

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

NEW SERIES. No. XVI.—OCTOBER, 1866.

ART. I.—THE DIFFERENT SPECIES OF SERMONS, AND THE
CHOICE OF A TEXT.

By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary.

IN classifying sermons, it is well to follow the example of the scientific man, and employ as generic distinctions as possible. It is never desirable to distinguish a great many particulars, and elevate them into an undue prominence by converting them into generals. That classification, therefore, which would regard the “applicatory” sermon, the “observational” sermon, and such like, as distinct classes, only contributes to the confusion and embarrassment of the inquirer. The three most generic species of sermons, are the *topical*, the *textual*, and the *expository*.

The Topical Sermon is one in which there is but a single leading idea. This idea sometimes finds a formal expression in a proposition, and sometimes it pervades the discourse as a whole, without being distinctly pre-announced. Topical sermons are occupied with one definite subject or topic, which can be accurately and fully stated in a brief title. South preaches a discourse of this kind from Numbers, xxxii. 23 :

festival seasons, where it may take the place of the Apostles' Creed.

The Athanasian Symbol, finally, being still more theological and scientific in tone and expression, is scarcely appropriate for liturgical use at all, except perhaps on special occasions, or, as has been proposed, once a year on Trinity Sunday. It is intended more for the clergy than for the people. The frequent use of it in the mediæval Latin church, and in the Church of England, is to be attributed in part to the former scarcity of hymns, now so happily supplied by our rich treasures of sacred poetry, and can, therefore, not be taken as a precedent.

The most solemn and impressive form of professing the Creeds in public worship is the chanting by the choir, either alone or in connection with the whole congregation properly trained for responsive liturgical worship.

ART. V.—THE POLITICAL CRISIS.

BY GEORGE L. PRENTISS, D. D., New York City.

IN closing an article on the Political Situation, in the April number of this Review, we expressed our fervent hope "that Congress and the President might soon come to see eye to eye, and agree upon a joint policy which should be, like the wisdom from above, first pure, then peaceable, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."

We need not say how grievously this hope has been disappointed. The differences, which six months ago seemed not incapable of being reconciled, have since widened into an impassable chasm. The Executive and Legislative departments of the Government are arrayed against each other in open and determined conflict. Both have appealed to the country and already the popular verdict has begun to utter itself. The nation is in the midst of a political crisis as momentous as any

it has ever known. We propose to take a brief survey of the contest, and of the issues involved in it.

In our previous article we traced the President's policy down to the veto of the Civil Rights Bill. His message returning that bill left but little ground of hope that he would approve of any plan of restoration, which the wisdom of the National Legislature might devise. Everything, indeed, indicated that his mind was fully set in him to have his own way, in total disregard of the law-making power; and that his own way was to admit the States lately in insurrection to all their old rights and privileges, and to increased power in the Government, *without any further conditions or guarantees whatever*. He declared them (with the exception of Texas) to be already reconstructed, and as completely entitled to representation in either house of Congress as New York or Ohio. He had said, it is true, that they must present themselves "*in an attitude of loyalty*" as well as "in the persons of loyal representatives." But as he evidently considered himself the sole judge of the first qualification, and loudly proclaimed their loyalty to be unimpeachable,* it only remained for Congress to look into the second. But here, again, there was an irreconcilable difference between the two branches of the Government. The word "loyal" was used by the President in a peculiar sense. He meant by it, as is now perfectly clear, anybody who, having been amnestied, or pardoned, professed approval of his "policy;" and this executive test Mayor Monroe, of New Orleans, or one of his "Thugs," could stand quite as well as Gov. Parsons and Gov. Orr. The Congressional test of a "loyal representative," on the other hand, was his ability to take the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution and the law of the land.† This oath, both in its letter and spirit, is in utter

* "They (the late rebel States) are one and all in an attitude of loyalty towards the Government, and of sworn allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. In no one of them is there the slightest indication of resistance to this authority, or the slightest protest against its just and binding obligation. This condition of renewed loyalty has been officially recognized by solemn proclamation of the Executive department."—*Address of the Philadelphia Johnson Convention.*

