

THE  
A M E R I C A N  
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL  
REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES, No. IV.—OCTOBER, 1863.

---

ART. I.—PRESBYTERIANISM:—ITS AFFINITIES.\*

By Rev. ALBERT BARNES, Philadelphia.

THE occasion on which we are met is one on which we may speak freely of our own system of religion, with no violation of a proper respect for other denominations of Christians. Entertaining views as Presbyterians which we regard as of great value to ourselves, and of importance to the world, it cannot be improper to suggest the grounds on which we regard those views as of value and importance, or to endeavor to strengthen the hands of each other in our efforts to maintain them, and to commend them to the attention of our fellow-men. There are reasons why we are Presbyterians and not Prelatists or Independents; why we are Calvinists and not Arminians, Arians, or Socinians; why we are respectively attached to one or the other of the great branches of the Presbyterian family represented here, and not to the Greek church; to the Roman Catholic church; to the Episcopal church; to the Methodist or Baptist churches; to a Socinian

\* Delivered as an address before the Presbyterian Historical Society in Philadelphia, May 5, 1863. On account of the length of this address, a portion of it (pp. 550-556) was omitted in the delivery. Though requested by the Society for publication, it is proper to say, that for the sentiments in that portion of the address, the Society can be considered in no way responsible. A. B.

organization or a Society of 'Friends'; and there can be no want of charity towards others, if, when we come together *as* Presbyterians, we suggest those reasons to each other. Among ourselves indeed there are reasons satisfactory to our own minds, why, in our respective church relations, we are attached to one or the other of the different branches of the great Presbyterian family, but this is not an occasion on which it is proper to refer to those reasons. At proper times and places we advocate and defend those particular views, each one for himself: here we meet on a common level, to consider the import of the term which binds us all together as a distinct community, divided in form but not in heart from the rest of the Christian world, and in reference also to our own particular views, to enquire whether the grounds of difference among ourselves may not be further narrowed down, or made wholly to vanish; whether there may not be in the common term under which we are assembled—*Presbyterian*—so much of dignity, value, and importance, as to make it desirable that our minor differences should disappear altogether. The privilege which we thus claim for ourselves, we do not deny to others. We do not question the right of any other Christians freely to state the reasons why they hold their peculiar views; we do not deny that they have the right to examine with the utmost freedom the reasons which we allege in behalf of our own views; we claim, in turn, the right of examining theirs.

On this occasion, with almost no reference to what has been said before, or whether what I shall say may not have been better said—and indeed without knowing *what has been said*—I shall invite your attention to some remarks on the *affinities of Presbyterianism*—or, in this general topic, **PRESBYTERIANISM:—ITS AFFINITIES.**

In the investigations of science there are always two points before the mind of the investigator:—the intrinsic nature of the object, and its affinities. He does not feel that he understands fully the former of these without an acquaintance with the latter; the latter may be, in fact, practically of much more importance than the former. Many of the works of nature are little known except by their affinities; none of them are fully understood except by those affinities. The original element—the atom—might perhaps be taken out by itself, and examined *as* purely independent, and might be described as such, but this would give but a very imperfect knowledge of its real nature considered as an object of scientific research. Its hardness, its weight, its tenacity, its elasticity, its malleability, its

shape, might be ascertained, but this knowledge would be most imperfect, and of very little practical importance in the arts of life, or in understanding the world around us. Iron, gold, the diamond, might be thus described; oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen might be thus examined; the sixty or more elementary bodies which, according to the chemists, make up in combination the whole material universe, might be thus accurately investigated, and their properties *as* independent bodies defined, but we should feel that we had scarcely entered on a knowledge of the true nature of these elementary bodies. We want to know what they are in combination; what are their affinities; with what others any one of them naturally unites; in what proportions they combine; what is the compound body which they thus produce. We ask with what oxygen naturally combines, and we study the results in the air, in the water; in plants and animals; in the varieties of the vegetable creation, and the tribes of animals that people the air, the earth, and the seas; in acids and oxides; in vitality, in colors, in the breath which we inhale, in the water which we drink, in the vegetable on which we feed, in the living and the moving world around us. Science is busy in finding out these affinities:—the elements which naturally combine with each other, the proportions in which they combine, and the results of the combination. Our knowledge of nature is practically measured by our attainments in this. These sixty or more elementary bodies make up the world; make up, so far as we know, all the material universe. If they lay scattered around with no affinities; if they were like separate grains of sand on the sea-shore, or pebbles strewed over a field, or boulders lying detached from each other where they were dropped by masses of floating ice and earth, or borne from some distant mountain, there could be no world—there could be no science. The most accurate knowledge of sands and pebbles and boulders in detail, could be of no practical use; nor could that knowledge ever be reduced to a *system* of science. It is only as combined that we feel an interest in them; it is only as combined that they make up the beautiful creation around us and above us.

What is thus true in regard to the elementary principles of matter, is also true of the principles of moral science and religion. We do not know fully what they are until we understand their *affinities*. Do the principles submitted to us combine readily with liberty; with just views of the rights of conscience; with a proper sense of responsibility; with social virtues; with the progress of the race; with the cultivation of the arts and sciences; with the development of the human faculties? Are they likely to be found where there is most

intelligence, most refinement, most purity of life, most courtesy of manners, most freedom of opinion, most elevated views of the dignity of man and of the government of God? Or is there a natural affinity with despotism, with slavery, with impurity of life and morals, with scepticism, with superstition, with atheism? What were the natural affinities of the doctrines of Democritus, of Epicurus, of Zeno, of Socrates, of Plato? What were the natural affinities of the opinions of Hobbes, of Spinoza, of Mr. Hume? What were those of Fourier and of Comte? What were those of Voltaire and Volney? What were those of Calvin, of Luther, of the Wesleys, of Jonathan Edwards?

Presbyterianism, whose affinities I desire, as I may be able, to illustrate, is properly a system of *government* in the church, as distinguished from Prelacy and Independency. It has, indeed, become now so combined with a certain form of *doctrine*, from a natural affinity which I shall attempt soon to explain, that we use the term familiarly, not as referring to the form of government, but in this combination with the Calvinistic doctrine. So close is this affinity; so uniform is this connection, and so prominent is the doctrine with which it combines, that in the popular estimation the *doctrine* is the prominent or main thing, and the popular feeling against it, if there is any, is arrayed against that rather than against the system as a mode of ecclesiastical government. In fact, in its bearing on the community, and considered with reference to preaching, the mode of government is rarely adverted to, and perhaps could be made to excite little feeling in the community in any way. Considered as a mere form of government, indeed, it has so much that is in common with our civil institutions, and so much, as we shall see, in accordance with just notions of liberty and the progress of the world, that it would seem to be easy to commend it to the favorable regards of mankind, if it were not for the odium excited by a form of doctrine with which, in fact, it is now invariably combined.

Yet it is strictly, and only, in itself *a system of government*; a system which, so far as would be apparent in an abstract consideration of its principles, *might* be combined with any form of religious doctrine, or with any forms and ceremonies in the public worship of God. Nothing could be detected in it, considered abstractly as a mode of government, which would forbid the idea that it might be combined in an actual organization of the church with Arminianism, with High Arianism, with Low Arianism, with Socinianism of the lowest forms; with the worship of God by a Liturgy; with splendid vestments, with processions, with pilgrimages and with genuflexions;

with the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration ; with the Mass, or with the doctrine of Purgatory. We shall see, however, whether we can explain the cause or not, that it actually *has* no affinity for any of these views of doctrine or these ceremonies, but that its whole career in the world has been in fact a career of steady repellantcy to them all :—as we understand the properties of matter by their repellancies, as well as by their attractions.

