

The Russian Church

Its Spiritual State and Possibilities

By Isabel F. Hapgood



WHAT elements of true life does the Russian Church possess? What are its capacities for development? These are important questions, especially in connection with the widespread and growing interest in the subject of Church Unity. We must first examine a few of the factors in the case. Then the questions will almost answer themselves.

Both the Church of Rome and the Church of England have made repeated overtures to the Russian Church—or to the Greek Church, of which the Russian is now the most important and prominent branch—with a view to union. On one or two occasions in the past, Rome has come very near indeed to attaining her object. But what the political wisdom of the highest ecclesiastical authorities reluctantly accepted at severe crises in the history of the Eastern Church, the hearts and consciences of that Church, as a body, rejected. At the present day, when the political and ecclesiastical prospects of the Latin and the Greek Catholic Churches have, practically, exchanged places, it is not probable that such overtures will result in anything more serious than a welcome excuse for a pleasant official sojourn in Rome on the part of some lucky Russian secular envoy. It is not likely that the Latin Church will be able to repeat the half-victory won three hundred years ago among the Orthodox population of Roman Catholic Poland, and the Slavonic peoples of eastern Austria and Hungary. There she persuaded the people (hence called “Uniate”) to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, and to accept the *Filioque* clause in the Creed, on condition that they were allowed to retain their own liturgy in the vernacular tongue, the Holy Communion in both kinds for the laity, the married parish clergy, and a few minor rights.

In England a society has existed for years for the promotion of union between the Anglican and the Russian Churches. It counts among its members a goodly array of Bishops, and, so late as 1888, at the celebration of the 900th anniversary of the baptism of the Russians, the English Church expressed its hopes, through the Archbishop of Canterbury. But it has not, so far as I am aware, yet complied with the suggestion made in his friendly reply by Plato, the venerable Metropolitan of Kieff, that it would formulate a definite proposal of terms of a reunion. But last summer the Russian Bishop for America (Nikolai, Bishop of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands) was most cordially received at St. Paul’s in London; and Bishop Wilkinson, on his triennial visit to Russia last March, was welcomed by the Russian ecclesiastics with unprecedented warmth and friendliness, while hopes of union were expressed with equal earnestness and frankness on both sides. Meanwhile, the Russian Church prays daily “for the prosperity of all God’s holy churches, and the union of all,” and waits, with calm, patient dignity, for the other churches to unite with her, the original, historic Mother Church, which she firmly believes that they all will do, some day.

Now, no one deliberately invites a lifeless corpse to become a member of a living, growing body of men. Therefore, we may consider that the elementary question as to whether the Greco-Russian Catholic Church really consists, exclusively, as is often asserted (chiefly on hearsay evidence), of a mass of dead ceremonies participated in by souls to match, has been definitely and satisfactorily answered for us by the Anglican and Latin Catholic Churches.

I find that the majority of people are in the habit of regarding the Russian Church—“the Russian religion” they call it—as a thing utterly apart from and unconnected with us; in the light of something far removed from the comprehension and sympathies of all Western nations. A

little knowledge in regard to the “Orthodox Church” would afford at once half an answer to the questions which I stated at the beginning of my article. As a matter of fact, the Orthodox Russian Church is very near akin indeed to both the Latin Catholic and the Protestant Churches. It forms a sort of connecting link between them. If they have shown capacity for development as churches; if they have demonstrated their power to evolve strong, fine, spiritual characters, why should that capacity and power be denied to a Church which combines some of the strong points of both? I do not think that there is the slightest likelihood that any union between these three great sections of Christianity will be brought about for a very long time to come—if ever. The barriers are slight but unsurmountable, human nature being what it is, and divine revelation being open to divers interpretations, in this world at least. Moreover, the religion of any nation or of any individual is, in large measure, a question of birth, geography, politics, and social conditions—and, last, but far from least, of temperament. But so long as any one purely Christian Church devotes itself conscientiously to its proper province, the spiritual, and does not turn itself into a political machine, there is no valid reason why the members of every other Christian Church should not encourage, sympathize with, and love it, in proportion to individual knowledge, zeal, and temperament.

If the Russian Church would but admit to communion the members of the Anglican Church, I am sure that there are plenty who would willingly comply with her requirements as to fasting and confession, for the sake of attaining such an end, though it would be better, of course, if no conditions were imposed on either side. It is not probable that there would be, in any case, on the Anglican side.