† The oath is as follows: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I have never

antagonism to the policy of Mr. Johnson. Probably not half-a-dozen of all the claimants of seats from the South can take it without committing perjury ; and yet not a single one of these claimants but is an enthusiastic supporter of the President ; nor is there any reason to think that a single one of them all is regarded by him as disqualified to sit in the halls of National Legislation. How, then, can any loyal man be surprised that the breach between Congress and the Executive was not healed? It could have been healed only by the former consenting to abandon the whole question of reconstruction to the discretion of Mr. Johnson, to abdicate to this end its functions as the supreme law-making power of the Nation, and to admit to seats on its floor men whose hearts and lips were still envenomed with disloyalty, provided only they brought in their hands the pardon, and praised the " policy," of the Executive ! Some have alleged, we are aware, that if Congress, early in the session, had decided upon the plan ultimately adopted, the President would, probably, have given it his approval ; for he had again and again expressed himself as in favor of every one of its principles. We cannot concur

voluntarily borne arms against the United States since I have been a citizen thereof ; that I have voluntarily given no aid, countenance, counsel, or encouragement to persons engaged in armed hostility thereto ; that I have neither sought nor accepted, nor attempted to exercise the functions of any office whatever, under any authority or pretended authority in hostility to the United States ; that I have not yielded a voluntary support to any pretended government, authority, power, or Constitution within the United States, hostile or inimical thereto. And I do further swear (or affirm) that, to the best of my knowledge and ability, I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States, against all enemies, foreign and domestic ; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same ; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God."

"And why (it may be asked) did not Congress admit the few claimants who *could* honestly take this oath?" We reply, because it would have been a virtual abandonment of the vital point in dispute ; it would have been giving up to the enemy the key to the whole position. Congress maintained the ground that no insurrectionary State was entitled to representation in either house of the National Legislature, until, as a State, it gave adequate guarantees that it had abandoned the principles of the rebellion, and would henceforth abide by the amended Constitution, the Union, and the obligations of honor and justice contracted by the nation in putting down the rebellion. So long as such guarantees were not given, Congress would have stultified itself in admitting any man, however loyal ; and so Horace Maynard, Senator Fowler, and Col. Stokes, the tried loyalists claiming seats from Tennessee, frankly acknowledged.

in this opinion. We are constrained to believe that Mr. Johnson had already made up his mind not to agree with Congress, except on the condition of its first yielding to him all the vital points in controversy. If there were no other evidence of this, his speeches, and those of his Secretary of State, during their late electioneering tour to the grave of Douglas, leave no doubt on the subject. Whatever may have been thought before, we are at a loss to understand how anybody, after reading these extraordinary effusions, can suppose for a moment that the dilatory action of Congress, or the "white-washing" epithet of Mr. Sumner, or even the sarcasms of that extremely "radical" but sturdy and whole-souled old patriot, Thaddeus Stevens, led Mr. Johnson to abandon the loyal cause. Is it not, alas! too plain that he had deserted it already in his heart; and that these things so offended him, because they helped to betray the fearful secret to the watchful eye of the country?

We are not disposed, therefore, to censure Congress for having delayed so long to decide upon a plan of reconstruction. This delay was highly salutary and needful. The task was one of the most difficult ever assigned to a legislative body. And for three months after Congress met, the country was far from being in the mood to break with the President and stand up in solid phalanx for its loyal Senators and Representatives. Thousands of patriotic and thoughtful citizens, who in July last were in full sympathy with Congress, in December, 1865, or even in February, 1866—at least before the 22d of that month—would have taken sides with the Executive; of this no other proof is needed than the memorable Cooper Institute meeting on the evening of Washington's birthday. So the final rupture came, probably, at the best time; neither too soon nor too late. It came just when public sentiment was ripe for the great issue. Instead of blaming Congress for not sooner agreeing upon a policy, we rather praise it for its wise delay. The policy was thus made far more perfect, and popular opinion was prepared to give it a much heartier and more intelligent support. However desir-

able it might have been to hasten the work of restoration, it was vastly more desirable that the work should be done well than done quickly. It is a thousand times better that the States lately in rebellion should be admitted in the right way one or two years hence, than that they should be admitted at once, or should have been admitted last winter, in a way dangerous to the future peace and safety of the country, or inconsistent with national honor and justice. And it seems to us that the future peace and safety of the Union, and not less the claims of honor and justice, are admirably provided for by the plan of settlement finally adopted by Congress. This plan is contained in a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution. It is as follows :

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE UNITED STATES.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of both Houses concurring), that the following article be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said Legislatures, shall be valid as part of the Constitution, namely :

ARTICLE XIV.—SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States ; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States, according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of Electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

SEC. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President or Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State Legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States,

shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

SEC. 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection and rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations or claims, shall be held illegal and void.

SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this Article.

This amendment speaks for itself and requires no interpreter. It is well entitled to the place in our American *Magna Charta*, which we trust it will soon occupy beside the great Amendment proposed by the Thirty-Eighth Congress.* The more it is pondered, the more will it commend itself to the reason and conscience of the Nation as an eminently wise, just, and magnanimous basis for the settlement of the questions arising out of the rebellion. It is, surely, the very embodiment of national leniency and moderation, containing nothing vindictive, nothing harsh, even. Indeed, the only plausible ground of complaint against it is its extreme mildness. Where do the records of history afford another instance of a great and high-spirited nation dealing with a conquered rebellion, which had assailed and almost destroyed its life, on terms so considerate and merciful? Let us for a moment examine these terms. Let us look at this ultimatum of Congressional "Radicalism."

