not Episcopal, but who are content to hold those inferences as matters of ‘private opinion,’ without charging them upon the Church; and without at all reproaching those who do not go as far in this respect as they do with breach of ordination vows, or rejection of our doctrinal standards. These are the true *HIGH CHURCHMEN*; weighty in influence; high in respectability as well as churchmanship, but dwelling together in unity with their brethren, who cannot go along with them to what Bishop White calls ‘the extreme,’ by which they are distinguished.

Fourthly. There is another class of Episcopalians in this country. They are those who hold with the ‘*Moderate Churchman*,’ the leading *facts* of Episcopacy, and also with the ‘*High Churchman*,’ the *inferences* that he draws from those facts; but they are not content like the latter, to hold those inferences as ‘matter of private opinion.’

They insist that both facts and inferences are authoritatively required in the standards of the Church, and that every conscientious Episcopalian is bound in truth and honor to maintain them both. They may, for want of a better term, be denominated HYPER-Churchmen. With these men originate almost all the difficulties within, and the disturbances beyond our borders. They too, are few in number, but not feeble in influence. That influence is created and kept alive by three methods of procedure, the efficiency of which will be understood as soon as they are mentioned; although the means by which such a deception is kept up may seem somewhat remarkable. They constantly endeavour to identify themselves with the third class of Episcopalians above mentioned, (the 'High Churchmen,') with whom, however, they essentially differ, and from whom they are to be carefully distinguished. Again, they as constantly attempt to identify their chief opposers, the advocates of moderate Episcopacy, with the class first named, the *Ultra Low Churchmen*; who consider all forms of Church government as equally good. And finally they have learnt from a few noisy Church politicians amongst the laity, who are invariably associated with the clerical leaders of this party, that sound may sometimes be made to pass for sense, in discussion; noise for numbers, in a deliberative assembly; and pretension for prerogative, in the exercise of official power.'

The more we look at this classification, the more we are convinced of its correctness. And this conviction springs, not merely from our confidence in the judgment of the writer and his opportunities of information, but from the agreement of the statement with facts previously known, and from the solution which it affords of some phenomena otherwise inexplicable. Believing, with the writer that it is likely to 'prevent important misunderstanding,' we shall not content ourselves with having copied it, but add a few remarks, to make the case, if possible, still clearer to our Presbyterian readers.

The first observation that occurs to us is this, that the distinction between the third and fourth classes, the 'High Churchmen' and the 'Hyper Churchmen,' as the writer calls them, is one which respects internal relations only, and has no effect upon the bearing of the parties towards other denominations. If two men agree in thinking that there cannot be a non-episcopal church, it makes very little difference to him who is unchurched whether either of them holds this doctrine as an article of faith or as a matter of 'private opinion.' Should one of them insist upon its being made a test of churchmanship, we can easily conceive that the demand might be very annoying to more 'moderate churchmen.' But out of doors, the difference between two such bigots is as insignificant as that between two members

of a family, who agree in thinking that their neighbours are 'no gentlemen,' and only quarrel as to the expediency of making all the other inmates of the household say the same. The truth is, that so far as the recognition of other churches is concerned, the old fashioned High Churchman and the modern Puseyite are one and the same thing. Though every High Churchman is not of course a Puseyite, every Puseyite is of course a High Churchman. The designations differ in extent, but there is a certain ground common to both, and this common ground includes the very question before us. For this reason, and because the other distinctions which the writer makes have reference, not to mere internal difficulties, but to the foreign relations of the church, we consider ourselves justified in lumping these two sets together, under the appropriate and familiar title of High Churchmen. And thus the four distinct classes named in the Recorder are reduced to three.

The next point, to which we must invite attention, is the expression quoted from the Bishop of London, that episcopacy is essential, 'not to the being, but only to the well being of a church?' We are willing to give the respectable writer of the article before us the full benefit of this liberal language in its most liberal sense. But we cannot dissemble our suspicions, that it admits of an interpretation which would make it any thing but satisfactory as a disavowal of unscriptural exclusiveness. To what extent a church, like any thing else, may be deprived of all that gives it value, and yet exist, or how much may be included in the comprehensive notion of 'well-being,' are questions which different men might answer in a very different manner; and this ambiguity or latitude of meaning must acquit us of being unduly *exigeant*, when we ask for something more than this epigrammatic dictum of the learned Bishop, as a proof of moderation in our Moderate Church friends.