But the relations of the three great divisions of the Catholic Church which I have mentioned can easily be stated without going very deeply into either historical, political, or geographical questions.

The creed known as the Nicene Creed still remains in full force in both branches of the Christian Church, with but one slight difference. That difference occurs in the statement regarding belief in the Holy Ghost. As finally settled by the Council of Constantinople in 381, and as still used by the Eastern Church, the clause in question reads: “And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father; Who, with the Father and the Son, is worshiped and glorified.” A little more than two hundred years later, the Western Church, influenced chiefly by the logic of St. Augustine, decided that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. Therefore, as a protection against the Arian doctrines, which were rife in Spain, the Council of Toledo, in the year 589, added what is known as “the *Filioque* clause” to the Symbol or Creed of Constantinople. Hence our Western creed differs from the Eastern creed by exactly these words: “the Holy Ghost, . . . which proceedeth from the Father and the Son.” The reasons for this difference in the Creed are good on both sides. The Western Church argues that the change was necessary, in order that the identity of the Holy Spirit with Christ and with God the Father might be asserted in a clear and indisputable manner; that the abstract unity of the Godhead might be guarded from all doubt or dispute. The Eastern Church, on the other hand, holds to the view that to make the Holy Spirit proceed equally from the Father and the Son is to imply two active principles or creative powers in the Divine Essence, and this divides the Godhead into two gods, and confounds the persons of the Trinity, besides being directly contrary to Scripture, and Christ’s words in John xv., 26. It is easy to see how these diametrically opposed contentions have furnished and will continue to furnish, on demand, food for endless theologi-

cal discussion, though learned divines of the Anglican Church have admitted that the addition was made arbitrarily and unnecessarily, to say the least. Neither side will yield—certainly the Eastern Church will not—and, really, it is not necessary that they should. At bottom both branches believe in the same essential dogmas: the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the identity of the Holy Spirit in essence, with God the Father and the Son. Discussion keeps alive interest; but the Russian Church holds that Roman Catholicism is the chief heresy of these latter days, and that the Pope of Rome is the first heretic.

A brief statement of the likenesses and differences will help us to judge of the possibilities of the Russian Church by our estimate of our own. The Greek and Latin Catholic Churches agree as to the number of sacraments—seven—and as to their nature, with the exception of Extreme Unction, which the Greek Church administers, in the apostolic spirit, as a means of bodily and spiritual healing, not as a final sacrament when death is inevitable, and which is designated by a word that signifies an assembling together, seven ecclesiastics being assembled, if possible, to pray and anoint the sufferer. They agree as to Transubstantiation, though not as to the moment or manner in which the solemn change in the holy elements is effected; they pray for the dead, and recognize the intercession of the saints and of the Virgin Mary. But, while the Latin Church denies the cup to laymen in the Holy Communion, requires celibacy in all ecclesiastics, forbids infant confirmation and communion, and asserts the Infallibility of the Pope and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, the Greek Church admits and forbids precisely the opposite things, insisting, in particular, that all parish priests shall be married before they are ordained, relegating celibacy to the higher orders of the priesthood, and absolutely rejecting the Pope as head of the Church, his infallibility, and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. At this point it is proper to state, in the most emphatic manner, that the Emperor is not the head of the Russian Church in any other sense than Queen Victoria is the head of the English Church; that is to say, in so far as it is one of the State institutions. Queen Victoria is, in fact, more truly the head of the English Church than the Emperor is of the Russian, because she is so legally. That false statement has been repeated, ignorantly or willfully, until it has come to be almost an article of faith among foreigners. The truth is that when a Roman Catholic joins the Russian Church, one of the chief things asked of him is: "Dost thou renounce the erroneous belief that our Lord Jesus Christ must not be acknowledged as the head of the Universal Church, and that the head of Christ's body, that is to say, of the Church Universal, can be a man, to wit, the Bishop of Rome?" Answer: "I renounce it." I quote from the official "Office for the Reception into the Orthodox Church of Converts from Christian Churches." In connection with this rite, I may pause to correct another misconception, and to show, incidentally, that the Russian Church is more tolerant and Christian in its dealings with converts than several Protestant and other sects. It will be remembered that when the present Empress joined the Russian Church, before her marriage, the foreign press repeatedly asserted that she had been compelled to "curse" the religion (or faith) which she was leaving, and that she had to be baptized anew. On the contrary, the Russian Church recognizes *all* Christian baptism, whether by immersion or sprinkling; applies sprinkling herself, when circumstances require it, to her own infant members, and merely anoints converts. The Holy Synod itself—not to mention the Emperor, who is a civil power—cannot change a single letter of the ecclesiastical law on such matters. And, indeed, it is inconceivable that, after recognizing the validity of baptism, the Russian Church should stultify herself by requiring converts to "curse" (or "anathematize") the powers which administered that valid sacrament. Common sense should have refuted that gross libel long ago. The Empress was simply anointed with the holy chrism, after "confessing" the Orthodox faith and dogmas.