Section 1 defines American citizenship, asserting this high privilege for the 4,000,000 of freedmen, and places it everywhere, without respect of persons, under the benignant and august protection of the National Government. It is nothing else than a practical enforcement of the principles of the Declaration of Independence. When once part of the Constitution, the true measure of the civil rights of every

* ARTICLE XIII.—SEC. 1.—Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

SEC. 2.—Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

American freeman, whatever his race or color, will be the supreme law of the land—the great law of our Republican Liberty—and not the mere good pleasure of South Carolina, Louisiana, or any other State, whether in the North or South.

Section 2 changes the basis of representation in Congress, and in the Electoral College, in accordance with the results of the war. Without this change the South would actually gain nine or ten members, while the North would lose ten. By this change the three-fifths rule ceases to operate, and the South, instead of gaining ten votes in consequence of rebellion, loses fourteen; so that the practical effect would be a difference of some *thirty-four* votes in Congress and in the Electoral College in favor of the North. And this is perfectly fair and just. The South can at any time turn the balance in its own favor by giving the elective franchise to its colored citizens. But so long as it refuses to do this; so long as it withholds the ballot from these four millions of its population on account of their color, it has no right to vote for them or to claim that it represents them. This section, we repeat, is most just and reasonable, and the North will insist upon it at all hazards. It certainly needs no argument to show that the vote of a late rebel in South Carolina, or Alabama, ought not to equal the vote of two loyal citizens of Maine or Iowa.

Section 3 provides that those who have added perjury to treason, in turning against the Union and adhering to its enemies, the leaders of the rebellion, shall be ineligible to any State or Federal office, until absolved by the people through a two-thirds vote of their Representatives in Congress. And this provision, it will be observed, not only puts a righteous stigma upon perjury and treason in the past, but holds out a solemn warning to all who in the future may be tempted to commit these crimes. Like the section following, it is intended to be a permanent law of the land, looking before and after. How entirely it harmonizes with the views of Mr. Johnson, as expressed in his speech "*defining* (to use his own language) *the grounds on which he accepted*" the Baltimore nomination, and in his various addresses on assuming the Ex-

ecutive reins, it is needless to remark ; although, to be sure, it falls very far short of the large scope and pitiless severity of his doctrine. If any one is disposed to question this statement, let him read the section again and then compare it with the following utterances of the President :

“Treason against the Government is the highest crime that can be committed, and those engaged in it should suffer all its penalties.” “They must not only be punished, but their social power must be destroyed.” “I say that the traitor has ceased to be a citizen, and in joining the rebellion, has become a public enemy. He forfeited the right to vote with loyal men when he renounced his citizenship, and sought to destroy our Government.” “After making treason odious, every Union man should be remunerated out of the pockets of those who have inflicted this great suffering on the country.” “Their leaders must feel the power of the Government. Treason must be made odious, and traitors must be punished and impoverished ; their great plantations must be seized, and divided into small farms, and sold to honest, industrious men.” “Why all this carnage and devastation ? It was that treason might be put down, and traitors punished. Therefore, I say that traitors should take a back seat in the work of restoration. If there be but five thousand men in Tennessee loyal to the Constitution, loyal to freedom, loyal to justice, these true and faithful men should control the work of reorganization and reformation absolutely.”

Section 4 affirms the validity of the National debt, and the illegality of all rebel debts and obligations, or claims for the loss or emancipation of slaves. We regard this section as of immeasurable importance. The repudiation of the rebel debt, it will be remembered, was one of the conditions of restoration laid down by the President himself. But that repudiation, even had it been made part of its new Constitution by every Southern State, would afford no sort of security to the country. It can itself be repudiated the moment the States are re-admitted. Moreover, it says nothing about claims for the loss or emancipation of slaves ; *nor does the Platform of Mr. Johnson's Philadelphia Convention.* Should the South be restored without further conditions, we entertain no doubt that a formidable combination would at once be organized to bring about the assumption of the rebel debt, and the payment of claims for the loss or emancipation of slaves, to say nothing of pensions for the Confederate soldiers. It has ever been to us a matter of unfeigned astonishment that the monied capital of the North, so vitally interested in the public

credit and national securities, should not have shown more alarm on this point. In our opinion the peril from this source can hardly be overestimated; and we see no adequate protection against it, except in an amendment to the Constitution. The South once restored, with a large increase of political power, would be a solid unit in favor of demanding compensation for its slaves, if not the assumption of its war debt; and with the aid of Northern allies hungering for place, who can be sure it would not succeed? Such a combination as we have mentioned, with so immense a prize in view, could well afford to offer a million of dollars, if need be, for a vote; and it is fearful to think what might, yea, what probably would be the effect of such colossal bribery! We should see a "Ring," whose vast magnitude, power, and turpitude, would utterly dwarf and put to shame even that which has so long preyed upon the property and morals of New York.

