

THE

# SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

---

VOL. X.]                      OCTOBER, MDCCCLVII.                      [NO. 3.

---

ART. 1.—THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY.

THE importance of the views entertained by the Christian world concerning the obligation to observe the Lord's day, or Christian Sabbath, is perpetual. But circumstances occasionally give this subject a temporary prominence before the public mind. Such circumstances were found in the recent agitation of the question of Sabbath amusements in Great Britain, and in the British Parliament. The victory gained there by Christianity encourages us to hope that this is a season not unpropitious to recall this great subject before the attention of our readers, in order to review the grounds on which, as Presbyterians, we assert the strict and proper consecration of the first day of the week. We have declined to place, at the head of this article, a list of the leading publications lately issued on this subject in Great Britain, simply referring the reader to such notices of them as have met the eye of all intelligent persons.

There is, perhaps, no subject of Christian practice on which there is, among sincere Christians, more practical diversity and laxity of conscience than the duty of Sabbath observance. We find that, in theory, almost all Protestants now profess the views once peculiar to Presbyterians and other Puritans; but, in actual life, there is, among good people, a complete jumble of usages, from a laxity which would almost have satisfied the party of Archbishop Laud, up to the sacred strictness of the "Sabbatarians" whom he and his adherents reviled and persecuted. It is a curious question: how it has come about that the consciences of devout and sincere persons have allowed them such license of disobedience to a duty acknowledged and important; while on other points of obligation equally undisputed, the Christian world en-

## OUR PROBLEM.

The greatest problem of duty, laid upon the Church of the South to solve, during this current age, unquestionably respects the negro race as found on our territory under our control; greatest, alike in importance and in difficulty. No generation has risen and passed away, since the denominations that obtain here began in any general or systematic way to deal with it. Individual efforts have been made and blessed, ever since we began to be a people. Indeed, it is doubtful whether as much is done to-day, by the mode of family instruction, as was done thirty years ago.

In nothing does the difficulty of the question appear more signally, than in the variety of attempts which Christians of every name are making to do this great thing. Our Methodist brethren send out white Missionaries to preach and catechise, committing a secondary supervision and the intermediate religious services to colored "leaders;" and it would be ungracious not to acknowledge the enthusiasm, perseverance, and Christian self-devotion, with which they have toiled. The democratic element among the Baptists has operated to prevent any *special* treatment of this special case; the negroes gather into churches and have pastors of their own race, or remain a kind of irregular branch church, connected with some other body in the same place—very much as a mission among the poor whites in our suburbs might be conducted by them. So far as we are aware, labor in this cause among Episcopal ministers is mostly confined to catechetical instruction, and informal religious exercises. This work they are pursuing in many parts of our State with an industry and faithfulness worthy of all praise.

But when we look at our own church, it is no longer possible to generalize. The good work is spreading, and has spread, far and wide; but not upon any uniform plan. As regards Charleston Presbytery, it is believed that not a single church entirely neglects its duty—yet hardly any two of them agree in their way of discharging it. One has a service for them during the week; another a meeting conducted by the pastor Sunday morning; yet another devotes the afternoon of Sunday to them, and commits the labor to the elders. Some prefer to reach them by Sunday Schools, and some by preaching. Some employ watchmen, or leaders; others dispense with them in name, but look to the patriarchs of the coloured membership to keep watch over their

younger brethren ; still others oppose the whole system of leaders.

Nor is there any humiliation or weakness in this, at the outset of an undertaking so vast, so difficult, interladed with so many moral, social and political interests, and affected so variously by influences beyond the control of the Church. On the contrary, it shows the independent life and zeal of the churches ; how, without following the print of any human foot, they have looked up to their Lord and striven to do His will among the darkened and the poor. God bless them in this chief and Christ-like labor ! Make them more abundant, both in toils and in fruits !

But it is time, surely, for something more than isolated experiments. Through the years of more than a generation of men, we have been seeking out the true principles and method of the undertaking—touching here and there upon the shores of this “undiscovered country.” Would that some Maury might arise in the Church, to gather up the entries in our journals, net for us the results of this multifarious experience, and furnish us with the charts for a voyage so arduous, and of such inestimable returns !