Another difference between the Greek and Latin Catholic Churches consists in their conflicting views on Purga-

tory. The Latin Church has a definite dogma, which includes fire and torments, from which souls can be redeemed by certain acts and intercessions on their own part (in anticipation), or on the part of others—in short, by indulgences founded on the doctrine that the works of supererogation of the saints and the righteous can be apportioned by the Pope. The Russian Church admits penance, but only in the sense of discipline for the sinning soul of the living person, not as a commutation of future punishment, or vicarious penalty; denies the possibility of works of supererogation, or any merits save those of Jesus Christ; and declares that these merits God alone can apportion, and that no one save God knows to whom they have been accorded. This is, essentially, the Protestant view of the matter, and produces a radical effect on the character of the prayers for the dead. The spirit of those prayers is precisely that of the twenty-third Psalm; and the actual language is, in part, that of the second verse in that Psalm. But the Russian Church does believe also that her prayers, alms in the name of the departed, and masses alleviate the state of those who have died suddenly, without opportunity for repentance, or who have repented but have had no time to prove the genuineness of their repentance by their works.

Both the Greek and the Latin Churches require auricular confession before the reception of the Holy Communion, as does the Anglican Catholic Church; and in the matter of fasting in general, and of preparation for that sacrament in particular, the Greek Church is far the most strict of the three. Greek and Latin Churches alike claim the right to interpret the Scriptures, on the ground that they are specially enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and accept the whole Bible as the rule of life. But the Russian Church allows its members to read the Scriptures for themselves in a version which is practically identical with our King James Bible (with touches of the Revised Version here and there), though it does not encourage the young to study the Old Testament, with the exception of the Psalms, for reasons which I need not discuss here, but which are easy to comprehend. Nevertheless, the children are taught the Old Testament stories and history (exactly as Protestant children are taught) in their daily religious lessons at school.

In short, the Russian Church corresponds to what might be described as a "Reformed" or a "Primitive and Uncorrupted" Latin Catholic Church. Except in the matter of confirmation and communion of infants, and the clause concerning the "procession of the Holy Ghost," it is practically identical with the Ritualistic or "Anglican Catholic" branch of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is not necessary to discuss the question of the *ikóni*—the "images, or holy pictures"—because they are not "worshipped," as it is customary for outsiders to assert. The language of the Office for Converts which I have already quoted is explicit on this point: "Dost thou confess that it is proper to have and to honor the *ikóni* of Christ our Saviour, and of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, not for purposes of worship, but that, by contemplation thereof, we may be incited to devotion, and to imitation of the deeds of the godly persons represented by those holy pictures?" Answer: "I confess it."

What is there in all this compared with Protestant Churches, or compared with the Roman Catholic Church, all of which have, confessedly, bred saints and holy persons not a few, to hinder equal spiritual development? Absolutely nothing. So far, the opportunities and chances are perfectly equal. In the church service the congregation has the same share that it has in the Latin Catholic ritual; that is to say, it responds to the petitions of the Litany by the sign of the cross, the audible responses being made by the choir. There is no law against any one joining in with the choir, if he knows enough. In practice it is very often done, and it is encouraged, that having been the olden custom. When I was in St. Petersburg there were popular singing classes, free, to train the congregations in the church music, and at one of the prominent cathedrals where this singing class usually resorted on Sunday afternoons the result was striking in the extreme. But the

Russian congregation has one very decided advantage over the Roman Catholic—the service is in Old Slavonic, and the people understand it. Until a very recent period, comparatively speaking—that is to say, until adaptations of the Anglican ritual were adopted by “dissenters”—no Protestant Church in this country, except the Protestant Episcopal, allowed the congregation any share in the service beyond participation in the hymns. On the other hand, the Anglican Catholic branch has almost reached the non-responsive state of service. The more or less universal adoption of ritual by former antagonists, and the intensification of ritual and symbolism by the ritualistic, together with the acknowledged devotional effect and helpfulness, really would seem to suggest that the Russian Church’s faith in a practical reunion on her basis is not so visionary as might appear at first sight.