Considered, therefore, properly as a system of *government*, Presbyterianism comprises the following as cardinal principles :

1. That all power in the church belongs to Christ ; or that he is the supreme Head of the church, and that all power which is not derived from him is an invasion of his prerogatives, and is in fact an usurpation.

2. That power in the church resides, under Him, with the people, and belongs to them as a brotherhood. It is not derived from men who profess to be descendants of the Apostles, and invested, therefore, with authority over the church ; it is not lodged with a clergy — a class regarded as invested with authority separate from, and independent of the church — a class to perpetuate their own order with no reference to the will of the church ; it is not derived from the state as having any right to legislate for the church as such, or to prescribe in regard to its doctrines, its ceremonies, or its mode of worship ; it is a “ self-governing society, distinct from the state, having its officers and laws, and, therefore, an administrative government of its own ”. This point has been so fully and so ably illustrated before this Society by one who has preceded me in this service, that, as I should have no ability to add any thing material to what has been said, and as there would be no occasion to attempt to illustrate it farther, it is not necessary to dwell on it.\*

3. A third material and essential point in regard to Presbyterianism, is the entire equality of the clergy, or the fact that there is but one order of ministers in the church. This doctrine we hold in the most absolute sense ; on this point there is no difference of opinion among us. We do not, indeed, claim that the belief of this is peculiar to us. Alike in the truth and the importance of this doctrine, we agree with a very considerable portion of the Protestant world, and in defence of the doctrine we make common cause with them. Holding this doctrine, we, without any inconsistency, recognize cheerfully

\* “ What is Presbyterianism ? An Address delivered before the Presbyterian Historical Society, May 1, 1855.” The main principles here referred to are illustrated at length in that address.

and fully the validity of the ordination and the ministrations of other denominations, and regard them as wholly on a level with us, as we regard ourselves in every sense as on a level with them. Neither in the theory of the doctrine, nor in fact, is there any spirit of *exclusiveness* on our part towards other churches as founded on this article of our belief, nor are we, nor can we, be constrained to take a position before the world which compels us to hold up the ministers of other denominations as having no right to minister in holy things; which would compel us to maintain that their ordination, or that baptism and the Lord's supper as administered by them, are invalid; or which would make it necessary to take the position before the world that the churches to which they minister, as well as they who officiate in those churches, are 'left to the uncovenanted mercies of God'—to the charitable hope that they *may be saved*—as the hope is entertained by those who hold those views on a scale not less large and broad, that Turks, and Jews, and Samaritans, and heathen, *may* in like manner be saved.

This doctrine of the equality of the clergy we regard as one of great importance. Taking the history of the church at large, we do not believe that its importance can be easily over-estimated. The effect of the opposite view—of a distinction among the clergy—of different grades of ministers—we think can be traced far back in the history of the church, by an *affinity* which is natural, and which it would be easy to explain, with pomp, and ceremony, and formality in religion; with a spirit of worldly aspiring in the clergy; with despotic civil institutions; with a want of freedom among the people; with the various forms of corruption prevailing in the Greek and Roman Catholic communions; and with the forms of despotism and of darkness which spread over Europe in the middle ages. Charles I, with more sagacity as a man than practical wisdom as a despotic monarch when a nation was struggling for freedom; with more of truth than of prudence as one who by his office was pledged to the support of Prelacy, uttered the memorable maxim, "No bishop, no king:" meaning, and stating a great truth, that "if there is no despotic power in the church, there can be no despotic power in the state; or, if there be liberty in the church, there will be liberty in the state". \*

4. A fourth material principle in Presbyterianism is, that there is to be *government* in the church. This we regard as an essential principle. We attach great importance to the idea of government; of a government *as such*. We shall see, in the course of these remarks, how this idea springs from our Calvin-

\* What is Presbyterianism? p. 11.

istic or doctrinal view, and by what a natural affinity it becomes, as derived from that, united with the Presbyterian mode of administration; and we shall see also, how it is connected with the idea of *loyalty as such*, and what position the Presbyterian church, when true to its principles, occupies in regard to loyalty and rebellion. It pertains to the present part of my discourse only as a principle which runs through all the arrangements in the church. Government is "the exercise of authority"; it is "direction and restraint over the actions of men in communities, societies, or states". *Webster's Dic.* It is not *advice*, however wise such advice may be; it is not *counsel*, however valuable and important such counsel may be; it is not a suggestion of *expediency*, however proper, in its place, such a suggestion may be; it is not an expression of *opinion* by those who are experienced, wise, or learned, however venerable by years, or however worthy of respect from their rank or social position; it is, as far as it is proper to be exercised, *authority*. It is power. It is designed to settle and determine things. It implies, as its correlative, obedience. The submission which it demands is not the mere submission which the mind renders to good advice, or sage counsel, or sound reason; it is the submission due to those who are appointed to rule, and who are entrusted with authority. Up to the point where it is legitimate, and is not an usurpation, it becomes obligatory on the conscience; and is to be regarded as a religious duty, an act of submission to God.

We attach great importance to this in the church, as we do in the state; an importance to be measured, when properly understood, by the evils of anarchy and disorder. We believe that the church, like the state, is to be characterized by order, and that in the one such order is not less important than in the other. We regard it as connected with all just ideas of right; with all ideas of propriety in a community. Our ideas of *government* are that it is universal. The worlds which God has made, and over which he presides, are not regulated by advice, but by law; a family listens to the expression of the will of the parent not as good counsel but as law; a civil ruler is not merely a wise man, a good counsellor, but is one who is to administer law; a judge decides a case not by giving advice, however wise, but by a sentence declaring what is the law; a community is kept in order, and made prosperous, not by good opinions, but by the steady operation of law. We regard it, therefore, as a very important principle that God has set in the church 'helps, *governments*', as well as 'teachers', 'miracles', 'gifts of healing', and 'diversities of tongues'. 1 Cor. xii, 28.