Meanwhile, it becomes us, as promptly and clearly as we may, to state the conclusions for which our experience already furnishes the materials, and narrow thus the matters yet to be explored and discussed. And the most comprehensive, and perhaps the only radical question, now upon the minds of our brethren, relates to the organization of our churches in respect to this element.

We need hardly remind our readers that two theories obtain among us in this matter, which give rise to two systems, known respectively as the “mixed” and “separate” systems ; homely terms, but expressive and convenient enough, and we shall use them without farther apology. The necessity for mentioning theories as well as systems, arises from the fact that neither theory is perfectly brought out in practice. No church which proceeds upon the idea of blending the two races in religious culture, blend them in all its services ; neither do churches specially devoted to the negroes, exclude, but welcome, white hearers and worshippers. We shall find points calling for remark both in the theories and the systems—alike in the principles and practice—on either hand.

Let us consider, first, the “separate” system, which proposes the establishment of churches of colored people exclusively, (though with provision for white hearers in the congregation,) under the care of pastors who are white men. And we take this plan first, because it is of later introduction than the other, and avows itself an improvement upon it. Justly alledging (as we shall see under another head) certain great difficulties and defects in the ministration of religion to the negroes in the old way, it offers to obviate them in the manner we have mentioned. This it has in a degree accomplished ; but it remains a fair question

whether on the whole the method proposed is the best method. Let us see.\*

A very weighty objection to this system is found in the fact that it fails to sanctify the relation of master and servant. Not—we hasten to add—altogether to take cognizance of the relation; for the faithful preacher in either congregation, black or white, will dwell upon the duties of his people; and duties grow out of all relations. But there is a difference palpable to us all, between such precepts delivered to one party only, and the same given to the two parties together; in the first case, it is counsel or precept *only*, in the other, it is of the nature of a covenant.

This difference becomes almost oppressive to one's mind, when we descend from the pulpit to the table of our Lord. Which of us does not feel the lack, if God's children of both races are not found together there? Who does not feel that the bond between master and servant is both strengthened and softened, when the same emblems pass from hand to hand, and from lip to lip, through the whole round of the family? Would it not seem a sad and strange thing to have one church for parents and another for children? And is there not a measure of the same objection to having one church for masters and another for servants?

The objection, as thus stated, applies to the principle of separation, and it appeals to the most affecting and unanswerable illustration of the principle involved—as it is natural and right that an argument should appeal. But the principle is manifestly the same, where the separation is of classes, as where it is of persons. Nay, is it not a *more* objectionable feature when generalized than when individualized? In the one instance, a difference of tastes, a lingering of former affections or ties, a special religious history, might account for the divided worship of the family. But in this case, it is the *organic law of the Church* that divides them; we have, inwoven in our very institutions, a permanent divorce of the two classes as regards worship. This, it seems to us, is a very serious matter—one for which only the greatest spiritual advantages can compensate; and then, only when those advantages are obtainable in no other way.

There is a tendency in the spirit of the age to introduce *caste* into religious as well as social matters—a tendency that shows itself not only, nor perhaps most seriously, in this particular case. It was not, we know, and rejoice to say, in this spirit that the advocates of the "separate" system undertook their work; but we fear it is this spirit which gives much of its popularity to the movement. This is an age of analysis; and the American peo-

---

\* It may be as well to say that some of the following remarks have already appeared in the Southern Presbyterian.

ple—next perhaps to the French—are most deeply bitten of that passion. It comes easily to us to classify men in order to deal with them, from the pulpit or otherwise. But does not the Gospel counterwork this spirit? Does it not continually group men crosswise to the lines of human discrimination? And shall we not, on the whole, be more in consonance with its manner and spirit, when we gather all classes and conditions of men to the same table, and feed them with the same bread? Is not Protestant Christianity pre-eminently the religion of families, honoring and strengthening the bonds which Popery stigmatizes and which communism destroys?