Perhaps the most essential difference lies in the absence of sermons. In the Russian Church, as a rule, sermons are preached only on special grand occasions, by men with a reputation for eloquence. Sermons are not required from every priest, irrespective of his talent. This arrangement is certainly a great relief to both priests and congregations, though there is undeniable economy in a bad sermon: it lasts much longer than a good one. The hearer does not wish to run the risk of listening to another of any sort for a long time; whereas a good sermon whets the mental appetite and produces a craving for another of the same sort immediately. My own opinion is that the Russian arrangement was made, primarily, with a view to safeguarding the flock from contamination by sensational or heretical preaching on the part of priests who are ignorant or bent upon achieving notoriety at any cost. There is some force in the argument that people who have been drilled from childhood in the principles of righteous living ought to know the difference between right and wrong, and are bound in honor to attain to their spiritual as well as to their physical majority without constant exhortation thereto. Preachers here tacitly recognize that fact, and make their sermons milk for babes, as a rule, rather than meat for men.

Another important factor is the position of the clergy. There was a period in the history of Russia when there was a law made forbidding any one except a priest’s son to become a priest, priests’ sons to adopt another profession. The natural, inevitable result of this was a caste, a social class, and such it has continued, in great measure, to the present day. There are no prohibitions at present, and priests’ sons adopt whatever career they like and often distinguish themselves, while nobles enter the priesthood, though rarely. I have personal knowledge of one such case. The result of the long separation from other classes is that the clergy are still, as a rule, specially and exclusively the servants of the altar and confessors. They mingle with their city parishioners more rarely and more formally than the ordinary Protestant clergyman. Naturally, this reduces to a minimum the moral influence even of those priests who are most deeply respected for their personal characters. But, as there are two sides to most questions in this world—though not to all—this defect has its compensating advantages. The socially ambitious may win the Russian priest’s friendship by simulated piety and lavish gifts for charity—the pious hypocrite is as favorite a subject for satire in Russian literature as in the literatures of Western lands. But there is no direct incentive for such action there, as there is here, for example, because the priest is absolutely powerless as a tool in financial and social speculations. He has no social ambitions for himself or his family, he is not expected to vie with his parishioners in pomp of living, and if he wishes to rise above the rank of Arch-priest he must abandon his family (which can be done if his children are all provided for, if his wife consents and enters a convent simultaneously), enter the celibate Black Clergy, and become even more thoroughly identified with the priestly class. After this he may rise to be a Bishop, Archbishop, or Metropolitan, but he is further removed from social life than before, and from influencing it.

A well-known Russian author, in a volume which he

wrote to defend his beloved Church from the attacks of the Protestants, once declared that, while the latter accused the Russians of idolatry, they were not themselves free from that reproach; they made a fetich of the Bible and worshiped it—but did not read it! Assuredly, there is no inherent reason why the Russian Church should not develop as fine spiritual characters as any other Christian Church, except the one suggested by the fact that, in general, its members do not study the New Testament as much as Protestants do, or are supposed to do; and that, though they hear it read in the services, the failure to expound it in sermons leaves them exposed to the danger of falling into serious errors when they try to interpret it for themselves. The multitude of extraordinary and fanatical sects which have arisen in Russia—the Russians are predisposed to religious mysticism and intensity—from precisely this study of the Scriptures by unguided, untrained minds, affords an illustration of this danger.

My own impression, founded on Russians whom I know, and upon observation, is that fine, strong Christian characters are no rarer in Russia than they are in America. But it is in keeping with the absence of sermons that they should talk less and less frankly on religious matters there than we do in this land of revivals, Salvation Armies, and experiments generally. They are not in the habit of digging up their deepest feelings at brief intervals and inspecting the roots, to see whether they are alive or dead. It is assumed as a matter of course that every one is a “believer,” and that calm faith requires no assertion. Consequently it is very easy for foreigners to go astray and accuse the Russians of unbelief, of “deadness,” because they talk too little, and of “idolatry” because they seem to do too much.