Section 5 authorizes Congress to enforce the foregoing provisions by appropriate legislation. Brief as it is, this section contains an ample supply of Constitutional power to destroy the last vestige of the rebellion, to maintain the public faith and credit, to protect Southern loyalty, whether of blacks or whites, and in due time to establish impartial freedom, order, and equal justice throughout the Union.

Such is the plan of restoration devised by the patient, far-seeing, and patriotic wisdom of the National Legislature. The Amendment has been ratified already by New Hampshire, Connecticut, Tennessee, New Jersey and Oregon. We cannot doubt that it will be ratified by all the other Northern States, and by a sufficient number of Southern States to make it valid as part of the Constitution. Nor do we doubt that it will confer imperishable honor upon its much-abused and calumniated authors—the faithful, fearless senators and representatives of the Thirty-ninth Congress. Compared with the insane policy of Mr. Johnson, it appears to us as the fine gold of sober, prudent, and high-toned American statesmanship—such statesmanship as sat in council in the renowned convention of 1787.

We are aware that some who acknowledge the Amendment

to be essentially just and reasonable, still deny the right of the National Legislature to make its ratification a condition precedent to the admission of the late rebel States to representation in Congress. They are willing it should be urged upon the acceptance of the South, but only in the way of "moral agitation." This is the ground taken by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher in the deplorable letter which shot such a pang of grief through the hearts of millions of his old friends, and made so jubilant the hearts of millions of his old defamers. It is the ground taken by other honored citizens, whose purity of motive and sincere devotion to their country are unquestionable. But we cannot for a moment admit its validity. We yield nothing to these eminent men in our desire for a speedy and complete restoration of the Union. Nor are we willing to concede that our faith in the New Era, or in the beneficent and reconciling power of American and Christian ideas, is less strong than theirs. But this is not a mere question of "moral agitation;" no more than was that of the adoption of the other great amendment abolishing slavery. Like that, it is pre-eminently a question of wise and practical statesmanship. It concerns not merely desirable things, but things absolutely vital to national honor, security and justice. Such, at least, is the deliberate conviction of myriads of the most thoughtful, sober-minded, and conscientious patriots in the land. Such is the solemn conviction of the overwhelming majority of the men and women, who sustained the country through the war, both at home and in the field. Nor have they the least misgiving as to the constitutional power, or the perfect historical and moral right of the American people, through their senators and representatives in Congress assembled, to require assent to the righteous provisions of the proposed amendment on the part of the late revolted States, as a condition precedent to their sharing again in the National Legislation and Government. No theory denying this power and right appears to them tenable; neither that which asserts the Nation to be pledged to the late rebel States by its public decla-

rations during the war ; * nor that of the transcendental and impeccable character of the States as States. This last doctrine, especially, as it is preached in support of Mr. Johnson's policy, they find it hard patiently to endure ; the doctrine, we mean, that the Southern States could do no wrong and impair no right, or privilege, by the treason of the people and governments which constituted them States ; that they could not go out of the Union, and never were out, either in law, or in fact ; and that, therefore, they were fully entitled to representation in Congress, not only the instant the war ceased, but *all through the rebellion*—as fully entitled as Massachusetts or Illinois—and that to deny them this representation *until they give to the Nation proper guarantees of the loyalty of the people and governments which constitute them States, as also of its own future peace and safety*—is an act utterly unconstitutional, oppressive, and destructive of the Government.† The over-

* On this point we think many have been misled by the language of the oft-cited resolution on the object of the war, passed by the two houses of Congress in July, 1861, just after the battle of Bull Run. This resolution was a manifesto to the insurgent States, and was intended especially to allay their fears for the institution of Slavery. It embodied, no doubt, the loyal sentiment of the country at the time. But it seems to us that a most inordinate importance has been attached to it. It was passed by a Congress chosen before the war. It was no *law*. It did not bind the Executive, who never signed it, nor did it bind the next Congress chosen in the midst of the war and with exclusive reference to the new issues. When President Lincoln issued his Proclamation of Emancipation, the act was bitterly denounced as a violation of the letter and spirit of this Crittenden resolution ; it was "overthrowing or interfering with the rights and established institutions of those States." But Mr. Lincoln did not consider that he was violating any pledge which bound either him or the Nation. The same charge was brought against the 38th Congress, for proposing the amendment abolishing slavery ; it was an attempt to "overthrow an established institution, and impair the dignity, equality and rights" of the Southern States. But that noble Congress did not admit the charge to be just ; nor did the loyal States who ratified that Great Amendment ; nor did President Johnson, when he required the rebellious States to ratify it also. The Crittenden Resolution had no legal or constitutional force when it was passed ; and it certainly has none now. Still, we see no real inconsistency between a vote for that resolution and a vote for the Constitutional Amendment. The object of the latter is simply to secure the great object of the war as declared by the former, and to fulfill the pledges given by the Nation in its successful prosecution.