The only reply to this objection of which we are aware, points to the provision made for white hearers, and to the fact that such hearers always are present, and can be addressed at the discretion of the minister; that the two races partake together of the sacred elements at the communion and with an association much more intimate than in fact obtains under the other system. This may all be admitted in palliation; we are dealing now with the evils not of the mixed, but of the separate system. In palliation, we say, it may be admitted; to admit it in refutation would be to commit an error fatal to our Presbyterian principles. It would be to confound the *audience* with the *church*. Upon the importance of distinguishing them, it surely cannot be necessary to dilate even a moment. The one is a heterogeneous and in part transient accumulation; the other is an organic body. Many of the former may be strangers; the latter are the minister's flock. To these, he is the Lord's under shepherd; to these, he speaks not as one having authority, but as the Scribes. These are there because it is their home; the others are drawn by their tastes, or their friendships, or best of all, by their love to the cause, and their desire to sustain a good man in an arduous and noble work. But even this gives him no right to deal with them. Indeed, speaking strictly, it does not appear by what right he notices them at all, or knows that they are present. The evil we speak of, therefore, is not removed, but somewhat narrowed, by the fact here alleged.

Just at this point, and closely connected with the remark just made, arises our *second* great objection to the separate system; it makes discipline the action solely of one class upon the other. These white hearers who are present in the congregation are not amenable to the same *authorities* as are the persons who compose the church. There is but one kind of officer, the white man; there is but one kind of subject under his administration, the negroes. And we earnestly press the question upon the consideration of our readers, whether this is not in some measure a departure from the Scriptural idea of the Church. We turn to the 12th chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, and in the 13th verse we find him saying: "For in one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,

whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free." These words make it plain that in the argument which follows his reference is not merely to diversities of spiritual gift, but to all kinds of gradation in the church; whether of intellect, or social position, or wealth, or race, they all reappear in the church and are provided for there as members of one body. Nor is he speaking here of the invisible church universal, but of the things healthful and right in the church of Corinth; and he argues: "If the whole body were eye, where were the hearing? if the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased Him." His thought evidently is that particles thus taken from all the divisions of human life are incorporated into one mass by a mighty and vital principle—subjected to the same influence, brought under the same law, wielded as one living frame, though they be different members. There is here, therefore, an absolute and irremovable intolerance of class distinctions in the framing and administration of his church. In social and domestic life they have their place—are sanctioned and blessed of God; but "lords over God's heritage"—rulers, standing on social rank or distinctions of race, and not on the consent and appointment of the church, are not known to the New Testament theory on this point, has thus been stated very broadly so as to leave a margin for whatever parings or limitations may in practice be found necessary. We admit, at once, that the officers of a church must often be chosen from one part of the body only; for there only will be found the convergence of the necessary qualities; but then, it is *because of the presence of these qualities* these men are chosen, and not because they come of a certain stock, or have reached a particular social position.

Now in the separate system, this particular class distinction is taken up, and made the basis of the whole organization. The whole function of government is discharged by the pastor, who is of one race, and the whole duty of obedience is assigned to the church, which is of the other race. Under the conditions of society here, there are, plainly, two ameliorations of this evil possible. The colored members might be fully organized into a church, having elders of their own color, and white pastors; or the church might be composed of the two races, and the whole body might be subjected to a session of white men. But the separate system steers carefully between these two expedients, and gives us, in the church as in the world, the naked rule of the black man by the white. Indeed, it is as an improvement upon the *second* of these forms of organization, as already existing in our churches, that it was called into existence.

It appears to us, then, that the churches of mixed membership had taken one step nearer the Scriptural model, in that they or-

tain elders *in every church*, instead of appointing officers over the flock.\* In them, though the officers are white men only, and in this respect a distinction is maintained, (whether the case admits of farther approximation to the primitive pattern, is a question reserved for another place,) yet these officers administer the same law to both white and colored members, and in this respect the distinction is done away.

The objection here advanced is certainly weighty; and to reply that the position of our colored members is anomalous, and the result of the impact of civil society upon the constitution of the church, is not to settle the question, until we have reduced the anomaly to the lowest point possible, and that on Scriptural principles.