5. A fifth material principle in Presbyterianism, is, that it is a *representative* system of government. It supposes, indeed, as has been already remarked, that the power resides with the people—the church—and is to be exercised by them, and that in no case is power to be exercised which has not been conceded by them; yet still it is power to be exercised not by them directly, and as a body, but by those who are chosen by them, and to whom that power is delegated. In this respect it is contrasted, on the one hand, with the exercise of power as derived from the apostles by those who claim to be their successors, and on the other with power exercised by the assembly itself, or the body convened for this purpose: distinguished, on the one hand, from the monarchical principle, and on the other from strict and radical democracy. In this, it accords with the best ideas of liberty in the state. All just notions of liberty have tended to the establishment of this principle, and in the best modern constitutions it is admitted as an elementary principle. It is in fact, in the state, the result of all the conflicts for freedom. The world has made the experiment of the exercise of unrepresented power and authority in the monarchical and despotic forms of government, under the claim of the 'divine right of kings' on the one hand, and of the strict democratic principle on the other, in the struggles for freedom, and has oscillated between one and the other in the great conflicts and throes of nations—dynasties setting up the claim to a divine authority, and swaying a sceptre of tyranny when all liberty of the people was disowned or destroyed, and then a people rising in their might, and dethroning monarchs, and taking the government into their own hands, and exercising the authority directly themselves, until disorder, anarchy, weakness, and failure, prepared the way for a new claim of despotism, by an old hereditary title, or by a military usurpation. In the history of the world no safe medium has been found—no system that would combine authority and freedom; that would constitute a government, and yet not invade the rights of the people; that would secure the best administration of *law*, except that of the principle of representation. *That* combines authority and freedom; that gives to government the sanction of law; that makes the people feel that the authority exercised is their own authority; that furnishes a security against usurped power; that gives stability as distinguished from the actings of a mob; and that principle furnishes the means of defining the power to be exercised by a government, and of committing the great interests of a people where the trust will be least likely to be abused. We are confident that



this principle has been better secured in the Presbyterian mode of administration in the church than in any other form in which Christians have been organized into communities.

6. A *sixth* principle in the Presbyterian mode of government is, that the power of government is limited and bounded by a constitution. The power exercised is not arbitrary power. It is not a mere expression of *will* on the part of the people, or on the part of those who rule. It is not even by an independent and a private interpretation of the Bible, the source of all authority indeed, and the ultimate appeal in determining the government of the church. It is, in reference to government, by authority as *agreed on*; as defined and limited by a constitution. A constitution concedes power, and expresses the limits of power. It defines what may be done; and it prescribes what shall not be done by the very fact that the authority to do a certain thing is *not* found there. The fact that there is a constitution is of the nature of a compact between the church and all who enter the church. It is a public pledge that no power shall be exercised which is not specified in this constitution; and that no one, in regard to his opinions, his faith, or his conduct, shall be affected in any way except under the well-considered and clearly-defined processes arranged in the constitution. An arbitrary sovereign has no limit except that of will or caprice; a mob has no rule of action, nor can any interests intrusted to it have a basis of security. A constitution defines and limits every right; constitutes security in regard to rights; makes the principles already established permanent; encourages labor, secures the avails of industry, diffuses contentment, intelligence, the just administration of law, safety, and peace. All just notions of liberty in modern times are connected with the idea of a *constitution*, and all the progress which society makes is identified with the guarantees and safeguards found under a constitutional government. As agreeing, therefore, with these notions, and as connected with all that is valuable in the state as well as in the church, we, as Presbyterians, attach great importance to the idea of a *constitution*, and have incorporated that idea into our ecclesiastical arrangements more prominently than has been done by any other denomination of Christians.

With these views of Presbyterianism in the strict sense, considered as a system of *government*, I proceed now to notice some of its *affinities*.

The first which I notice, the most remarkable, but not the most obvious, is its affinity for the Calvinistic system of doc-

trine. I notice this first, not because it is the most obvious, but because the two, which would seem to have no natural affinity for each other, have in fact become so combined as to constitute one system in the general estimation of men, and the name *Presbyterianism* is now commonly so used as to designate the result of this amalgamation. Whatever of power there may be in Presbyterianism, for good or for evil, is now understood to be the result of this combination; whatever of confidence there is in the system by those who love it, is connected essentially with this combination; whatever of hatred there is towards the system by wicked men—and there is not a little of that—is hatred cherished not so much against the system considered as a mode of ecclesiastical government, as against a system having in itself an element of power combined with the Calvinistic system of doctrines.

I said that the combination is more remarkable than it is obvious. There would seem, in the nature of the case, to be no natural affinity—no perceptible reason, why this particular form of government should combine with this particular system of doctrines; why the Presbyterian mode of administration and discipline should not be found, in fact, combined with Arminianism, Sabellianism, Pelagianism, Socinianism; or why, when either of these forms of doctrine have effected a lodgment in a Presbytery or Synod, it should not secure a permanent hold, as they may with Prelacy or Independency.

The facts, however, are well established, in whatever way they may be accounted for; and these facts, therefore, as in the natural affinities of the gases, the acids, the metals, the alkalis, become one of the means of ascertaining the true nature of the system. As a matter of fact in the history of the church, the Presbyterian mode of government does *not* combine with Arminianism, with Sabellianism, with Pelagianism, with Socinianism, and if such a union occurs at any time it is only a temporary, and is manifestly a forced connection. There are no permanent Arminian, Pelagian, Socinian Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies on the earth. There are no permanent instances where these forms of belief or unbelief take on the Presbyterian form. There are no Presbyterian forms of ecclesiastical administration where they would be long retained. Arminianism combines freely and naturally with Methodism, with Prelacy, with the Greek church, with the Papacy; Pelagianism, Sabellianism, Arianism, Socinianism combine freely with Independency, and most naturally assume that form of administration. There

was doubtless some reason why Dr. Priestley, why Mr. Belsham, why Dr. Channing were *not* Presbyterians ; there was a reason why Calvin, Knox, Chalmers, Witherspoon *were*.

The causes of this, not obvious at the first view, may, perhaps, be satisfactorily stated.

(a) Each springs essentially from the same idea—the idea of government, of regularity, of order ; the idea that God rules ; that government is desirable ; that things are, and should be, fixed and stable ; that there is, and should be, law ; that the affairs of the universe at large, the affairs of society, and the affairs of individuals, should be founded on settled principles, and should not be left to chance or hap-hazard. Calvinism, though it seem to be, and though it is often represented as a mere system of doctrine, or of abstract dogmas having no philosophical foundation and no valuable practical bearing, is, in fact, a system of government — a method and form in which the Divine power is put forth in the administration of the affairs of the universe. It is based on the idea that God rules ; that he has a plan ; that the plan is fixed and certain ; that it does not depend on the fluctuations of the human will, on the caprice of the human heart, or on contingencies and uncertain and undetermined events in human affairs. It supposes that God is supreme ; that he has authority ; that he has a right to exercise dominion ; that for the good of the universe, that right should be exercised, and that infinite power is put forth only in accordance with a plan. Its essential idea, therefore, is that of authority, regularity, order, law ; and hence it naturally combines with that form of administration where stability, regularity, order, are most recognized ; where there *is* a government ; where the government is administered on the fixed principles of a constitution, and is not dependent on the changing phases of society, or the caprices of human feeling.

(b) Each, as we shall soon see, naturally draws to itself the same class of minds. What that class is, it will be most convenient to describe in another part of this address. There is in the world, in all countries and communities, a class that characteristically loves order, law, just government, fixed principles ; that seeks to lay the foundations of society and of government deep and firm ; that aims to carry fixed principles into the family administration, into the intercourse of man with man, into civil institutions, and into the laws of a country ; which seeks guarantees for the rights of man, and the administration of justice ; which leaves as little as possible

to the feelings of a populace, and removes government as far as possible from the ascendancy and sway of passion ; which seeks to preserve and send forward to future times all that has been secured of value in the past ; which has a fondness for permanent endowments in education, in colleges and universities, and in eleemosynary institutions.

