



✓
THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, S. C.

VOLUME II.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
PRINTED BY I. C. MORGAN.

1848-9

CONTENTS.

NO. I.

Art.		Page.
I.	THE ELDER QUESTION,.....	1
	The Chistian Pastor, one of the Ascension Gifts of Christ. By ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D. To which are added by way of Appendix, Presbyterian Government not a Hie- rarchy, but a Commonwealth; and Presbyterian Ordination not a Charm, but an Act of Government. By the same Author. Baltimore. 1845.	
II.	A BRIEF INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF JEPHTHAH'S Vow. By the Rev. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M.....	68
III.	LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY,.....	75
	Public Causes for Gratitude: A Sermon, preached on Thanks- giving Day, Nov. 25, 1847, in the West Church, Boston. By C. A. BARTOL, Junior Minister.	
IV.	THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT,.....	81
V.	ON THE BDELLIUM OF THE BIBLE,.....	94
VI.	ASSURANCE—WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT—AND THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY,.....	99
	1. A Treatise on Assurance, by the Rev. THOMAS BROOKS, Preacher at St. Mary's, Fish Street Hill, London, Author of Mute Christian, &c. &c. London, 1810.	
	2. The Forgiveness of Sin and the Possibility of attaining a Personal Assurance of it, by Rev. S. EAST. Birmingham. Glasgow, 1847.	
	3. The Witness of the Spirit with our Spirit, by Rev. AUGUS- TUS SHORT. Being the Bampton Lecture, for 1846.	
	4. The Doctrine of the Direct Witness of the Spirit, by FRED- ERICK A. ROSS. Phila., 1846.	

5. What Constitutes a Call to the Gospel Ministry, in the Biblical Repertory, for 1831.—p. 196.
6. The Necessity of a Divine Call. Ch. II. of the Christian Ministry, by the Rev. CHARLES BRIDGES. Fourth Edition. London, 1835.
7. Necessary Call to the Ministry. Ch. III. of the Christian Ministry, by J. EDMONSTON, a Wesleyan Minister. London, 1828.
8. On the Call of a Minister of Jesus Christ to the Sacred Office. Ch. IV. of EADE's Gospel Ministry.
9. What is a Call to the Ministry? Tracts of the American Tract Society. Vol. 9, p. 333, and vol. 10, p. 285.
10. The Use of Preachers, and How to Obtain More, by the Rev. A. A. PORTER. Charleston, 1848.
11. A Call to the Ministry—What are the Evidences of a Divine Call? in the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, 1841.
12. A Discourse on Theological Education, and advice to a Student, by GEORGE HOWE, D. D. New York, 1844.

VII. CRITICAL NOTICES..... 133

1. The Work claiming to be the Constitution of the Holy Apostles, including the Canons. Whiston's Version, revised from the Greek; with a Prize Essay, at the University of Bonn, upon their Origin and Contents. Translated from the German, by Irah Chase, D. D.
2. Francisci Turretini Opera.
3. Germany, England and Scotland; or Recollections of a Swiss Minister. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D. D.
4. Christ and Anti-Christ. By Rev. S. J. Cassels.
5. The Theses of Erastus touching Excommunication.—Translated from the Latin, with a Preface. By the Rev. Robert Lee, D. D.
6. Thirteenth Annual Report of the Association for the Religious Instruction of Negroes in Liberty County, Georgia.
7. Our Saviour's Example: A Discourse delivered at La Grange, before the Students of LaGrange Female Institute. By the Rev. Samuel K. Talmage, D. D.
8. General History of the Christian Religion and Church; from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated from the first, revised and altered throughout according to

Contents.

iii.

Art.

Page.

- the second edition. By the Rev. Joseph Torrey, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, in the University of Vermont.
9. The Life of Jesus Christ, in its Historical Connection and Developement. By Augustus Neander. Translated from the Fourth German Edition. By John M'Clintock and Chas. E. Blumenthal, Professors in Dickinson College.
 10. Thoughts on Family Worship. By Rev. James W. Alexander, D. D.
 11. Now and Then. By Samuel Warren, F. R. S.
 12. Thoughts on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes of this Country. By William S. Plumer.
 13. Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, Past and Present, including a Notice of the Origin, History, and Present State of the Waldenses. By Robert Baird.
 14. Memoir of Rev. David Abeel, D. D., late Missionary to China. By Rev. G. R. Williamson.
 15. The Power of the Pulpit; or Thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers and those who hear them. By Gardiner Spring, D. D.
 16. Usefulness: An Oration, delivered before the Euphemian and Philomathian Societies of Erskine College, S. C., at the Annual Commencement. By Rev. Wm. T. Hamilton.
- Letter from Gutzlaff.

NO. II.

- I. THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY—ITS NATURE AND EVIDENCE, 157
 1. What Constitutes a Call to the Gospel Ministry, in the Biblical Repertory, for 1831: p. 196.
 2. The Necessity of a Divine Call. Ch. II. of the Christian Ministry, by Rev. CHAS. BRIDGES. Fourth Edition. London, 1835.
 3. Necessary Call to the Ministry. Ch. III. of the Christian Ministry, by J. EDMONSTON, a Wesleyan Minister, London, 1828.
 4. On the Call of a Minister of Jesus Christ to the Sacred Office. Ch. IV. of EADE's Gospel Ministry.

5. What is a Call to the Ministry? Tracts of the American Tract Society. Vol. 9. p. 333, and vol. 10, p. 285.	
6. The Use of Preachers, and How to Obtain More, by the Rev. A. A. PORTER. Charleston, 1848.	
7. A Call to the Ministry — What are the Evidences of a Divine Call? in the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, 1841.	
8. A Discourse on Theological Education, and Advice to a Student, by GEORGE HOWE, D. D. New York, 1844.	
II. FOLEMIC THEOLOGY,.....	183
1. JOH. FRID. STAPPERI, V. D. M., Helv. Bern. Institutiones Theologicae Polemicae Universae ordine Scientifico dispositae.	
2. Lectures in Divinity, by the late GEORGE HILL, D. D., Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. Edited from his Manuscript, by his Son, the Rev. ALEXANDER HILL, Minister of Dailly.	
III. THE ORIGIN OF OUR IDEAS CONCERNING A GOD,...	203
1. CHARNOCK on the Attributes.	
2. PALEY'S Natural Theology.	
3. LORD BROUGHAM'S Discourse on Natural Theology.	
4. LOCKE on the Human Understanding.	
IV. THE PLATONIC TRINITY,.....	215
V. FAVORABLE INDICATIONS FOR THE INTRODUCTION AND SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN AFRICA, by Rev. J. L. WILSON, Missionary at the Gaboon, West Africa,.....	222
VI. THE BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST, AND THE SIN UNTO DEATH. An Examination of Matthew 12 : 31, 32, and 1 John 5 : 16. By the Rev. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M., Dallas County, Ala.,...	239
VII. JOHN THE BAPTIST, THE UNITARIAN JESUS; OR, OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, ON THE UNITARIAN HYPOTHESIS, A SURPLUSAGE PERSON AND CHARACTER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,.....	250
VIII. THE POWER OF THE PULPIT; OR THOUGHTS ADDRESSED TO CHRISTIAN MINISTERS, AND THOSE	

Contents.

v.

Art.

Page.

WHO HEAR THEM. By GARDINER SPRING, D. D. New York.....	270
IX. CRITICAL NOTICES,.....	294
1. The Substance of an Argument against the Indiscriminate Incorporation of Churches and Religious Societies. By Wm. S. Plumer. Baltimore, 1847.	
2. Apostolic Confirmations. By Rev. James M. Allen, Richmond, Virginia, 1848.	
3. The Czar, His Court and People; including a Tour in Norway and Sweden. By John S. Maxwell. New York, 1848.	
4. Life, Letters and Remains of Rev. Robert Pollok. By James Scott, D. D., Pastor of the First Reformed Dutch Church, Newark, N. J. New York, 1848.	
5. "The Mysteries of Godliness." By Samuel L. Southard, A. M., Rector of Calvary Church, New York, 1848.	
6. Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, drawn from the writings of St. Augustine; with Observations, by Richard Chenevix Trench, A. M., Author of Notes on the Parables. London. John W. Parker.	
7. Differences between Old and New School Presbyterianism. By Rev. Lewis Cheeseman, with an Introductory Chapter, by John C. Lord, D. D. Rochester, 1848.	
8. Union to Christ and to his Church; or, the Duty of all to Believe in Christ, to confess Christ; and to become Communing Members of the Church of Christ. By Rev. Thomas Smyth, D. D. Edinburg, 1846.	
9. The Agency devolving on White Men in Missions to Western Africa. By Rev. John Leighton Wilson, Missionary at Gaboon, in Western Africa. Boston, 1848.	
10. Addresses at the Inauguration of Rev. R. C. Grier, President of Erskine College, Due West Corner, Abbeville District, S. C. 1848.	
11. The First Annual Report of the Southern Baptist Publication Society; with the Proceedings of the Meeting held at Griffin, Georgia, 1848.	
12. The Advantages of Sabbath School Instruction. By Rev. C. D. Mallory. Charleston, 1848.	

NO. III.

Art.

Page.

I. SOME THOUGHTS ON THE DEVELOPEMENT OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A., during the ten years which have elapsed since its Disruption in 1838, suggested by the published Minutes of the General Assembly of 1848,.....	311
II. THE OFFICE OF DEACON,.....	341
The Deaconship: A Treatise on the Office of Deacon, with Suggestions for its Revival in the Church of Scotland. By the Rev. JOHN G. LORIMER, of Glasgow. Edinburgh: 1842.	
III. OBSERVATIONS ON 1. JOHN, 5: 7, 8. By the Rev. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M., Dallas County, Alabama,	362
IV. DISSERTATION ON ROMANS, 8: 19—22,.....	368
V. HISTORY OF THE GIRONDISTS, OR PERSONAL MEMOIRS OF THE PATRIOTS OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, from unpublished sources, by ALPHONSE DE LAMARTINE, author of "Travels in the Holy Land, ect.".....	387
In three volumes. Translated by H. T. Ryde. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1847.	
VI. ON THE MANNA OF THE ISRAELITES,.....	413
VII. THE CERTAINTY OF THE WORLD'S CONVERSION. By Rev. J. L. WILSON, Missionary at the Gaboon, W. Africa,.....	427
VIII. CRITICAL NOTICES,.....	442
1. Apostolic Confirmation.	
2. Oration before the Charleston Library Society. By James L. Petigru, L. L. D.	
3. Revealed Religion. By Rev. Samuel Gilman, D. D.	
4. The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. S. Bagster & Sons. London.	
A new Translation, with Notes, critical and explanatory, by Rev. D. A. De Sola, L. L. Lindenthal, Rev. Morris Raphall. Vol. 1. Genesis.	

Contents.

vii.

Art.

Page.

5. Elements of Plane and Spherical Trigonometry. By Professor Williams.
6. Popery. By Alexander T. McGill, D. D.
7. The Women of the American Revolution. By Elizabeth F. Ellet.
8. Christian Psalmody. By Rev. Edwin Cater.
9. History of the Jesuits. By Andrew Steinmetz.
10. The Family Companion. By Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.
11. The Valiant Man. By John C. Lord, D. D.

NO. IV.

- I. PAUL'S PREACHING AT ATHENS,..... 463
- II. ON THE SCENE IN REVELATION, CHAPTERS IV. AND V., 505
- III. PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS,..... 520
 1. Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America on Parochial Schools. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1847.
 2. Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1848.
- IV. A PLEA FOR AMUSEMENTS. By FREDERICK W. SAWYER, New York, Philadelphia, &c..... 550
- V. ROMANS, 9th CHAP. I-V. VERSES,..... 562
 1. I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost. 2. That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. 3. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh.
- VI. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND SLAVERY,..... 569
 1. Correspondence between the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions, the Rev. S. B. TREAT, and the Prudential Committee of the A. B. C. F. M. Missionary Herald for October, 1848.
 2. The Negro Law of South Carolina, collected and digested by JOHN BELTON O'NEALL, one of the Judges of the Courts of Law and Errors of the said State, under a Resolution of

Thomuel
E. F. Rockwell
Dr Smyth

Anon.
Dr S. L. Graham

Anon.

the State Agricultural Society of South Carolina. Columbia: Printed by John G. Bowman, 1848.

3. Considerations upon the nature and tendency of Free Institutions. By FREDERICK GRIMKE, Cincinnati. H. W. Derby & Co., Publishers. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1848. 8vo. 544 pages.

VII. PAUL'S REBUKE OF ANANIAS,..... 587

VIII. CRITICAL NOTICES,..... 591

1. A Greek-English Lexicon, based on the German Work of Francis Passow, by HENRY GEORGE LIDDELL, M. A., and Robert Scott, M. A., with corrections and additions, by Henry Drisler, M. A.
2. The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers, publishers.
3. A Discourse, delivered in the Baptist Church, Carlowville, Ala., by the Rev. CHARLES A. STILLMAN, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Eutaw, Alabama.
4. Two Discourses on the popular objections to the doctrine of Election, by HENRY A. BOARDMAN, D. D., Pastor of the 10th Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.
5. Biblia Hebraica, secundum editiones Ios. Athiae, Johannis Leusden, Jo. Simonis. Aliorumque. Nunc denuo recognita et emendata ab Isaaco Leeser, V. D. M. Synagogae Mikre Israel, Phila. et Josepho Jaquett, V. D. M. presbyter prot. Episc. Ecclesiae, U. S.
6. A Key to the Book of Revelation; with an Appendix, by JAMES McDONALD, Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Jamaica, L. I. Second edition.
7. University Sermons, by FRANCIS WAYLAND, President of the University.
8. Phrenology Examined, by N. L. RICE, D. D., Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati.
9. Nineveh and its Remains, by AUSTIN HENRY LAYARD, Esq., D. C. L.
10. A Sermon on the death of the Rev. WM. M. ATKINSON, D. D., by the Rev. BEVERLY T. LACY.

IX. THE MECKLENBURG DECLARATION — SUPPLEMENTARY NOTICE..... 611

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER I.

JUNE, 1848.

ARTICLE I.

THE ELDER QUESTION.

THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR, *one of the Ascension Gifts of Christ.* By ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D.D. *To which are added by way of Appendix, Presbyterian Government not a Hierarchy, but a Commonwealth; and Presbyterian Ordination not a Charm, but an Act of Government.* By the same Author. Baltimore. 1845.

In our review of Dr. Breckinridge's Sermon, we were conducted, by the natural order of the subject, to the vexed questions which are elaborately discussed in the speeches before us. Our limits did not allow us to give them then the prominence and attention which their magnitude and importance demanded. We accordingly reserved the remarks which we had excogitated upon them to another opportunity, when we proposed to subject the speeches to an analysis similar to that to which we had subjected the Sermon. The convenient season has now arrived—and we undertake to redeem the pledge which was implicitly given in our former article, though many of our readers would, perhaps, prefer that the whole subject should be blotted—the sooner, the better—from the memory of man. We cannot indulge their humour. These great questions ought to be discussed; and we feel that we are only acting in obedience to the hallowed principles on which truth rallies her friends to her cause, and wisdom is justified of all her

children, when we present our feeble contribution upon the same altar on which Dr. Breckinridge, in the speeches before us, has offered his gifts. All that we ask is a patient hearing. And if we shall be able to add nothing to the defence of our doctrines, we hope that we shall detract nothing from the spirit of the Gospel.

The precise issue which is involved in the Quorum question, the subject of Dr. Breckinridge's first speech, has not been distinctly apprehended by all who have written or spoken upon the subject.* The General Assembly of 1843, decided "that any three Ministers of a Presbytery, being regularly convened, are a quorum competent to the transaction of all business agreeably to the provision contained in the Form of Government, ch. x., §7."† The same principles of interpretation which exclude elders from the quorum of a Presbytery will exclude them also from the quorum of a Synod, or of the General Assembly — so that it seems to be the doctrine of our highest judicatory, that every Court, above the Church Session, may be lawfully constituted and proceed to any and to every kind of business without the presence of Ruling Elders.

Dr. Breckinridge, on the other hand, maintains, that according to the fundamental principles of our government, "no Assembly of the Church, whether it be Congregational, Classical, or Synodical, can be regularly, legally, or completely constituted, without the presence of Ruling Elders, as members thereof."‡ The question, therefore, is, not whether elders, in the strict and proper acceptance of the term, are *essential* to the *being* of a Presbytery or Synod, so that these Courts could, under no circumstances exist, or perform any valid ecclesiastical acts without them, but whether any such Courts can be "*regularly, legally, or completely* constituted without their presence as members thereof." As ministers, properly ordained, are Presbyters, and as a Presbytery is essentially a College of Presbyters, it hardly admits of argument that a Presbytery *may* be composed exclusively of ministers. And upon the same

* There was much confusion in the minds of the speakers on both sides in the General Assembly of 1843, if we may judge from the printed Reports of the Debates.

† See Minutes of the Assembly of 1843, p. 196.

‡ See first speech, Presbyterian Government, &c. p. 12, closing minute.

principle, as Ruling Elders, according to our system and the Scriptures, are Presbyters, and a Presbytery is nothing but a College of Presbyters, it is equally obvious that a true Presbytery may be composed exclusively of Ruling Elders. Each of these partial bodies is *essentially* a Presbytery, and each, under extraordinary circumstances, may exercise the powers of a Court of Jesus Christ. The occasional Councils of New England, which ordain and instal Pastors in their charges, are temporary Presbyteries; and though we do not regard them as scriptural, regular or complete, yet their proceedings are not to be invalidated, because they have retained the *essence* of the court. In an unsettled or formative condition of the Church, Presbyterial acts may, from the necessity of the case, be performed by Assemblies defective in their elements, excluding either ministers or elders. And yet these acts, though irregular and inconsistent with the order of a settled Constitution, are not to be despised as void. For, upwards of four years after its formation, the First Presbytery of the Secession Church of Scotland, the Presbytery of Erskine, Fisher, Moncrieff and Wilson, consisted of none but ministers.* No churches had withdrawn from the Establishment, and these venerable men felt themselves justified, from the extraordinary circumstances of their case, in introducing anomalies which their historian confesses to be departures from Presbyterian practice. A Presbytery, without churches to govern, or sessions to be represented, is certainly irregular; and yet who would vitiate the acts by which the foundations of the purest church in Scotland were laid? When the question therefore is, what *constitutes* the *essence* of a Presbytery, what *must* be found that any body may be entitled to the distinction of this name, the answer obviously is, neither *ministers* nor *elders*, but simply *Presbyters*, irrespective of the classes to which they belong. But to affirm, that because a Court, consisting exclusively of ministers, may be essentially a Presbytery, therefore, in a settled church-state, such Courts are to be treated as legitimate and proper, carries no more force than to affirm that, because a Court consisting exclusively of elders may be essentially a Presbytery, therefore such

* M'Kerrow's History of the Secession Church of Scotland, vol. 1, p. 224.

Courts are also to be treated as legitimate and regular. The question is not what *makes* a Presbytery, absolutely considered, under any and under all circumstances—that, without which it could not possibly exist nor discharge the least ecclesiastical function, but what is *the* Presbytery to which, in a settled state of its affairs, Christ has committed the government of His Church, the Presbytery defined in our standards and essential to the adequate operation of our system. The question, in other words, is, under what circumstances a convention of Presbyters, according to the principles of our government, which are also the principles of the word of God, becomes not simply a Presbytery, but a *legitimate, regular, complete* Presbytery. The doctrine of the Assembly is, that any *three ministers* regularly convened—convened in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution, are a *lawful* Presbytery, and according to our system of government, competent to the transaction of all Presbyterial business. The doctrine of Dr. Breckinridge is, that though it may be a Presbytery, yet such a convention is not “a regular, legal or complete Presbytery.” This we apprehend to be the precise state of the controversy.

To say that the General Assembly has not decided that three ministers regularly convened are *not* a *lawful Presbytery*, but only the *quorum* of a Presbytery, is a verbal evasion which is nothing worth. “Quorum,” says Bouvier, in his law dictionary, “used substantively, signifies the number of persons belonging to a legislative assembly, a corporation, society, or other body, required to transact business.”* The word is strictly Latin, the genitive plural of a pronoun, and came into use as a common noun in our language, from a clause in the second branch of the commission of the peace accustomed to be issued by the crown of England, in which the powers of justices, when assembled in sessions, are created and defined. “We have also,” is the clause in question—“we have also assigned to you, and every two or more of you, of *whom* (QUORUM) any one of you, the aforesaid A. B. C. D., &c, we will shall be one, our justices,” &c.† And the sessions cannot be held without the presence of two justices at least. This number con-

* S. V. Quorum, vol. 2, p. 322.