In this view of the matter we are confirmed by the remarkable fact, which we shall next advert to, that the definition or description of the Moderate Church party, contained in the same sentence with the phrase just quoted, and immediately preceding it, is negative in form. The specific peculiarity of the Moderate Churchmen is something that they do not. They 'draw no inferences' that would invalidate the ecclesiastical standing of other Christians. If this form of expression could be insulated, and looked at apart from all that now serves to interpret or modify its meaning,

it might be accepted as entirely satisfactory. But when we connect it with the fact already brought to light, that the tendency of late, among Moderate Churchmen, has been to this negative position, to the substitution of silence or evasion for explicit recognition, and that this change, so far as it goes, involves or threatens a virtual merging of the Low Church in the High; our friends must bear with us if we 'ask for more.' They are content with holding the 'great facts of episcopacy, its apostolic origin and primitive establishment,' and therefore 'draw no inferences' as to other churches. But did it never occur to them that these 'great facts' carry inferences along with them, whether drawn or not, unless these are expressly disavowed? A man is charged by his neighbour with being an impostor and with making gain by false pretences. Another neighbour is appealed to for his testimony, and replies as follows, 'I hold the great facts of my own integrity and honesty. Content with these I draw no inferences as to my neighbours.' This might be very charitable if there had been no dispute or accusation. The notorious existence of grave charges from another quarter gives a new character to the declaration. The silence and forbearance, which in other circumstances might have been benevolent, is now even more offensive than the open charge, because, from its negative evasive character, it engenders indefinite suspicions far more difficult to meet and answer than a palpable calumny. The man who, in private conversation, and without suggestion *ab extra*, professes to say nothing against his neighbour, may be understood to testify in his favour; but not when he is placed upon the stand in court, to vindicate a character aspersed by others. These are the grounds on which the mere forbearance to 'draw inferences,' or the determination to 'say nothing,' to 'make no allusion' to others, must be regarded as coming far short of open and express acknowledgment. And the marked agreement, as to this negative policy, between Mr. Southgate's vindication, the Recorder's classification, and the growing practice of Moderate Churchmen, is a fact which we cannot but regard as most significant.

Our next remark is, that this classification leaves no room for the great body of the Low Church party in the Church of England. This is a startling fact; but how shall we escape from it? To which of these categories are we to refer such men as the conductors of the London Record

and their numerous supporters? Not to the first; for they expressly disavow that indifference to the forms of church-government, which is stated as characteristic of the 'Ultra Low Churchmen.' They hold the 'great facts of episcopacy,' and adhere to their own church from conviction that it is the best and the most scriptural. They cannot be placed in the second division, if, as it seems, the specific attribute of this is a refusal to 'draw inferences.' The Low Churchmen of England do expressly draw inferences, at least by rejecting those drawn by the High Churchmen. They expressly recognize the Presbyterian and other non-episcopal societies as churches, and insist on such a recognition as an obligatory act of Christian fellowship and brotherly love. Now this position, for reasons which have been already stated, is, in the present state of things, essentially distinct from that of mere forbearance, silence, or evasion.

The only way in which the old Low Church party, as we have described it, can be fairly comprehended under the second head of the Recorder's arrangement, is by giving to the latter such an exposition as will make what it says about not drawing inferences equivalent in meaning to an explicit recognition of other churches. If this be its meaning, we are perfectly satisfied, as to the spirit of the writer and of those who are like-minded. But we very much doubt whether these terms would be regarded as convertible by the great body of 'Moderate Churchmen.' We suppose the truth to be that different men would understand and act upon the principle here laid down in very different ways. Some would at once and cordially admit that by refusing to draw inferences to our disadvantage they intended a positive disclaimer of such inferences. Others would stick to the negation, entrench themselves behind their right to keep their own secret, and refuse to be catechised. And thus this large class of 'Moderate Churchmen' would be separated into two distinct and uncongenial sets, the genuine Low Churchmen of the Old School, and the High Low Churchmen of the New.

Such an adjustment of parties as brings these classes together under a common name, like that of 'Moderate Churchmen,' is strongly recommended by the obvious facilities which it affords for avoiding or postponing a breach of unity and strength in one large division of the church, and also for repelling the humiliating charge of being lax

Episcopalians, or even Presbyterians in disguise. Some indication of this latter motive we think we can perceive in the suggestion made by the writer now before us, that the 'Hyper-Churchmen' are constantly attempting to identify their chief opposer with the 'Ultra Low-Churchmen.' The fear of this imputation has no doubt led some to take the middle ground of 'non-committal' and to vindicate their Churchmanship, which had been brought into suspicion through the open recognition of their brethren, by simply refusing to draw inferences respecting them, by saying nothing about them, and making no allusion to them. Among the troops by which the fortress of episcopacy is surrounded, there are some whom a portion of the garrison regard as friends, in arms against the common enemy, while the rest not only reckon them as enemies, but look upon their charitable comrades as unfaithful to their trust, if not as traitors. Tired of this mortifying imputation, a part of those who have hitherto insisted on acknowledging these friends without the walls, begin to hold their peace, and to decline drawing inferences—nothing more. Open hostility they carefully avoid. They never dream of aiming at these friends when they fire. They only fire away, and let their comrades do the same, as if these friends had no existence, or as if they did not see them—that is all. Such opponents are certainly entitled to the praise of being prudent if not 'moderate' belligerents.