Presbyterianism in its fixedness, its order, and its love of law, well represents that idea, and draws to itself that class of minds—not exclusively, I willingly admit, but naturally ; Calvinism, as a system of doctrine, beginning with an eternal plan on the part of God, regarding the universe as governed by settled purpose and law, and its affairs as in no sense under the control of chance, and as, therefore, fixed and stable, draws to itself also naturally—I will not here say by any means exclusively—the same class of mind. Yet though it is not in either case so universal that we can claim that all of such classes of minds are drawn to the system, yet it is so natural an affinity, the objects dear to such minds can be so well secured by the principles of Presbyterianism as a system of government, and by Calvinism as a system of doctrine, that we are not surprised to find that there *is* a large portion of the community always that finds its views better represented in this *combined* system than could be found elsewhere, or that these views are, in fact, so often found united together.

(c) Each, therefore—Presbyterianism as a scheme of government, and Calvinism as a system of doctrine—contemplates the same *results*, and we are not surprised to find them seeking a natural alliance, and often combined. That they may exist separately, I do not deny. That the Presbyterian mode of government has been found in a few instances originally combined with other forms of doctrine, or that, in some instances, as now in Geneva, and in some of the Protestant churches in France, in England, in Ireland, the form of Presbyterian government has been retained after the churches have materially departed from the original faith which bound the two systems together, is not to be denied. Nor is it to be denied that the Calvinistic doctrine may be found under other modes of ecclesiastical government. To a certain extent it *is* found in connection with Prelacy and Independency, but still the regular historical fact is, that the two seek an alliance, and that they have such a natural affinity, and are so often found together, as to justify the popular use of the term *Presbyterianism* as denoting a peculiar mode of church government combined with Calvinistic doctrines. It is the carrying out ideas of order, authority, and law as manifested in government and in

doctrine ; as a statement of the way in which God controls the universe, and of the best mode of preserving order, and of securing just government on earth.

Proceeding now with this idea of Presbyterianism *as* the union of a certain mode of government with a certain form of doctrine, I shall notice some of the affinities of the system as thus understood.

The most obvious, perhaps, is its affinity for a simple mode of worship. The facts as bearing on this point are so well understood as to demand little more than a bare suggestion that they are so. Nothing is more certain than that history, as a general statement, records the progress and the prevalence of Presbyterianism as connected with the simplest forms of worship ; nothing is clearer than that the word Presbyterianism suggests at once to the popular mind the idea of a repugnance to gorgeous forms of devotion, to imposing rites and ceremonies, to a liturgy, to splendid vestments, to worship celebrated in magnificent cathedrals, and to the idea of grace communicated by official sanctity in a priesthood. The lofty cathedrals of the old world were built with other ideas of worship than those which are embraced by Presbyterians. It was always difficult to adjust the old church of St. Peter's at Geneva to the worship celebrated there with Calvin as a pastor, or to keep up an idea of a correspondence between the comparatively simple worship which *he* introduced there, and the lofty edifice built with reference to the pomp of the Roman Catholic worship. Even now, with all that there is of rites and forms in the Episcopal Church, no one can enter Westminster Abbey or York Minster without feeling a sense of incongruity and unfitness between the vast and magnificent structures where the worship is celebrated, and the mode of the worship ; and nothing could adapt those structures, or St. Mark's at Venice, or the cathedrals at Cologne or Milan, or St. Peter's at Rome, to the idea of *Presbyterian* worship. In the very form of the Gothic edifice there is a manifest incongruity between the structure and the modes of worship preferred by Presbyterians ; and the idea which strikes the mind where such a structure is reared is that, as it was originally adapted to a mode of worship materially unlike the *Presbyterian* view of the design of devotion, so it will be forever impossible to combine the two.

So remarkable is this principle ; so deeply is it, from some cause, imbedded in the very nature of Presbyterianism, that it has been impossible to retain in connection with it, or to revive permanently even those modified forms of devotion, and those

remnants of pomp and show in the worship of God, which some of the Reformers adopted under Presbyterian organizations. It is known that some of the Reformed churches under Presbyterian organizations adopted, in a modified way, Liturgical Forms of worship; it is known also that having naturally died away, from the very nature of Presbyterianism, an attempt has been made in our times to revive them. Yet these forms cannot be revived and perpetuated under Presbyterian auspices. There is, from some cause, a repellancy between the two, and Liturgical Forms, imposing ceremonies in religion, pomp, and splendor of ritual, will seek and find their natural affinities in other denominations. They cannot be attached permanently to Presbyterianism. The history of Presbyterianism demonstrates that, for some cause, it seeks simplicity of worship, and that its true spirit flourishes only there.

It is not difficult to account for this fact. Presbyterianism, in the form in which I am now noticing it, as a combination of a particular mode of government with a certain system of doctrine, gives such a prominence to one great doctrine, and guards that doctrine with such anxious care, that it looks with a jealous eye on all those forms and ceremonies which would tend in any way to render it obscure, or to displace it in the estimation of the worshipper. That doctrine is the doctrine of justification by faith. It is in the view of all Presbyterians a great principle that the merit of our salvation is wholly in the Redeemer—in the sacrifice which he made for mankind on the cross; that that doctrine is to stand *alone* in the matter of man's salvation; that nothing else is to enter into a sinner's justification; that there is no human merit that can be urged as a ground of acceptance with God; that the single idea that the merit of Christ is the sole ground of justification is to be kept before the mind, with nothing that shall tend to obscure it in the view of the worshipper, or to turn away the mind from it.

Thus Presbyterianism as a system, and in its very nature, rejects all idea of human merit, and every thing which the mind of the worshipper might be in danger of construing *as* merit. The mind is to be held to the doctrine of justification by faith alone. *Some* forms of worship are, indeed, indispensable, from the nature of the case, but Presbyterianism insists that they shall be as simple as possible; that they shall be such that the mind shall not be in any necessary danger of mistake on the subject; that they shall not be such as shall have any natural tendency to turn away the mind from the doctrine of justification by faith; that there shall be no such

view of the sacredness of the priesthood by a pretended derivation from the apostles as having authority to forgive sin ; that there shall be no such view of the sacraments as having an efficacy, derived from a priesthood, to regenerate the soul ; that there shall be no such view of the power of imparting grace by the imposition of sacred hands ; that there shall be no such idea of sanctity or merit attached to the bowing of the head at the name of Jesus, or to genuflexions, or to any other forms and ceremonies of religion, as to *displace* in any way the doctrine of justification by faith, the idea of entire dependence on the merits of the Saviour, in the mind of the worshipper.

We think that it is not easy to separate an idea of merit from imposing and gorgeous and painful forms of religion, and that while there is no indispensable *necessary* connection between such forms and the idea of human merit, yet, as the mind of man is constituted, there is a constant danger of obscuring the doctrine of justification by faith *by* such forms. As a matter of fact in the history of the church, pompous rites and ceremonies did effectually obscure that doctrine until it was lost from human view, and the Reformation became necessary to give it the prominency which it has in the New Testament. Nor is it easy now to secure in the view of a worshipper the prominency which the New Testament gives to that doctrine, in connection with the idea that there is a sacred order of men to whom properly pertains the office of a *priesthood* ; or with the idea of grace imparted directly by the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in virtue of the official character of those by whom it is administered, or with the idea of such an efficacy in baptism as to secure regeneration. Whatever justness of view there may be in individual members in such churches, and whatever influence of evangelical doctrine there may be in such churches, yet it is rather *in spite* of such views, and of such rites and ceremonies, than by any tendency in such rites and views to secure such influences ; nor are we much surprised at any defection of faith in such churches on the great cardinal doctrine of the Reformation, or with any disposition in any portions of such churches towards the views which prevailed when the doctrine of justification by faith was wholly obscured and lost amidst the imposing forms and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic communion.