† Penny Cyclopædia, vol. 21, under the word Sessions.

stitutes the Court, and is as truly and really such as if every justice were present. The quorum of a Presbytery is therefore the Presbytery which the law, under the circumstances of the case, has created and defined. It is the number of persons which is necessary to organize the Court and to do the business which appropriately belongs to it, and is as truly and really and lawfully the Court, as if every member were present. If a quorum only should meet at the time and place appointed, its proceedings would be recorded as the proceedings of the *Presbytery*—its acts would be reviewed as the acts of the *Presbytery*, and no one would refer to it in any other terms than as the meeting of the *Presbytery*. This point Dr. Breckinridge has set in a very clear light:

“What sir, is a *quorum*? Gentlemen talk and write, as if it were a fifth court of the church; or rather a sort of sub-court to every Church Assembly. If ruling elders are essential to the composition of a Presbytery, and a quorum of a Presbytery is actually and potentially a Presbytery; then by the terms of the proposition, Ruling Elders are essential to the formation of this quorum. If a quorum of a Presbytery is not a Presbytery, actually constituted and competent to proceed to business—then to assert that it can do all the business of a Presbytery—is utterly absurd and self-contradictory; or else it is the erection of a new court, which can do all the business of a Presbytery, without being a Presbytery—which is contrary to common sense, to the Constitution, and to the Scriptures. And yet, sir, it is upon quibbles and evasions like this, that men having a character in the church, are content to rest the defence of acts and principles subversive of the order of God’s house! It ought to be, and I suppose is, well known to the members of this court, that many law processes take their names from the first or other prominent words in them. Thus we say, *habeas corpus*, *capias ad satisfaciendum*, *fieri facias*, *venditioni exponas*, *venire facias*, &c. &c.; designating by these terms writs in common use and well understood. Such is the origin of our use of the word *quorum*; the king by his writ appoints certain persons to particular duties or offices, of which persons (*quorum*) he specifies in his warrant, certain individuals or a certain number as competent to act, or required to be present. The rule of common sense, and universal practice, in the absence of any such specific provision, in regard to deliberative bodies at least, necessarily is *lex majoris partis*—the law of the greater number; less than the majority not being, in the eye of reason, the body itself, and the majority being

capable of determining the question, even where all are present."—Presbyterian Government, &c. p. 6.

With this explanation of the meaning of quorum, the real point in dispute is evidently, as we have stated, whether in a settled church state, or under the operation of our own system, a Classical or Synodical Assembly can ever be *lawfully, regularly, completely* constituted without the presence of Ruling Elders. This question may appear to be very minute; but as Dr. Breckinridge properly observes, "in point of fact the ultimate principle involved is one of the most important and comprehensive that could be submitted to the people of God. In deciding it, we virtually decide, whether our Church Constitution establishes a government under which the final power and the actual authority are in the hands of preachers as preachers, or of the body of the Christian people to be exercised through officers regularly connected with them; and as we confess that our Constitution derives its binding force from its accordance with the word of God, the question at last is, between a divine hierarchy and a divine commonwealth."* This is indeed a "question whose fearful scope is manifest upon every page of the history of Christianity;" and if, as Dr. Breckinridge affirms, it be directly or indirectly involved in the apparently insignificant decisions of the General Assembly upon the quorum of a Presbytery, they are any thing but agitators and needless disturbers of the church, who are trying to rouse attention to the magnitude of the interests at stake.

The speech of Dr. Breckinridge may be divided into three parts. In the first, he considers the distinctive principles of our system, and shows that they are directly contradicted by the decision of the Assembly; in the second, he refutes the arguments by which the resolution of the Assembly has been defended; and in the third, he proves that the whole question is a *res adjudicata*, having been long ago determined, not only by the church from which we have copied most largely in the preparation of our own forms and Constitution, but also by our own church itself in the memorable transactions of 1837.† We need not

* First Speech, Presbyterian Government, &c. p. 3.

† The first part extends from p. 3 to p. 5. The second from p. 5 to p. 9; and the last from p. 9 to the conclusion—the whole speech occupying 12 pages, closely printed with very small type in double column.

say that upon all these points his arguments seem to us to be clear, conclusive and irresistible. The speech, taken as a whole, is the best treatise, within the same compass, upon the peculiar features of Presbyterian church government with which we are acquainted. Its tone is manly, earnest and energetic; and there are parts in which it is distinguished by that high and elevated eloquence which can only be attained when the language uttered is the spontaneous dictate of the heart. That such a speech could have been delivered by a man, concealing purposes of low and paltry ambition, under the garb of zeal for the glory of God and the purity of His church, can only be maintained by those, who can see no difficulty in ascribing the pathos and simplicity of Judah, when pleading for Benjamin arraigned before Joseph, to affectation and pretence. The language of the heart cannot be mistaken—when truth and nature speak there is a mysterious power in the tones which widely distinguishes them from the finest efforts of art and study.

As a specimen of what we mean, we give the peroration of the first speech, which, it seems to us, must, upon every unsophisticated mind, produce the impression, that however mistaken he may be in his opinions, Dr. Breckinridge is a man of God, solemnly intent upon the great end of his calling, and occupies a position of moral grandeur even in the midst of his errors. If there be any who can read the passage without sympathy or emotion, we envy them neither their hearts nor understandings:

“For my part, there is but one course which I can adopt. It does not satisfy my conscience, to be told that the construction which is to work this destructive change, was adopted by a great majority of the Assembly; that it is approved by the leading men and institutions of the church; that learned civilians pronounce it correct; that foreign ministers have been consulted and have acceded to it. It does not deter me, to be threatened with the pains of an incendiary, and the penalties of a church disturber. It does not remove from my path one ray of light, nor shake in my heart one firm resolve, to have predicted defeat and threatened ignominy set before me in the most distinct and appalling forms. I have borne much in the service of this church; I am willing to endure more. I have stood for the truth, when fewer stood by me, than I can count to-day. Make this cause as desperate as you please, as degraded as you can; make the dan-

ger to me and to the church as imminent as the most confident of those against me can desire—or the most timid of those with me can dread ; and still I will take the risk, and meet the peril. When the army of the king of Babylon beleaguered Jerusalem, the very prophet who in the face of death itself and with the brand of a traitor upon him for his fidelity, denounced the doom of the wicked city, paid down in the very courts of his prison, the price of the field that was in Anathoth, and subscribed the evidence, and called witnesses, and with all precision and formality redeemed the spot, it may be, on which the victorious army of the Chaldeans was encamped : for he knew that houses, and fields, and vineyards would be possessed again in the land of Israel. Sir, I will take courage from this sublime example. Let this Synod say the church is not a free commonwealth established of God, but is a hierarchy—which my soul abhors ; and I will meekly, I trust, but yet resolutely deny that the Synod utters God's truth. Let the great institutions which rule the church—and the great men who conspire with them—assert with one accord, that we are a hierarchy and not a free commonwealth ; and I will still lift up my humble voice against their loud and unanimous cry. Let the General Assembly of the church, if such be the will of God, angry at us for our sins, adjudge for a hierarchy and against a commonwealth ; and while I must respect even the errors of that venerable court, I will set my poor name against its adjudication, and let posterity decide betwixt us. Let the Ruling Elders themselves, overborne by the clamor or seduced by the caresses of the ministers, prove insensible to their calling and negligent of the sacred trust reposed in them by God and God's blood-bought people ; and even this fearful apostacy shall not shake my immoveable purpose, to defend the spiritual freedom of the church, while there remains one inch of ground on which I can plant myself. For surely I trust in God that this sudden, amazing and wide-spread stupor which has seized the officers of the church, and blinded them to the true character of our institutions, and under whose baleful influence a line of conduct and a course of observation so remarkable have been adopted in this Synod and elsewhere, cannot be perpetuated ; and that sooner or later the church must return to her ancient landmarks, the distinguishing and vital principles of her polity."—Presbyterian Government, &c. p. 12.

As we shall not have occasion to refer again to that part of Dr. Breckinridge's speech in which he illustrates the current of previous decisions, we shall present it to our

readers in his own words. Prescription, it is confessed, never amounts to more than a presumption, and is strong or weak, according to the wisdom, integrity and learning of the party on which it ultimately rests, and the intelligence and freedom of those who have subsequently acquiesced in its authority. The natural effect of it is to throw the burden of proof upon those who desire to introduce a change. As the wisdom and experience of the past are, in some sort, pledged to established institutions, established customs, and established opinions, it is rashness to assail them unless they are obviously contradictory to reason, propriety and truth. But still, what has been done has not necessarily been well done; and hoary error is not, like the hoary head, to be treated with veneration. Novelty, on the other hand, is only a presumption against a proposition, weak or strong, according to the likelihood of its previous discovery, upon the supposition of its truth. Opinions are not to be condemned simply because they are new, but the burden of proof falls upon their authors—neither are they to be received simply because they are old, truth and falsehood resting upon higher grounds than naked presumptions. The weight which is due to the precedents industriously collected and clearly presented by Dr. Breckinridge, the reader may determine for himself, one thing being certain, that the charge of innovation upon which so many changes have been rung, lies not against him, however violently the contrary has been asserted, but against the Assembly of 1843.

“I will now, sir, advance a step further, and show that the act of the last Assembly is contrary to the clear and well settled construction of the law of the case—that it is directly contradictory of the established construction of our own and of the Scottish constitutions upon this important subject. The whole matter is *res adjudicata*, and the decision of our last Assembly is as completely aside from the whole current of decisions, as I have shown it to be of fundamental principles. According to the settled law of the Scottish church, every church court in which ruling elders do not sit, is illegal, and all its acts are null. *Steuart of Pardovan* declares that neither the constitution of the church nor the law of the land, in Scotland—“do authorize any other ecclesiastical judicatory but Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk Sessions, or their committees, consisting of ministers and ruling

elders;" that no "*ecclesiastical judicatory, or committee thereof, can be lawful*" "*without consisting of both ministers and elders;*" and he expresses a doubt whether the State would recognize or correspond with any bodies, not thus composed."* The Assembly of 1638, the most memorable except that of 1843, that ever met in Scotland, annulled, as utterly illegal, no less than six preceding, and as they called them "*pretended Assemblies;*" to wit, those of 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, and 1618. Amongst the reasons assigned for this immense stretch of authority, in five out of six cases, one reason is that there were no ruling elders in these Assemblies; in some, none being lawfully commissioned, in others, none lawfully sent.† The Assembly of the following year in an elaborate statement, entitled "*Causes and Remedie of the by-gone evils of this Kirk,*" addressed to the king, assign as the fifth cause of past troubles, the six fore-cited Assemblies, which they pronounce to have been corrupt, null, and unlawful—amongst other chief reasons, because they were "*called and constitute quite contrary to the order, constitution, and uninterrupted practice of the church ever since the reformation, by all which ruling elders did rightly constitute a part of lawful General Assemblies.*"‡ The law, as laid down by Pardovan, extends even to commissions and committees of the church courts; which differ from each other in this, that the former may examine *and conclude*, while the latter can only examine *and report*; and I have discovered a very curious fact strongly illustrative of the subject now before us in which the Commission of the Scottish Assembly of 1643, in appointing a special commission of itself, had its attention directed to the very principles for which I now contend, and fully recognised them in one of the most interesting acts, and in its issues one of the most important, ever performed by a church court. It was on the occasion of appointing the Scotch Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly. Baillie, who was one of them, tells us, that he moved in the meeting of the Commission of the Assembly, that some elders should be placed on the Commission about to be sent to Westminster; but, he adds, "*I gott not a man to second me; yet the absurditie and danger of such ane omission pressing my mind, I drew up reasons for my judgement, which I communicat to Argyle and Warristone; and when they had lyked the motion, I went so about it, that at the next meeting, it was carried without opposition.*"§

* Collections, p. 68, Book i., tit. 15, sec. 29.

† Printed Acts of Scottish Assemblies, p. 8-14; Pardovan, p. 57, Book i., tit. 15, sec. 1.

‡ Printed Acts, p. 75, Assembly of 1639.

§ Baillie's Letters and Journals, vol. ii., p. 55, Edinburgh, 1841.

These "reasons," more fortunate and effectual than reasons usually are, have come down to us, and are worthy still to be pondered. The one which is immediately pertinent to my present argument is in these words: "4. The excluding of Ruling Elders from a Commissione of this nature, *may call in question the validity of the Commissione; may hazard the approbatione of it by the next General Assemblie; may give just offence to all Ruling Elders; may make all the actions of these ministers more unpleasant, and of lesse authoritie with the bodie of any nation.*"* The result was the recognition of the universality of the principle, that Ruling Elders must regularly be members of all assemblies whose constituent parts are Preaching and Ruling Elders, and even of all commissions and sub-commissions of them, whether general or special; and three Ruling Elders, the Earl of Cassalis, Lord John Maitland, and Johnstoun of Waristoun, were united with the ministers Henderson, Douglas, Rutherford, Baillie, and Gillespie, as commissioners on the part of the Kirk of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly. All this is the more remarkable, when we compare the phraseology of the Scottish Standards with that of our own, and the construction of the language with the construction adopted by our late Assembly. In the printed Acts of the Scotch Assemblies, I have before me repeated acts of the successive assemblies from 1638 to 1649, appointing their standing "Commissione for the public affairs of this Kirk." These acts name first a large number of ministers, then a large number of ruling elders, who are directed to meet on a day certain at a place fixed, and afterwards "as they shall think good;" and then "gives and grants unto them, *or any fifteen of them, there being twelve ministers present*, full power and commission, &c."† Here is a case far stronger for the exclusion of elders, who are not even named as a part of the quorum, than can be produced out of our Standards; and yet of such cases as this, Pardovan asserts that unless elders are present the commission is illegal;‡ and Baillie informs us, that in this identical commission of which he was a member, so many ministers, "*and three elders made a quorum.*"§ In regard to the quorum of Presbytery, the case is even more striking; for "to perform any classical act of government or ordination there shall be present, *at least, a major part of the ministers of the whole classis,*" says Pardovan; and yet, says the same authority, this very Presby-

* Baillie's Letters and Journals, vol. ii., p. 479.

† Printed Acts for 1643, p. 209; see also pp. 147, 223, 318, 361, 434, &c. for the commissions of other years, where the same phraseology is used.

‡ Collections, p. 68.

§ Letters and Journals, vol. ii., p. 97.

tery is illegal, unless ruling elders be also present.* That is, by the Scottish Standards, in the quorum of a Presbytery there must be at least the major part of all the ministers of the body—nothing being said, in this relation, of elders; but seeing it is a fundamental principle of the whole system that elders enter into the composition of every court—they are, upon that principle, held to be indispensable here, and are so adjudged to be. But our Standards fully recognize and assert the same general principle, and moreover particularly name elders in the special clause about a quorum, as members presumed to be present; and yet our Assembly concludes that they need not be present at all! The state-church of monarchical Scotland, with rules less manifestly clear for the rights of the especial representatives of the Christian people, declared steadfastly and clearly for those rights, ages ago; while the free church of republican America, with every general principle and every special enactment of its constitution, strongly and manifestly for those high and important rights—decides even at a time like this, earnestly, yea indignantly against them; nay, a storm is raised against the presumption of vindicating what are stigmatized as Brownists, radical and revolutionary doctrines, and even many of the elders themselves are amongst the very foremost in destroying their own sacred liberties! Surely these things are calculated to arrest the public attention, and to create a profound anxiety in the minds of all those who know how difficult it is to preserve the purity of free institutions, and to maintain the spiritual liberties of mankind.

This extraordinary decision of our General Assembly, and the violent efforts made to uphold it as just and wise, are the more surprising, when it is remembered that it is contrary to former decisions of our church. From the earliest period of this church in America, the *Collections of Pardon* have been its rule of discipline, and the general principles therein embodied recognised as essentially our own;† and that work was made the basis of a portion of our present standards when they were compiled.‡ Although, therefore, it may have been true, in the forming and unsettled state of the church, and especially, amid the difficulties created by a bloody and protracted national struggle for freedom, in which our whole church embarked with the country, as one man; that occasional departures from strict rule were unavoidable; yet these irregularities could do little harm so long as the law remained unaltered and clear against them, and the

* Compare Book i., title xiii., sec. 1, p. 44, with tit. xv., sec. 59, p. 68.

† See printed Minutes of the Presbyterian Church, p. 519.

‡ Idem., p. 535.

sentiment of the church was right—as the places I have cited clearly prove it was, up to the period when our present standards were compiled, fifty-five years ago. Upon the law of those standards, as written, I have already spoken fully. That law, as expounded, presents little or nothing to countenance, and a mass of proof against the interpretation of the last Assembly. Even the early and monstrous violation of the constitution by the formation of the *Plan of Union* of 1801, so far respected reason and truth that no pretension was made that the contemplated arrangements were either regular, constitutional, or permanent. That plan as it relates to the present question, virtually abolished the office of ruling elder; and if there is one point upon which this church has pronounced an irreversible judgment, it is that that plan was utterly null and void from the hour of its inception up to the declaration of that nullity thirty-six years afterwards, by the Assembly of 1837. It is true the controversy which resulted in this decision, involved other questions of doctrine, and questions of practice, as well as questions of church order; and I am ready to admit that in all my efforts, and no man made more, to reform the church at that period, the question of order was never considered by me the paramount question. But the fact is recorded palpably and beyond denial upon all the proceedings of that period, civil and ecclesiastical, that the controversy was settled mainly on the point of church order. There were great irregularities and there were great heresies no doubt, to be removed; but these could not make the *Plan of Union* unconstitutional—they could only make it improper. But the Assembly of 1837 annulled that plan as unconstitutional, and then declared the four Synods out of our connexion for the reason that they were illegally constituted and illegally continued, by and under that void Plan. In what respect, sir? Why, sir, the churches, the Presbyteries, and the Synods were declared to be not Presbyterian mainly upon the very point this day involved. They had no ruling elders and therefore were not Presbyterian. And whoever will carefully study the acts of the Assembly of 1837—its answers to protests—its official letters—the whole current of its proceedings, will find the stress of the whole question laid upon church order, and the hinge of the whole case, in the question debated before you this day. Upon this ground, more than upon any other, it was triumphantly carried through that great Assembly, through the church at large, and through the civil tribunals of the country. Sir, I was an actor in all those scenes. I have personal knowledge of what I assert. The records of the church and of the country bear me out in what I say. And I

now tell you—I tell the church—I tell posterity, that if the decision of the Assembly of 1843 is law, the decisions of the Assembly of 1837 are not law. If it is law that ministers without charge make a Presbytery, a Synod, and an Assembly—for the decision covers all this, then it was illegal, it was monstrous, to separate four entire Synods from the church, upon the pretence that even ministers with charge cannot, without the presence of ruling elders, constitute church courts which can constitutionally belong to this church. They might deserve, upon other grounds, to be separated from us; but it could not be true, that for this defect they never were with us, or of us, if this defect is no defect. It is vain to say, the disowned Synods had no elders appointed in any of their churches; the fact is otherwise—there were elders, more or less, in many churches; and as it regards the Presbyteries and Synods, the fact of presence, not the fact of existence, is the sole fact in the case. For my part, sir, I stand by the reform of 1837—by its principles, and by its acts. I pronounce the decision of 1843, a counter revolution; and I unhesitatingly denounce it, as at once compromising the character of the church, subverting the fundamental principles of its polity, prostrating the rights of the elders, and endangering the spiritual freedom of the people.”—p. 10-11.

I. Our first argument against the decision of the Assembly is, that IT CONTRADICTS THE WHOLE ANALOGY OF PRESBYTERIAN POLITY. It is common to assert that our government is a Commonwealth, but with few exceptions, those who have written upon the subject, have failed to enter into the full meaning of the truth. As a political system, Presbyterianism has always been in advance of the age; and it is only in recent times, under the plastic hand of modern refinement and civilization, that some of its characteristic principles, embodying a deep political philosophy, have developed their power and found their way into the constitutions and governments of States. It is a noble panegyric which Milton pronounces upon a free Commonwealth, that it “is not only held by wisest men in all ages, the noblest, the manliest, the equalest, the justest government, the most agreeable to all due liberty and proportioned equality, both human, civil and Christian, most cherishing to virtue and true religion, but also (I may say it with greatest probability) plainly commended, or rather enjoined by our Saviour himself, to all Chris-

tians, not without remarkable disallowance and the brand of gentilism upon kingship.”* But when we proceed to enquire what are the securities which a Commonwealth presents, that the great purposes of government—justice, liberty, safety and protection—shall be adequately answered, the scheme of Milton must be pronounced to be grossly defective. “The happiness of a nation,” says he, in developing his plan, “must needs be firmest and certainest *in full and free council of their own electing*, where no single person but reason only sways.”† The same doctrine is repeated in another passage of the same admirable treatise: “For the ground and basis of every just and free government (since men have smarted so oft for committing all to one person) is *a general council of ablest men, chosen by the people* to consult of public affairs, from time to time, for the common good.”‡ This great council, however, was to be a permanent assembly—even the dependence on the people which the system of partial rotation would create—analagous to that which obtains in the Senate of the United States, is condemned by him as having too much affinity with the wheel of fortune.”§ It is a strange inconsistency that he should make the principle of representation the cardinal principle of a Commonwealth, to which it is indebted for all its excellence, and from which it becomes “the noblest, the manliest, the equalest, the justest government, the most agreeable to all due liberty and proportioned equality,” and yet enervate the whole virtue of the system by corrupting his body of representatives into an elective oligarchy. The attention of this great man was so much absorbed in the evils of monarchy and a hereditary peerage, that in his anxiety to avoid them, he overlooked the arrangements which experience shows to be essential to the efficacy and perfection of representative assemblies. His speculations were directed rather to the circumstances which would give skill, readiness and competency to the rulers than to limitations and restraints upon the exercise of their power and the tendency which power always has to corrupt its

* Prose Works—The Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth. Royal octavo edition, by Ball. London. p. 444.

† Ibid, p. 445.

‡ Ibid, p. 446.

