

HARPER'S WEEKLY

A JOURNAL OF CIVILIZATION

Vol. XVI.—No. 792.]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1872.

[SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS.
\$4.00 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the Year 1872, by Harper & Brothers, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

A WOMAN IN THE PULPIT.

The good Presbytery of Brooklyn have been greatly scandalized of late by the appearance of Miss SARAH F. SMILEY, a Quakeress preacher, in the pulpit of the Rev. THEODORE L. CUYLER, of the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church. Miss SMILEY, as we learn from the daily papers, preached a most excellent and acceptable sermon, and none of the congregation took the least offense at the unusual spectacle of a woman in the pulpit. Not so, however, the Presbytery. Alarmed and apparently horrified at the innovation, they took immediate steps to call Dr. CUYLER to account, and a meeting of that body was held to consider what action, if any, should be taken in reference to his conduct. The moderator, the Rev. JOSEPH M. GREEN, expressly stated that the meeting was not called in an unfriendly spirit toward Dr. CUYLER or his church, but chiefly to ascertain the sense of the Presbytery upon the following questions: "First, shall the Presbyterian Church open corresponding relations with the Quaker Church, or Society of Friends? second, shall women be ordained as preachers? and third, shall the Presbyterian Church change its practice and modify its interpretation of Holy Scripture so as to recognize the right of women to ordination?"

At this meeting Dr. CUYLER made a full statement of the circumstances under which Miss SMILEY was invited to preach in the church of which he is pastor; and, without entering into the merits of the question at all, we do not hesitate to say that his statement was exceedingly creditable both to himself and Miss SMILEY. Dr. CUYLER's relations with the Society of Friends are of the most intimate and cordial character. He long resided in a Quaker family. A short time since he received a courteous and fraternal invitation from the Friends to address one of their revival meetings in Brooklyn. He had accepted this invitation, had been welcomed to their preacher's bench, or pulpit, and at the close of his discourse one of their most eminent ministers

rose and said, with feeling: "We are in full accord with all that has fallen from our esteemed and beloved brother, THEODORE CUYLER. 'Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.'"

In response to this invitation Dr. CUYLER invited Miss SMILEY, to whose discourses he had listened with deep interest, to address his own congregation on a Sunday evening. He announced the fact to his people in advance, and not a single member of the church expressed the slightest objection. "On the following Sunday evening," says Dr. CUYLER, "Miss SMILEY was conducted to the Lafayette Avenue pulpit by the pastor. She came there in the decorous Quaker garb, and clothed upon with humility 'as becometh the saints.' Unlike some of the more extravagant ladies of our own congregation, she obeyed the Pauline precept, 'I will that the women be not adorned with gold, or pearls, or costly array.' After the usual opening services I introduced my friend to the very large, intelligent, and deeply solemn and attentive auditory. I said: 'My esteemed friend and co-worker in the service of Christ, SARAH F. SMILEY, will now give to us such a Gospel message as she may have to offer.' Dr. HODGE, of Princeton—Dr. HODGE, of Christendom—says that St. PAUL saluted PRISCILLA as his 'fellow-laborer in the promotion of the Gospel.' As such I introduced the good Quakeress, who having edified me with her pen, I was quite certain would edify my congregation from her lips. She used no text, but took the vision of JACOB at Bethel as her theme, and illustrated from it the upward steps of the soul from sin toward holiness and heaven; the steps being repentance of sin, faith in the atoning Saviour, and so forth. Her address, or discourse, was weighty, solemn, Scriptural, orthodox, tender, and melted some men to tears whom I have never seen so much moved before. She offered a devout and reverent prayer, a hymn was sung, and I concluded with the apostolic benediction."

On the conclusion of Dr. CUYLER's address an animated debate took place upon the subject of

the meeting. It was not quite certain that the Presbytery knew exactly what they had come together for, or what was the real nature of Dr. CUYLER's offense. The Rev. Dr. SPEAR and the Rev. Dr. TALMAGE and the Rev. ALFRED TAYLOR contended that the Presbytery had no occasion to act in the matter; but the Rev. Dr. VAN DIKE, the Rev. Mr. PATTON, and others took the opposite view, and spoke strongly in condemnation of women as preachers. What they had to say on the subject was most plainly and succinctly stated by the Rev. Dr. M'CLELLAND, a blind Scotch clergyman. He contended that preaching by women was not sanctioned by church law nor by the Scriptures. Not from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Malachi could a single instance be found where a woman was installed into ordinary ministerial functions. That record covered 3500 years, and during all that time only three prophetesses were mentioned, and these clearly had qualified powers. Thus you have an average of one in 1200 years. The exceptional cases, he argued, established the rule against the women. In the New Testament he contended that the authority was all against the women. The Christian church, he remarked, was founded on the synagogue, not on the temple, and who does not know that no woman was ever permitted to teach in the synagogue? Both history and presumption were against women preaching, and he concluded by contending that direct prohibition was against it also.