The next thing which I notice in regard to this combination—this union of the principles of a certain mode of government and a certain system of doctrines which we call Presbyterianism—is its affinity for a certain class of minds, or the

probability that it will draw to itself a class of minds of a peculiar order which will not be as likely to find their views represented by any other form of government and belief.

I mean by this, that there may be presumed to be in every community a class of minds which will be more likely to be Presbyterian than to be drawn to any other denomination, Protestant or Papal; that an appeal to them on the subject of religion from the Presbyterian standpoint will be more likely to reach them, and affect them, than an appeal from any other quarter; that Christianity itself will be more likely to commend itself to them when presented in the Presbyterian form than in any other form; that they will be more likely to be converts to Christ under that form than any other; that they will see fewer objections to the gospel as presented in that form than in any other form; that they will see in that form more that commends itself to their views of what true religion is, and must be, than in any other; and that, in the Presbyterian church they will be more useful as Christians than they would be in connection with any other denomination.

While I say this, however, I would say also for myself, without now claiming to represent the views of any whom I address, that I believe that the same thing might be said by those connected with other denominations, and with just as much truth and propriety. For the same reasons why I believe that there is a class in every community which will find more that accords with their views of religion, and which will be more edified and more useful in the Presbyterian church than in any other, I believe also that there is a class of minds in every community which will find more that accords with their views of religion, and with the structure of their own minds, and which will be more happy and more useful in the Episcopal church, or in the Methodist church, or in other Protestant churches, than they would in the Presbyterian church. And as, with this view, I should regard it as indicating no want of charity, and as no evidence of a narrow and illiberal spirit, for one of another denomination to *say* this, so the remark which I now make cannot be construed as indicating a narrow and illiberal spirit, or as indicating a want of charity if said by one who is a Presbyterian. No man who has any just view of the human mind can doubt that men, equally honest, from their natural temperament; from the mode of their training; from their standpoint in religion; from their habit of viewing things; from their associations in life, will take different views on a subject so important and so difficult as religion, or that they may find more that is congenial in carrying out an honest



purpose to lead a religious life with one class of persons rather than with another. Nor, understanding human nature as it is, can it be doubted that harmony and peace can be better promoted by persons entertaining peculiar views being associated in one organization than would be if the same persons were associated with those of a different temperament, and entertaining different views. In like manner, for myself, I believe that there are not a few sincere Christians who will be more edified, and who will be more useful, in connection with the forms of religion—the Liturgical services—in the Episcopal Church than they would be in the severe and simple modes of devotion which, as Presbyterians, we regard as more in conformity with the spirit of the New Testament, and as better adapted to our comfort in devotion, to our usefulness, and to our growth in grace, and to the general interests of religion in the world.

Without, therefore, in the slightest degree desiring to interfere with other denominations in setting forth the advantages of their own modes of worship, and showing their adaptedness to promote the edification of Christians, and to extend religion in the world by such words and by such arguments as they may prefer to use, and to any extent which they may please, it is not improper for us, on an occasion like this, to state the reasons why we suppose that there is a class of minds in the community which will be more likely to be Presbyterians than to be attached to any other denomination; and to refer to our special mission in the world in securing the proper influence of religion on that class of minds.

(a) There are men whose native characteristics of mind, or whose habits of thought as they have been cultivated, incline them to the Calvinistic views of religion. They are men who in their philosophy look first to God; to government; to order; to law; to stability:—men who naturally regard all things as the result or the carrying out of a fixed plan; who see no evidence of permanency or security but in such a plan; whose minds could find no security or peace in the idea of chance or contingency, or in the results which would follow from making the human will, human wisdom, or human freedom, the centre or the standpoint in the contemplation of the universe. Such men, when their minds are turned to religion, will be Calvinists and not Arminians, and any attempt to bring them under the influence of religion from an Arminian point of view would be at a disadvantage, if not a failure altogether. Perhaps it is not too much to say that there *are* minds which sooner than embrace the Arminian views of religion

with all the appeals which Christianity under that form could present to them, would rather embrace an infidel view with which their philosophy *could* be identified; or, rather perhaps, it should be said that their views of order, of law, of plan, and of the necessity of eternal counsels and purposes would be so settled that they could not embrace religion in any form if it was to be presented only with the Arminian view. Whatever may be said of John Wesley, it is certain that Jonathan Edwards could never have been any thing but a Calvinist; and when we think of the native structure of his mind, we never associate it with any other possible idea in religion than that of Calvinism.

This class of minds is largely diffused through every community; and it has characteristics of great value in regard to religion. It will be likely to be calm and sober in its views; firm in principle; not easily swayed by passion; rigid in its adherence to truth; friendly to just government, order, and law. It will be found everywhere in religion as representing the religion of *principle*, rather than the religion of *sentiment*.

(b) Again. There are numbers of persons who by the very manner of their conversion become Calvinists, and who can never be any thing else than Calvinists. They are spiritually-born Calvinists, and the Calvinistic idea will be incorporated into all their religious convictions, and will, under any external form of devotion, attend them through life. In their conversion their sense of sin is so deep; their conviction of the native obduracy of the heart, and the perversion of the will, is so entire; they are made so conscious of their utter helplessness; they are led by their own experience to attach so significant—almost so literal—a meaning to the statement that men are by nature ‘*dead in sin* ;’ the manner in which their attention was arrested, and in which they were convicted of sin, was so clearly a matter of sovereignty—so entirely without any agency or purpose of their own, so clearly not the act of man, so absolutely and unequivocally the work of God; and their conversion—their change of heart—was so manifestly to their view the work of God—the result of a creative power—that they can never doubt the doctrine of the divine agency in conversion—the doctrine of the divine purposes—the doctrine of election as bearing on them—and the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints as constituting the only ground of *their* hopes that they will ever reach eternal life. Knowing as we now do, the mental process through which Dr. Thomas Scott, and Dr. Chalmers passed when they were converted, we see at once how

their conversion naturally issued in Calvinism, nor can we see how, under that process of conversion, they *could* ever have glided into Arminian views.

(c) Again. Much of the educated mind in this country, and in other lands, will be likely to be Calvinistic. In our own country, in Scotland, in Ireland, in England, in Switzerland, in Holland, a portion of the young, not few in number and destined to exert a large influence in public affairs, receive their early training in the families of Calvinists, and under the direct teaching of the Shorter Catechism. In our own country, a majority of the colleges of the land were founded under Calvinistic influences, and have received their patronage from Calvinistic sources, and are under the instruction of men who favor the Calvinistic views. The first college in the land, and the second, and the third, and the fourth, were founded by Calvinists, and no small part of those which have been since founded were originated and are controlled by those of the same faith. These, indeed, are not sectarian institutions. They are not designed primarily or mainly to give instruction in the Calvinistic views. They are not exclusive in regard to other views. But, in the nature of the case, it is inevitable that these views will give shape and form to the philosophy which is taught in these institutions; that the first impressions in regard to religion will be derived from these views; that minds educated in these institutions will go out without prejudice against these views, and that the educated mind of the country to a large extent will identify religion with these views, and be prepared to welcome that form of doctrine when such minds are brought under the power of religion at all.