† "It seems to us in the exercise of the calmest and most candid judgment we can bring to the subject, that such a claim, so inferred, involves as fatal an overthrow of the authority of the Constitution, and as complete a destruction of the Government and Union, as that which was sought to be effected by the States and people in armed insurrection against them both."—*Address of Mr. Johnson's Philadelphia Convention.*

whelming majority of those who sustained the country through the war, we repeat it, regard this doctrine as a monstrous sophism, repugnant alike to political reason, to fundamental principles of moral and social order, and to sound common sense. And their opinion of it seems to us entirely correct.

No fine-spun metaphysical theory of State rights, or of the Constitution, can serve as a just and proper basis for the settlement of such novel, momentous, and eminently practical questions as have sprung out of the Slaveholders' rebellion. The founders of the Republic never anticipated the occasion for such a settlement; just as little as they anticipated the breaking out, in 1861, of such a stupendous civil war; and they made special provisions for the one as little as for the other. In conducting the war to a successful issue, the Nation was compelled to adapt itself to the unparalleled exigency by creating, both on land and water, its own military precedents; and it has the right to do a like thing in securing the fruits of its incomparable victory. When the Constitution and its own experience cast no sure light upon its "dim and perilous way," it must seek light elsewhere. Following its own Heaven-inspired instincts, and taking counsel at the oracles of Eternal Truth, why should it not create new political precedents in the interest of republican freedom, humanity and justice? Has it not already done so in devising and adopting the great Amendment? Nor have we any fear that such a course will lead it astray from the paths of a wise and genuine conservatism, or of Christian mercy and magnanimity. The loyal heart of the Nation is still disposed, as it has ever been, to the largest possible exercise of mercy and magnanimity towards those lately in arms against its life, that is consistent with the claims of public order, righteousness and good faith. It is afraid to exercise even the blessed quality of mercy at the expense of these sacred principles. And we believe the time is coming when even the South will fully understand this; when she will be willing to acknowledge that the great heart of the Nation, like the heart of its martyred President, was governed in its policy of restoration by no sen-

timent inconsistent "with malice toward none, with charity to all."

We have thus taken a brief view of the political crisis through which the country is passing ; and what we have said might, for the most part, have been written as well before the adjournment of Congress as now. But since that date, public events have occurred of the gravest import, and bearing directly upon our subject. The nation has been in the midst of a severe moral, as well as political crisis. Its patience, its self-command, and its holiest convictions, have been tried and tested as hardly ever before. It has seen the boundless patronage of the Executive prostituted to the work of intimidating and corrupting popular opinion with open and shameless effrontery. Unscrupulous and ambitious, or disappointed, politicians, some of them veterans of half a century in the arts of party intrigue, and whose very names have become odious to the moral sense of the nation, have been seen conspiring together to thwart the righteous will of the people, and to betray the cause of Loyalty and Freedom into the hands of its worst foes. Deeds of savage butchery have been perpetrated at mid-day, in one of the chief cities of the Union, and in the sight of the Flag of our country, which find no parallel this side of the Sepoy massacres in the dark places of Oriental heathendom ; and, to crown the horror, the Chief Magistrate of the Republic stands in such relations to them, both before and after, as to have impelled sober-minded, Christian citizens to turn deliberately to the Constitution and ponder, for the first time, the meaning of those "*OTHER high crimes and misdemeanors*" on impeachment for and conviction of which "**THE PRESIDENT . . . SHALL BE REMOVED FROM OFFICE.**" (ART. II. Sect. 4.)

And, as if this were not enough, the ear of the nation has been assailed, week after week, by denunciations of its Supreme Legislature as a usurping, disunion body "hanging upon the verge of the Government," and by dark threats of a rival Congress to be made up of late rebels and their allies from

"the other end of the line," as also of another civil war, to be carried on—not on Southern—but on Northern soil. Nor have such threats and denunciations been uttered by reckless politicians alone; they have been scattered broadcast over the land, like so many fire-brands, arrows and death, by the lips of the Executive himself! Is it strange that these things have filled the public mind with the deepest excitement and alarm? Is it strange that they have pressed, like an incubus, upon all loyal hearts, keeping thoughtful men and women awake at midnight? Is it strange that, in view of them, the tide of popular sentiment is running with such resistless might in the direction indicated by the Vermont and Maine elections?