We are constrained to offer a *third* remark upon this matter, so much involved in what has been said as to seem a repetition of it, yet important enough to claim a brief but distinct consideration. It is, that the preaching of the gospel to the poor is a vital point with every Christian church, and that to cut off the poor from it is to wound and impoverish the whole body. It cannot be too often repeated and enforced, especially in these unspiritual and worldly days, that each church is a missionary committee—exists not for itself, but for the spreading of the Gospel and the evangelization of the world. It is of exceeding importance, therefore, to incorporate the missionary element in every church by blending the destitute with the enlightened. It is one of the moral diseases of the day to make all this evangelistic labour *foreign* to the churches. They like such buildings, arrangement, worship, preaching, as does not pre-suppose the presence among them of the ignorant, the lowly, the poor. And it is our duty, and our vital interest, not to cultivate, but to extirpate this feeling.

So far as the reply to this is based on the fact that some negroes will worship in the white churches, and some white people in the churches devoted to the negroes, we have considered it already, and have seen that while, practically, it palliates the evil, it does not alter the organic law of the separate churches. But there is another, and very important reply. It denies that the negroes are our poor—point, with great truth, to the comfort and plenty in which they live—and bid us reserve our pity for our white brethren who have not where to lay their head, or a morsel of bread wherewith to feed their children.

All this we freely and gladly admit, with daily thanks to Him who has enabled us to fence out hunger and the extreme of destitution from our dependant population. Nevertheless, *as regards the supply of the gospel*, the negroes are our poor. If we have not

---

\*Smyth's Ecc. Repub'n, p. 78. Form of Gov't, chap. XII, sec. I.

compassion on them, they must die without the bread of life; and this is just the point which our argument respects—the missionary element, as necessary to the completeness of our churches.

A word will suffice for the irregularity in the constitution of these churches, as respect, our form of government. It would be unfair to press this, inasmuch as we are meeting a case not imagined when that admirable constitution was prepared. Dear as it is to us, it is not so dear as the souls of men, or the coming of the kingdom of Christ, and if it should prove necessary to adjust it to this great enterprise, we thank God for the hope we have that the whole church with one voice would call for amendment just as large and free as the exigency demanded. The question at present, however, is whether any alteration in practice or theory is needed; and if it is, whether the necessary alteration is of this kind. Whether the present provision for evangelist and missionary fields does not cover the inception of every such work, and whether the mixed churches are not upon the very basis whereon we ought to build? Whether the wide-spread establishment of these separate churches would not be a silent revolution in our system? That changes in our organization of some kind are necessary, we are not prepared to deny; but we have been endeavoring thus far to show that this is not the change we need.

We have thus endeavored to state clearly some of the chief objections to the separate system; it remains, now, to glance at those which attach to the other. And they have been so well and fairly stated in the Appendix to the Minutes of Charleston Presbytery, in session at Barnwell, April, 1837, that we shall do little more than quote substantially or literally, from that most interesting document.

We urge as a first defect, following the order of the Appendix, that “on the ordinary plan of our churches, especially in cities, the Gospel cannot, from the nature of the case, be fully and effectually imparted” to the negroes. “There may be some instances, in which, by extraordinary exertion and by means of extra services, Pastors succeed in imparting the Gospel in such a manner as to be understood by them. These cases, however, are rare. The *amount* of labor is too much for most men, and for the *sort* of labor demanded, many are unsuited. To meet the necessities of both whites and blacks in the *same* service is ordinarily impossible. If he gratifies the taste of the whites, the blacks do not understand him, and if he preaches so as to be comprehended by the blacks, the expectations of the whites are disappointed.”

We should like to strike out the word “especially” so as to read “our churches in cities.” For the country churches have nobly made the necessary sacrifice, and given half their Pastors’ time exclusively to the negroes, and, in the villages, by one expedient or another the difficulty is virtually obviated. But the



demand upon their Pastors by city-congregations do nearly or quite disable them from labor properly adapted to the ignorant and poor. The strong tendency is to grow respectable, prosperous and refined, *in such a way* (for that is all we object to) as to cut them off entirely from the lower strata of society. We shall say nothing yet of the remedy ; it is our present duty to state the fact.