(d) Again. The history of our own country has been such that that class of minds may be expected to be found extensively diffused over the nation. The class of minds for which Calvinism has an affinity, or which has been trained under Calvinistic influences, has had an important agency in the affairs of the nation, and has contributed not less than any one class of minds in making us as a people what we are.

The Puritan mind, to which our country owes so much in its character, and in the form of its civil institutions, is essentially Calvinistic. The form in which Puritanism first developed itself in the mother country was essentially Calvinistic; the Pilgrims who landed on Plymouth Rock were Calvinists; the churches which they formed were Calvinistic churches; the colleges and schools which they established were based not less on the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly than on the spelling book, on Euclid, and on Homer. That mind,

more than any other mind that constituted an element in our early history, has been diffused over this great land, and is found now *as* a powerful element in all our States and territories from Maine to California. It is still a leading mind in religion, in education, in civil and military matters; in all the powerful organizations that affect the destinies of our country. That mind is not Unitarian; not Arminian; not Prelatical; and though Unitarianism has sprung out of it, and though that class of minds may be found in connection with Arminian views, and in connection with the Prelatical forms of worship, yet we cannot but be sensible of an incongruity in those connections, and we attach almost instinctively to the Puritan mind found in those connections the idea which we attach to those who 'remove ancient landmarks'—the idea of apostacy from the appropriate form in which such elements should be found.

The Huguenot mind, one of the most noble, liberal, large, warm-hearted, and courteous, in all the classes of mind that have moulded our institutions, is essentially Calvinistic, and naturally develops itself in the form of Presbyterianism. Not a few of the most eminent, learned, and benevolent Christians in our country have had this origin, and such minds have shed a lustre at the same time on our common Christianity and on the Presbyterian church.

The Scotch mind is essentially Presbyterian. There was a natural affinity between Edinburgh and Geneva; between Knox and Calvin. Nowhere in the world have there been such staunch defenders of Presbyterianism as in Scotland; nowhere has there been so decided opposition to Arminianism and to Prelacy; nowhere have so many martyrs shed their blood in defence of Calvinistic and Presbyterian principles; nowhere has it been so difficult to establish Prelacy, or to institute an order of bishops as in Scotland. So natural, so deep and abiding is this affinity, that the idea of a Scotch Episcopalian, a Scotch Methodist, or a Scotch Unitarian, always strikes us as incongruous: a thing to be accounted for in a particular case, and not on any general principles, as any other anomaly is to be.

The Scotch-Irish mind, so extensively diffused in our country, is also essentially Calvinistic and Presbyterian, and when we meet this mind we anticipate of course that we have found, if it takes a religious turn, an ally for Calvinism and Presbyterianism.

These classes of mind have some peculiar characteristics. They are firm, resolute decided; they act more from principle

than from impulse ; they are friendly to order and law ; they are the friends of sound learning and science ; they will be certain to found and patronize schools and colleges ; they will be reliable in all times when great principles are at stake, and they will not be far off when the spirit of martyrdom is demanded. That class of mind *may* be harsh, rigid, possibly blunt, uncourteous, and rough, regarding great principles as more important than the manner in which they are defended ; but it will be decided.

That class of minds is scattered extensively over our country, and it is one of the missions of the Presbyterian church to which it is especially called in endeavoring to diffuse the common principles of Christianity, so to direct its efforts and its influences towards this class of minds that it shall be Christian and not infidel. The question in regard to this class of minds is not mainly whether it shall be Calvinistic *or* Arminian ; not whether it shall be Trinitarian *or* Socinian ; not whether it shall be Presbyterian *or* Prelatical, Presbyterian *or* Methodist, Episcopalian *or* Catholic, *it is whether it shall be Christian or infidel* : whether it shall embrace the principles of Knox and Chalmers, *or* those of Hume and Kames and Monboddo. No men make better Christians, and no men make as dangerous sceptics, and there is no more important work to be done in our country than that which seems properly to pertain to the Presbyterian church, to see that this class of mind shall be saved from infidelity, and shall be trained to believe and embrace the Gospel.

The next thing which I notice in regard to this system of religion is its affinity for the doctrine of human rights, and the principles of liberty. It is a fundamental principle, as represented in the words adopted by each of the branches of the church represented in this Society, that "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship." Confession of Faith, ch. xx, § ii. This great principle lies at the foundation of all our notions of liberty and of the rights of man. It is nourished and sustained by all our veneration for the Bible, as a divine Revelation, as the source of law, as the fountain of doctrine, as containing a true history of man in his creation, fall, and redemption, and as an emanation of divine wisdom : — by that respect for the word of God which has always so characterized Presbyterians that the great principle enunciated by Chillingworth that "The Bible is the religion of Protestants", has been more perfectly maintained and carried

out in our denomination than in any other Protestant branch of the church. This great principle has been incorporated into all Presbyterian Confessions of Faith, and in no other branch of the church, and under no other form of belief, has there been a more stern regard for liberty and the rights of man, and a more firm resistance of tyranny and oppression.

We may begin at Geneva—abused and slandered Geneva—and move among the Huguenots, and pass to Holland, and recall the scenes in England in the time of Charles and in the Commonwealth, and retrace the bloody history of Scotland, and bring to our recollection the history of the Presbyterian church in our own country, and we shall trace all along a close connection between the principles which we hold as Presbyterians and the spread of the doctrines of civil liberty, and we may challenge the world for a record of more honorable struggles in behalf of freedom and the rights of man than have been manifested in connection with the Presbyterian Faith.

I have not time to illustrate this point properly, or to consider the full influence of our Calvinistic views on the subject of the rights of man, or as bearing on the subject of oppression and slavery.

I have already referred to the principle which we hold in regard to the right of self-government in the church, or of power as emanating, under God, from the people—a principle which as applied to civil affairs constitutes the foundation of liberty in the state. I have referred to the principle of representation as recognized in our system of Government—a principle now regarded as essential to all just notions of civil liberty. I have adverted to our idea of constitutional limits and bounds in the exercise of power—a principle so vital as a check against arbitrary power, and so essential to the protection of vested rights, to rights of property, to freedom of speech, to personal security, and to the protection of character. I have incidentally adverted to the right of conscience, and to our direct and supreme responsibility to God. As these principles are applicable in the state as well as in the church; as they pertain to men as men, and are, therefore, in our view, of universal applicability and importance, perhaps it might be proper for me to close this part of the subject here as having suggested all that is essential to the point now under consideration.

But there are a few thoughts, derived especially from Presbyterianism in its Calvinistic aspect as bearing on liberty, which it seems necessary to suggest. Part of those views are held also by other Christians; part are peculiar to us. They

are views which contemplate the human race as on a level, and as endowed by their Maker with equal rights—'life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness.'

The fundamental view on this subject, which we hold in the main in common with other denominations of Christians, but which we think we have some advantage over others in presenting in its full force, is that **THE RACE IS ONE**. The views which we entertain on this subject, partly in common with other Christians, and partly as springing from our peculiar doctrines, make it essential, if we would be consistent, that we should maintain also a steady opposition to slavery in all its forms, and that we should be advocates of universal freedom.