§ Ibid, p. 446.

possessors. He indulged in the glowing vision of an immortal commonwealth, rich in the experience of ages and generations, and losing nothing from the death of its Senators, as the main body would continue permanent and unimpaired. His council was to be both foundation and main pillar of the State, and secure and immoveable as foundations and pillars behove to be.*

But while we condemn Milton's views in reference to the mode of applying the representative principle, he clearly perceived upon what its peculiar value depends. Its excellence, as he suggests in a passage already quoted, consists in the probability which it furnishes that reason only shall sway; the danger of democracy is from the passions and the ignorance of the people—the danger of monarchy from the caprices, the tyranny and the ambition of the king—and the danger of an oligarchy from the selfishness incident to privileged orders. *Reason*, whose voice is the will of God, is much more likely to prevail in a deliberative assembly composed of men, who, coming from the people, know their interests, their desires and their fears; and whose measures are adopted under a full sense of the responsibility incurred. The great problem of political philosophy, is to devise a constitution which shall give the amplest security for individual rights—the amplest scope for the developement of man's nature in all its important relations—which shall approximate most nearly in all its purposes and plans to the true, the just, the good. In other words, a constitution which should provide in every case that only *reason* should prevail would, as Milton intimates, be absolutely perfect. It is a great mistake to suppose that the end of government is to accomplish the will of the people. The state is a divine ordinance, a social institute, founded on the principle of justice, and it has great moral purposes to subserve, in relation to which the constitution of its government may be pronounced good or bad. The will of the people should be done only when the people will what is right. The representative principle is a check upon their power—an expedient to restrain what would otherwise be an intolerable despotism within the limits of an authority which they are bound to respect—

* Prose Works—The Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth, p. 446.

the authority of right.* There is no misapprehension more dangerous than that which confounds representative government with the essential principle of a pure democracy. It is not a contrivance to adapt the exercise of supreme power on the part of the people to extensive territory or abundant population—to meet the physical impediments which in large states must obviously exist to the collection of their citizens in one vast assembly. It is not because the people *cannot* meet, but because they *ought* not to meet, that the representative council, in modern times, is preferred to the ancient convocations in the forum or the market place.† Power has a natural tendency to settle into despotism; and the legitimate ends of the State may be as completely defeated by the absolute power of the people, in the absence of proper checks and restraints, as by the absolute power of a single ruler. Absolute power is tyranny, whether in the hands of large masses, of privileged orders, or of single individuals; and a government which aspires to be free, has made but slender advances, when it has only changed the seat of authority. The representative principle is accordingly to be prized, not as an approximation to a pure democracy, but as an independent institution, having its own peculiar advantages, not the least of which is to guard against the evils incident to popular masses.‡ The hin-

* See Lieber's Political Ethics, vol. 1, Book II., §§113-114. We make the following extract: "Here then we find the great principle of a representative government, even in a democratic republic. It is not because the people are too numerous, and cannot any longer assemble in the market, as in the ancient republics, that representative governments are advisable, or have become necessary, merely by way of expediting business, but it is on the very same principle that a monarch, who interferes himself and does not leave matters to their proper authorities, even in absolute monarchies, is considered to act despotically; that the people, if they hold the supreme power, must not act themselves, but ought to act through agents. He who has power, absolute and direct, abuses it; man's frailty is too great; man is not made for absolute power."

† "We, the people," says Dr. Lieber, "are not absent from the legislative halls, because, for local reasons, we cannot be there, but because we ought not to be there as people, as mass, for the same reason, that in monarchies the king is not allowed to be present in the halls of justice, or as the legislators cannot debate in the presence of the monarch."—Political Ethics, vol. 2, Book VI., §8.

‡ For a masterly exhibition of the real nature and advantages of Representative Government, see Lieber's Political Ethics, vol. 2, Book VI.,—from §6 to the close of the first chapter. Compare also Brougham's Political Philosophy, vol. 3, chap. 8.

derances which, in the one case, exist to the discovery of truth are, in the other, removed. It is an expedient to secure the ends of government without the inconveniences to which every other institution is subject. Its assemblies are essentially deliberative, and its processes are correspondingly cautious.

That a government may secure, in the largest degree, the prosperity and happiness of the people, two conditions seem to be essential. An accurate knowledge of their circumstances and wants, and a fixed purpose to aim at the collective interests of the whole. The representative plan fulfils both conditions—the first by entrusting the election of representatives to small communities, so that each portion of the country may possess an organ to express its own wishes and desires—the second by making each representative, while he is the organ of a narrow section, the representative, at the same time, of the whole State. The wants of all are made known, and by wise and free discussion, the measures which ought to be adopted to promote the interests of the whole, are likely to be elicited. As the excellence of representative assemblies consist in the probabilities they furnish, that the legitimate purposes of the State shall be the objects of government, and that the measures adopted shall be those which reason approves—it is obvious that the perfection of the system will be increased by imposing checks upon these assemblies themselves, and raising barriers within them against the impulse and excitement into which even Senates are sometimes betrayed.*

* The following remarks of Lord Brougham are commended to the attention of the reader.—*Political Philosophy*, vol. 3, chap. 13, p. 99. London edition.

“We have seen how important a security against the mischiefs of popular assemblies is afforded by the representative principle. But this is not sufficient; for the assembly of the representatives themselves, though in a much less degree, subject to the same risks of misdecision from ignorance, deception, passion. Therefore the supreme power, even when entrusted to representatives, must, for the safety of the people, and for the same reasons which require the delegation, be exercised in a certain fixed manner and under certain material restraints, voluntarily imposed, and which may be varied at any time, if found inconsistent with freedom and with popular rights.

The three principal checks upon rash and erroneous decisions are therefore these—delay interposed between any proposition and its final adoption; the requirement that it be submitted to more than one body of

Accordingly, the freest modern States have adopted the principle of *two chambers*, composed of different persons, belonging to different classes, or elected for different terms of service. This is a vast improvement upon the single council of Milton. It gives to the representative system the fairest scope for its legitimate exercise, and provides the strongest security which the wit of man can devise against the violence of party, the predominance of passion, selfishness, or local interests, and the tyranny of unscrupulous majorities. In modern times, no one would regard a government as completely representative, whose legislature was confined to a *single* chamber. The irregular influences to which pure democracies are subject, would be likely to enter so largely into it, that it could not be consistently denominated, according to the conception of Milton—a free commonwealth.

The introduction of two chambers, is perhaps as great an improvement upon the representative principle, as the representative principle itself, upon that of deputies in the middle ages. The one is the offspring of the progress of society, as independent communities and petty principalities and estates became fused into the national mass and imbued with a national life—the other is the offspring of the spirit of liberty, seeking its firmest protection in the moral restraints which reason and truth, and reason and truth alone impose.*

This description of a Commonwealth in the State is an exact picture, in its essential features, of Presbyterian government in the church. The very principles which the progress of modern society has developed, and which constitute the glory of modern politics, were found embedded in the Presbyterian system, ages before a representative republic, in the true sense of the term, existed upon earth. The ecclesiastical platform of the Scriptures embraced those very doctrines of political philosophy through which nations are now rising to greatness—ancient dynasties are falling into ruins, and liberty is beaming on the world.

popular representatives; and the independence of the bodies entrusted by the people, within reasonable limits, consistent with their being responsible."

* For the distinction between deputies and representatives, see Lieber's *Political Ethics*, vol. 2, Book VI., chap. 2; Brougham's *Political Philosophy*, vol. 3, chap. 6.

The first characteristic principle of our system is, as Dr. Breckinridge largely proves,* that the government of the church is not in the hands of individual officers, nor yet in the hands of the mass of the people, but in the hands of officers chosen by the people, judicially convened—in other words, the cardinal principle of our polity is the government of the church by free representative assemblies. This distinguishes us from prelacy on the one hand and independency on the other. Other denominations may agree with us in rejecting a distinction of orders in the ministry of the word, but if they entrust jurisdiction and discipline to single Presbyters, excluding Parochial, Classical and Synodical Assemblies, they can not consistently be called Presbyterian. Ours is a government, not by *Presbyters*, but by *Presbyteries*; and if we deny that such assemblies are essential to our system, we deny, at the same time, that our system is a commonwealth.

In the next place, in the composition of our Assemblies, the same principle is embodied which has led free States, in the constitution of their Legislatures, to introduce two chambers. As the end in human governments is to promote the objects of the State, the representative system is adopted as being the most likely to reach the verdict of truth and reason. The Legislature must know the wants, the necessities, the desires of the people—and hence representatives are *chosen*, and chosen from comparatively small sections, that the condition of the whole country may be adequately known; but as the interests of the whole society are supreme, as right and justice are the highest expediency, each representative, while he makes known the wants and exigencies of those who have immediately sent him, is bound to act for the collective community, and to do what under the circumstances of the case his constituents *ought to* desire. To guard more effectually against the supremacy of will, and to preserve the supremacy of right, the representative principle checks itself against the dangers to which all assemblies are exposed, and diminishes the chances, in multiplying councils, of the irregular influences of passion, interest and party.

In the government of the church, as the Assemblies

* Presbyterian Government, &c. p. 3-4.

which exercise jurisdiction and authority are *judicial* as well as deliberative—are *courts* as well as councils—and therefore very frequently required to act as an unit, it would be a cumbersome arrangement to have two houses, but the end is accomplished in two classes of representatives, and the relations to each other of the bodies which they constitute. The Ministers are a check upon the Elders, and the Elders are a check upon the Ministers, and the higher are checks upon the lower courts. The object of the check is to promote the discovery of truth by bringing different views and different modes of thought into collision—by securing the certainty of a full and free discussion—and diminishing the probability that party interest or temporary prejudices shall predominate in the result. Its efficacy does not depend upon the mode in which the representatives are chosen, nor the term of service which they are required to fulfil—these are only circumstances which the Constitutions of States have defined as likely to secure that variety of opinion and that discrepancy of feeling which are essential to adequate deliberation. They are signs of the check, but not the check itself. When a council is composed of those whose previous education, whose daily habits, whose employments and pursuits—whose prejudices and feelings—whose associations and opinions are widely different, though they may all sustain the same relation to their constituents, and hold their office by the same tenure and for the same length of time, still the spirit of what Lord Brougham* denominates a perfect check, is unquestionably preserved—and this is preëminently the case in Presbyterian Courts. A government exclusively in the hands of the clergy is fraught with dangers to them and to the people, against which all ecclesiastical history is a solemn warning; and although as long as the ministers were truly chosen, their assemblies would be enough to give the church the form of a commonwealth, the spirit of liberty would soon depart. The possession of power would produce its natural effects; the clergy would aspire to be a privileged class, and the people would soon lose the significance and importance which the legitimate operation of our system attaches to them.†

* Political Philosophy, vol. 2, chap. 2, p. 13.

† The following reasoning of Dr. Miller against committing the govern-

On the other hand, a government exclusively in the hands of the Elders would lean too much to popular will. Mingling habitually with the people, and identified with them in their relations and interests, their habits and associations, the Elders might be disposed to regard themselves as mere deputies, and to aim at local and sectional advantages, rather than the good of the whole church. Ministers, on the other hand, trained to habits of retirement and study, and accustomed to meditate upon abstract principles and general truths, while they furnish precisely the sort of check which the inconveniences of a government of Elders seem to demand, create a danger against which, in turn, Elders are the only adequate security. But with our double representation, ecclesiastical despotism and popular

ment of single churches exclusively to pastors, applies as strongly to the government of the whole by councils of pastors. The class and the individual will be distinguished by similar tendencies. "But, even if it were reasonable or possible that a pastor should, alone, perform all these duties, ought he to be willing to *undertake* them; or ought the church to be willing to *commit* them to him *alone*? We know that ministers are subject to the same frailties and imperfections with other men. We know, too, that a love of preëminence and of power is not only natural to them, in common with others; but that this principle, very early after the days of the Apostles, began to manifest itself as the reigning sin of ecclesiastics, and produced, first Prelacy, and afterwards Popery, which has so long and so ignobly enslaved the church of Christ. Does not this plainly show the folly and danger of yielding undefined power to pastors alone? Is it wise or safe to constitute one man a despot over a whole church? Is it proper to intrust to a single individual the weighty and complicated work of inspecting, trying, judging, admitting, condemning, excluding, and restoring without control? Ought the members of a church to consent that all their rights and privileges in reference to Christian communion, should be subject to the will of a single man, as his partiality, kindness, and favoritism, on the one hand; or his caprice, prejudice, or passion, on the other, might dictate? Such a mode of conducting the government of the church, to say nothing of its unscriptural character, is, in the highest degree, unreasonable and dangerous. It can hardly fail to exert an influence of the most injurious character, both on the clergy and laity. It tends to nurture in the former, a spirit of selfishness, pride, and ambition; and instead of ministers of holiness, love and mercy, to transform them into ecclesiastical tyrants. While its tendency, with regard to the *latter*, is gradually to beget in them a blind, implicit submission to clerical domination. The ecclesiastical encroachments and despotism of former times, already alluded to, read us a most instructive lesson on this subject. The fact is, committing the whole government of the church to the hands of pastors alone, may be affirmed to carry in it some of the worst seeds of Popery; which, though under the administration of good men, they may not at once lead to palpable mischief, will seldom fail of producing, in the end, the most serious evils, both to those who govern, and those who obey."—Miller on Ruling Elders, chap. 8, p. 176. Edition of 1831.

passion are equally discouraged.* Local and sectional interests are not disregarded—the voice of the people is heard—but the checks and balances of the system are so nicely adjusted, that the strongest probability is furnished which any conceivable arrangement, dependent for its execution upon fallible men, can give, that the voice of Christ shall be supreme in all our courts. We cannot, therefore, attach too much importance to the office of Ruling Elder in its relation to our church courts. Upon it the security of our liberties mainly depends; it is the principal means, under God, of making the church not only a commonwealth, but

* Anderson, in his defence of Presbyterian Church Government, has taken a similar view of the case, though the relation of ministers to their people is not that of princes to their subjects.

“And indeed the wisdom of our Lord, and his care of his church, is very much seen in the institution. For, as he has appointed ministers, that the faith of the church may be kept sound; and deacons, that the wants of her poor members might be supplied; so he has appointed Ruling Elders to oversee the manners and outward conversation of Christians, that they be such as become the Gospel. Besides, by this constitution the discipline is the more willingly submitted to by the people, being exercised by persons chosen from among themselves, appointed to represent them, to take care of their interest, and that they may have no reason to complain of the rigour or severity of the ministers. To illustrate this a little from the constitution of the civil government: Princes, ordinarily, live in state, see nothing but coaches and six, fine rooms and full tables; nor does any body appear before them but in his Sunday’s clothes. All this is very necessary and reasonable, yet it leaves them very much unacquainted with the condition of the country; nor can they have other than a very faint sense of the pressures and calamities their people may be groaning under: And were the legislature solely in their hands, they could hardly escape being blamed for every thing the people might think a grievance. But now, when a parliament meets once a year, the prince gets the condition of the people in the most remote corners of the kingdoms represented; and the people cannot but be satisfied, when they consider they are governed by no other laws, nor burdened with other taxes, than what were asked and enacted with their own consent; or, which is the same thing, by representatives of their own choosing. Just so, ministers through their retired course of life, are ordinarily very much strangers to the way of the world, and are ready to measure the world by the abstract notions they have gathered out of books, or from their own solitary musings, which do not always suit with the practical part of life. Hence, it comes to pass, that, till age and experience have mellowed them, they are apt to have too much keenness on their spirits, and to express too much rigour in their actings. But Ruling Elders are more conversant in the world, know better what the times will bear, and what allowances are necessary to be made in this or that case. Now when the people (in the case of scandal) see themselves judged by such persons, and that there is no other discipline exercised on them, but what even their own neighbours, as well as their ministers, think reasonable, they can have no just cause of complaint.”—p. 209–10. Edinburgh. 1820.

a *free* commonwealth, the “noblest, manliest, justest, equallest” government on earth.

The combination of these two principles, the government of the church by representative assemblies and the double representation which obtains in them, may be styled the *analogy* of our system; and whatever is inconsistent with either of them, though there may exist no positive statute to forbid it, is inconsistent with our Constitution. The argument against it is of the same sort as that which convicts of heresy any method of justification, though not specifically condemned in the Bible, which comes into collision with the righteousness of faith—or which brands with reprobation any species of conduct, though not expressly rebuked in the Scriptures, which is contrary to the spirit and temper of the Gospel. It is enough, in the one case, to say that the new doctrine contradicts the analogy of faith; and in the other, the new practice, the analogy of holiness; and upon the same principle, whatever is repugnant to a government of courts, composed of two classes of representatives, contradicts the analogy of Presbyterianism. Our standards contemplate the full developement of the representative system, with all its checks and securities. It aims at the execution of the law of Christ, in its application to the varying circumstances and exigencies of His people; and they have provided equally that the law shall be expounded without the prejudices incident to a mass, or the dangers incident to a class: they have accordingly prescribed Assemblies, in conformity with the word of God, in which the desires of the people shall be known, without being permitted to be supreme. Double representation is the safe-guard of our system, and so completely pervades all its arrangements, that it is with manifest reluctance even sessions are permitted to be constituted without the presence of a minister.* But the Assembly has decided that in Classical and Synodical Assemblies, one class of the representatives described in our Standards may be wanting, and yet the law be preserved. It tells us that our Courts of Review and Control, may be constituted, and regularly constituted, without the presence of the Ruling Elder—that our representative system is unimpaired when one of its material elements

* Form of Government, chap. 9, §4.

is removed. As well might a State-Legislature undertake to enact laws without the presence of one of the chambers. Our system contemplates Ministers *and* Ruling Elders in every superior Judicatory. The Assembly declares that the Elders may be dispensed with. If there be not a contradiction here to the whole analogy of our government, we are incapable of determining what that analogy is. If there be not a mutilation of the perfection and symmetry of our scheme, we have mistaken the grounds on which its value and excellence depend.

In the constitution of our courts with two classes of representatives, we have given the world an example of the operation of a principle, the application of which, in the government of States, is justly regarded as the boast of modern civilization, and yet we are suddenly infatuated to trample our priceless jewel in the dust as a thing of nought. The Presbyterianism which the Assembly has sanctioned is a maimed and partial thing—as different from that of our Standards, and the Standards of all the Presbyterian churches, as a statue is different from a man. The form of a commonwealth may exist under it, and will continue to exist, as long as the Ministers are pastors—but the vitality is gone—the arteries of the body become withered and dried, the very moment Ruling Elders, fresh from the people—with feelings, habits and interests which identify them with their constituents—are removed from our courts. We cannot but think that it is a rash and ill-considered resolution which would impart the whole power of the Presbytery, under any circumstances ever likely to happen in a settled church-state, to three ministers; and yet this has been done by the General Assembly of the freest church in the world. We have been gravely told, that since a Presbytery is left to us no violence is done to the law. As well might the people of South Carolina, or any other free State in which the Legislature, consisting of two chambers, receives the general name of Assembly, be induced to believe that the acts of a single branch, passed and ratified in the absence of the other, were constitutional and binding, because they were passed by a body which was a real and true Assembly. An Assembly it might be, but it was not the Assembly which the fundamental laws of the State contemplate; and so this thing of three minis-

ters may be a Presbytery, but it is not *the* Presbytery of the American standards.*

This then is our first argument—the resolution of the Assembly contradicts the whole analogy of our government—it mars the perfection of our representative system—it removes one of its most important securities, and leaves the church in the hands of rulers, who are least acquainted with the details of its interests and strongly tempted, in the absence of salutary checks, to pursue abstractions or to exalt themselves into a privileged class. It is remarkable, too, that the officers whose presence is rendered unnecessary, are precisely the officers whose sole business it is to rule. We have appointed them in conformity with the word of God for a particular department of duty, and then gravely declare that this department can be conducted legally and properly without them. There is an inconsistency in such proceedings; violence is done to our standards, and no majorities can make it right.

When we consider the multitude of ministers without charge, the facility of increasing their number, and the lax discipline which permits them to exercise the full power of Scriptural bishops, the danger seems to us more than imaginary, which threatens the balance of our system, when Elders are treated as comparatively unimportant. Though valuable at all times, they are particularly needed, when Senators are admitted to our councils who have never been chosen by the people, except upon a principle which Brougham pronounces to be inconsistent with representative government—the principle that the Presbyteries are virtually electors in the case, and that their choice is putatively the choice of the church.† It is a wise maxim to resist the beginnings of evil. To give the clergy the power

* The Constitution of our Courts has been supposed to be analogous to the Constitution of the British House of Lords, which consists of the spiritual and temporal Peers. But the analogy fails in a very material point. The organization of our Assemblies should be compared, not to that of a single house—but to the Constitution of the Parliament—the *whole* legislative Assembly. Each Court with us is a *complete* judicial Assembly, and must therefore be compared to corresponding Assemblies only *as they are complete*. If the British Legislature could be constituted, without the Lords, by the Commons alone, or, without the Commons, by the Lords alone, then the analogy would hold, and Presbyteries might be constituted without Ruling Elders.

† Political Philosophy, vol. 3, chap. 9, p. 63.

of multiplying their own number, according to their own discretion, is to present a temptation which should not, without inevitable necessity, be offered to fallen humanity, to exercise irresponsible authority, and to seek the elevation of an order, rather than the general interests of the universal church. The danger might be slow in its development, but it is the undeniable experience of the world, that power unchecked tends to abuse, and will ultimately corrupt the sincerest men. We can dispense with none of the securities for the liberties of Christ's people; least of all with that which has placed our system, in every age of its existence, immeasurably beyond the standard of earthly politics; and which, in proportion to their approximations to it, has rendered States free, prosperous and happy. To dispense with Elders in the Assemblies of the church, is to sever the chords which bind the hearts of our people to their government, and to prepare the way for converting a free, vigorous and healthful commonwealth into a sacred aristocracy. We should pause on the threshold. Perpetual vigilance is the price of liberty; and the recorded experience of the past abundantly proves, that from the slightest and most insignificant beginnings, stupendous results have proceeded. We are far from supposing that there exists, among any, a deliberate design to destroy the liberties of the people, or to degrade the Eldership, or to corrupt the Ministry, or to effect any radical change in our system. We cast no imputation upon the motives of those who concurred in the resolution of the General Assembly; but their purposes are one thing, and the tendency of their measures another. And, as we believe before God that they have established a doctrine which may be pushed, in coming generations, to consequences which we shudder to contemplate, we feel bound in conscience to resist the evil in its birth. The direct increase of power is less dangerous, because less insidious, than the removal of a salutary check.