At length, after a long and desultory debate, the following expression of opinion was adopted:

"The Presbytery having been informed that a woman has preached in one of our churches on Sabbath, at a regular service, at the request of the pastor, with the consent of the session; therefore,

Resolved, That the Presbytery feel constrained to enjoin upon our churches strict regard to the following deliverance of the General Assembly:

"Meetings of pious women by themselves for conversation and prayer we entirely approve. But let not the inspired prohibitions of the great Apostle as found in his epistles to the Corinthians and to Timothy be vio-

lated. To teach and to exhort, or to lead in prayer in public and promiscuous assemblies, is clearly forbidden to women in the Holy Oracles."

The Presbytery then adjourned, without having brought Dr. CUYLER or his church to a sense of the enormity of their offense in listening to a sermon by a Christian woman.

Miss SMILEY, of whom we give a portrait on this page, is a woman of maturity, of sweet Christian character, and gifted with extraordinary powers as a preacher. She has passed her life in doing good with the talents God has given her. Two years ago she made a "religious visit" to Great Britain, and was not only honored by the British "Yearly Meeting" of Orthodox Friends with fullest fellowship, but was cordially welcomed by eminent persons of all denominations. The most brilliant man of letters in Scotland (himself a Presbyterian) sought her friendship, and opened up to her some of his spiritual difficulties; and as PRISCILLA of old expounded to the eloquent APOLLOS "the way of God more perfectly," so this gifted woman brought her wise counsels to the man of genius. After the war was over she left her cultured home and went as a voluntary missionary to the emancipated slaves of the South. She taught and addressed both males and females. Those liberated bondmen "heard her gladly." And, says Dr. CUYLER, I do not believe that if the Apostle PAUL had stood by her side he would have said, "Woman, it is a shame for you to preach Jesus Christ to these poor negroes." Miss SMILEY is a native of Vassalborough, Maine, and is now resident in Baltimore, Maryland.

The Rev. THEODORE L. CUYLER, of whom also a portrait is given on this page, was born at Aurora, on Cayuga Lake, in 1822. His father, a lawyer of reputation and ability, died when he was only four years old. He graduated from Princeton College at the age of nineteen, and from the Princeton Theological Seminary three years later. Since then he has been settled at Burlington, Trenton, the Market Street Church, New York, and is now pastor of the Lafayette



THE REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER.



MISS SARAH F. SMILEY, THE QUAKERESS PREACHER.
[FROM A PHOTOGRAPH BY W. H. WILLIAMSON, BROOKLYN.]

Avenue Church, in Brooklyn, whose membership is over 1400. The church edifice seats 2000 persons.

Dr. CUYLER is not only an eloquent preacher, but a very accomplished and successful writer. He has contributed over 1500 articles to various religious papers and magazines. The ensuing spring he will visit Scotland as the delegate of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church to the General Assemblies of Scotland and Ireland. His course in regard to the Quakeress preacher is generally approved by the religious and secular press of the country.

HARPER'S WEEKLY.

SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1872.

SUBSCRIBERS will please excuse the inevitable delay in supplying them with the Back Numbers of the present Volumes of the WEEKLY and BAZAR, which have been exhausted, but which will be forwarded as soon as reprinted.

THE POLITICAL PROSPECT.

THE report that the meeting of the Cincinnati convention had been postponed was perhaps due to the fact that the response of the country to the movement for the dissolution of the Republican party has not been satisfactory. Indeed, the summons has been nowhere very heartily welcomed. Mr. GROSVENOR, the chairman of the Missouri convention which issued the call, says that success depends very much upon co-operation in other States. But that co-operation does not yet appear. Of course Mr. GROSVENOR is too shrewd a politician to rate the applause and sympathy of Democratic conventions very highly. The Connecticut Democracy adopted two of the Missouri resolutions, but they did not allude to Cincinnati, and they have only taken up a smiling position upon the fence. They propose to "co-operate" for the benefit of the Democracy if an opportunity offers. But that is the limit of their co-operation, while the New York *Tribune*, which is the chief anti-Administration Republican journal, can have no very vital sympathy with an assembly of revenue reformers.