The monastic ideal in the Russian Church is prayer and meditation rather than activity and education, though the monasteries have their philanthropic and educational institutions like many of the Latin Catholic and Protestant Orders. But here again arises the vexed question as to the respective attitudes of Mary and Martha, which it is profitless and, in a small compass, impossible to discuss. Naturally, among the monastic as among the parish clergy there exists every degree of education, spirituality, and personal qualities—precisely as among the clergy of other churches and countries. It would not be worth while to print such a trite commonplace were it not for the sweeping and calumnious assertions on this point which are habitual with uninformed writers.

Two things are certain: First, that the Russian Church understands better than any other with which I am acquainted how to inspire, even in the breasts of those who come to her services in a mood of cold indifference, that frame of devout prayerfulness of worship and communion with the Church visible and invisible, which it is the special object of all church services to produce. The second significant fact is that in Russia there is never any problem as to “how the men are to be induced to go to church.” The churches are always thronged, and the men go more than the women. Moreover, the very poor go in a way which would rejoice the heart of a clergyman in New York, and the absence of pews, rented places, or seats of any sort brings about an ideal commingling of all classes which would suit the Christian theory, if not the republican practice, of this country. Hence, mission churches for the poor, church parlors, church sociables, are not needed to encourage church attendance or brotherly feeling, and do not exist in the Russian Church for the encouragement of visiting foreigners, who judge of the Church’s state exclusively by such external signs. There are cases and localities, no doubt, where adaptations of certain practical features in this direction might prove of value, though these needs are met in a great measure in other ways.

I took the trouble to study the religious beliefs, ceremonies, and their effects, though I went to Russia with all the prejudices of the Protestant and the New Englander of Puritan descent. The result was that I came to understand precisely how these ceremonies and beliefs affect, help, and comfort the members of that Orthodox Church, and to love that Church equally with my own. Its music

is the most devout, suitable, and inspired, as a whole, that I know. Altogether, it appeals to and warms the heart in a way which the coldly intellectual forms of worship do not, though it is of a wholly different world, intellectually and artistically, from camp-meeting and similar methods of emotionalism.

As for the present state of the Church, I cannot see that there is any difference between it and that of any other truly spiritual branch of the Catholic Church Universal. As for its spiritual possibilities, I consider them quite as great as in any other branch of the Christian Church. The Russian Church and people are civilizing and Christianizing Asia; but they do it, as a matter of course, as part of the daily duty, and talk very little about it.

Let me say, in conclusion, that the Russian Church nobly endures the one great and abiding test—it produces millions of Christians of the old-fashioned, Gospel pattern, who live their lives with gentleness, patience, long-suffering, self-renunciation, faith, and love, and die with a simple calm to match. What more is required?



The Old-Time "Fourth"

By Frank W. Crane

Our Fourth of July celebrations have undergone a radical change from the old-time methods of honoring this auspicious day. Noise of any kind, so long as it is associated with powder, seems to be the chief element at the present time. Firecrackers were practically unknown to the lively lads of one hundred years ago, nor do we find in such accounts as are left of the Fourth during the early years of our Republic any mention of the remarkable variety of explosives which Yankee ingenuity has produced for the patriotic amusement of the boys and girls of to-day. In those good old times, when the worthy framers of our Government wore knee-breeches and powdered hair, the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence was remembered chiefly by patriotic speeches and dinners, the latter evidently being the great feature of the day, as all the clubs and societies had them; and, however different might be the political opinions expressed around the board, they all agreed upon one point, and that was the number of toasts. These always corresponded to the number of States in the Union, and for several years thirteen was the number. With the rapid admission of new States this custom gradually died out, probably from the fact that the diners were unequal, even on patriotic occasions, to drinking as many toasts as there were States. In the larger cities the veterans of the Revolution generally paraded with military organizations, and as those old warriors marched by, how they were cheered by old and young alike!—cheered as only those could cheer who knew so well just what the cost of independence had been—for many, indeed, had paid a large part of it themselves, willingly, however, even if sacrificially.