(a) The race, we hold, is one. "God hath made of one blood all the nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts xvii, 26. This doctrine we embrace in the strictest sense. We regard it as essential to true faith in the Bible, and as vital to all just views of religion. We could not retain our faith in the Bible for a moment if we were compelled to regard men as made up of different races of independent origin; we could not retain our views of the work of redemption except as we believe that there was one head of the race, of all human beings, as originally created; and one head of the race, of all human beings, in the work of redemption. This doctrine we maintain in opposition to all the efforts which are made to establish the idea that human beings are constituted of essentially different races, having a different origin, and having each its own peculiar ancestry or head:—that there have been separate acts of creation in reference to the Caucasian, the Mongolian, the Ethiopian, or the American races. All the differences in color, complexion, cranial bones, and facial angles in the race we hold are to be accounted for on some other supposition than that God originally created different races of men, or that men have been developed from the lower forms of the animal creation. But this idea, when properly pursued and applied, is fatal to all the conceptions of slavery; to the supposition that human beings are ever to be held as property, or to be placed on a level with chattels and things. God by creating the race "of one blood" has made an impassable barrier between man and the ape, the ourang-outang, the chimpanzee, the gorilla, the ox and the donkey, and no man can be held as property without a violation of the scriptural idea in regard to the creation of man.

(b) Again. We entertain views of the relation of man to Adam such as to suggest the idea of equal human rights, and such as to constitute an argument against slavery. We re-

gard Adam as the head of the one race, as the one ancestor of all human beings, as sustaining a peculiar covenant relation to all his posterity ; and hence we regard all, of all colors and conditions, as having his image, and as implicated in his act. This doctrine we hold more decidedly than it is held by any other denomination of Christians, for it is *essential* to all notions of Calvinism. It has gone into all our Confessions of Faith ; it lies at the very foundation of all our system of doctrines. Whether the doctrine be held that we have been affected by his fall by 'immediate' imputation or by 'mediate' imputation ; whether we regard Adam as the constituted 'federal head' of all his posterity, or as merely the 'natural' head ; whether we attempt to explain the effect of his disobedience on his posterity by a direct and special act of God constituting him a 'representative' of the race, or by natural laws—by an arrangement in fact universal in its nature, but existing in the highest form in his relation to his posterity, we are unanimous in the belief that *his* act involved the race in ruin ; that it made it certain that all his posterity would be born with a fallen nature, with corrupt hearts, with a proneness to sin ; that his fall was the source of death—the reason why *any* human being would ever die, and why *all* human beings must die ; and that thus, alike in the fact that they have derived their existence through him, and have inherited a corrupt nature from him, they are all on a level before God.

The doctrine of the unity of the race, and the equality of all men before God, is thus secured by our doctrine of the creation and fall of man. Adam in the beginning was the head of THE RACE—Caucasians, Mongolians, Americans, *Africans* ; and, as in the creation, so in the apostacy, there is one great brotherhood. Each one, no matter what his color or his country, is a brother to every other one in human form, alike in creation and in ruin. As the creation made no one in the condition of a slave, so the fall has put no one necessarily in that condition, and has left to no one on any ground such superiority as to lay the foundation of a claim to be an owner or a master.

(c) The same thing is true in the doctrine which we hold in respect to redemption. In the views which we entertain on that subject, partly in common with other Christians, and partly as peculiar to ourselves, we regard all the races of men as on a level ; all as ransomed by the same blood ; all, so far as the work of redemption bears on them, or appertains to them, as viewed by God with the same feeling, and invested with the same privileges ; all as ransomed *men*, not one of them as



a *chattel* or a *thing*. There is, indeed, as is well known, a difference of opinion among those who bear the Presbyterian name, as to the *extent* of the atonement made by Christ, whether it had reference to the whole of the race, or whether it was made only for the elect, considered as elect; but whatever difference of views may be entertained on that point, there is entire agreement on the immediate point now before us. Even where it is held that the atonement was made for only a part of mankind, still it is not maintained that the application of the atonement was determined by the question of *racess*, as if one were in any respect superior to another before God. Christ, even on that theory, did not die for the Caucasian race as such, nor was the African race as such excluded in his design in making an atonement for man. In the divine purpose the line, if such a line was run, was not between the Mongolian, the Caucasian, the African, the American races as such, or indeed with any reference to such classifications of the human family, or with any idea that as connected with redemption any one division of the human family had any superiority over the others. The line was run from causes which are unexplained to us, but it was not for *this* cause, nor can any one of these classes undertake to enslave any other class without the moral certainty that he is defrauding of natural rights those for whom Christ died; that in making a slave, or reducing any one to the condition of a chattel or a thing, he is subjecting to that wrong, one who in the work of redemption is to be regarded as a brother; or one, who, so far as the idea of *race* is concerned, has been redeemed with the precious blood of the Son of God.

(*d*) The same idea is suggested by our doctrine of election. With all of us this *is* a cardinal doctrine; a doctrine to which we trace all our personal hopes of salvation, and all our expectation of the success of the Gospel in the world. In the system of truth which we hold we do not think that its importance can be over-estimated.

But the division of the human race which the doctrine of election contemplates in reference to the church on earth, and to the final condition of the race in the future world, is not a division by any imagined upper and lower *strata* in society; it is not a division by geography, by climate, by national peculiarities. The line is not run by races. Men are chosen to salvation not as Caucasians, as Mongolians, as Ethiopians, as Americans. The eternal destiny of man, according to that doctrine, is not determined by the size or shape of the cranium, by the measurement of the facial angle, by the crispiness

or the straightness of the hair, by the thickness of the lips, or by the color of the skin. What it *is*, we may not be able, with our wisdom, to determine, but we are agreed that it is not *this*. The elect of God are found in the '*quarters*'—the humble cottages on the 'plantation' as well as in the homes of the masters; and we go to Africa, to the Islands of the Sea, to the abodes of Mogul Tartars, and to the wigwam of the American savages, expecting to find the elect *there* as really as when we preach to Teutons, Gauls, Celts and Saxons.

The African is a man redeemed by the blood of Jesus. The Caucasian is a man redeemed by the blood of Jesus. When we have said this, we have said what is the most significant thing in regard to man. We have suggested that which rises above all the distinctions of wealth, and caste, and complexion, and intellectual grade. We have referred to man as he is regarded by the Creator on his throne; as he was regarded by the Redeemer on the cross; as he is regarded by the Holy Ghost in his 'office-work' in converting and sanctifying the soul.

It follows logically from this view—a view which we all entertain, that no one should regard another as a slave—as a property—as a chattel—as an article of merchandise; that no one should rob another of the proper avails of his own industry; that no one should deprive another of access to the word of God—the sacred record of his own redemption, his guide in duty, and the foundation of his hope of heaven; that no one should interfere in the sacred relation of husband and wife, parent and child, and "put asunder what God hath joined together"; that no one should *make* a human being a slave—that no one should *own* or sell a redeemed brother.