It is very possible that the disaffection in the Republican party may have been wrongly estimated both in character and extent. We have more than once stated that Senator SCHURZ is the only conspicuous Republican who has declared that he can not support General GRANT if he should be renominated. Senators SUMNER, TRUMBULL, FENTON, and LOGAN have as yet made no such declaration. That they would prefer another nomination is unquestionable, and that they will take all lawful methods to defeat it is very probable. But that these gentlemen and certain newspapers, which are brilliant free-lances in politics, really represent a great sentiment in the party nowhere appears. The main effort has thus far been to cast suspicion upon the honesty of the President. There has been a constant shower of innuendoes against "the White House." It is announced with an air of profound concern, by those who are striving to defeat the renomination, that the President's friends are ruining him; and when every thing that ingenuity can plausibly invent about the President has been exhausted, ingenuity turns and asks whether it is not suicidal folly to renominate a President of whom such things are said?

But the important question is not what is said, but what is believed. The Cincinnati managers seem to have mistaken the significance of the criticisms upon the Administration. There have undoubtedly been many things which good men in the party do not approve, and there is a wish among some members of the party that another candidate than the President may be selected at Philadelphia. But that is very far from a disposition to connive at a Democratic restoration by refusing to support the regular Republican nomination. Senators in Washington, breathing the air of personal gossip and scandal, which is the atmosphere of every great political capital, see the President not more truly than the country, and very differently from the great mass of the people. To the people of the United States the President is the hero of the war of the rebellion, and a plain, honest man seeking to do his duty. We do not believe that they suppose him to have made money by the general order system, nor by selling arms to France to defeat Germany. Nor do we believe that they hold him personally responsible for the knavish tricks of those who hold positions in the government. They see what one journal declares to be incontestably proved another journal insists not to be proved at all. In a word, they see that in the passionate tumult of assertion and denial it is not easy to discover the truth, and they rest upon the one thing which remains, and that is the general results of the administration,

and their faith in the personal purity of the President.

If the Administration were the seething mass of corruption which it is sometimes alleged to be, would the Democratic party be in the moribund condition which the action of its Connecticut convention reveals? Could that party ask any thing more favorable to its hopes than a dominant opposition dissolving in its own corruption? What does the situation show but that the Republican hold upon the heart of the country is very sure? Yet what has so confirmed that hold but the general confidence in the character and purpose of the Administration? It is true that certain gentlemen who are called the President's friends oppose measures which he has recommended, such as the reform of the civil service and amnesty. But the gentlemen have always opposed them, and have opposed them openly, and despite their opposition the President urges them. It is alleged that this shows the President's interest in them to be a shallow pretense. Indeed! and when was it shown that the will and tenacity of General GRANT were less than those of the gentlemen who are called his friends? And what events in his career justify the theory that his action is mingled of folly and duplicity?

From this time to the assembling of the Republican Convention the attempt to stain the character of the President, and to stigmatize him to the country as unfit for another term, will be incessant and malevolent. But he has been in the Wilderness before—and he came out of it. They mistake profoundly and perilously who suppose that the people forget, or that the mists of calumny that gather about every Administration have obscured the remembrance of the days when General GRANT was the hope of America and of liberty. Coming fresh from the camp to the cabinet, has he betrayed one of the great principles of the party which lifted him to power? Differing from many honored leaders, as they differ among themselves, has he forgotten the emancipated race, or the honor of the nation, or the welfare of the people? Silent by nature and by the conditions of his position, has he to one honest mind seemed guilty of any of the foul charges that have been thundered against him? There will certainly be an indignant reaction in the mind and heart of the American people against the relentless effort to injure the good name of the President of the United States—a reaction which will surely and triumphantly re-elect him, as a man who, in the "fierce light" of the intensest party animosity, as in the long doubt of the war, has shown himself a modest and faithful servant of his country.

THE ENGLISH TREATY.