The forms of ancient despotism may never again be revived, but there is an evil worse than tyranny, which may be produced by alienating the affections and confidence of the great body of the people from the persons of their rulers. The Church or State which is reduced to this deplorable condition, is without strength or energy; like the body, when the nerves have lost their power and the vital func-

tions their tone. There is a public opinion of society, not to be confounded with momentary impulses or the impetuous dictates of temporary passion, which lies at the basis of all efficient, healthful, successful government. In this the laws find their strongest sanction, and no institutions can be permanently safe which contradict or fail to receive a cordial response from the sentiments of those who are immediately affected. The public opinion of the church must be consulted by its rulers; and while they should hold themselves above the paltry influences of popular clamour or popular whim, they should earnestly seek to understand the under-current of feeling and thought which pervades, animates, strengthens and consolidates the whole body of God's children. There are chords of sympathy which they must touch, if they would make their government a living, effective reality. This cannot be done without some adequate representation on the part of the people. It deserves, therefore, to be considered whether, if our Assemblies should continue to be held and the outward forms of our present government observed, the system could be preserved in life, energy and tone, when Ruling Elders shall have lost their interest in the department to which they are specially called. When they depart from our courts, the sympathies of the people will depart with them. A calamity so portentous should render us cautious how we trifle with measures which may have even a remote tendency to disturb the relations of the people to their rulers, and to arrest the free circulation of opinion through all the veins and arteries of the ecclesiastical body.

In every view of the case, therefore, the resolution of the Assembly seems to us to be dangerous. It is a violation of the spirit of our system, against which expediency as loudly remonstrates as the sacred voice of law.

II. Our second argument, which turns upon the same general principle with the first, is drawn from the fact that the simple question concerning the expediency or fitness of calling a special meeting of the Presbytery cannot be determined, according to a positive provision of law, by *all the Ministers together, without the concurrence of two Ruling Elders*, belonging to different congregations.* This

* Form of Government, chap. 10, §10.

consideration was urged in the Assemblies of 1843 and 1844, both in the debates and protests of those who dissented from the opinions of the majority, and in the able speech before us. To our minds it possesses great force. Whatever reason may be assigned for the introduction of the clause which contains the law, it will apply as strongly to the Constitution of the Presbytery as to the preliminary point whether it shall be constituted at all at a given time and place. If the object were to guard against rash and inconsiderate meetings, it seems a little unreasonable to assert that Ministers have not prudence to be trusted with the subject of the convention of a Presbytery, while they have all the wisdom which is necessary to transact all its business. To say that the object was to guard against the possibility of meetings without the knowledge of most of the members of the Court, is to overlook the provision which requires that adequate notice shall be given to every minister and church. Why then has the clause been inserted? Most evidently to preserve the cardinal principle of our system, the principle of double representation.

There are two aspects in which this clause may be deemed to be decisive of the point in dispute. In the first place, it furnishes an argument from the less to the greater—*ex minus probabili ad magis*—a species of reasoning which, in the ordinary affairs of life, is regarded as conclusive. If so slight a matter as the expediency and propriety of a special meeting of the body cannot be decided without the concurrence of *both classes* of representatives—if *all the Ministers together*, however distinguished by learning, piety and prudence, cannot even *determine* to meet without the approbation of the Elders—it violates all the measures of probability to affirm, that the Constitution, which has guarded, checked and restrained them in relation to a point comparatively unimportant, has yet given them plenary powers in relation to the very thing which makes a meeting important or unimportant, the business to be done. There is something ludicrous in declaring, in one breath, that they are incompetent to say whether a meeting ought to be held or not, and then affirming in the next, that they are fully competent to conduct the weightiest affairs in the kingdom of God. What is it but a paradox to assert that three Ministers, when regularly convened, are Presbyte-

rially omnipotent, and yet that these three ministers are insufficient to call a meeting of the body which they themselves can make! They can constitute the body in fact, but they cannot *agree* to do it.

In the next place, the resolution of the Assembly renders it possible that Presbyteries shall be organized, which under the Constitution, shall not be possessed of the power to call a special meeting—a state of things which our fathers evidently never contemplated. The doctrine is that three Ministers, whether with or without charge, may constitute a Presbytery; and, as in the present state of our affairs, it is a lamentably easy matter to find places and districts which, though destitute of churches, contain the requisite number of ordained men, it is possible, under this new law, to organize Presbyteries without Christian people to be governed or Sessions to be represented. Whatever can make a quorum can make a Presbytery; and if Elders were not indispensable to the one, the other can exist without them. But how shall these churchless Presbyteries call a special or extraordinary meeting? The law requires the concurrence of two Elders, but these Elders they have not got. Here, then, is a singular anomaly; and the *possibility* of such a case under the regular operation of our system, is enough to condemn the law which renders it conceivable. “It is the settled doctrine of our church and of all other reformed churches,” as Dr. Breckinridge truly remarks,* “that the right to convene in Church Assemblies, both stated and pro re nata, is Divine, inherent, and absolutely independent of the civil power;” and hence our standards never could have contemplated the existence of a body which, by their own provisions, is deprived of this right.

III. As there is a positive presumption arising from the general analogy of our system and the spirit of a particular provision of our law against the decision of the Assembly, clear and overwhelming evidence would seem to be demanded in order to justify it. This presumption is increased by the consideration that, in the absence of an express provision to the contrary, no quorum, according to the ordinary principles which regulate the case, *could* be formed

* Presbyterian Government, &c. p. 6.

without the presence of a Ruling Elder. In all cases in which an act is to be done by a definite number of persons, "a majority," according to Bouvier, "is required to constitute a quorum, unless the law expressly directs that another number may make one."* It is evident that, according to the letter of our standards, a majority never could be obtained exclusively of Ruling Elders. That they should be deprived of a privilege which, independently of positive law, they would obviously possess, and deprived in contradiction to the whole genius of the constitution, is an improbability so violent, that nothing short of very clear and unanswerable proof ought to be deemed sufficient to remove it. Now the only semblance of proof is found in the language of the Constitution pleaded by the Assembly itself—"that any three ministers and as many elders as may be present belonging to the Presbytery, being met at the time and place appointed, shall be a quorum, competent to proceed to business."† The question is, whether the terms—*and as many elders as may be present belonging to the Presbytery*—so obviously extend to the case in which *no* Elders shall be present, that they cannot be fairly and legitimately construed upon any other hypothesis. It is not a question whether they *may* include this case, but whether they *must* include it. Unless the interpretation of the Assembly is necessary and irresistible, another ought to be adopted, which shall reconcile the language with the general current of the law. Does the phraseology then, according to its natural, simple, inevitable import contemplate the *absence* of elders or not? If we may credit Dr. Rice,‡ this form of expression was selected to obviate the difficulty of those, who, in the absence of such a provision, might be tempted to doubt the legality of a meeting in which the elders out-numbered the ministers. It is certain that under any probable operation of our system, this is a case which may often happen; and if it were indeed the object of our fathers to meet this specific case, it is evident that they not only contemplated the presence of elders, but the presence of *more* elders than ministers. Under this view, the lan-

* Law Dictionary, vol. 2, s. v. Quorum.

† Form of Government, chap. 10, §7.

‡ See his speech in the Assembly of 1844, reported in the Protestant and Herald of June 20, 1844.

guage is a prohibition to Elders to organize the Presbytery, without the presence of at least three ministers; it is a restriction in favour of the ministers, and implies a state of things precisely the opposite of that which the Assembly has inferred from it. We are told by the Assembly of 1844,* that the object was to provide for all the contingencies that might occur, which are accordingly reduced to four—the case when no ruling elders are present—when the number of ministers exceeds that of ruling elders—when the numbers are equal, and when the elders exceed the ministers. That the rule extends to the last three cases we cheerfully concede—but that it includes the first, rests upon nothing but naked, unsupported authority. The whole question is a question of interpretation, and the object is to arrive at the idea in the minds of those who framed the Constitution when they adopted this particular language. Were or were they not thinking of the case in which no elders should be present? We can determine the point only by reference to instances in which similar phraseology, adopted under analogous circumstances, has a clear and undisputed meaning. We are free to confess that examples may be produced in which these or equivalent expressions, *independently interpreted*, will bear the sense which is defended in the present clause. But then, the instances are not precisely analogous. In the case before us, there is an antecedent presumption against the interpretation in question. This throws the burden of proof upon those who make it, and they are required to produce examples in which, against the pressure of a similar presumption, like phraseology has a like meaning to that for which they contend. Now this we believe to be impossible; and as all admit that the disputed clause provides for cases in which elders *are* present, in whatever numbers, the absence of proof that it provides for any other contingency, is conclusive on the point. We can call to mind no instances which will justify the decision of the Assembly, but we can conceive of those which are precisely against it. If a master had ordered a portion of his servants to go to a particular place—as our standards require elders to be present at Presbyteries—and then should subsequently command three

* See Minutes, p. 387.

others and as many as might be at the specified place, to execute a given task, would his language imply, would it be the idea in his mind, that there might, after all, be no servants there? Our fathers have drawn a constitution under whose provisions it is always likely that there shall be more elders than ministers at Presbytery; and yet in framing a clause which confessedly implies the *presence* of elders, we are gravely told that their *absence* is the prominent point contemplated. The interpretation of the Assembly is evidently not a necessary one—and accordingly upon the true principles of the case, ought not to be received. The meaning of the law should be drawn, not from verbal technicalities, nor from strained and arbitrary inferences, but from a candid comparison of its letter with the whole spirit and genius of the Constitution. The doctrine of the Assembly requires something more to support it than the naked possibility that the words *may* mean what they have been interpreted to teach. They *must* mean it, or the doctrine is tacitly condemned. If they are capable of *any* explanation, consistent with the analogy of our system, the laws of sound criticism demand that this explanation should be adopted. It seems to us preposterous to affirm, that because the clause, which contains the definition of a quorum, may, when independently interpreted, suggest the inference that the presence of elders is not essential, this inference is to be taken as the true meaning of the passage in gross contempt of the fundamental principles of the instrument in conformity with which the quorum is permitted to act. We have yet to learn that what logicians are accustomed to denominate a fallacy—the argumentum a posse ad esse—from possibility to fact—is yet so sound as to bear the weight of tremendous innovations upon an established constitution, and to justify what would seem to unsophisticated minds, the guilt of depriving rulers of their rights.

The second speech of Dr. Breckinridge—to which it is time we should advert—is devoted to the question, whether or not, Ruling Elders, when members of Presbytery, are entitled to lay on hands in the ordination of ministers of the word. The Assembly of 1843 had decided, that neither the constitution nor the practice of the church gave them

* Printed Minutes, p. 183.

any such authority*—and the Assembly of 1844, in re-affirming the decision, has pronounced ordination to be a “rite,” and has treated it simply as “*a declaratory ministerial act*.”† The point in dispute, therefore, involves the very nature of ordination—and in the different stages of the controversy two distinct issues have been presented. The first is, whether upon the supposition that ordination is an act of government and belongs to the power of jurisdiction and not of order, there be not something so peculiar in it, that the only rulers who are competent to execute it, are ministers themselves. This is the form in which the subject was first submitted to the church.‡ It was generally conceded that ordination was the act of a Court—that it was neither analogous to preaching nor to the administration of the sacraments, nor to any other function which pertained to ministers in their individual relations as preachers of the word. It was a joint and not a several power.§ This principle being undisputed, the question arose whether it pertained to the Court as *a whole* or only to those members of it who possessed the office to which the candidate was about to be set apart. There were two leading grounds on which the doctrine of the Assembly of 1843 was defended. 1. That ordination conferred ministerial authority—was a sort of spiritual generation of spiritual teachers—and therefore *could* be bestowed only by those who already possessed it—upon the obvious principle that a man cannot give to others what he has not himself. 2. That ordination pertained only to Scriptural Presbyters—and that as Ruling Elders are not the Presbyters of Scripture, they had no right to unite with the Presbytery in the performance of a

* Printed Minutes, p. 183. † *Ib.*, p. 370.

‡ We do not mean to assert that no one had yet expressed the views of the Assembly of 1844—but the controversy, for the most part, was conducted on the assumption that ordination pertained to jurisdiction. We do not recollect but a single speech in the Assembly of 1843 that distinctly denied this doctrine—many contended in general terms that it was a *ministerial* act—evidently meaning that ministers were the only rulers competent to execute it.

§ Ecclesiastical power is divided into two kinds—the power of order—*potestas ordinis*—and the power of jurisdiction—*potestas jurisdictionis*. The first is called several power—because it can be exercised by any individual who belongs to the order, without the concurrence or coöperation of others—the other is called joint power, because it can only be exercised in conjunction with others—that is—in some ecclesiastical court. See Second Book of Discipline of the Kirk of Scotland, chap. 1.

strictly Presbyterian act. This seems to us to have been the state of the controversy when the Assembly of 1844 met. That Assembly has made another issue by denying that ordination is an act of government at all—by pronouncing it to be a rite—and by referring it to the category of order rather than jurisdiction. In every aspect of the case the characteristic principles of our system are involved. To admit that ordination is the act of a court, and to exclude any class of members from participation in it, is to raise a question concerning the nature of the office and the extent of the rights with which these members are invested. No one has ever attached the least degree of importance to the circumstance of the imposition of hands, as a simple matter of fact—by the Ruling Elders of Presbytery. It is the *principle* on which their right has been denied—whether it respects the nature of ordination, or the nature of their office, that has given the subject all its interest and value. It is certainly a matter of some moment to determine what ordination is—the consequence attached to it by Prelatists and Papists—the bitter controversies it has occasioned in the church—and its obvious relations to the authority and duties of the ministry require that we should, at least, be settled in our own views as to what constitutes its essence. Our church ought to have a definite testimony—and yet their recent agitations have revealed the melancholy fact that upon this whole subject, our language to each other, to other churches and the world, is as confused and contradictory as the dialects of Babel. It is also a matter of some moment that the office of Ruling Elder should be clearly apprehended. Is he a mere deputy of the people, clothed with delegated power, and only the organ of the constituents who elect him—or is he an officer divinely appointed—clothed with jurisdiction by the authority of God, and elected by the people to discharge the duties which Christ has connected with his office? Is he or is he not the Presbyter of the Scriptures? These surely are not slight questions—they affect the very heart of our system—and in deciding them, we settle the distinctive principles of our government. Whether or not Ruling Elders shall ever exercise the right, which we contend belongs to their office, of imposing hands in the ordination of ministers, is a matter in regard to which we are profoundly indifferent—

we are content to leave them to their own discretion—and so we are equally indifferent whether any *minister* beside the Moderator shall engage in the same act. But when it is asserted that they are precluded from this or any other Presbyterian function by the very nature of their office, or the peculiar character of the service, then principles are involved which possess a magnitude and importance proportioned to the excellence of the Presbyterian Polity in contradistinction from every other mode of church government. Then we are required to say whether we believe with the Papists, that ordination is a sacrament—with the Prelatists, that it belongs to the power of order—with the Independents, that it belongs to the people—or with the great body of the Reformed Churches—that it belongs to the power of jurisdiction—is an act of government, and must be administered by the legitimate Courts of God's House. Then we are required to say, whether Ruling Elders are lawful members of ecclesiastical courts—are the Presbyters of Scripture, or are mere intruders into Congregational, Classical and Synodical Assemblies. We are required, in other words, to say whether we are Presbyterians or not.

Slight and insignificant, therefore, as the question may appear to be in itself, in its collateral issues, it involves considerations which justify all the gravity and importance which have ever been attached to it. The minutest pimple on the face, is a fit subject of alarm, when that pimple is the symptom of a cancer?

The points which Dr. Breckinridge discusses in the speech before us, are “that the whole work of the ordination of ministers of the word, belongs regularly and properly to a Presbytery, composed of preaching and ruling elders; and that the Presbytery which should impose hands is the same as that which performs all the rest of the work of ordination.”*

His doctrine, in other words, is that ordination is an act of government and appropriately belongs to the rulers of God's house judicially convened—that it is the exercise of joint and not of several power, and cannot be restricted to one class of elders more than to another. *Every* Elder who is a member of the court, whether he be a preacher or not, may participate in the execution of the act.

* Presbyterian Ordination not a Charm, &c. p. 29. Minute submitted to the Synod.

This speech, like the former, may be divided into three parts. The first presents what may be called the constitutional argument—the second illustrates the propriety and fitness of the provisions of our standards on which the constitutional argument depends—and the third is devoted to the doctrine of other churches in reference to the point in dispute, as this doctrine is gathered from the authorized symbols of their faith.* Any language which should, at all, be proportioned to our convictions of the ability with which these topics are discussed, would, to those who have never investigated the subject, seem to be extravagant. It is impossible to read the speech without being struck with the power it displays. Nothing but inveterate prejudice or obstinate perverseness of mind can deny that a cause which has enlisted so much talent—and such noble earnestness and zeal—is entitled to worthier treatment than that of being dismissed with a sneer.

What we have styled the constitutional argument, embraces four points: 1. The express language of the law which concedes to the Presbytery, and to the Presbytery as a whole—the power to ordain, to remove, to install and to judge ministers. 2. The inconsistency of denying to Ruling Elders the right of uniting in the imposition of hands, when they are obviously entitled to bear a part in every other portion of the work. 3. The fallacy is exposed which, from the language put into the mouths of the members after the ordination has been performed, would restrict the Presbytery, to which the Constitution has entrusted this office, exclusively to ministers; and 4. The presumption against the right of Elders, arising from its inconsistency with the general practice of the church, is satisfactorily removed. This presumption is shown, in the first place, to lie as strongly against other principles which are universally acknowledged to belong to our system, as against the proposition in question. In the next place, a very important distinction is suggested between the fact and the inference which ought to be drawn from the fact. It may be granted that elders, as a general rule, have never been accustomed to impose hands—it has never been their practice—but as

* The first part extends from p. 14 to p. 17—the second from p. 17 to p. 20, and the third from p. 20 to the close. The whole speech occupies sixteen closely printed pages.

other reasons may be conceived which are sufficient to explain the phenomenon, beside a denial of their right, that denial is hardly a legitimate, certainly not a necessary inference from the fact.

To illustrate the manner in which these points are discussed, we shall present extracts bearing upon each in the order in which it has been mentioned.

1. "The main point of this discussion, so far as the question is one of positive law, is one, in regard to which it would seem to be impossible there could be a difference of opinion amongst us. Where is the power of ordaining ministers of the word lodged under our constitution? "The *Presbytery* has power * * * * *to ordain, install, remove and judge ministers.*" (Form of Gov. ch. x., sec. 8.) What Presbytery? Why, sir, beyond all doubt, that Presbytery which is one of the divinely instituted assemblies declared in this same constitution to be invested with power to govern the church of Christ; (ch. viii., sec. 1)—that Presbytery defined in the same chapter which declares its power to ordain, as being composed of many separate congregations, which, by their need of mutual counsel, invest presbyterial assemblies with their importance and usefulness, and declared *to consist of ministers and ruling elders*; (ch. x., sec. 1 and 2)—that Presbytery, thus constituted, which is so often and so prominently held forth throughout the entire chapter which treats expressly of the ordination of Pastors and Evangelists; (ch. xv.)—that Presbytery, to which as constituted of the officers called of God to receive the fearful trust of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power of church censures is committed. (Confession of Faith, ch. xxx., sec. 1 and 2.) This, sir, is the body to which, by language as plain as language can be, the power to ordain ministers is confided under this constitution. This power is confided to it *as a body*—not to its individual members; to it, as *the* body defined in the instrument itself: and to place the power in any other hands than those of an Assembly composed of the Pastors and Ruling Elders of the churches of a particular district, is to act in gross disregard of law which we have solemnly declared we believe to be in full accordance with the revealed will of God, and which we have sacredly bound ourselves by mutual covenants to observe. It is nothing to the present argument whether other ordinations be valid or invalid; though I readily admit them to be for substance good, even when they are irregular in form. It is nothing worth to enter into the questions so largely disputed in the Westminster Assembly, about congre-

gations fixed and congregations fluid; about a church-state settled and a church-state unsettled; about the exclusive power of Presbytery and the concurrent power of Presbytery and consistory or church session, in the premises. It is wholly beside the question, as matter of strict argument, what our own church even, believed or did before the formation of the present Form of Church Government and its adoption in 1788: as much so as it would be to determine the powers of the present Congress of the United States, by the practice or the theory of the government under the old Confederation, instead of doing it by a fair construction of the present constitution. The true question is, what is the law of this church as laid down in this book? And the answer is simple, clear, explicit—that the ordination of ministers of the word belongs under our covenanted system, neither to Pastors nor Committees, nor nondescript things called quorums, nor church sessions, nor Synods—but to *Presbyteries*; and not to Presbyteries in the vague and general sense of the term, but to the Presbyteries of this Constitution. Nor can I conceive, sir, that a candid mind can doubt in regard to this point, after it has been plainly stated.