A second point of prime importance is that, as things now stand, the blacks cannot experience the full benefit of *pastoral labor*." "Besides preaching the Gospel, the other functions of a Pastor are catechizing, visiting, administering rule and discipline, and performing marriage and funeral ceremonies." Now, on the ordinary plan, how much of this labor is overtaken? Facts answer, "but little. The system is more to blame than the Pastor. Can a man discharge his duties to a large white congregation, and at the same time perform the labor required in catechizing colored candidates for church membership as they should be, visiting the colored sick and poor, performing funeral and marriage ceremonies, and above all, investigating and deciding the numerous and tangled cases of discipline which are ever arising? He cannot, simply because he is human."

"A *large white congregation*"—perhaps there is a ray of light there. We will look at it again.

A third argument against things as they are is found in the lack of sufficient and good accommodation for the colored people. These large white congregations need and occupy too much of the space—too much, that is, for the accommodation at the same time of their proportion of the negroes. There is truth and force in this also.

Very weighty is the fourth allegation of the Appendix, that colored churches under white Pastors are needed as a "bar to the collection of such congregations under the supervision and control of ignorant colored men." In such congregations "good may be done, but mingled with evil. They are served \* \* \* by uneducated men, and where the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch." This allegation is evidently intended to derive its force from the beforenamed defect in the present mixed system. But in truth, there is a much deeper and more powerful cause at work—the *instinctive, inextinguishable desire for congeniality and close drawn ties between the leader of worship and the congregation*: a passion strong enough to override the petulance, vanity and misrule of ignorant men—to outlive the opposition of masters—to counterbalance the attractions of our best churches. This element in the calculation must be fully acknowledged, and wisely and efficiently provided for, or, in our humble opinion, our hold upon the negroes will be weakened more and more, and in the end cease altogether.

Looking back, now upon the ground we have traversed, rather than surveyed, one comprehensive remark suggests itself. The objections to the separate system, are objections to the principle, and are modified and weakened by the present practice, while the objections to the mixed system, are altogether practical, and their principle stands unassailable. And the question arises—though it can scarcely need to be discussed. To which, as intelligent and farseeing men, shall we give our adhesion; to the system which springs out of the principles of the Gospel and the Constitution of our Church, and admits of indefinite development toward our own ideal; or to that which, though well-worked by wise men, departs from our principles in the outset?

We have no patience with that intolerance of anomalies which would consent to the failure of any good work rather than depart from recognised forms; but we submit the question, whether, first, that is not something more than anomalous to which our arguments under the first head fairly apply; and secondly, whether, considering the separate system as an anomaly, its advocates have not yet to complete the proof of its necessity.

Leaving that with them, let us now attempt to show how the "mixed system" may be so developed as to meet the exigencies, and begin to perform the work, which has here pressed itself upon our attention. But it will be necessary, first, to bar the inference that, because we fail in presenting a perfectly satisfactory scheme, the Church must necessarily fall back upon the separate system. The true inference would be—and we hasten to write it—that wiser heads, more mighty in the Scriptures, more thoroughly informed with the spirit of our polity, and better able to vindicate the truth, should lend their utmost energies to the help of the Church, now entangled among her foes in the meshes of this great problem, and sorely bested by it—trying often times in vain to feed and protect her own—stumbling upon those she meant to help—bewildered, but not desponding; weakened, but not discomfited; foiled thus far, but rising again to the work with a purer heart and a better, because a more spiritual, hope in her Great Captain. Let it not, therefore, be counted presumption to us that we have coveted the blessing of them that are ready to perish, even though we fail.

To set forth our thought upon this matter, it will only be necessary that three grand axioms concerning the Churches of our Lord Jesus Christ be stated and applied. Perhaps another opportunity may arise for a full elaboration of them.

The first axiom is, that every church is set as truly for the "gathering" as for "the perfecting of the saints in this life." It will instantly follow, that no church is in a scriptural position—that is to say, in a place of health or spiritual honor—that regards only the conservation of what has already been attained; or which maintains itself in a condition which virtually excludes aggression

and missionary life. The application we make is that large churches should *colonize*, and reduce their swollen bulk—not to the lowest point at which life can be sustained, but to *the point of highest individual efficiency*. We proceed briefly to justify this application.