If, in this discussion, we have done injustice to the motives or the principles of any, none can regret it more sincerely than ourselves. We have felt ourselves called upon to state, in the plainest terms, what we regard as an alarming change in the position taken by many at least of the Low Church party with respect to other churches. If there is no such indisposition to acknowledge other Christian bodies as we have imagined and suggested, it is an error of all others the most easily corrected, by a bare performance of the act in question. If, on the other hand, evangelical Episcopalians are really unwilling to make this acknowledgment, we think it would be easy to satisfy impartial men, that they are greatly in the wrong; that their unwillingness to make such avowals must arise from the same mistaken view of the nature of the church and of the ministry, which lies at the foundation of the system of Puseyism; that it is part of the same leaven which has wrought out

the evils they themselves deplore; that such doubt or denial of the validity of Presbyterian orders is contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England and her divines for a hundred years after the Reformation; that her authoritative canons and official acts, and of her teaching at every period of her history; that by such denial, whether actual or actual, they place themselves and Romanism on the one side, and all Protestant Christendom on the other; that by so doing they turn their backs on the friends of truth, and give their countenance to its enemies; and finally that they thus commit the very sin which they appear most anxious to avoid, the sin of schism. Episcopalianism must see that this is a turning point. Other denominations must, in fidelity to truth and to God, insist that the churches of Christ shall not be disowned, and real fellowship with those who thus disown them must be impossible.

We conclude with a summary recapitulation of the points which we have touched and endeavoured to illustrate.

1. The real distinction between High Church and Low Church lies in the recognition or denial of non-episcopal societies as churches.

2. There is reason to fear that the real Low Church party, in this country, has begun to disappear, and that it will be, sooner or later, merged in the High Church.

3. The middle ground, over which the transition is likely to take place, is that of 'saying nothing,' and declining to 'draw inferences' as to the validity of non-episcopal institutions.

4. The only way in which any men, or class of men, can satisfactorily wash their hands of this defection, is by clear and explicit admission of the fact, which the High Church openly denies, and as to which the High Low Church stands mute.

5. This refusal to acknowledge or deny the character of other churches is, in effect, as exclusive as the High Church doctrine, and in spirit, less magnanimous.

6. Against this spurious and insidious form of Protestant Episcopacy, Presbyterians and other Christians are not only authorized but bound to contend, by exposing its true character and utter inconsistency.

7. To include in this condemnation those, however few, who still maintain the genuine spirit of the Low Church party, and of the Church of England in its best days, or to

represent them as less faithful to their own communion than their High Church opponents, is at once a perversion of historical truth and a breach of Christian charity.

Charles Goodell

- ART. VI.—1. *The Integrity of our National Union vs. Abolitionism. An Argument from the Bible, in proof of the position; that believing masters ought to be honoured and obeyed by their servants, and tolerated in, not excommunicated from, the Church of God, being part of a speech delivered before the Synod of Cincinnati, on the subject of Slavery. September 19th, and 20th, 1843. By Rev. George Junkin, D. D., President of Miami University. Cincinnati: 1843. pp. 79.*
2. *The Contrast, or the Bible vs. Abolitionism: an Exegetical Argument. By Rev. William Graham, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian church, Oxford, Ohio. 1844.*
3. *A Review of the Rev. Dr. Junkin's Synodical Speech, in defence of American Slavery, with an outline of the Bible argument against Slavery. Cincinnati. 1844. pp. 136.*
4. *Line of Demarcation between the Secular and Spiritual Kingdoms. By the Rev. William Wisner, D. D. Ithaca. 1844. pp. 22.*

USAGE often gives a comprehensive word a limited sense. If, in our day, and in this country, you ask a man whether he is an abolitionist, he will promptly answer no, though, he may believe with Jefferson that slavery is the greatest curse that can be inflicted on a nation; or with Cassius M. Clay, that it is destructive of industry, the mother of ignorance, opposed to literature, antagonist to the fine arts, destructive of mechanical excellence; that it corrupts the people, retards population and wealth, impoverishes the soil, destroys national wealth, and is incompatible with constitutional liberty. A man may believe and say all this, as many of the wisest and best men of the South believe and openly avow, and yet be no abolitionist. If every man who regards slavery as an evil, and wishes to see it abolished, were an abolitionist, then nine tenths of the people in this country would be abolitionists. What then is an abolitionist? He is a man