The *formal* parts of this ordination are stated with absolute precision. A fast day ought to be observed in the congregation where the ordination is to take place, previous to it. (Form of Gov., ch. xv., sec. 11.) The *Presbytery* being convened, a member ought to preach a sermon; the same or some other member should explain, enforce, and recapitulate the case; the person appointed to preside should ask the questions set down to be answered both by the candidate and people (*idem.*, sec. 12 and 13;) “Then the presiding minister shall by prayer, *and with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, according to the Apostolic example, *solemnly ordain him* to the holy office of the gospel ministry.” (*Idem.* sec. 14.) Who shall ordain him? “*The presiding minister*”—in the name—by the authority, with the concurrence, in the bosom of the constituted Presbytery—as its Moderator—and not otherwise: so are the words written. Whose hands are to be laid on him that is ordained? “*The hands of the Presbytery*”; so again are the written words. What Presbytery? Why beyond all the powers of human ingenuity and perversity to gainsay—the Presbytery of this constitution; the Presbytery of this chapter; the Presbytery that licensed the candidate—the Presbytery that received his call and put it into his hands; the Presbytery that examined him, and appointed a day to ordain him, and met for that purpose in the church that called him; the Presbytery that chose one of its ministers to preach,

another to deliver a charge to the people, another to deliver a charge to the new minister, another to preside at his ordination. This is the Presbytery that lays its hands on him—and to assert the contrary, I say it without intending to give offence, is utter folly. But this Presbytery is a Presbytery which consists of ministers and elders; a presbytery in which one elder from every congregation in the district, has a right to sit as a member. Therefore, by the irresistible force of the very terms of the law, every elder present and a member of the body, is as much bound to lay on his hands as any minister present can be. Why, sir, would you stultify our fathers? Did they first define with the utmost clearness the term *Presbytery*; then invest the body so called with the power of ordaining ministers of the word; then in a long chapter treating of this ordination in detail use the word a dozen times in its defined sense; and then without notice or motive, use the same word in the same chapter and touching the same business, in a sense not only inconsistent with their own definition of it, and their constant use of it, but in a sense flatly contrary to both? The thing is supremely absurd. We have in this city a municipal government which consists of a Mayor and two bodies called jointly the City Council. Suppose the Legislature of this State were to pass an act of fourteen or fifteen sections, defining the power belonging to the municipal government over any particular subject, and directing minutely the manner of its exercise: suppose it should say in one section it meant by the words “municipal government,” the Mayor and the two branches of the the City Council, and then throughout the act use the words confessedly in this sense, until it came to the fourteenth section, and in it should use the same words, in regard to the same matter, once more; now, sir, I demand of you, what would be thought of a man, who could seriously contend that in this case, the words “municipal government”—used in the fourteenth section of the act, really did not mean the Mayor and both branches of the City Council—but in fact meant only and singly the first branch? Will you say, no man would venture upon so marvellous a folly? Then why, sir, shall we have a thing just as preposterous, forced upon the church, in the name of reason, of our constitution, and of the word of God?”—p. 14–15.

2. “It cannot escape notice, that if ruling elders are denied the right of imposing hands in the ordination of Pastors and Evangelists, it must necessarily follow that they ought to be prevented from taking any part in every other portion of these ordinations. The ground upon which they act in the matter at all, under this

constitution, is, that they are declared to be a component part of the Presbytery, (Form of Government, chap. x., sec. 2 ;) that the Presbytery is declared to have power to ordain ministers, (Idem, sec. 8 ;) and that "the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery" is declared to be a formal part of this ordination, (Idem, ch. xv., sec. 14 ;) and it is a ground altogether impregnable. If the laying on of hands be the only essential part of ordination, or the main part of it, then the more clearly this is proved, the more important it is that ruling elders be not illegally ousted of their rights, and the more manifest it is that this right is inherent in their office—since, if this is ordination, this is the very thing they are commanded to do. But, on the other hand, if the imposition of hands is any part at all of ordination, then manifestly, the body which has the entire power of ordination, has power to perform this part of ordination, and therefore ruling elders have it upon the same ground precisely that preaching elders have it, namely, that they are members of the body to which the right appertains; and to deny this involves, either that imposition of hands is no part of ordination, or that ordination is not by the Presbytery, both of which are absurd and contrary to express law—or that ruling elders may be denied any participation in a part of ordination which is expressly declared to belong to the whole Presbytery; and if this can be done, then they can, on the same grounds, be deprived of all participation in all parts of ordination—and that act cease to be presbyterial and become merely hierarchic, as to every part of it; which is precisely the tendency of the greater part of the arguments I have heard and read on the other side. Furthermore, upon the same grounds precisely, the ruling elders ought to be deprived, and if they tolerate the present encroachment, they will be deprived at last, of all right to take any part in installing, removing, and judging ministers, as well as in ordaining them; for the whole four powers are of one and the same class, and are embraced and invested by a single clause (Form of Government, chap. x., sec. 8,) of the Constitution. There is full as much sense in the notion that an elder cannot take away the ministerial office because he cannot give it, as in that so current amongst us, that he cannot give it because he has it not himself; and there is far more reason to say he shall in no case take part in installations, than to prohibit the imposition of his hands, since the latter act is only and always presbyterial, while the former one may be done by committee. (Form of Government, ch. xvi., sec. 6.) And surely it is far more evident that when ministers are installed by a committee of ministers, ruling elders can have no right to take part

in removing them, seeing they had none in placing them; that it is that they cannot impose hands in ordination, even though ordination be an act of Presbytery only, and they members of the body. The truth is, sir, the whole matter resolves itself into one of these four propositions—either the imposition of hands is not a Presbyterial act, which is exactly contrary to the words of the Constitution;—or Presbyterial acts may be performed where there is no Presbyterial authority, which is absurd and revolutionary;—or ruling elders, when members of Presbytery, must unite in the act, which is true;—or you must show an explicit statement in the Constitution, not only that a Presbytery is good without them—which the Synod asserts and the Constitution denies—but that even when they are present, they are denied this right; that is, that even when members, they are not members.”—p. 15-16.

3. “But, chiefly, the whole sophism, rests on an error of fact. The word *ministry* is, no doubt, in its popular use often, perhaps generally, applied to the ministers of the word; but our standards, and those of other Presbyterian churches, and our Bible too, use it technically to mean all the divinely ordained officers of the church. Our confession says, “Christ hath given *the ministry*, oracles, and ordinances of God for *the gathering and perfecting* of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world,” (ch. xxv., sec. 3,) and our Form of Government declares that Pastors, Ruling Elders, and Deacons, are the ordinary and perpetual officers of the church, given to it by Christ—as already abundantly proved: therefore these standards must contradict themselves, or else in them, and so in this place—the word *ministry* does not mean simply the ministers of the word. The *Second Book of Discipline*, of the Kirk of Scotland, is equally explicit:—“according to the parts of this division, (to wit, of the policie of the Kirk,) ariseth a sort of threefold officers in the Kirk, to wit, of ministers, preachers, elders, governors, and deacons, distributors. *And all these may be called by a general word, ministers of the Kirk,*” (ch. ii., part 2). Yes, sir, and our brother Paul is more explicit even than our brother, Andrew Melville; for knowing that the Master had laid down, and enforced in his own inexpressible humiliation, the great truth that *minister* of the church and *servant* of the church are the very same thing; he expressly declares that all the gifts of him who ascended far above all heavens, were for a work which he expresses by a word borrowed from the name of the humblest office in the church—a *deaconry*—a *ministry*; and seeing that he had called Christ himself—a

minister, a servant for the truth of God, using the same word—when he speaks of himself and even of his apostolic office, he goes out of the circle of ecclesiastical phraseology and selects a word lower than the lowest he could find there—to say, ‘so account of us as of the *ministers* of Christ.’”

4. “And as for the pretended practice—what is it? That Elders *shall not* impose hands in the ordination of ministers of the word? I deny that any such practice ever did, or from the nature of the case ever could exist, independently of clear law; or if it existed, could be proved in the manner here attempted. That Elders *did not* so impose hands, might be a practice, and might be proved; but that they *should not*, is a long step farther; and the moment this principle has been attempted to be asserted as the sense of the church, it has created an excitement which it will require better arguments than the previous question to allay. That Elders *did not* impose their hands *actually*, is asserted with great confidence to have been the uniform practice; the very *general* practice it may have been; the *universal* practice, I have personal knowledge it was not—and that in portions of the church the most thoroughly imbued with the principles of our system. That *potentially*, whoever did impose hands, did it as the act of the whole body, and therefore of the elders in the body, is just as clear, as that when the candidate is ordained by the Moderator presiding—as by the words of our book he is—the ordination is potentially that of the body—and so is Presbyterian: and this is one manifest proof of the absurdity of talking about a practice that Elders *should not* impose hands.”

Having proved that according to the plain and obvious meaning of the constitution, ordination belongs to the Presbytery as a *whole*, and not to a single class of its members, Dr. Breckinridge proceeds to vindicate the law, and shows conclusively to our minds, that there is nothing in the nature of ordination itself, or in the nature of the Ruling Elder's office, which renders it unfit that he should take part in the service. As we shall have occasion to refer again to the principles involved in this portion of the speech, we shall content ourselves with a single passage in which the teaching of the Scriptures upon the question at issue, as it was evidently understood by our fathers, is clearly and felicitously presented.

“Our Form of Government, ch. viii., sec. 1 and 2, quotes Acts xv. 6, to prove the government of the church to be *jure divino*, in

assemblies congregational, classical and synodical; and then in ch. x., sec. 1, and ch. xi., on the title, it quotes the same passage to prove that, *jure divino*, classical and synodical assemblies are composed of Pastors and Ruling Elders. In ch. xv., sec. 14, 1 Tim. iv. 14, is quoted to prove that in ordination the hands of the Presbytery ought to be imposed; and in ch. x., sec. 1, the same passage is quoted to prove that many congregations are united in one Presbytery composed of Pastors and Ruling Elders. So that holding Ruling Elders to be incompetent to impose hands, we quote a passage which proves that Presbytery ordains by imposition of hands, and quote it again to prove that ruling elders as well as preaching elders were in that Presbytery. And holding that the power of regimen held by ruling elders does not qualify them to act in a matter which falls immediately and absolutely under the power of an assembly having rule; we quote a passage to prove, in the first place, that this assembly has the power of rule, and in the second, that ruling elders were in it! The passage in Timothy, puts it out of dispute, that the body which ordains is a Presbytery, and that it ordains with imposition of its hands; while that in Acts is equally conclusive that it had jurisdiction, and that the elders who sat in it, were all neither more nor less than Presbyters. Here, sir, I may boldly take my stand. These marginal citations clearly prove by Scripture, that the doctrine asserted in our standards is that which I assert before you now; and that the men who put them there and have kept them there, understood these standards to teach this doctrine. Assemblies which have rule in the church—which are composed of teaching and ruling elders, and are therefore called Presbyteries—ordain ministers of the word, by the imposition of the hands of their members, without discrimination. This is the doctrine of these standards and of God's word. And, sir, I invoke your solemn consideration of the state of the question to which the whole argument conducts us. The whole office of the ruling elder is involved. His power to ordain depends on his power to rule—and they stand or fall together. His position under our constitution and by the word of God, is determined by the same argument, and will be decided by the same vote. With him falls the grand peculiarity of Presbyterian, and as I believe, of Christian, Church Order."

The last portion of the speech is devoted to the doctrine of foreign churches. "The *practice* of other churches," Dr. Breckinridge tells us, "I do not pretend to have sufficiently examined into, to speak with confidence about it—

nor indeed does it appear to me a point of sufficient importance to be worthy of discussion, under the circumstances. * * * The *doctrine* of other Reformed Churches I have considered as standing in a different light, and have carefully examined it, especially as it is set forth in their public and formal standards.* Independently of the reasons which Dr. Breckinridge has specified for attaching more importance to *doctrine* than to *practice*, it is worthy of remark that general principles are seldom apprehended, on their first announcement, in the full extent of their application. Though the truth of the universal always includes the truth of the particulars, yet it is possible—it is a fact daily exemplified in the processes of thought—that the general may be received without any adequate conception of the number of particulars it contains.† The definitions of mathematics and the leading principles of ethics *contain* all the truths which belong to either science—and yet it is the study of a life to develop in either case the full extent of virtual knowledge which is involved in an assent to the definitions of the one and the fundamental doctrines of the other. The Reformers, in many instances, like the prophets of Israel, were the heralds of doctrines which they knew to be true, because they were found in the word of God, but whose compass and extent, their past associations and established habits of thought prevented them from duly appreciating. Step by step, they followed the truth in its vigorous assault upon their settled prejudices and existing institutions, but the whole work of the truth it was not for a single age or a single generation to achieve. It is the duty of after-times to apply their principles, when just, to abuses and corruptions to which their fathers saw not, that the principles could be extended. In this process we are not opposing—we are acting in consistency with their testimony—we are simply hatching the egg which they have deposited. It may, therefore, be true, that the founders of the Reformed Churches abroad never in fact reduced to a complete and consistent practice their Scriptural doctrine of ordination—and yet this circumstance is by no means a proof that it is incapable of an application which they never made. Their practice may not have been reformed into

* Presbyterian Ordination, &c. p. 20

† See chap. ii., Book IV. Whatly's Logic.

perfect harmony with their principles. They may neither have seen nor felt the discrepancy—and yet the discrepancy may have really existed. They may not have apprehended all the details which were legitimately embraced under their general statement. Their *doctrine*, therefore, is a surer guide than their practice—it is the mould into which their practice ought to have been cast—and if they failed to do it, we are wanting in reverence for them and veneration for the truth, when we prefer what they did not condemn to what they cordially approved.

So far as the point of doctrine is concerned, Dr. Breckinridge has shown, that wherever it is repugnant to the conclusions for which he contends, it is in consequence of principles distinctly rejected in our standards. This is particularly the case in reference to the Reformed Church of France.* He alleges in his favour—and we do not see how his arguments can be resisted—the second or latter Helvetic Confession—which he pronounces to be emphatically “*the Confession of the Reformed Churches*”—the Second Book of Discipline of the Kirk of Scotland†—and disposes very successfully of the arguments which have been drawn from the formularies published by the Westminster Assembly.‡ He considers in the last place the history of our own Constitution§—in which he proves, beyond the possibility of doubt, that upon the subject of church-order the Scotch, and not the Westminster Standards, were principally followed, and that in the successive modifications of our system, the principles have been more and more clearly embodied from which his own views seem to result as a necessary consequence.

It seems to us that the opposition to Dr. Breckinridge's theory, arises from a two-fold error—the first having reference to the nature of ordination itself, and the second to the office of the Ruling Elder. Our limits do not permit us to enter, at this time, into an extended investigation of these topics, but we shall present, with all the brevity consistent with perspicuity, the results to which our inquiries have conducted us. What then is ordination?

It deserves to be remarked, in the first place, that the very term itself obviously implies, what every definition,

* Presbyterian Ordination, &c. p. 21. † *Ibid.*, p. 22-24.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 24-26. § *Ibid.*, p. 26.

whether Protestant or Papal—Prelatic, Presbyterian or Congregational, assumes as a conceded proposition, that the ministry of the Gospel is an *ordo*. The different gradations which the churches of England and of Rome have introduced into the general office of the clergy are accordingly styled *holy orders*. In these applications, the word *ordo* is used in a sense analogous to that in which it was employed to indicate the rank of a Roman Senator. The clergy, as Knapp suggests,* seem to correspond to it, while the mass of the people, the laity, are distinguished from them, not as another order—but by the absence of that which, in the other case, is the ground of separation.

Ordination has evidently some relation to this *ordo*, and our views of this relation must depend upon our previous conceptions of the source and nature of that, whatever it is, which constitutes the essence of the order.

According to Rome,† three sacraments, baptism, confirmation and orders, impress an indelible character on the soul—which, consisting not in a new and peculiar relation, but in an absolute quality, fits it to discharge the duties of religion, assimilates to Christ, and is a badge of distinction from others. The character, whatever it is, which the sacrament of orders confers, constitutes the difference between the clergy and the laity. There is a mark upon the souls of one which is not found upon the souls of the other. Orders enrol a man among the leaders of the hosts of the Lord, and communicate the power—as a personal and substantive possession—to distribute to others the blessings of the covenant. In correspondence with this view of the nature of the order, Rome teaches that ordination is a sacrament—and *as a sacrament*, actually impresses the indelible character which distinguishes the priesthood. It is that which *makes* a man a priest—the only Divine calling which can justify a creature in ministering at the altar. His ordination and his commission from above are one and the same thing.

According to the divines of the Church of England, the possession of ministerial power, which Hooker‡ does not scruple to denominate “a kind of mark or character, ac-

* Lectures on Theology, vol. 2, p. 494, Art. xiii., §136.

† Bellarmin De Effectu Sacramentorum. Lib. ii., chap. 19.

‡ Ecclesiastical Polity, Book V., chap. 77, §2. Cf. §7. Keble's edition.

knowledge to be indelible," is that which entitles a man to the rank of a minister. "Ministerial power," says the author of the Ecclesiastical Polity, "is a mark of separation, because it severeth them that have it from other men, and maketh them a special *order*, consecrated unto the service of the Most High in things wherewith others may not meddle." To introduce a man into orders, in the Church of England, is to give him authority to execute the functions which pertain to the ministry. Ordination *confers* the power which constitutes the badge of ministerial rank, and, as in the Church of Rome, so in this Protestant communion, it is the only valid commission which a man can legitimately plead to administer the ordinances of God. "Canonical ordination," says Hooker,* "in the Church of Christ, is that which maketh a lawful minister as touching the validity of any act which appertaineth to that vocation." The very words which the Bishop employs, in the services prescribed for the occasion, are conclusive proof that ordination is regarded as the real communication of a Divine warrant to discharge the duties of a minister—it creates a right to the *ordo*—it impresses the character or bestows the power which is distinctive of the rank—so that the relation of ordination to the *ordo* in the churches of England and Rome is essentially the same. Their Bishops undertake in the name of God to call and commission the ministry for its work.†

But, according to *our* doctrine, and the doctrine of the great body of the Reformed Churches of Europe, the right to the ministerial office depends upon the calling of God.

* Ecclesiastical Polity, Book V., chap. 81, §12.

† We extract the following passage from a Dictionary of the Church, by Rev. Wm. Staunton. Ordination is defined to be—

"The act of conferring holy orders, or the right and authority to execute the offices of the Christian ministry. Ordination is not to be confounded with the *designating* or *setting apart* of a person to the work of the ministry; for in strictness, any one may do this for *himself*, or it may be done for him by his parents, guardians, &c. and involves nothing but what any layman may perform; whereas ordination is the actual *communication of authority* from a legitimate source, to execute those functions which appertain to the several orders of the ministry. Neither is ordination to be viewed as the appointing of a person to the spiritual charge of a particular congregation; on the contrary, every ordained clergyman is to be held as a Minister of the Church Catholic, and his location in any particular sphere of labor, is a mere accident, not affecting the validity, or the extent of his spiritual powers."—*Art. Ordination.*

A divine vocation, imparting a spiritual fitness for the work, is the only mark or character which distinguishes the ministry from every other class of men. Those gifts of the Holy Ghost—that heavenly and powerful unction by which God qualifies His agents for the positions to which He has assigned them, are the only badges of the order which the Scriptures lead us to recognize. Hence, upon our principles, ordination must sustain a very different relation to the *ordo* from that which is ascribed to it in the Churches of England and of Rome. As with us, it is God through the Spirit who imparts the ministerial commission, and conveys the right to discharge the duties of the office—as God and God alone can communicate the distinctive qualities of the *ordo*. Ordination with us can only be an acknowledgment of the fact that a man is a minister of God and entitled to rule and to teach in His church. We do not undertake to put into the hands of ministers their Divine warrant for their work—we only receive and set our seal to the credentials which God has given. In our use of the term ordination and that of the Prelatists, there is a difference of meaning analogous to that which obtains between Protestants and Romanists, in their use of the much more important term justification. To justify with the one is to make righteous, as to ordain is to create a minister—to justify with the other, is to pronounce righteous, as to ordain is to declare a man a minister. Hence, Presbyterian ordination imparts nothing—whether character, power, grace, or privilege. It is neither a charm nor a commission—it is a simple acknowledgment of what God has done. As a right is comparatively worthless whose existence is not recognized by others—the logical maxim being universally applicable *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*—it is of the utmost importance to the success and efficiency of a minister, that his divine authority be admitted. Hence, God has appointed ordination as a public recognition on the part of His church of the rights which He has supernaturally conferred. It is the established mode in which it is *made to* appear that He has called and anointed the subject of it for the work of the ministry.

As it is evidently, therefore, the decision of a question of fact concerning the Divine right of an individual to be ranked in the *ordo*, two elements must enter into it, the in-

vestigation of the evidence, and the formal rendering of the judgment. The decision must be made in conformity with the laws of Christ. He has prescribed the principles on which it must depend. He has defined the qualities which characterized the ordo and settled the mode in which the knowledge of their existence can be acquired. The whole process in the investigation of the evidence and the declaration of the verdict is only an application of the laws of Christ, and is consequently committed to the same hands with the general administration of government. Ordination is a judicial decision, and therefore belongs to a Court. Imposition of hands is the formal rendering of the judgment—and as the judgment is the judgment of the whole Court, it must be rendered as the decision of the whole, though a particular individual may be selected as the organ. There is nothing, therefore, in any part of the process in which a Ruling Elder may not fitly and consistently participate. The point to be determined, is a question of fact concerning the right of a given individual to be enrolled in the ordo of ministers. This right depends upon a Divine vocation, imparting a spiritual fitness for the work. This vocation is, in turn, to be determined by the laws which Christ has prescribed in the case. The judgment of the Court is reached by calling on each member to express his opinion by a vote—and when the result is known, the judgment is formally declared by the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery. If a Ruling Elder, therefore, has a right to vote in the case, he has also a right to impose hands. They are both expressions of the same judgment—the one being the opinion of the individual as a member of the Court, and the other the judicial decision into which that opinion has entered as a component element. Such we apprehend to be the nature of Presbyterian ordination—and every other hypothesis, as it seems to us, must proceed upon the assumption of Prelatists and Papists, that it is in the power of man to communicate the distinctive peculiarities of the ministerial order. Every other doctrine must make ordination the *commission* of the ministry. The mystical jargon about the transmission of authority, the communication of power, the delegation of office, is essentially prelatic—and we can conceive of no theory of ordination which renders it incompatible for an elder to partake in it, which does not assume that

its relation to the ordo is that for which Prelatists and Romanists contend.