An overgrown church falls below the highest point of efficiency, because it outruns the pastor's ability to watch over the flock. There are no more hours in his day than in another man's; his locomotion is by the same means; his appliances for reaching and moving his people are the same. Beyond a certain limit, therefore, the effect of the growth of the church is just a more minute subdivision of his efforts if he is sanguine and energetic, a slacking of them if he is despondent, a partial distribution of them if he is weak. And though it may be said that the elders are his assistants and must supply what is lacking in him, it leaves the fact unaltered as regards the Pastor; and the notorious, the unquestionable tendency of this state of things, is that a certain portion of the congregation monopolize more or less completely the cares of the Pastor. This brings us back to the argument quoted from the Appendix—that "a large white congregation" absorbs the energies of the Pastor and compels him to neglect the colored people. Now, if the Pastor's influence is necessary to the highest individual efficiency of the members, and a large church outruns his ability to supply that influence, then our syllogism is complete, and very large churches fall below the highest point of efficiency possible to them.

The same thing appears in the necessity impressed on large bodies to move in masses and not by individuals. Such churches must abound in meetings, speeches and resolutions—in committees, boards and delegations; they learn to do that *immediately*, which the highest welfare of the particular members requires should be done *immediately*. Now it is clear that much of the life and individuality of each man must be held in obedience, in order that they may move in mass; and the highest point of individual efficiency is again seen to be sacrificed to the numbers and external prosperity of the church.

Now this absorption of the individual is itself a very serious loss, and not remedied if we suppose such a systematic sub-division of labour as appoints a definite duty to every man. He is overshadowed by the machinery from the outset, and his sense of responsibility weakened by it. Besides, this devotion to the one duty assigned him by the supposition has itself a tendency to cramp the mind. If we take the supposition of the previous paragraph, then, the tendency of the large church is and make soldiers of the line instead of riflemen—parts of a mass instead of independent actors; if we take the second supposition, then the tendency is to make grinders of pin's points instead of thinkers, inventors, living men.

Once more—there is great danger with such churches of withdrawing men's eyes from spiritual to carnal indications and sources of strength. Numbers, wealth, and splendidly appointed services grow but too easily in importance to our gross minds; and the faith thus wrongly bestowed reduces greatly the efficiency of the people.

It will doubtless be replied that these evils are foreseen and fought against; we hasten to admit it. There are no evils against which prayer and pains will not largely avail. Yet the only relevant question is not, whether these evils are palliated, but whether they are *inevitable*; or, if inevitable, whether there is not another system which reduces them to a minimum, while this system (as we have seen) cherishes them. We maintain that there is, and we urge its consideration upon our readers. Give us churches, every member of which can claim and receive a fair share of his Pastor's time and care—where the aroma of his goodness and wisdom can be infused into their lives—where their individuality can be preserved and the utmost amount of good be accomplished by each, and the largest net result be attained by the whole body.

Just here we approach the second axiom we wish to apply. The "*perfecting* of the saint in this life" involves the drawing out into action of all his powers and graces. And though this point was touched upon, in a preceding paragraph, it was with a different argumentative aspect from that now before us. The question there was of the efficient aggressiveness of the church; here, it is of the spiritual perfecting of the members. Such is the unalterable oneness of a man—his *atomism*, if we may coin a word—that no one of his powers can be neglected, whether passive or active, without damage to the whole of him. Symmetrical development is the condition of healthy life; and this can only be secured by the exercise of all his faculties. Providential environments, without our will, accomplish a part of this work; the remainder is devolved upon man. It is manifest, therefore, that the providing a place and duties for every member in, its body should enter into the very structure and the daily working of every church, though not always, perhaps, into its written constitution. It is not enough that as head or member of a family, as citizen or stranger, as master, or servant, he has work to do; his power as a christian, the resources of his spiritual citizenship, his zeal as a believer and lover of his God, must have all possible play, and must learn to bear the strain of arduous exertion.