It is not our purpose to discuss the New Orleans riot. The end of that dreadful story is not yet. The American people are still reading it; and they require no interpreter and no argument to explain to them its meaning, or to tell them who are the responsible and guilty authors of it. They have studied and compared the President's dispatches and every other dispatch, whether in its mutilated or un mutilated form; they have read Mr. Johnson's apology for the massacre in his speech at St. Louis; they have pondered Gen. Baird's report, and will ponder every word of the Report of the Military Commission when it sees the light. If any further evidence is needed, they will demand that it be taken the moment Congress shall assemble. And we are very much mistaken if they do not also demand in due time, and in a voice not to be trifled with, that in some way the crime should be punished and the matchless infamy of it washed off from the American name. In dismissing the subject, we content ourselves with putting on record a single extract from one of Gen. Sheridan's dispatches to Gen. Grant; simply begging our readers to compare the closing recommendation respecting Mayor Monroe with the dispatch, signed five or six weeks later by that Head Centre of the "Thugs," as still Mayor of New Orleans, lauding the President and his "policy," and supplicating him to return from St. Louis to the seat of Government by way of Louisiana:

“The more information I obtain of the affair of the 30th in this city, the more revolting it becomes. *It was no riot. It was an absolute massacre by the police, which was not excelled in murderous cruelty by that of Fort Pillow. It was a MURDER which the Mayor and Police of the city perpetrated without the shadow of a necessity.*

“Furthermore, *I believe it was premeditated, and every indication points to this. I recommend the removal of this bad man.*”

In passing from the New Orleans massacre to the Convention which met in Philadelphia on the 14th of August, we have no thought of casting wanton reproach upon that body. We shall not question that many of its members were actuated by honest and patriotic motives. Some of them are known to the whole country for their high personal worth, their eminence in public service, and their varied attainments; some of them, also, like the accomplished temporary chairman, Gen. Dix, for their honorable record during the war. We have no disposition to speak of such men otherwise than with respect. But the Philadelphia Convention did not originate with such men; they were not its managers; nor is their character any fair exponent of its real intent and purposes. Their aim was very different from the ultimate aim of the Washington and New York politicians, whose old, cunning brains and expert hands contrived and manipulated it; and some of them are, probably, already finding this out. The Convention was imposing in numbers and marked by extraordinary enthusiasm for Mr. Johnson and his “policy,” for itself and for the triumphs it was going to win; it seemed to excite no enthusiasm, however, among the loyal and great-hearted people of Philadelphia. Its chief authors evidently thought “the order of exercises” a master-piece of adroit management; the country, on the other hand, was inclined to regard the whole thing, from the “arm-in-arm” farce at the opening to the closing scene in the White House at Washington, as a huge political blunder. What, for example, could be less fitted to win the public confidence and admiration than the frantic manœuvres to keep out Mr. Valandigham, Mr. Fernando Wood, and a Mr. Dean? Our noble Board of Health did not struggle with a more anxious and persistent zeal to keep the Asiatic cholera out of New

York. And yet the entire country knew very well, that if all the members of the Convention, who sympathized with the principles represented so faithfully by these gentlemen, had been required to leave it, the whole concern would have suffered an instant collapse; scarcely a Southern delegate would have remained, and the places of the larger portion of the Northern delegates would also have become vacant. It was beyond measure absurd to imagine that the clear and single eye of the American people could be deceived by such a bungling political trick. And then, what could be more unwise than to convert the Convention from an arena of honest public conference and discussion into a ridiculous dumb-show, by muzzling the lips of all the delegates, except the handful to whom special parts had been assigned? The Address and Resolutions, although posterity will not, probably, consider them quite equal to the immortal work of the Convention of 1787, or even as a "Second Declaration of Independence," (President Johnson to the contrary notwithstanding), are yet written with skill and ability, as was to be expected from their author; and in spite of much fatal error and sophistry, they assert also many most important truths; but was it exactly kind and "magnanimous" to require the delegates from the late rebel confederacy to give their solemn assent and applause to doctrines, statements and pledges, which their hearts, if not their consciences, must have utterly refused to endorse? * Was not this imposing "degrading conditions upon our Southern brethren?" So it was regarded by the leading organs of public opinion at the South; and accordingly, with a

* As e. g. the following Resolutions of the Platform :

8. "While we regard as utterly invalid and never to be assumed, or made of binding force, any obligation incurred or undertaken in making war against the United States, we hold the debt of the Nation to be sacred and inviolable, and we proclaim our purpose in discharging this, as in performing all other National obligations, to maintain unimpaired and unimpeached the honor and the faith of the Republic.