The other error which we mentioned has reference to the nature of the office of the Ruling Elder. It is becoming common to represent it, not as the immediate appointment and institution of Christ, the only King and Head of the Church, but as the creature of the people, possessed of no other powers but those which they have chosen to entrust to it. The Elder is an organ through which the people exercise the jurisdiction which Christ originally committed to them. He can do nothing but what the people themselves might do, and his office is Divine only in the sense that God is supposed to sanction the act of his constituents in delegating their power to him, instead of exercising it in their own collective capacity. According to this extraordinary theory, the people in mass might constitute, in connection with the ministry, the judicial Assemblies of the Church. The Session might be composed, not of the Pastor and Elders, but of the Pastor and the brotherhood. The Presbytery might be composed, not of the Ministers and a Ruling Elder from each church within the bounds of a district—but of the ministers and the entire congregations of professed believers committed to their charge. Our government upon this scheme, as it was originally instituted by Christ, and as it might now be *jure divino* practically administered, is an odd mixture of an elective aristocracy—the clergy—and a pure democracy, the people. We have no hesitation in affirming that this whole theory of the origin and nature of the Elder's office, is absolutely false—unsupported by a single text of Scripture, or a single doctrine of our standards. Presbyterianism venerates the *rights*, but it is a new thing under the sun to maintain the *judicial power* of the people. Christ has not committed the government of the church into their hands. The language of our law is as clear and explicit as language can be made. "The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a government—IN THE HANDS OF CHURCH-OFFICERS, distinct from the civil magistrate."* Not a word is said about the right of the people to coöperate in all acts of discipline and government. The *potestas jurisdictionis*

* Confession of Faith, chap. xxx., §1.

pertains to *church-officers* — “to these officers” — it is added — and not to the people, “the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed”* — “it belongeth to the overseers and other rulers of the particular churches, by virtue of their office, and the power which *Christ* hath given them, for edification, and not for destruction, to appoint “Synods and Councils” — “and to convene together in them as often as they shall judge it expedient for the good of the church.”† “Our blessed Saviour, for the edification of the visible church, which is his body, hath appointed officers, not only to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments, but also to exercise discipline, for the preservation both of truth and duty; and it is incumbent upon these officers, and upon the whole church in whose name they act, to censure or cast out the erroneous and scandalous.”‡

These passages of our Standards recognize the doctrine of Owen,§ which we apprehend to be the true doctrine of the Scriptures — that “all church-power in actu primo, or fundamentally is in the church itself: in actu secundo, or its exercise, in them that are especially called thereunto.” “He hath instituted,” says this great man,|| “and appointed the offices themselves, and made a grant of them unto the church for its edification. As also, he hath determined and limited the powers and duties of the officers. It is not in the power of any or of all the churches in the world, to appoint any office, or officer in the church, that Christ hath not appointed. And where there are any such, they can have no church-authority properly so called; for that entirely riseth from and is resolved into the institution of the office by Christ Himself. And hence, in the first place, all the authority of officers in the church proceeds from the authority of Christ in the institution of the office itself: for that which gives being unto any thing, gives it also its essential properties.” “It is hence evident,” he insists in another place,** “that in the communication of church-power in office unto any person called thereunto, the work and duty of the church consists formally in acts of obe-

* Confession of Faith, chap. xxx., §2. † Ibid., chap. xxxi., §1.

‡ Form of Government, Book I., chap. 1, §3.

§ Owen on the Nature of a Gospel Church, chap. iii., §2. Works, vol. 20, p. 378.

|| Ibid., p. 386. ** Ibid., p. 389.

dience unto the commands of Christ. Hence, it doth not give unto such officers a power or authority that was formally and actually in the body of the community, by virtue of any grant or law of Christ, so as that they should receive and act the power of the church, by virtue of a delegation from them; but only they design, choose, set apart the individual persons, who thereon are entrusted with office-power by Christ Himself, according as was before declared." While, therefore, "all church-power, which is nothing but a right to perform church duties in obedience unto the commands of Christ and according unto his mind, is originally given unto the church essentially considered," yet it has evidently "a double exercise—1, in the call or choosing of officers; 2, in their voluntary acting with them and under them in all duties of rule."

That the people, and not Christ, are the direct and immediate source of all the power and authority committed to the office of Ruling Elder, is an error which, though it evidently contradicts the express teachings of our standards, has arisen from a total misapprehension of the title with which they distinguish him—*the representative of the people*. A representative and a delegate are essentially distinct—they differ not merely, as Lord Brougham* seems to suppose, in the extent of the subjects on which they are authorized to act, but in the *relation* which they bear to those who elect them. It is not a little remarkable that Brougham should treat "the representative principle as the grand invention of modern times," and yet in his formal and elaborate definition of it, embody what strikes us as the distinguishing characteristic of a delegate or deputy. It "consists" he tells us,† "in each portion of the same community choosing a person, to whom the share of that portion in the general government shall be entrusted, and not only the administration of the affairs of the whole as related to other communities, or the administration of the affairs of each portion in its relation to other portions of the State, but the administration of all the concerns whatever of that separate portion." The problem, according to this definition, to be solved by representative government, is the accommodation of the principles of pure democracy to ex-

* Political Philosophy, vol. 3, chap. 6, p. 31. † Ibid.

tended territory or abundant population—it is an artificial arrangement by which the regiment of masses is approximated when it cannot be attained—and the excellence of the whole system depends upon the degree in which this result is secured. The representative of Lord Brougham and the deputy whom he had previously described, and from whom he expressly distinguishes his representative, differ only in the *extent* and *not in the nature* of their commission. Their relation to those who appoint them is precisely the same. But we contend that the offices are radically and essentially distinct.* A deputy is simply the locum tenens of his principal—the creature of instructions which he cannot consistently transcend—a substitute, and nothing more. A representative, on the other hand, is a confidential agent, pursuing the dictates of his own understanding, and bound to act in conformity with his own private convictions of right—a deputy is an organ, through whom the will of his constituents is declared—the herald which proclaims their voice—a representative deliberates and acts *for* his constituents, and upon his own personal responsibility must endeavor to promote the true interests of the people; whatever may be their temporary whims or caprices. Burke was a noble representative, but not a deputy, when he declared to the electors of Bristol—“I did not obey your instructions—No—I conformed to the instructions of truth and nature, and maintained your interest, against your opinions, with a constancy that became me;” and Chatham understood the true nature of his office, though he may have erred on a point of etiquette, when he declined presenting a petition from his constituents of Bath. Representative government is a different kind of government from a pure democracy. It is essentially a limitation upon the people—they choose representatives because it is not safe that they themselves should discharge the functions of legislators or rulers. In human governments, the power of representatives may, for the most part, be ultimately traced to the people, as this whole system of polity is generally, though not always, the offspring of popular will. In establishing this species of government, the people create

*The ablest and clearest discussion of this subject which we have ever seen, is in Lieber's Political Ethics. We refer particularly to vol. 2, Book VI., concluding chapter.

the office of representative, define its powers, specify its duties, and settle its rights. They form a Constitution, the very object of which is to prevent the accumulation of too much power in their own hands—to restrain the supremacy of their own will—and to check the tendencies of absolute authority to abuse and tyranny. This Constitution, once fixed, is the immediate source of all power to all the representatives chosen under it—to it, and to it alone, must they appeal for a knowledge of their rights, privileges and duties. *It*, and not the will of those who elect them, becomes their law. Their relations to the Constitution, which equally binds them and their constituents, render it absurd that they should be treated as mere organs, machines or automaton through which others act. It deserves further to be remarked, that in all organized States in which the representative principle is a part of the Constitution, the representatives possess powers and discharge functions to which their constituents as a mass can lay no claim—putting it in this way beyond all doubt that a representative and deputy are fundamentally distinct. In the Church, the representative government is not, as in the State, even ultimately the creature of the people—it is the direct appointment of Christ, and the powers and duties of ecclesiastical representatives are prescribed and defined in the word of God—the only Constitution of the Church. They are there represented as rulers, and not as tools—they are to study and administer the laws of the Saviour, and not bend to the caprices of the people; and they are to listen to no authoritative instructions but those which have proceeded from the throne of God. Christ never gave to the people, as a mass, any right to exercise jurisdiction or to administer discipline. They cannot appear in Session or Presbytery. It is not only inconvenient that they should be there, in their collective capacity, but they have no right to be there. The privilege of attending as members, as component elements of the Court, would be destructive of all the ends which representation is designed to secure—it would subvert the whole system of government. The business of the people is to elect the men who give sufficient evidence that they are fitted by the Spirit to fill the offices which Christ has appointed. “This is the power and right given unto the church essentially considered with

respect unto their officers, namely, to design, call, choose and set apart the persons by the ways of Christ's appointment unto those offices whereunto by His laws He hath annexed church-power and authority."* These men represent the people, because they are the choice of the people. The term representative, therefore, is equivalent to chosen ruler—it designates the manner in which the office is acquired, and not the source of its powers. When Elders, consequently, are styled in our Standards the representatives of the people, it is a total misapprehension to suppose that the meaning intended to be conveyed is, that they are the deputies or delegates of the people, occupying a position and exercising powers which the people themselves might occupy and exercise. The title imports nothing more than that they are the persons whom the people have selected, as duly qualified and called of God, to perform the functions which Christ has enjoined upon the rulers of His house. The people *as such* possess not a single element of the potestas jurisdictionis which pertains to the Elders and the Courts of the Church.

It is obvious from this explanation of the term, that Pastors are as truly representatives of the people as Ruling Elders. They have, in this respect, a common ministry; and the reason why the title is not given to them as well as to the elders is, that they are called to discharge other duties, unconnected with the department of government, so that this title cannot be a complete description of their office. Pastors are more prominently preachers than rulers—and hence the names by which they are distinguished have a more pointed reference to the ministry of the word than the power of jurisdiction. But in relation to the Ruling Elder, the term representative of the people is a complete description of his office. He is a chosen ruler and nothing more. While the Pastor, in so far as he is a ruler, is as much a representative of the people as himself, yet he combines other functions with his representative character, which would render this term a very inadequate description of all his relations to the Church of God. His right to rule depends precisely upon the same grounds with the right

* Owen on the Nature of a Gospel Church, chap. iii. Works, vol. 20, p. 389.

of the Ruling Elder. Hence, the argument is nothing worth which denies that an Elder may impose hands in the ordination of ministers, because he is the representative of the people, entrusted with no other powers, but those which they themselves might exercise, among which the authority in question cannot confessedly be ranked. He is not a locum tenens of the brotherhood, but fills an office which Christ has appointed—whose duties Christ has defined—whose powers were never the property of the people, and cannot be claimed by them without gross usurpation. He can do many things which his constituents are not authorized to do—among which, for ought that appears, the imposition of hands may be properly reckoned. We might pause here, and the argument would be complete against those who maintain the doctrine of the Assembly on the preposterous ground that a representative and deputy are essentially the same. But the Scriptures and our Standards go much further, and both expressly teach that the Ruling Elder is strictly and properly a Presbyter, and therefore entitled to participate in all acts in which any Presbyter, *as such*, can bear a part. If the imposition of hands is a Presbyterial act, and the Scriptures and our Standards both style it the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, Ruling Elders may join in it as lawfully as any other members of the Court. The only way of evading the force of this argument is, either to deny that the imposition of hands is a Presbyterial act, or that the Ruling Elder is properly a Presbyter. What we have said before on the general subject of ordination, coupled with the express words of Paul and our Form of Government, may be sufficient to show that there is no foundation for the hypothesis that ordination pertains to several and not to joint power, and belongs to the ministry of the word and not to a court. The stress of the argument has turned chiefly on the other horn of the dilemma, and elaborate efforts have been made to prove, what seems at first to be little less than a contradiction, that the Elder is not properly a Presbyter—this term being restricted to preachers, to preachers *as such*, and to preachers exclusively.

It cannot fail to be observed, that the obvious effect of this theory is to invalidate the arguments for the Divine appointment of the office drawn from the natural meaning of the

title, the acknowledged constitution of the Jewish Synagogue, and the plurality of Elders confessedly ordained in the Apostolic Churches. When these points are abandoned, we know of nothing stronger or clearer that shall be left from which a Scriptural warrant for our system can be deduced. To us they seem to have been consistent, who, when they had proved that the Ruling Elder was not a Presbyter, were prepared to abolish the office as a human contrivance and an unnecessary appendage to the church.

It is idle to tell us that Paul speaks of *governments*, and using the abstract for the concrete, means governors themselves, since it can be readily retorted that all preachers are governors, being invested with authority to rule as well as to instruct. The term, in itself considered, does not necessarily convey the idea of a class of men whose sole business it is to administer the government of the church. Paul may be speaking of an important function of the ministry of the word, or enumerating the gifts with which the officers whom he had previously mentioned were furnished by Christ. Occasional allusions, like that which occurs in Romans, to "him that ruleth," can be interpreted apart from the supposition that there were those whose whole office in the church was conversant with jurisdiction and discipline. These passages, independently and alone, cannot prove the office of Ruling Elder as it exists among us. They naturally fall in with the supposition of such an office, and become cumulative proofs of it when there is positive evidence apart from them to establish its existence. But it must be ascertained to us upon other grounds, that there were such rulers in the primitive church, before we can confidently interpret such passages as allusions to them. It seems to us, therefore, that to deny that a Ruling Elder is a Presbyter, is virtually to deny the *jus divinum* of the Eldership.

That Presbyter, as a title of office, means a ruler, and nothing more than a ruler, we shall endeavor to show is at once the doctrine of our Standards and of the Word of God.

In treating of the person who fills the office of a Pastor, our Form of Government* assigns the reason why he is termed Presbyter or Elder. The reason, of course, must

* Book I., chap. 4.

include a definition of the title—as all the names by which the Pastor is distinguished, whether bishop, minister, angel, or ambassador, “are expressive of his various duties.” Now, on what ground is he styled a Presbyter? If this word were synonymous with preacher, it would evidently be “because he is sent to declare the will of God to sinners, and to beseech them to be reconciled to God through Christ, or because he dispenses the manifold grace of God and the ordinances instituted by Christ.” Yet our Constitution expressly declares, that upon these grounds he is termed an ambassador and a steward of the mysteries of God. Why, then, is he denominated a Presbyter, and what is included in the application of this name? “AS IT IS HIS DUTY,” the Constitution answers—“TO BE GRAVE AND PRUDENT, AND AN EXAMPLE OF THE FLOCK, AND TO GOVERN WELL IN THE HOUSE AND KINGDOM OF CHRIST, HE IS TERMED PRESBYTER OR ELDER.” Preachers, accordingly, are Elders, not because they preach or administer the sacraments; but because they are *governors*. He whose duty it is to be a grave, prudent, exemplary ruler in the house of God, is a *Presbyter*. This is the definition of our Standards—and as every element of it is unquestionably found in the Ruling Elder, the name can, with equal propriety, be applied to him. The preacher shares in common with the deacon the title of minister, because both are appointed to a service; and he shares, in common with the Ruling Elder, the title of Presbyter, since both are appointed to rule. That our Standards regard the term as equally applicable to both, is manifest from the fact that they quote the same passage of Scripture as a warrant for the Presbyterianial authority of both. They tell us that the Scriptures recognize a Pastor as a Presbyter, and refer, among other texts, to 1 Tim. v., 17. They tell us farther,* that “the office of Ruling Elder has been understood, by a great part of the Protestant Reformed Churches, to be designated in the Holy Scriptures by the title of governments; and of those who rule well, but do not labor in the word and doctrine,” and refer to this very same passage of Timothy, in which those persons, who rule well without laboring in the word and doctrine, are expressly denominated Presbyters. The inference is unavoidable, that they

* Book I., chap. 5.

regarded *Presbyter* as synonymous, not with preacher, but *ruler*, and as properly descriptive of all who are called to administer government in the house of God.

That the definition of our Standards is in full accordance with the word of God, we shall attempt to show, without going into an extended investigation, from which we are precluded by the length which our article has already reached, from such general considerations as are obviously suggested by the current phraseology of the sacred writers.

In the first place, we would call attention to the maxim of the great father of modern philosophy, the neglect of which has been the fruitful parent of most of the misapprehensions and mistakes which have perplexed and confused the minds of those who have defended the doctrine of the Assembly. "It is the peculiar and perpetual error of the human understanding," says Lord Bacon, "to be more moved and excited by affirmatives than negatives, whereas it ought duly and regularly to be impartial; nay, in establishing any true axiom, THE NEGATIVE INSTANCE IS THE MOST POWERFUL." It is a false induction, therefore, to collect together a bundle of passages in which Presbyters are mentioned who were unquestionably preachers, and then, without pausing to inquire whether there may not be negative instances, or whether the real ground has been discovered of the application of the term, to lay it down as an indisputable axiom, that the Scriptural *Presbyter* is a minister of the word. As the negative instance is most powerful, *one* such instance is sufficient to overthrow, to establish the logical contradictory, of the universal conclusion deduced from a host of affirmatives. To produce a thousand texts in which the words *presbyter* and *preacher* appeared to be interchangeable, would signify nothing, if a single case could be alleged in which they were evidently of different import. In such a contingency, the dictate of sound philosophy and of sober criticism would be to enquire whether there were not some property common to both terms, in consequence of which the affirmative and negative instances might be fairly harmonized. If *Presbyter* in a multitude of Scriptures is applied to preachers, and in a single instance applied to those who are not preachers, instead of making the term equivocal, a definition should be sought embracing the points, in which those who were, and those

who were not, preachers, agreed. This definition would include all that is essential to the meaning of the title, and should set forth the precise ground on which it is attributed to either class. If any other persons, besides preachers, are denominated Presbyters in the Scriptures, it follows irresistibly that preachers are not so called because they are preachers, but in consequence of some other property of their office, common to them and to others who have no right to dispense the mysteries of God. This common property, whatever it may be, is the essence of the Presbyterate; and that it consists in the right to rule is clear from the passage, which proves, beyond the possibility of doubt, that Presbyters and ministers of the word are not synonymous terms. That passage is 1 Tim. v., 17. "Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." These words, furnishing the powerful negative instance of Lord Bacon, contain the logical contradictory of the proposition, that Presbyter is the title of ordinary ministers of the word. To affirm, in the face of this Scripture, that all Elders are teachers, is no less preposterous than to affirm in the face of experience and of fact, that all that are mortal are men.

But we are told that* "as the Greek word for *Deacon* is used in a general sense for all church-officers, and yet is the specific title of one particular class of officers; so the word Presbyter may be taken in a wide sense, including even Apostles, and yet is the definite title of ordinary ministers of the word, and is never applied in its specific sense and without qualification to any who are not ministers." That is, if we understand the argument, Presbyter, from being a generic term, susceptible originally of a larger extension, became eventually the definite title of a particular class. It is an universal law of classification, that what logicians call the whole comprehension of the genus, or every idea which enters into a just definition of the name of a class, must be found in *all* the species which are included under it. This is the only ground on which the genus can be predicated of the subordinate classes. Hence, if the word Presbyter is generic, and, in its full comprehension, capable

* Reference is here had, as in other parts of this article, to a pamphlet on the Elder Question, under the signature of Geneva. See p. 9.

of being affirmed of other classes of men, beside ministers of the Gospel, the idea of preaching cannot enter as an element into the definition of the genus. The specific differences which distinguish the various classes embraced under a common name, cannot be included in the definition of that name. If preachers, accordingly, constitute a species of the genus *Presbyter*, and some who are not preachers constitute another, it is intuitively obvious that the comprehension of the generic term excludes the property of preaching. The *specific* difference of the classes consists in the possession, in the one case, and the absence, in the other, of lawful authority to preach. Hence, the original ground of applying the general term to preachers must have been some property, from the very nature of classification, which they possessed in common with others who were not called to dispense the word and sacraments. To say that *Presbyter* became eventually restricted to a single class, though in its general sense capable of a larger application, is not an answer to the difficulty. It could only become definite by being limited in common usage, to a species which, at first, was included under it, not in consequence of its specific difference, but in consequence of possessing the whole comprehension of the genus, whatever it might be. A generic term must first be applied only in its generic sense, before it can be made the definite title of any of its species. The illustration suggested in the case of the word *deacon*, though fatal to the purpose of the author, is precisely in point for us. The generic idea expressed by the word is that of *servant*—in this wide sense it embraces a great variety of classes distinguished from each other by the different nature of their services, but agreeing in the common property of service. The whole generic idea is found in each species, whether composed of private individuals, inspired Apostles, ministers of the word, dispensers of alms, or rulers of the church—all, without exception, are deacons, because all, without exception, are *servants*. This word, however, is restricted, for the most part, as a title of office, to a particular class—in which, however, the whole generic idea is found and very conspicuously presented. The generic meaning remains unchanged, and the definite title simply applies it to a particular kind of service. If now the case of *Presbyter* is analogous, the generic idea ex-

pressed by the word can have no reference to preaching. This can be no part of the wide sense in which it is predicated of other men as well as ordinary ministers of the word; and if a general term, by becoming specific, only limits the application of its generic sense, as in the instance of deacon, Presbyter can never, under any circumstances, be applied to ministers simply *as such*. In ordinary cases, the name of genus is not likely to be restricted to any of its species, unless the species exhibits very clearly, strikingly and prominently the peculiar elements which constitute the genus. The generic is sometimes more conspicuous than the specific difference, and in such cases the limitation is easy and natural. Upon this principle, it is more probable that the term Presbyter, if restricted, should be restricted to those who are exclusively rulers than to those who combine other duties with the function of government. Hence, we find that in the fourth century, when Prelacy had made such encroachments in the church, that almost every title of office, the Deacon not excepted, had become confined to the clergy, the few scattered remnants of the primitive rulers, who lingered as monuments of by-gone days, were distinguished by names corresponding exactly to that of Presbyter, and borrowed from the Latin translation of the Scriptures in common use. It is true that the accommodated word itself was applied only to preachers, because every where, except in Northern Africa, there was nothing else to correspond to it. But wherever the office has existed, or after long years of discontinuance has been revived, it uniformly receives a title which answers to the original term in the Greek.