The application to be made of this principle is, that no church is soundly constituted, a certain class of whose members are mere dependents and hangers-on. That there will be neutrals, *faineants*, in every church, is only too true; but they must be seen and felt to be a foreign element; the attitude of affairs should be a standing protest against their sloth and barrenness. And here will be seen, we think, the bearing of the remark to which we were

brought a few pages back, concerning the inextinguishable desire of congeniality and close drawn ties in worship. The negroes must to some extent participate in the social service of God; and the talents that are always to be found in the possession of some of them for counselling, guiding, and leading in worship, must be drawn out and employed, *under the careful supervision of the established officers of the church*. "If all things done in the church should be done decently and in order," so especially should the gifts of the "gifted" be exercised under and within the limits of well defined and *absolute* regulations. The *truly* gifted and the right minded, the zealous and the modest, will rejoice to submit themselves to such restraints which will at once sustain them against their own timidity and misgivings, and defend them against the jostlings of independent competitors."\*

The third axiom to which we appeal is, that in order to the healthy condition of the church, there must be constant interaction of all the parts. This has been so abundantly illustrated by Paul that we shall not venture an argument upon it. It is not without significance that more than one Apostle has confounded our logical deductions from the temple-like character of the Christian Church, by calling it a "*living*" temple. Returning thus to its best analogon, the human frame, we see that it is not permitted the blood to curdle in slow assimilation within this or the other member; it must fly from the heart with a swift largess to every limb, and back to the deep and central shrine, there to be inter-fused, and poured out in the endless commerce of life upon the whole body.

Our application here is not far to seek; every church must jealously guard against the resolution of its mass into different congregations worshipping within the same walls. One of the sorest evils under the sun is doubtless the inevitable gravitation of custom into routine and thence to formalism. Another is, the tendency of churches formed out of originally various elements to *dissimilate* them, and settle back into those elements. And one indispensable mode of warding off these dangers is found in the suggestion just made—to take up into the body materials from every side, and hold them in unity by the might of Christian life; that is, by the inworking grace of God.

But we are most unwillingly driven to the conclusion that this subject cannot be justly dealt with in the closing paragraphs of an article. Yet we linger, with a feeling near of kin to tenderness, upon the beautiful hope that has risen upon our thoughts—the hope of a Church of the Future that shall be indeed the Garden of God; where the lofty and lowly, the fruit and blossom of many

---

\*Isaac Taylor.

climes, the wild vines and olive trees reclaimed and grafted, shall blend their several gifts in perfect tribute to the Heavenly Husbandman—where those whom He hath “joined together” in faith and holiness, and in daily life, shall not be “put asunder” in worship—where the “rich and the poor” shall yet more happily “meet together,” before the Lord who is “the Father of them all.” This is Utopian, no doubt, there is Utopia in all things good—that sweet faint perfume from the Paradise so far away! But what then?

---

## THE TESTIMONY OF THE ROCKS.

BY HUGH MILLER.

The world has scarcely yet recovered from the shock experienced by the news of Hugh Miller's decease. For the Stone Mason of Crodmarty had hewn out for himself by the diligent culture of magnificent endowments a fame wide as the world. Rude and ignorant laborers had ceased to be his companions and the wise and learned had welcomed him as a peer to their brotherhood; the bleak hill-side and quarry had been exchanged for the study—the mason's hammer for the pen—poverty for comparative affluence and obscurity for a renown honorably won and undimmed by a stain. Master of a style which for pictorial vigor and accuracy, is under the circumstances of his early life absolutely marvellous; endowed with a native sense which preserved him even in his loftiest flights from extravagance and exaggeration; vigorous and powerful in argument; subtle in analysis; keen in observation; of a lively and graceful fancy, he added yet one crowning charm to manifold accomplishments, by which to endear himself to the wise and good, namely, the consecration of his powers to the noblest work for which an immortal being can live—the glory of the Almighty Maker. It must be long ere the thoughtful student of God's providence, can recover from the sorrow and alarm with which he sees such a man cut down in the strength of his years and the maturity of his powers, “when his eye was not dim” nor his natural strength abated and by means so inscrutable and sorrowful. But whilst we render most heartily this tribute—whilst we admit the genius and power of the writer—whilst we readily confess that in this last work of his hands which comes to us sanctified by death and can be read only with tears of sorrowing love