9. "It is the duty of the National Government to recognize the services of the Federal soldiers and sailors in the contest just closed by meeting promptly all their just and rightful claims for the services they have rendered the Nation, and by extending to those of them who have survived, and to the widows and orphans of those who have fallen, most generous and considerate care."

promptitude and frankness that did honor to their manhood, they repudiated with disdain the action of their delegates in committing the Southern people to such a creed and such sentiments. Had we space, it would be easy to cite pages of the most explicit testimony to this effect. Still, in spite of all these things, it must be admitted that the Philadelphia Convention was planned with no little skill, availed itself of every advantage thrown in its way by the cross-currents of public opinion, and for a time appeared to those, who looked merely at the surface, as not unlikely to succeed. But there were insuperable obstacles in the way of its success, and sagacious observers saw it to be so from the outset. It was essentially a movement in utter hostility to the loyal cause—an attempt to gratify personal ambitions and revenges by precipitating the process of National restoration on principles in direct conflict with the very ideas which had led the country in triumph through the war; and instead of being deceived, the people at a glance saw through the whole scheme, and were only kindled by it to fiery indignation. That is the rock upon which the Johnson-Seward movement was doomed to be wrecked and go to pieces. And this catastrophe was hastened and rendered doubly sure, by the light which the New Orleans murders cast upon the baleful tendency of the Executive policy; as also by the startling revelation which the stumping pilgrimage to the grave of Douglas afforded of the political temper and discretion of its authors.

Of this melancholy, we had almost said hideous, spectacle upon which the nation was compelled to gaze for two long weeks, we shall allow ourselves to say but very little; it pains us deeply to have to say a word. But silence in this case would be disloyalty to the Christian character of the country, and to the moral dignity and honor of the Presidential office. Government is ordained of God; and if those who are entrusted with its exalted and awful functions by the free suffrage of their fellow-citizens, publicly descend from their high position to the level of the vulgar wrangler, the incendiary demagogue, the boastful and railing egotist, or the clown

and postprandial jester, they merit and should receive the sternest rebuke ; for they desecrate a divine institution, as well as bring disgrace upon the cause of republican liberty. The American people have never before been called to bow the head so low in shame and sorrow for the conduct of their Chief Magistrate ; we trust they will never be called to do it again. One such humiliation ought to be enough for all time. It is a sad thing to say, that the most charitable construction which can be put upon the conduct and language of both actors in this shocking exhibition, is to suppose them not to have been always sober, or in their right mind. How otherwise *could* they so forget themselves, or attribute such political and moral idiocy to the Christian people of the North, as to have ventured to address them in such a style ; still more to expect, by such language, to change their honest and profound convictions respecting great questions of public duty and policy ? We lament beyond measure the effect of this evil example in arousing the angry passions and intensifying the bitterness of party strife. Is it not one office of our Chief Magistrate and Ministers of State to illustrate by word as well as deed, in the presence of the people as well as in the cabinet, the dignity, self-possession, moderation, and high-toned courtesy, which belong to the idea of a Christian Republic ? And we cannot be sufficiently thankful that in the midst of even the repulsive scenes upon which we have animadverted, there appeared—most unwillingly, we doubt not—two illustrious servants of the country—its greatest soldier and its greatest sailor—who well fulfilled this grand office. How expressive the very silence of Grant and Farragut, in contrast with the miserable noise and confusion that surrounded them !

We have written these things with heartfelt regret and sorrow ; for they concern men who have heretofore rendered eminent services to their country, and to the cause of liberty. We gladly leave a subject so ungrateful, and pass on to say a word of the other Philadelphia Convention, which met on the 3d of September.

The records of this remarkable gathering are before the country, and we need not go into details respecting it. The Northern people listened eagerly to its voice, have calmly pondered its statements, and will, in due time, make their own response to its pathetic and manly appeal. It was an assemblage as impressive as it was unique in American history. Its story sounded like a chapter from the old martyrologies of Christian faith and liberty, while its addresses and resolutions carried one back to the Declaration of Independence, and the "times that tried men's souls." How different in all respects from the Confederate portion of the Convention that preceded it! That was largely composed of Southerners, who had done their utmost to tear to tatters the Flag of our Country; this, of Southerners who had suffered shame and loss for their unfaltering allegiance to that glorious flag. The one represented chiefly the old slave-holding aristocracy and wealth of the South; the other represented its poor, plain people, its "mean whites," and its four millions of negroes. The former uttered what had been prepared for it by the calculating politicians who called and "run" it, and was allowed to utter nothing else; the latter was, at all events, a council of unmuzzled freemen, each speaking what was in his heart. The one deemed it a great achievement to have kept out Mr. Vallandigham and Mr. Fernando Wood; the other had a colored man among its delegates, was proud to welcome Frederick Douglas to its floor, and listened with delight to his manly and powerful eloquence. Andrew Johnson had the unbounded admiration of the one, ABRAHAM LINCOLN seemed to be enshrined in the grateful love and veneration of the other; and while the former adjourned to meet again in the White House, and there offer incense to its idol, the latter adjourned to meet again around the grave where repose the mortal remains of our martyred President. There was not in all the South a man still cherishing the spirit of the rebellion, who did not rejoice greatly in the August Convention, how much soever he may have scorned the thought of being bound by its pledges, or of assenting to its doctrines; nor was there in all the South such a man, who did not regard

the September Convention with mingled contempt, hatred and fear. Are all these strange contrasts accidental? or do they not rather express deep affinities, and fundamental principles of political right and wrong?