The New Yorker of the present day is inclined to smile when he reads that on the Fourth of July, 1795, the parade of soldiers in this city numbered nine hundred men. Their route was from the Battery up Broadway to the new Presbyterian Church, where the Declaration of Independence was read by Edward Livingston. The Tammany Society also turned out on that day, each member wearing a buck's tail in his hat. After the parade they listened to a sermon and had a grand banquet in the evening. The "Daily Advertiser," in its issue on Fourth of July morning, 1795, contains this outburst of editorial patriotism:

"This morn has ushered in the nineteenth anniversary of the independence of the United States, a day at whose return every American bosom must beat high with pleasure and with honest pride. When we reflect that on this day our country 'rose to take her seat among the nations of the earth,' and when we consider the vast importance of that event, an event which may be viewed as the era of civil and religious liberty, not only to ourselves, but to all mankind, how should our hearts expand with gratitude to the Supreme Disposer of events, who conducted us during

our arduous conflict for the attainment of that object, and who both kindly brought us to see this day, and to behold our country in the possession of peace, of freedom, and of national and individual happiness. Amidst the festivities of this auspicious day, let us, as heretofore, evince by our order and decorum that those grateful sentiments are duly impressed upon our minds. Long may it please a gracious Providence to continue us happy and united among ourselves, and long may the return of this day find our country in possession of those incidental blessings we now enjoy!"

New Yorkers did not allow the event which has ever since made the Fourth of July of 1776 famous go by without due public acknowledgment. This was the first celebration of the Fourth in New York City, but the celebration itself did not occur until Wednesday, the 9th, as there were no telegraph wires then to flash the news from Philadelphia to New York of the most important event since the discovery of the continent. Washington was in New York at that time with his soldiers, and the Declaration of Independence was read to each brigade, being everywhere received "with the utmost demonstrations of joy." The patriotic enthusiasm of the citizens was displayed in no uncertain manner during the evening of that day, when a large crowd assembled at Bowling Green and ruthlessly pulled from the pedestal the equestrian statue of King George III., which had been erected in 1770. The lead with which the statue was made was melted into bullets, and many of them undoubtedly were used against the British in the disastrous battle of Long Island, which was fought six weeks later. It is interesting and also curious to see that the benefits of the Declaration were at once given to all debtors imprisoned in the old Provost Jail, now the Register's Office, in City Hall Park.

One of the most amusing accounts of these early celebrations appears in the "Pennsylvania Gazette" of July 9, 1777, and it is of particular importance as marking the first anniversary of our country's independence. There was comparatively little, so far as the progress of the war was concerned, to cause jubilation to the Americans at that time. It had been a severe year for them, with only a few minor successes to brighten the gloom. But their hearts never faltered, and this Philadelphia celebration, just one year after the ratification of Thomas Jefferson's memorable document, shows with wonderful distinctness the buoyant hopefulness of the American patriots when all seemed dark about them. The original account of that day's festivities is too good to abbreviate, and is as follows:

"Friday, the Fourth of July, being the anniversary of the Independence of the United States of America, was celebrated in this city with demonstrations of joy and festivity. About noon all the armed ships and galleys in the river were drawn up before the city dressed in the gayest manner, with the colors of the United States and streamers displayed. At one o'clock, the yards being properly manned, they began the celebration of the day by a discharge of thirteen cannon from each of the ships, and one from each of the thirteen galleys, in honor of the thirteen United States.

"In the afternoon an elegant dinner was prepared for Congress, to which were invited the President and Supreme Executive Council, and Speakers of the Assembly of this State, the General Officers and Colonels of the army, and strangers of eminence, and Members of the several Continental Boards in town. The Hessian band of music taken in Trenton the 26th of December last attended, and heightened the festivity with some fine performances suited to the joyous occasion, while a corps of British deserters, taken into the service of the continent by the State of Georgia, being drawn up before the door, filled up the intervals with *feux de joie*. After dinner a number of toasts were drank, all breathing independence and a generous love of liberty, and commemorating the memories of those brave and worthy patriots who gallantly exposed their lives and fell gloriously in defense of freedom and the righteous cause of their country. Each toast was followed by a discharge of artillery and small arms, and a suitable piece of music by the Hessian band.

"The glorious Fourth of July was reiterated three times,