MR. THOMAS HUGHES is so frank a friend of the United States, and the feeling for him in this country is so kind, that his late letter to the *Tribune* upon the treaty difficulty may be considered as the view of what may be called the American party in England. Mr. HUGHES says in substance that there was a certain understanding in regard to the treaty, which we have violated in the presentation of our case under the treaty. The understanding, he says, was that there was to be no claim for indirect losses or constructive damages. We have heard the same assertion made by others: there was "an understanding" that certain points were not to be included, but that we were to be satisfied with an apology, with the concession of certain principles, and with the payment of actual and proved losses. But if there were such an understanding, who were the parties to it? Where is the record of it? Mr. HUGHES really accuses the United States Government of the utmost dishonesty.

No treaty of which the cardinal condition is the reference of disputed points to an arbitration can be interpreted by what is vaguely called a tacit understanding. The essential understanding between the negotiators is recorded, as it was in this case. When national parties to an ordinary treaty differ as to its significance, they will very properly often refer it to friendly adjudication. But when the treaty itself provides for such a settlement, there is no question left except that of accepting the award of the arbitration. In the case of the Treaty of Washington, the claim of "an understanding" must be relinquished, because the very question at issue was not left to understanding. The American case, as we showed last week, has always been the same. It has always been composed of two claims, for direct and for indirect losses. In the very protocol to which Mr. HUGHES refers it is expressly stated that the right to demand the indirect losses was not waived if the amicable settlement was not made. That amicable settlement was an apology and the payment of a gross sum—and England declined it. That having failed, and the right to claim indirect losses being resumed, the treaty was negotiated, by which every ques-

tion and every claim were referred to the tribunal.

Mr. HUGHES quotes the words of the treaty as sustaining the English view of the case, but he must be aware that the meaning of the treaty can not be finally settled by either of the parties. "The high contracting parties agree that all the said claims, growing out of acts committed by the aforesaid vessels, shall be referred to a tribunal of arbitration." And that means, says Mr. HUGHES, the claims arising from vessels actually and unlawfully seized and destroyed. But why are not the expenses of pursuit, and the enhanced payments of insurance, and the prolongation of the war to be considered "as growing out of acts committed by the aforesaid vessels?" Because every body knows that they were not meant, says Mr. HUGHES. But he must excuse us. We do not know it in this country, and it is the very question that we have referred to Geneva, not to England.

It is very evident why the English people and Mr. GLADSTONE should be annoyed by this view of the subject. They had laughed at the idea of consequential damages as growing out of the Queen's proclamation according belligerent rights to the rebels. And when General GRANT stated that each nation must decide for itself when to recognize belligerency, they undoubtedly considered the remark as a renunciation of our claims. But the claim of indirect loss remained. It was not, however, based upon the proclamation, but upon the acts of "the aforesaid vessels." And the American concession in the treaty was the reference of both the indirect and direct claims to a tribunal which might award damages for neither. This is a point which Mr. HUGHES and his fellow-Englishmen fail to see. The United States said that deep and universal as was the national sense of injury, and great as was the possible amount of the claims they might prefer, yet, to heal bitterness of feeling and to avoid the chance of war, they would, in consideration of the expressions of regret, and of the retroactive principles of international law, leave the entire pecuniary question to the tribunal. Should that tribunal not award the United States a single dollar, they will abide by the treaty which contains the regret and the improved law.

Mr. GLADSTONE knows that the pride of Englishmen is touched by the supposition that they could possibly have left the question of payment of an incalculable sum to the decision of five gentlemen at Geneva. But that he should insist that England should disregard the treaty if her own view of it is not conceded in advance of the arbitration for which the treaty provides, is a position so singular and untenable that we must expect it to be abandoned. Why should the United States accept the English theory of the treaty, and England not accept that of the United States? We think that it covers indirect losses. England thinks that it does not. Geneva must decide. If England declines, she tears the treaty.

THE SPOILS OF OFFICE.

THE resignation of Mr. TERWILLIGER, and the circumstances attending it, show how deep-seated is the danger which now most threatens free government, and to which the public mind is fortunately now so sensitive. Yet the assurance of remedy is by no means so positive as the loud demand for it, and for the simple reason that the spirit of the demand seems so often to be personal or party hostility, and not the public welfare. That Mr. TERWILLIGER, as his letter states, has acquiesced in an evil custom is unquestionable; but nobody doubts that what he did was consonant with the usual standards of political morality, and that he is, therefore, not guilty in the sense that he would be if he were convicted of the charge of altering the amounts of bills. It is, indeed, no extenuation of his conduct that nobody doubts, also, that many of his loudest accusers are guiltier than he. But this fact, again, only shows the depth of the evil, and the total want of confidence in many men of conspicuous public position.