Another general consideration, which proves that the Scriptural Presbyter is simply a Ruler, and that the term as appropriately belongs to Elders as Ministers, is the fact, that all the words which are used interchangeably with it, are expressive of government rather than of teaching. There can be no doubt that Pastors, Bishops and Presbyters are different names of precisely the same office. To fix the meaning, therefore, of the words, Pastor and Bishop, is to settle the import of the Scripture Presbyter.

Pastor or Shepherd, in its metaphorical acceptation, expresses the general idea of guidance and authority, and may refer either to the instructions of a Teacher, or the direc-

tions and government of a Ruler. Perhaps, in the old Testament it is more commonly descriptive of government than of the office of teaching, and we are inclined to think that the true ground of its application to a teacher is the tendency of his instructions to regulate the conduct of life. Be this as it may—a Pastor is unquestionably a ruler. Every scholar will call to mind the ποιμένα λαων of Homer—which the scholias texplains to be equivalent to βασιλεα οχλων. Instances of similar usage abound in the classical authors, but the Septuagint is better authority for us. In Ezekiel 37: 24, Shepherd, and King, are evidently employed as synonymous. "And David my servant shall be King over them, and they all shall have one shepherd." "*Pastor*" says Schleusner, "hoc est, *rex*, unus erit omnium." God promises His people in Ezekiel 34: 23, 24, that He "will set up one *shepherd* over them," even His servant David, who is immediately described as a "Prince among them." To feed the people of Israel is explained in 1 Chronicles 11: 2, by being their ruler. "Thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be ruler over my people Israel." When we come to the New Testament, the idea of rule seems to be intimately associated with the word Shepherd or Pastor, and its derivatives.

The clause which our Translators have rendered, Revelation 2: 27, "he shall *rule* them with a rod of iron," is, in the original, he shall *feed* them with a rod of iron. In Matthew 2: 6, "out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule my people Israel;" the Greek is, that shall *feed*, or be the Shepherd of my people Israel: and in Paul's enumeration of the officers whom the ascending Saviour bequeathed to the Church, if Pastors and Rulers are not synonymous, as Ambrose evidently* thought them to be, there is no mention of rulers at all.

The passages are sufficient to prove that Pastors are not necessarily teachers—and that Elders may be Pastors in both the Classical and Scriptural sense, without being ordinary ministers of the word. The generic idea is that of guidance or direction—the specific form of this guidance may be instruction or government.

In reference to the other synonyme of Presbyter, Bishop,

*Comment. on Ephes. iv.

(ἐπισκοπος) the case is still clearer. This term, wherever found, whether in the classical writers of antiquity, the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, the works of Josephus, or the books of the Apocrypha, seems to convey the general idea of guardianship, superintendence and care. As a title of office, it is properly applicable to a subordinate class of rulers, who, possessing no independent powers of their own, are appointed to see that duties enjoined upon others are faithfully discharged. They differ from the higher order of magistrates in having no original authority, and in being confined to the supervision of others in the department committed to their care. They have no power to prescribe the law—they can only see that its precept is observed. Their functions seem to be exactly expressed by the English word overseer. The subordinate magistrates, sent out by Athens to take care of her interests in tributary cities, were styled Bishops.* Homer, to inculcate the doctrine that the Gods will protect the sanctity of treaties, does not scruple to call them the bishops of covenants.† Hector, as the guardian and defender of Troy, is lamented by Andromache under the same title.‡

According to the usage of the Septuagint, the word is much more intimately associated with ideas of rule than those of instruction. In Numbers 31: 14, where our English version has *officers of the host*, the Greek translation is *bishops* or overseers *of the host* — ἐπισκοποῖς τῆς δυνάμεως. An officer in an army certainly occupies a position of authority—he has a right to command and can exact obedience under the severest penalties. Such subordinate officers as those contemplated in this passage, were specially appointed to enforce obedience to the orders of their superiors. In Judges 9: 28, Zebul, in the Greek version, is expressly styled a *bishop*—and as in the thirtieth verse of the same chapter, he is denominated a *ruler* of the city, the terms would seem to be synonymous. The word occurs in Nehemiah 11: 9, 14, 22, and in each text evidently means a ruler of the specified division—one entrusted with authority, and not a teacher.

* Scholiast. in Aristoph, Av., 1023. Boeckh's Public Economy of Athens. Vol. 1.

† Iliad, 22, 255. Μαρτυροὶ ἐσθόνται καὶ ἐπισκοποὶ ἁρμονιαίων.

‡ Ibid., 24, 729. ἡ γὰρ οὐλώλας ἐπισκοπος.

The English version has properly translated the word as it occurs in the original, *overseer*—which is also the precise rendering of the Greek. The overseers appointed over all the people, in 1 Maccabees 1: 57, were evidently magistrates, who had it in charge to see that the commands of Antiochus were observed. Josephus* employs the word in a sense completely analogous, and the first meaning which Hesychius assigns to it is that of king.

The introduction of the term, as a title of office in the Christian Church, is happily explained by Neander.†

From the account which has been given of the meaning of this term, it follows, in the first place, that it is not applicable to preachers, *as ministers of the word*. And, in the second, that there is great beauty in its application to the rulers of the church. A preacher, as such, is charged with declaring the whole counsel of God; and if, in relation to this matter, he has the oversight of any one, it must be of himself. The rulers of the church have the oversight of him, but he has, as a minister, the oversight of none. To church-rulers the term is peculiarly appropriate. The officers of Christ's kingdom are only subordinate functionaries, whose whole business it is to see that the laws of Christ are

* Ant., 10, 4, 1.

† "The name of *Presbyters*, by which this office was at first designated, was, as we have before remarked, transferred to the Christian Church from the Jewish Synagogues. But now, when the churches had spread themselves more among the heathen of Grecian origin, there was associated with this appellation, thus borrowed from the civil and religious constitution of the Jews, another name, more connected with the mode of designating social relations among the Greeks, and better adapted to denote the official duties connected with the dignity of Presbyters. This was the appellation ἐπισκοποι, *overseers*, over the whole church and over all its affairs; just as in the Attic civil administration, those who were sent out to organize the States dependent on Athens, were called ἐπισκοποι; and just as this name seems to have become generally current in the language of civil life, to denote any kind of governing superintendence in the public administration. Since now the name ἐπισκοπος was nothing more than an accommodation of the original Jewish and Hellenistic name of office to the social relations existing among the heathen; it follows even from this, that originally both names referred to one and the same office; just as also both appellations are often used interchangeably, as being entirely synonymous."—*Biblical Repository*, vol. 4, p. 254.

duly administered and observed. They have no power to legislate themselves, nor to invent new and additional sanctions—they are nothing but ministerial agents to carry out the instructions of their Lord and Master.

The considerations which have been presented, we deem sufficient to show that our Standards and the Scriptures concur in teaching that the Ruling Elder is truly and properly a Presbyter; and therefore, has a right to participate in all acts in which any other Presbyter can bear a part. It does not follow, however, that because he is a Scriptural Pastor and Bishop, he is, therefore, a minister of the word and a steward of the mysteries of God. Preaching is a very different department of labor from ruling, and though all preachers, whether Apostles, Evangelists, or Pastors, in the technical sense of our Standards, are rulers, according to the appointment of God, yet the converse of the proposition is by no means true, that all rulers, whether Elders, Bishops, aut alio quocunque nomine vocentur, are Preachers. We affirm, without hesitation, that all ministers of the word, lawfully called and ordained, are Presbyters; but we are very far from affirming that all Presbyters, lawfully called and ordained, are ministers of the word. We maintain that Christ has appointed two classes of rulers, or chosen representatives of the people—one to preach and rule—the other only to rule—that Presbyter and Bishop are terms expressive of *government* and not of *instruction*, and, therefore appropriate to both classes. If now we have proved that an Elder is a Presbyter, and that ordination is a Presbyterian act, we can deduce no other conclusion from our premises but that Ruling Elders, when members of the Court, have an equal right with their ministerial brethren, to participate in all the stages of the process. In this conclusion, we can detect the elements neither of Prelacy nor Independency—it seems to us to be nothing more nor less than plain, simple, consistent Presbyterianism. And here we shall make an end, commending the subject to the prayerful study of the church—especially of those who are called to administer its government and discipline.

ARTICLE II.

A BRIEF INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF JEPHTHAH'S VOW.

JUDGES xi: 30-40.

BY THE REV. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M.

Dallas Co. (Ala.)

In this article we intend to do little more than present to the reader what has been written on both sides of this *quaestio vexata*. The greatest and best scholarship has been called into action in all ages of the church, to determine its exact meaning, and, if possible, to settle all further controversy: still, it remains surrounded by all its difficulties. Therefore, the reader need not expect that we are going to untie the Gordian knot. This has been attempted by abler hands and wiser heads.

The first writer on the *affirmative* side of the question that we would introduce, is the celebrated Jewish historian, Josephus. His language is, (Antiq. b. v., ch. vii., sec. 9,) "But as Jephthah came back, he fell into a calamity no way correspondent to the great actions he had done, for it was his daughter that came to meet him—she was also an only child, and a virgin—upon this, Jephthah heavily lamented the greatness of his affliction, and blamed his daughter for being forward in meeting him, for he had vowed to sacrifice her to God. However, this action that was to befall her, was not ungrateful to her, since she would die upon occasion of her father's victory and the liberty of her fellow citizens; she only desired her father to give her leave for two months to bewail her youth with her fellow citizens; and then she agreed that at the fore-mentioned time he might do with her according to his vow. Accordingly, when that time was over, he sacrificed his daughter as a *burnt* offering, offering such an oblation as was neither conformable to the law nor acceptable to God, not weighing with himself what opinion the hearers would have of such a practice." Here we see that Josephus boldly maintains

that she was immolated by her father. The Chaldee paraphrast, several learned Rabbins, and most of the ancient Christian fathers, are of the same opinion with this impartial historian; and do affirm that he did offer her in sacrifice, being deceived by a mistake of the sense of the law, Lev. 27: 28. "No devoted thing that a man shall devote unto the Lord of all that he hath, of man and beast and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed; every devoted thing is most holy unto the Lord."

Many of the modern writers hold to the same views. The "Comprehensive Commentary" has this exposition: "It seems probable that he offered her up for a sacrifice, according to the letter of his vow, misunderstanding that law which spoke of persons devoted to the cause of God, as if it were to be applied to such as were devoted by men's vows. Abraham's attempt to offer up Isaac, perhaps encouraged him, and made him think, if God would not accept this sacrifice which he had vowed, He would send an Angel to stay his hand, as He did Abraham's, if she came out designedly to be made a sacrifice."

The very learned Michaëlis insists most decidedly, that the phrase "did with her as he had vowed," cannot mean any other thing but that her father put her to death, on the sacrificial altar. Poole, Calmet, Warburton, Jahn, Scott and Henry, think that Jephthah immolated his daughter. John Brown, of Haddington, in his Bible Dictionary, has these remarks: "Those on the other side—viz., those who hold to the reality of the sacrifice—and to which I am chiefly inclined, allow the sacrifice to have been abominable, but remark, that the law allowed of the redemption of nothing devoted under the form of a curse—that in Jephthah's age, idolatry and ignorance greatly prevailed—that Jephthah's manner of life was highly unfavorable to a correct acquaintance with the law—that vows of perpetual virginity are of a far later date—that if there had been no more in it but perpetual virginity, Jephthah had comparatively little occasion for such agony of mind, and tearing his clothes at the sight of his daughter; that the plain tendency of the whole passage leads to the conclusion that she was sacrificed—that not long after this, the story of one Iphigenia, or the daughter of Jephthah, being sacrificed by her father, was spread through no small part of the East."

Barnes, of Philadelphia, says: "Even in the great and improper sacrifice of his only daughter, which the obvious interpretation of the record respecting him, leads us to suppose he made, he did it as an offering to the Lord, and under these mistaken views of duty, he showed by the greatest sacrifice which a man *could* make, that of an only child, that he was disposed to do what he believed was required by religion." Bishop Patrick is in doubt on the subject. The Jews also are not willing to decide the matter—for some say Phinehas lost his priesthood, because he would not absolve Jephthah from his vow; but others say, that he was forbid to release him by the Spirit of Prophecy; and Jephthah, when he was admonished by his friends to go and advise with him how to save his daughter, was forbid by an angel. See Selden, *De Successione ad Pontificatum*, Lib. I., cap. 2. But the Targum blames Jephthah very much for his not consulting Phinehas—for if he had, he would have redeemed her for a sum of money. See Lev. 27.

Those on the *negative* side of the question, and there are many able and learned scholars, hold that Jephthah only devoted his daughter to a life of celibacy. Selden, in his work, *De Jure Nat. et Gent.*, Lib. IV., cap. 11, observes that the two Kimchis, father and son, who lived in the 13th and 14th centuries, with Rabbi Levi ben Gerson, a celebrated writer on the Pentateuch, translates the last clause of the 31st verse differently from the received version. They take the vow in a *disjunctive* sense, and then read the verse thus, "Whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me shall surely be the Lord's, *or* I will offer it up for a burnt offering." The *ipsissima verba* of Kimchi, are to this import: "It shall be consecrated to the Lord, if it be not fit for a burnt offering; or, it shall be offered for a burnt offering, if it be fit for it." And thus they conclude that she was devoted to God, and separated, like our modern nuns, from all secular affairs and worldly amusements—that she might give herself continually to prayer and holy exercises. Ralbag says, she was separated from the company of men—for if she had had a husband, she could not have served the Lord alone. Dr. Hales adopts the same rendering of the passage, and maintains that the vow which we translate *and* should be changed to *either* or *or*, which he affirms is justified by the Hebrew idiom. Gesenius dif-

fers from the learned Doctor on this criticism. In his Heb. Lex., he says, that vav is put as a *disjunctive* between words i. q., or is hardly supported by a single probable example. Dr. Hales adds, "that Jephthah could not possibly have sacrificed his daughter, according to the current opinion founded on an incorrect translation, may appear from the following considerations: 1. The sacrifice of children to Moloch was an abomination to the Lord, of which, in numberless passages, he expresses his detestation; and it was prohibited by an express law under pain of death, as "a defilement of God's sanctuary and a profanation of his holy name." Lev. 20: 2, 3. Such a sacrifice, therefore, unto the Lord Himself, must be a still greater abomination. And there is no precedent of any such under the law in the Old Testament. 2. The case of Isaac, before the law was given, is irrelevant—for Isaac was not sacrificed, and it was only proposed for a trial of Abraham's faith. 3. No father, merely by his own authority, could put an offending, much less an innocent child to death, upon any account, without the sentence of the magistrate. Deut. 21: 18–21. 4. The Mischna or traditional law of the Jews, is plainly against it—"If a Jew should devote his son or daughter, his man or maid servant, who are Hebrew, the devotement would be void, because no man can devote, what is not his own, or of whose life he has not the absolute disposal."

The Dutch and Assembly's Annotations, Dr. Doddridge, Horne, Dr. A. Clarke, Hewlett, Dr. Gill, Dr. Waterland, Saurin and Williams, are all of the opinion, that she was devoted to a single life. On this view, Selden observes that there was no such power given to parents, to shut up their children and separate them from all society with men, for there were not the least traces of any such law in the whole body of their Talmud.

Theodoricus Hackspan remarks, that since God allowed cities of refuge, whither a manslayer might flee and be safe, when he had unwittingly killed a man, the same privilege might have been allowed to a son or a daughter, who was perfectly innocent, to save their lives by flight.

Prof. Bush, of New York, thinks that a human sacrifice was contemplated, but that during the two months of respite, Jephthah might have obtained better information respecting the nature of his obligation, and how he could

legally redeem her from his *votum temerarium*, as Tertulian calls it. Those writers who have taken this view of the question, render *to lament*, (Heb. *thannoth*) in the 40th verse, *to discourse* with her, or *to comfort* her, though the most ancient interpreters translate it as it is in our version. The Lxx. use *θρηνεῖν* in their translation and the vulgate *plangent*; both of which mean *to lament*.

But the learned Lud. De Dieu and Sixtinus Amama, interpret *thannoth* (Infin. Piel) *to praise* her. Gesenius gives it the same meaning; and in the song of Deborah and Barak, Judges 5: 11, it is rendered *to rehearse*. Buxtorf, in his Heb. et Chal. Lex., renders it "ad confabulandum."

Though we have very briefly noticed the different renderings of *thannoth*, yet they do not, as we suppose, in the least affect the whole subject in dispute. To lament, to rehearse, to praise, may refer, as Grotius justly conceives, to verses composed in honor of her, and sung four times in every year to her memory.

We have heard the witnesses on both sides, and their testimony is now before us. All that remains is to bring in the verdict. Although we are strict constructionists of the divine law and testimony, yet we would most willingly cast the mantle of charity over Jephthah, whom the Apostle Paul has ranked among those who have obtained a good report through faith.

It is certain that human sacrifices were forbidden by the law of Moses. Of this, we think Jephthah could not be ignorant, for he had been Judge in Israel many years, and was no doubt well acquainted with all the laws which God had given for the government of his chosen people. How then could he fall into such an error, *if* he sacrificed his daughter? The only answer we can present is, that the Judges lived in a very rude and unsettled age, when the Israelites had introduced a number of wicked notions and practices from the surrounding heathen neighbors, and considering the warlike life that Jephthah had led, the recent idolatries into which the people had fallen, and the loose ideas which they had imbibed about moral and natural duty, we need not be surprised that from the first he contemplated a human sacrifice as the most valuable offering to God. Yet, we do not think that these circumstances should exonerate Jephthah from condemnation. He knew

from his acquaintance with the law, that he was not at liberty to sacrifice to the Lord whatsoever came forth from his dwelling. Sacrifices, or animals for sacrifice, were divided into *clean* and *unclean*. Now, suppose a dog or a swine should have happened to come out first to meet him; he dare not have offered either of these upon the holy altar of Jehovah. They would have been an abomination unto him. His pure and Holy Spirit would have abhorred such an offering, and the Jews would have turned away with disgust and sorrow at such a sight. We know with what grief they viewed the profanation of their temple, when Antiochus Epiphanes caused a swine to be sacrificed within its precincts. And could he expect that they would approve of the sacrifice of a beloved and an only daughter? Would they not rather look upon him as a murderer—one who had imbued his hands in the blood of his innocent child. This is the light in which his countrymen would have looked upon the result of his “foolish, incautious vow,” as Theodoret and St. Austin call it.

Some of the above writers, we think, have fallen into a mistake about the nature of the vow: they confound it with *cherem*, i. e. the accursed thing.

There are two sorts of vows mentioned in the Old Testament: 1. The *cherem*, which was the most solemn of all—it was called the *irrevocable curse*. By it animals and human beings were devoted. It was designed in its operations upon men, to bear only upon the *wicked*, who were thereby made an example to others. If this vow was uttered in respect to an enemy, it implied the widest destruction, and it was sacrilege for the conquering army to appropriate to itself any of the plunder, and the conquered were put to death without mercy, for they *could not* be redeemed. Now Jephthah's vow was not of this character. The text says that Jephthah vowed a vow (*neder*) unto the Lord; and, again, that he did with his daughter according to his vow (*neder*.) There is no word in either of these passages that either implies or expresses a *cherem*.

2. The *neder* or common vow, in the stricter sense of the word was, when a person engaged to bring an offering to God, or otherwise to dedicate it to him.

Things vowed in this way, were—1. *Unclean beasts*. These might be estimated by the priest, and redeemed by the

vower, by the addition of one-fifth to the value. See Lev. 27: 11-13. 2. *Clean beasts* used for offerings. Here there could be no redemption, nor could the beasts be exchanged for others, under the penalty of both being forfeited and devoted to the Lord. Men who were thus devoted, became servants in the tabernacle or temple, unless they were redeemed. Money, lands and houses, which were given under this vow, became the property of the tabernacle or temple, excepting that the *land* could be redeemed before the year of Jubilee. Lev. 27: 14-24.

We do not think that it requires any very deep insight into the whole transaction, for it is a plain unvarnished story,—nor any profound learning to ascertain from the sacred record that Jephthah did not sacrifice his daughter. The religion of the Bible is wholly free from the shocking abomination of human sacrifices. The practice was the result and mark of barbarism most gross and revolting. Human life is the most precious thing on earth, and of this most valuable gift, the most precious and dearest portion is the life of one's child. All that a man has will he give for *his* life. O, my son, my son, my son, would God I had died for thee. This is the language of parental affection over a beloved son.