It was in entire accordance with these principles that in the early periods of our Presbyterian history, when as yet we were few and feeble, and when as yet there was no General Assembly in the land, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia—the original of two of the branches of the Presbyterian family represented in this Society, in 1787 gave solemn utterance to the following sentiment: "The Synod of New York and Philadelphia do highly approve of the general principles in favor of universal liberty that prevail in America, and they recommend it to all the people under their care, to use the most prudent measures consistent with the interest and the state of civil society, in the parts where they live, to procure, eventually, the FINAL ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN AMERICA".

And it was in accordance with these principles that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in 1818 uttered

its memorable declaration before the world — a declaration which to this day stands on its Records unrepealed—unmodified in reference to both the branches of that church:—“ We consider the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another, as a gross violation of the most precious rights of human nature ; as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves ; and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ, which enjoin that ‘ All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them’. Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system — it exhibits rational, accountable, and immortal beings, in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of others, whether they shall receive religious instruction ; whether they shall know and worship the true God ; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the Gospel ; whether they shall perform the duties, and cherish the endearments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbors and friends ; whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity.

“ From the view of the consequences resulting from the practice into which Christian people have most inconsistently fallen, of enslaving a portion of their *brethren* of mankind—for ‘ God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth ’—it is manifestly the duty of all Christians who enjoy the light of the present day, when the inconsistency of slavery, both with the dictates of humanity and religion has been demonstrated, and as generally seen and acknowledged, to use their honest, earnest, and unwearied endeavors, to correct the errors of former times, and as speedily as possible to efface this blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, and if possible throughout the world ”.\*

I need not say to this audience that the other branches of the Presbyterian church represented in this Society fully coincide in these sentiments. There is no portion of the whole church of Christ on earth that has been more decided in the expression of its sentiments on the subject of slavery, and more firm and consistent in its opposition to the system, than the Scotch Presbyterian churches represented here to-night. Not a slave is owned by any of their members ; not one who is a holder of human beings as property would be tolerated in their communion.

\* Minutes of the General Assembly for 1818, pp. 29, 30.

This is the spirit of true Presbyterianism.' This is the proper carrying out in one direction of those grand principles which as Calvinistic Presbyterians we hold. In the noble testimony to which I have just referred, there is not one word which is inconsistent with the principles which as Presbyterians we all hold; there is not one word which those principles do not naturally suggest; there is not one word which could be withdrawn without a violation of those principles. First in our country, except the Society of Friends, the Presbyterian church proclaimed these views — views so much in accordance with the sentiments of the men, North and South, who fought for our Independence, and who laid the foundation of our civil institutions. Nor can those principles be abandoned without a renunciation of the great doctrines which we hold in regard to the creation of man; the unity of the race; the work of redemption; and the doctrine of God's sovereignty in choosing man unto life. He who is the advocate of slavery violates each and all of those principles; and when Presbyterians violate those principles, and the church at large becomes the defender of Slavery, it is not wonderful that God visits a people with such heavy judgments as are now spreading over the region where slavery has been established, and where it has been defended in the pulpits of our land.

It was my purpose to have noticed the affinity of Presbyterianism for learning, and for the diffusion of knowledge among the masses of men. I should not have insisted on this as *peculiar* to Presbyterianism, but I should have shown from the principles which we hold, and from the history of Presbyterianism, how it has been, and is, the patron of schools, academies, colleges, seminaries of learning; how those principles lead to sound views on the liberty of the press; how they are carried out in the arrangements for the diffusion of Christian literature.

But I have already detained you too long. There remains one point, however, in reference to which at the present time, and under existing circumstances in our country, I should be recreant to my duty to you and to the cause if I did not, at least, allude to it. I refer to the affinity of the principles which we hold to loyalty—loyalty to just government—loyalty to our country.

The very foundation of our principles of Calvinism is laid in the duty of loyalty—loyalty to God and to his government. The sum of all our doctrines, and all our efforts, is to bring men back to allegiance to the laws and the government of

our Maker. There is a government over the universe, a government of law; there is a government under which, from the perfection of the Great Ruler, there is secured in his administration all which we endeavor to secure, though so imperfectly, by a *constitution*. Beyond all the powers of any human arrangement—any wisdom or permanency in the constitutions of civil government—the constitution of the government of the universe is fixed. The limits of power and of right are determined. There is the utmost security against any usurpation of power; there is the most absolute security against any invasion of right; there are all the checks and safeguards appointed for securing the permanency and the wise administration of government forever.

The tendency of Presbyterianism, from the nature of the case, is to loyalty. Presbyterianism does not, indeed, reject the principle that there *are* cases where it is right to throw off a government, and to change it by revolution; but its tendency is to loyalty—loyalty to established government as such; loyalty to a government administered in conformity to a constitution; loyalty to the principles of liberty; loyalty to a country as such; loyalty to 'the powers that be'. Were there time, it would be easy to show how this has been illustrated in other lands than ours—but that must be now passed by.

On this subject there is time to say only that the history of our denomination, in the dark periods of our country's struggles for freedom, has been such as to fill the heart of every Presbyterian with gratitude for the past, and with a profound respect for our principles as related to human rights, to patriotism, to civil liberty. Whoever among the clergy of the land, in the time of the Revolution, were disloyal, Presbyterians were not. Whoever they were,—and there were many such, who embarrassed the government, who rejoiced in the reverses, the sorrows, and the defeat of our armies, or in the success of the enemy; whoever they were,—and there were many such,—who gave 'aid and comfort to the enemy'; whoever they were who refused to pray for the success of the armies of the struggling colonies,—and there were many such;—whoever they were who were found in traitorous communication with the enemy, Presbyterian clergymen were not of that number. By prayer; by preaching; by their presence in the army as chaplains; by their zeal in encouraging their people to leave their homes in defence of their country; by correspondence; by humble and constant trust in God, the Presbyterian ministers of that day have acquired, and deserve a noble place among the Revolutionary patriots,

and the true history of our country cannot be written without an honorable reference to the course of the Presbyterian Church. Some other denominations are, and must be, reluctant ever to refer to the history of their clergymen and many of their people in the time of the American Revolution; our denomination is willing that all that occurred—all that was done by us as a denomination—should be written in letters of living light to be read by all mankind. The past is fixed; and fixed as we would desire it to be. We would not wish to alter it. There are no Presbyterian names as connected with the trying periods of our Revolutionary history to which the world will attach the idea of dishonor. There is not a line on that subject which we would desire to expunge or change.

The struggle is again upon us; for the same principles; the same country; the same essential issues. Happy and honored evermore shall we be if in this struggle we are found evincing the spirit of our fathers; like them sustaining the government in the great struggle; loyal to its principles and to our own; commending our country and its cause in no ambiguous language to God in our prayers; encouraging our people to the work of patriotism; frowning on treason; rejoicing in the success of our arms; standing in our place boldly, firmly, nobly, in the support of the government, the constitution, the laws, the liberty of the nation.

---

#### ART. II.—THE SOURCES OF CRIME.

By E. C. WINES, D.D., LL.D., New York.

*Annual Reports of the Prison Association of New York  
from 1844 to 1862.*

AN examination of the 18 Annual Reports of the New York Prison Association has produced in our minds a profound conviction of the excellence of this organization, and of the importance and value of its labors. These Reports not only show a vast amount of work done, and well done, but they embody many able and luminous discussions of questions connected with crimes and their punishment, with prison discipline and prison reform, and with the treatment of criminals, both while undergoing the penalty of the law and subsequently to their discharge.