There was only one point of serious difference among the members of the September Convention, viz., the question of impartial or negro suffrage; and even on that point the difference related rather to the time and mode than to the principle itself. Most of the delegates from the border States were unwilling to assert the principle at once, and put it into the platform; while most of the delegates from the "unreconstructed States" were not only ready to assert the principle and put it into the platform, but they maintained that their political salvation and that of the whole South which they represented—the Union men during the war, the poor whites, and the colored population—absolutely depended upon its bold assertion and early realization. And certainly no candid person can read their argument and statements in support of this opinion, without feeling their overwhelming force. Without approving of everything that was said, we believe the effect of the Convention will be to enlighten the public mind on this momentous question, to remove prejudice, and so to hasten the day when the mere color of his skin shall debar no American citizen from the right and privilege of the ballot-box. That day is sure to come. The logic of our democratic institutions, the inexorable logic of events, and the calm reason and justice of the nation will combine to bring it to pass without fail. And why should anybody be afraid of that day? Even President Johnson fully acknowledges the principle and the wisdom of putting it in practice, in his dispatch to Provisional Governor Sharkey, of Mississippi, dated August 15, 1865, in which, referring to the State Convention, he says: "If you could extend the elective franchise to all persons of color who can read the Constitution of the United States in English, and write their names, and to all persons of color who own real estate valued at not less than two hundred and fifty dollars, and pay taxes thereon, you would completely disarm the adversary

and set an example the other States will follow. *This you can do with perfect safety.*" And if it could be done in Mississippi "with perfect safety" in August, 1865, when the war was hardly over, it certainly could be done now "with perfect safety" in every Southern State, and (alas! that it needs to be added) in every Northern State which is still enthralled to the cruel prejudices begotten of slavery and *caste*.

Let this question of impartial suffrage and the political rights of the colored citizen be settled in accordance with the fundamental principles of American society; and then—the Constitutional Amendment having been adopted, and enforced by appropriate legislation—we cannot doubt that peace and prosperity would soon prevail throughout all our borders, and that all classes and conditions and races of men among us would rejoice together in the blessings of a new era of Christian light and liberty. In the enjoyment of such blessings the bitter memories of the war would gradually fade away, the antipathies and rivalries of North and South would cease, and the whole nation, revering the merciful hand of God in the past, even in the bloody conflicts of the battle-field, would march forward on the line of its great destiny with exultant hope, trusting still to the guidance of that merciful and almighty Hand. A consummation so devoutly to be wished will not, indeed, come of mere legislation, however wise and beneficent; all the agencies of Christian faith and philanthropy, untiring prayers, every form of pious labor and self-sacrifice, the pulpit, the press, the church, the school, innumerable men, women and children even, who love Christ and His cause, must be added to complete and crown the glorious work. These heaven-born agencies are already busy with their part of the divine task. Let Christian patriotism and statesmanship do their part also, both at the ballot-box and in the council chamber; let political and religious wisdom and zeal thus conspire together; and who can refuse to believe that God, even our fathers' God, will be merciful unto us, and bless us, and make His face to shine upon us, as never before; or that the end thereof will be peace and assurance forever? Then shall come to pass in this great Re-

public the prophetic words, written thousands of years ago among the hills of Palestine : In righteousness shalt thou be established ; thou shalt be far from oppression ; for thou shalt not fear ; and from terror, for it shall not come near thee. Thou shalt know that I, the Lord, am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob. For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron. I will also make thine officers peace and thine exactors righteousness ; violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting and destruction within thy borders ; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise.

ART. VI.—DIVINE REVELATION.

Translated from the German of Dr. Richard Rothe, by J. W. NEVIN, D. D.,
Lancaster, Pa.

THAT no theory of the Holy Scriptures can be constructed without a positively settled conception, in the first place, of *Revelation*, and that bibliology, consequently, must begin its work here, may be considered as at present, beyond question. With our older Protestant theology, indeed, it was otherwise. The thought of a divine revelation was for its view covered almost entirely by that of the Bible ; they were treated as at once identical. Even after theologians had begun to distinguish them, the distinction was maintained only in the abstract ; concretely, they were still blended together as before. The Bible was for them now, it is true, only the *revelatio divina mediata* ; but this alone had any interest for them, and that between it and revelation proper, there could be anything more than a mere formal difference, entered not into their thought. Proceeding always from the notion that divine revelation consists in the supernatural communication of religious *doctrine* to men, they thought of it at once as holding in the divine gift of the Holy Scriptures, from which we now draw this doctrine. For under the *revelatio divina immediata*