It is remarkable that the active opponents of a reform of the civil service do not see that so long as the present system continues it offers a premium for dishonesty. The reform which the President proposes is denounced as a proposition to disband the party. But will honest reform disband it faster than rascality? If an election is to be regarded as a battle to secure the control of the public revenue, and of the thousands of minor offices which have charge of it, it is mere folly to talk of the American hostility to a caste of office-holders as the reason of opposition to the reform. The principle of those who contend that the minor offices of the government should be put up as prizes to stimulate partisan zeal is simply and only that to the victor belong the spoils of the enemy, and they ought not to be afraid of the phrase which describes their faith.

But if that is to be the principle, its consequences must be frankly accepted. The offices must be called prizes and rewards. Promises and pledges of positions must be regarded as the lawful currency of a campaign. Those who obtain them must make hay while the sun shines. Conscientiousness, scrutiny into methods, diligence, fidelity, must take their chance. The object of political or party activity being money, or place as the means of getting money, the rest will follow, and those who defend the spoils system can not complain. But it is defended upon party grounds. Do the investigations at Albany, then, help the party? Do the exposures of the general order system help the party? Does the rancorous schism in New York help the party? Does the desperate fight every where, in the Senate and out of it, help the party? Do impatience, doubt, and disgust help the party? They all spring from the system of the spoils for the victor. And does any sensible man suppose that such things unite the party, and that an effort to reform them will disband it?

The President, we are glad to believe, does not think so meanly of the people. He does not seem to suppose it a chimerical idea that they would prefer to remove as far as practicable all temptation from the officers of the government to betray or to neglect their trusts. He seems to believe that if clerks and other officers were selected because they were suitable and qualified, and not because they had been useful to Senator A, or were family friends of Representative B, the country would not complain. He evidently reposes upon the common-sense of the people. In this country, indeed, every man should, in a certain sense, be a politician; that is, he should be so familiar with political principles and tendencies as to be able to vote intelligently. But there is a class of men called by distinction "politicians" who naturally suppose that they monopolize all political knowledge, and that the world is on the way to ruin when they are not exclusively heeded. But it is not to this class, we believe, that the country gives its confidence. Today, unless we are mistaken, it trusts the President more than the politicians, and doubts him chiefly when he seems to yield to them. He is not likely to approve any measure of reform which seems to him impracticable or foolish. But if any man in the country may be supposed to know the working and the results of the doctrine that to the victor belong the spoils, it is the President, and he has declared his hostility to it.

ARMS AND HONOR.

THE investigation into the grounds of the aspersion upon the Government of the United States, made in a resolution of a committee of the French National Assembly, will be heartily desired by every good citizen. The resolution declares that "certain American officials" are suspected of participating in the buying of arms for the French Government during the war. What are the names of these "officials?" and upon what grounds are they suspected? These are the questions of interest for this country. Were they "officials" of such character that the allegation, if true, constitutes a breach of international law? or were they only dishonest knaves who took fraudulent commissions? It would have been better, it seems to us, as Senator SHERMAN suggested, if Senator SUMNER had omitted the preamble to his resolutions, and for the reason that the preamble is in the nature of an argument favoring the suspicions alleged, while all that was necessary was the declaration that the French Assembly had entertained a resolution of suspicion of American officers. But the investigation will, we hope, be made quickly and thoroughly, and the whole subject plainly exposed.

The facts we believe to be very simple. When our war ended there were great supplies of arms and material of war, which Congress authorized the War Department to sell. From the 1st of April, 1865, to the 30th of June, 1871—the close of the last fiscal year—the amount realized by the sales was something more than \$15,000,000, of which the United States has received every dollar. The material was sold, and the money was fully counted into the Treasury. During the French and German war the United States Government refused to sell arms to either belligerent, but, of course, it could not prevent sales to those who might sell again to the belligerent governments. All it could do was to refuse to sell to known agents of those governments, and this it did. The apparent discrepancy between the amount of receipts for sales by the War Department and the amount paid into the Treasury is due to the fact that the reports are not simultaneously prepared, nor for the same term. But the important fact is that the whole amount of more than \$15,000,000, realized between April 1, 1865, and July 1, 1871, has been paid into the Treasury and accounted for, except a balance of something more than \$114,000, which