It is worthy of remark, says Horne in his Introduction, “that it is not afterwards said that he actually *sacrificed* her, but that “he did with her according to his vow. The sacred historian adds, *she knew no man*, if she was *sacrificed*, this latter remark is frivolous, but if she were devoted to perpetual virginity, this idea coincides with the visits of the Israelitish women.”

The phrase, “he did with her according to his vow,” (*neder*) does not necessarily imply that he immolated her—he had an alternative—he could *redeem* her—and we are inclined to believe that Jephthah availed himself of this privilege, when his rashness had time to cool.

We have said enough to convince the reader that the question is not one of easy solution, and perhaps we have spent more time upon it than it really deserves. But as all Scripture is given for instruction, we trust we will be pardoned for having written so much on a subject which the best and worthiest men did not consider beneath their notice; and if we have cast no light upon the transaction, we

have done what we could in presenting the views of others in as concise a manner as possible.

If we condemn Jephthah for his cruelty or unkindness to his daughter, let us imitate him in his *faith*, and thereby obtain a good report.

ARTICLE III.

"LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY."

PUBLIC CAUSES FOR GRATITUDE: *A Sermon, preached on Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 25, 1847, in the West Church, Boston. By C. A. BARTOL, Junior Minister.*

The West Church, Boston, is one of the principal Unitarian churches in that city, and Mr. Bartol is one of the most respectable ministers of that body. The sermon is well written, and bears marks of a highly cultivated mind. But we should not have given it this particular notice, were it not for the sentiments advanced under the concluding head, which furnish matter for very grave reflection to all observers of the signs of the times, as well as to lovers of truth and "orthodoxy," who "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." After speaking of the continued fruitfulness of the earth—the progress of useful inventions—the increase of a philanthropic and benevolent spirit, observable in the growing sentiment against war—and the provision made for the poor, the blind, the insane, &c., the writer proceeds to name as "the highest cause for thanksgiving—the present tendency among Christians of various names, to a more harmonious understanding and exposition of divine truth." Under this head, he remarks as follows: "Truth, sanctifying truth, is the hope of the world. It is the basis of all real advancement of intellectual character and social well-being. Apprehended by faith, and resting in the deep convictions of the soul, it is the source and inspiration of all the noble *sentiments* even, of which

human nature is capable. Piety and philanthropy are but the twin-streams, that can flow clear and refined from no other fountain than God's truth. Error diverts and pollutes them; doubt is the barren sand that swallows them up. The perception of this holy truth of God has in time past been much obscured, by the antagonism of many creeds, by the wrestling with each other, and mutual ex-communications of the several sects. It is a blessed sign, when we see this sectarian strife on the whole decidedly moderating; the disposition to assail each other's error, giving place to a willingness to recognize each other's truth; in the lull of the whirlwind of contention, the soft breezes of charity arising to fan us, and common agreement attracting more attention than special difference. And the diverse denominations thus approximate to each other, because they all gravitate towards the central substance of the Gospel. Some in our times have gone over into historical scepticism, rejection of the miraculous accounts in the New Testament. But they have been like the car, unhitched to slide down the precipice, while the rest of the train, united moves back into the ways of safety. Among the great body of believers, supernatural faith was never more prevailing, intelligent and invincible than now. What are called the liberal Christians, have begun to retire as by common consent, and almost in a body, from some dangerous extremes to which they were approaching; and what are called the orthodox, have shifted their ground from the old, untenable form of many dogmas, to meet this countermarch of their long separated brethren. The doctrines of total depravity, irresistible decrees, unconditional election, infant damnation, (pardon is almost needed for uttering that phrase,) everlasting torments, with all their affiliated conclusions, are very much withdrawn on the one side, while those of hereditary bias, inward regeneration, the atonement, and the influence of the Holy Spirit, are more positively accepted and earnestly maintained by the other. Let the *words* of the creed, or confession of faith, stand as they may, Christ is neither *called* 'very God,' so much on the one hand, nor regarded simply as a man, on the other. The Trinitarian looks upon him more in his subordinate relation to the Father, and the Unitarian, less in his separateness, and more in his oneness with God. The Universalist preaches retribution, reaching

beyond the grave—and his opponent, pausing before the dim veil, which Scripture itself hangs over the particular discipline of the future state is not so swift, or stout to maintain, that it will be infinite, unmitigated and endless."

We would call the attention of our readers to the *admissions* with regard to what is called liberal Christianity, and the *charges* against orthodox Christians contained in the extract quoted above. There is no doubt but that Unitarians have "begun to retire from some dangerous extremes to which they were approaching." When Rev. Theodore Parker began to broach his startling and infidel views in Boston, about seven years ago, it needed no prophetic inspiration to foretell the result. We predicted then that the less reckless among the Unitarians would be alarmed as to the tendencies of their system, and that they would be driven at last to the adoption of a creed, in which their views might be embodied in a tangible form. When the fellowship of the association of ministers, of which Mr. Parker was a member, was virtually withdrawn from him, and he was excluded from most of their pulpits, it was a very inconsistent, but most significant expression of the alarm and disapprobation of that reverend body at such an exposé of the legitimate tendencies of "Liberal Christianity." Well might Mr. Parker say to his frowning brethren—"I do not know that I have transgressed the limits of Unitarianism, *for I do not know what these limits are.*" Well does he call upon them to declare what they do believe, if they regard him as having by the frank avowal of his sentiments as a Unitarian, exposed himself to their disapprobation and excommunication. Most truly and provokingly does he remark—"The ORTHODOXY of the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers is not a thing so easy to come at. As I try to comprehend it, I feel that I am looking at something dim and undefined. It changes color, and it changes shape; now it seems a mountain, then it appears like a cloud—you will do a great service, if you will publish your symbolical books, and let the world know what is the true doctrine, according to the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers."

Now it is a fact which cannot be questioned, that Unitarians have always boasted their freedom from the trammels of a creed; and that by their own principles, they were

bound to admit all men to their fellowship who professed to be Christian men, without inquiring into the exact nature of the Christianity they adopted; and Mr. Parker might justly complain, that an ecclesiastical association which professed to hold to no form of doctrines, and which admitted him to membership without any inquiry into the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of his sentiments, should by their own act hold him up to the world as an unbeliever and unworthy of the office of a Christian teacher. But they have been forced, in order to free themselves from the imputation of acknowledging the identity of *Parkerism* with Unitarianism, to "retire from these dangerous extremes towards which they were approaching." This retreat is not from a conviction of the unscriptural and unsafe character of Liberal Christianity. It is not a consciousness that the whole system is fundamentally wrong, and perfectly powerless, for the salvation of men. It does not involve a confession that the distorted and reviled doctrines of Calvinism, are found in the Bible, and are the only doctrines adapted to meet the wants of men. It is not an admission that all the ridicule, and revilings, and bitter opprobrium that have been heaped upon "Orthodoxy" have been unwarrantable, unjust, and to be deeply repented of. Nor does it imply that these doctrines, of which the discourse before us speaks as "hereditary bias, inward regeneration, the atonement, and the influence of the Holy Spirit," are received in the sense in which they are held by orthodox Christians. When Mr. Bartol tells us what he means by "hereditary bias"—what is its nature, and to what liabilities it subjects man—when he defines in what "inward regeneration" consists—what is the nature of "the atonement," and by whom it was effected; and what he means by "the influence of the Holy Spirit," we shall then see that his boasted approximation on the part of "Liberal Christians" towards the truth, is an approximation in language, and not in reality. Does he mean to say that "Liberal Christians" believe in the depraved nature of man, which in all cases leads him to sin, and exposes him to the wrath and curse of God? Does he mean by "inward regeneration," that complete and radical change in the whole moral nature of man, by which he is turned from sin unto holiness, and his affections placed supremely upon spiritual things—a change so radical and vital, as to

demand a Divine and Almighty agency in the soul of man, and never accomplished but by such an agency? Does he mean by the "atonement," the active obedience and vicarious sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, the second person in the Holy Trinity, equal with the Father—in human nature—by which obedience, sufferings and death, divine justice was satisfied, the majesty of a violated law honored, and a way opened by which God "could be just and yet justify him that believeth in Jesus?" Does he mean by the "Holy Spirit," *God* the Holy Ghost, a divine person, possessing the attributes, bearing the titles, performing the works, and worthy of the homage and worship of God? The foremost man in the foremost rank of "Liberal Christianity," will not assent to these views. But if these be not their views, how far have they progressed in their approximation to the truth? The position of the great body of Unitarians, we apprehend to be this—They are pressed on the one side by Rationalism and universal scepticism, avowed by their own ministers and members, and by that Calvinism which they have described as such a monster, on the other. They cannot go all the lengths of Parkerism—they are equally unwilling to become orthodox. They would fain "retire from some dangerous extremes to which they were approaching"—but they cannot cast anchor in the only safe harbor. They are vainly seeking some happy medium—some "terra incognita"—some "isle of the blessed," to which Liberal Christianity may retreat safe from the revolting fellowship of bald infidelity on the one hand, and the pungent, man-abasing doctrines of orthodoxy, on the other. We sympathize with them in their present dilemma—for we know it must be one of scanty comfort. They need a spiritual, vital religion, and seem vaguely conscious of their need—but like some fond mother, in her frantic agony over a departed child, they cling with desperate grasp to the lifeless corpse of a dead system, or vainly attempt to galvanize it into an unnatural and spasmodic life. "Unitarianism is crumbling to pieces—not for want of a creed, that could not hold it together—but for want of a moral coherency in its doctrines and in its disciples; for want of that vitality which belongs only to connected and consistent moral truth—truth harmonizing personal experience with the revealed will of God."

But what shall be said of *the charges* (for in this light do we regard them,) which Mr. Bartol makes against the Orthodox Christians in New England? Is it true, that the doctrines of "total depravity, decrees, election, and eternal punishment, (we know of none who hold to the doctrine of "infant damnation,") are "very much withdrawn" on the part of those who profess to be Calvinists? Is it true that Christ is not called "very God" by our eastern brethren? Is it true that the future punishment of the wicked is not considered "infinite, unmitigated and endless?" Or does Mr. Bartol make these statements by way of softening down his own admissions with regard to the approximation of "Liberal Christians" towards the truth, representing the Orthodox as kindly meeting their returning brethren half way. We doubt not that he has in this instance "taken counsel of his wishes," and persuaded himself, that Orthodoxy is really becoming more "liberal," and that between Calvinists and Unitarians there will not be always "a great gulf fixed." But while we would fain believe that the great body of the New England Churches are essentially sound in doctrine, and that they do in heart love the distinctive features of Calvinism—yet do we greatly fear, that, through a desire to win back their erring friends, some may have been too ready to present the truth in a way rather adapted to obviate Unitarian objections, than distinctly to establish Calvinistic doctrines. We have no sympathy with such a course. It is mistaken in policy, and disastrous to the interests of truth. "They went out from us, because they were not of us." Unitarianism must fall. The influence of an early Orthodox education, more than anything else, gave its feeble life to the first generation of its advocates. They have passed from the stage. Their children have only its meagre philosophy and its cold morality to live upon, and they are starving. Let "Liberal Christianity" alone, and it will die a natural death, and not a tear will be shed above its grave. It is not suited to man—it cannot satisfy one deep craving of his spiritual nature. It is a soulless system, and therefore worthless for the soul. All that Calvinism has to do in relation to it, is to "avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it and pass away." Having reached its allotted time, it will pass away, and the place that now knows it, will know it no more.

But it is fitting that all true Calvinists in New England, and throughout the land, should be faithful in the setting forth, and defending the distinctive features of that system, which we fully believe, embodies that "faith once delivered to the Saints." Let the doctrines of Depravity, Election, Regeneration by the Holy Ghost, the Atonement by a Divine and Almighty Saviour, Justification by Faith, the final perseverance of the Saints, and the eternal punishment of the sinner, be plainly, boldly, faithfully, avowed, defended and enforced, and we need not fear for the advancement of true spiritual piety. There is an inherent vitality, a divine omnipotence in these doctrines, which will insure their life and efficiency to the salvation of men. And while others are vainly trying to quench the thirst of the soul at the broken cisterns of human philosophy, be it ours to lead the fainting, dying pilgrim, to the exhaustless fountain of eternal truth.

ARTICLE IV.

THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT.

We propose to discuss in the following pages, this question: Is the Abrahamic Covenant still in force? or is it abrogated? Or in other words, is the Church under the Gospel Dispensation, the same Church to which Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and all the Prophets, belonged? Or did those holy men belong to one Church, and we to another?

We are aware that so many volumes have been written upon this subject, that it would be preposterous to claim for our remarks absolute originality. No such claim do we set up.

But, if we do not mistake, most of the able treatises upon this momentous subject, are so long as to defeat the object of the writers—they confuse the mind of the enquirer. But

to this remark, these are either *entire* or *partial* exceptions : such as the Pamphleteer, No. I, written by Rev. Dr. John H. Rice, and Rev. Dr. Miller's Tract, and the Treatise of Rev. Dr. John Mason.

An honest, perhaps a youthful enquirer, (as was once our own condition,) asks for some treatise, in which, in the course of one hour's reading, he may ascertain what are the precise views of Pedobaptists, relative to the Abrahamic Covenant, the identity of the Church under the present and the former dispensations; and the definite scriptural reasons, why we baptise our children? He asks for an argument, brief, clear, logical, scriptural, and unmixed with other questions, such as the *mode* of baptism, &c.

Now where will you send him?

We will suppose the enquirer to ask concerning the baptism of the Jailer and his household. (Acts 16 : 33.)

"Why does this new convert present his children for baptism, when we have no evidence that any member of the family was then pious, except the head? Why did Lydia, (Acts 16 : 15,) on embracing the Saviour, present her household for baptism? Were these rare instances of household baptism? Or, are the infant offspring of believing parents, (having a regular connexion with the Church,) under the gospel, entitled to baptism?"

Now we proceed to answer this question in the affirmative, for the following reasons, viz : If we are genuine believers in Jesus Christ, we belong to the same identical Church to which Abraham belonged, and are under the same gracious covenant which God made with him.

Now for the proof of this proposition :

And 1st. The terms of salvation were the same in the case of Abraham as they are with us. Faith in Jesus Christ, in both cases, is requisite to salvation. Says Paul, in Gal. 3 : 8, "The scripture foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen through faith, *preached* before, the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed."

Here the gospel was preached to Abraham by the Holy Ghost. He believed that gospel. He believed in a promised Messiah to come, and was thereby justified. In Gen. 15 : 6, we read, "And he" i. e. Abraham, "believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness." And in Gal. 3 : 6, we read, "Even as Abraham believed God,

and it was accounted to him for righteousness." Just so all real Christians believe God—they believe the record which he has given of his Son—they believe in Jesus Christ, and are thereby justified. Says Paul, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Are not the conditions of justification, in the case of Abraham, and of believers under the Gospel, precisely the same? And if so, do not both belong to the same Church? Who can doubt it? Abraham believed in a Messiah to come. That was the ground of his justification. Christians now believe in a Messiah already come, and this is the ground of their justification. Do they not belong to the same Church? If so, no marvel that the Jailer, when he became a believer in Christ, had the present Seal of the Covenant applied to his offspring, as Abraham did the ancient Seal to his. But again, obedience was required of Abraham; and the same obedience is required of all Christians in our day.

Here is the proof: Gen. 22: 18, "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, *because thou hast obeyed my voice.*" And the Saviour said to his Disciples, John 15: 14, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you."

Are not the terms of Discipleship the same in both cases? And if so, do not both belong to the same Church?

But 2dly. Abraham is expressly called the father of all believers in the Word of God, and believers are called his seed, or his children.

God said to Abraham, "Behold my Covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations," Gen. 17: 4. Now, in what sense is Abraham the father of many nations, except as he is the spiritual father of all believers in all ages, and in all nations? Is it true that Abraham is the *natural* father of many nations? If so, where are those nations? Can they be found upon the face of the earth? They can not. Who, besides the Jews and the Arabians, lays the slightest claim to being the *natural* descendants of Abraham? But God promised that he would make Abraham the father of many nations. Has God failed to redeem his pledge? He has not. Heaven and earth shall sooner pass away than one jot or one tittle of his word shall fail. Where then are those many nations? We reply, they are

all true believers scattered over the earth. These are the spiritual children, or seed of Abraham, as they are included in the same Covenant with him.

As the father of all believers, Abraham now has many thousands and hundreds of thousands of spiritual children dispersed among different nations of the earth; and the number is constantly increasing.

But when the Heathen shall be given to Jesus Christ for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession—when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea—when the stone, cut out of the mountain, without hands, shall become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth, then it will be fully understood what God meant, when he said to Abraham, “Thou shalt be a father of many nations.”

But we have stronger testimony still, to prove that all believers, Jews and Gentiles, are included in the same Covenant which God made with Abraham, are all considered as his spiritual seed, and as such, belong to the same Church.

In the 4th chapter of Romans, Paul says, “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised, *that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised*, that righteousness might be imputed to them also.” Can anything be plainer than this? Abraham is our spiritual father, if we are true believers, although we are not of the circumcision.

Do not the father and the children belong to the same Church? If so, no wonder that the Jailer at Philippi, when he became a believer, and thus a son of Abraham, brought his children forward, and applied to them the *présent sign and seal* of the Covenant, as his spiritual father had the *former sign and seal* of the same Covenant. This all appears plain, consistent, and beautiful. But again, in this same 4th of Romans, 16th verse, our Apostle uses this

language: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law," i. e., not merely to the Jews, or the natural descendants of Abraham, "but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, *who is the father of us all.*" And immediately in the first clause of the 17th verse, the Apostle quotes the passage from the 17th of Gen., (already considered,) "As it is written, *I have made thee a father of many nations.*" This explains the Apostle's meaning, when he says that Abraham is the father of us all. He is the father of all believers; no matter to what nation they belong; no matter where they reside; no matter whether they be Jews or Gentiles—if they are Christians, they are under the same Covenant with Abraham, and shall be blessed with him, as we shall proceed to prove.

Again we ask, do not the father and the children belong to the same Church?

Let us now turn to the 3d chapter of Galatians, and see how the Apostle dwells upon this subject. "Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." We have line upon line, and precept upon precept. No one can deny that all believers are Abraham's children, or his spiritual seed. If this point is not proved by the passages just quoted, we may despair of proving anything from the Bible.

But the enquirer still asks, do we know that these spiritual children are heirs with the father to the same spiritual blessings? This is a momentous point; and if we fail to prove this, our argument is incomplete. It is not enough for us to know that we are children of Abraham. We want to know whether the children are, by God's gracious Covenant, heirs to the same spiritual blessings which were promised to the father. The Holy Ghost has anticipated this enquiry which arises in our minds, and most fully and satisfactorily answered it by the pen of the Apostle in this same chapter, the 3d of Galatians: "So then they which be of faith *are blessed* with faithful Abraham." "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and *heirs according to the promise.*" "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." What can be more explicit? What more could we desire? If believers, we

are Abraham's seed, and heirs with him to the same blessed promises. God promised to be a God to Abraham, and to his seed after him. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. By faith, Abraham took fast hold of a promised Saviour—here was his righteousness. He saw Christ's day and was glad. It was through a forthcoming Messiah, in whom Abraham now believed, that the LORD promised to be Abraham's God. And it is by virtue of their connexion with the Lord Jesus Christ, that the same LORD is the Covenant God of all believers. Our Saviour said, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom he hath sent." And this is the work which all true Christians are enabled, (by the grace of God,) to do—they believe in Christ, and hereby receive the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry, Abba, Father. And the Lord says, "I will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Cor. 6 : 18. This was what God promised to Abraham, and he renews, in the New Testament, the same to all believers.

But God's Covenant with Abraham included his natural children. Not that Abraham's seed were to be saved by virtue of his faith, and without personal piety—this is not what we mean—but by virtue of the Covenant which God made with Abraham, (besides the temporal blessings promised,) his children were attached to the Church, and pious influences were thrown around them. Now, as pious parents are the spiritual children of Abraham, and heirs of the same spiritual promises, (see Gal. 3 : 29) and as they belong to the same Church with Abraham, are not their children included in the Covenant also? By virtue of this Covenant, have they not a connexion with the Church? Are not the Church bound so to regard them, and then to throw around them their believing prayers, and their most holy, pious influences? Was not this the view of the Jailor, when, upon his own profession of faith, he brought forward his household and had them baptised? Was not this the view of the pious Lydia, who, upon the profession of her own faith, had her household baptised? Was not this the view of Peter, when, on the day of Pentecost, he said to those anxious enquirers, "Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of

sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you and *to your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Was not this the view of Paul, when he baptized "the household of Stephanas?" Now, we can understand Paul's reasoning in the 11th chapter of Romans, where he illustrates the identity of the church under the former, and the present dispensation, by the olive-tree. He says that some of the natural branches were broken off, and others, wild by nature, were grafted in among the remaining natural branches, and with them partook of the root and fatness of the olive tree. And he warns these wild, Gentile branches thus: "Boast not against the branches: but if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say, then, the branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." Rom. 11: 18-21. Now all this is unmeaning, if the church, under the former and the present dispensation, be not one. But admit that, and all is as clear as the noon-day sun. Had the Apostle represented the olive-tree as being dug up by the roots, and thrown out of the orchard, and another brought in and planted in its place, then the idea would have been distinctly conveyed to the mind that the church under the Gospel is a new church. But not so. The root is there. It has never been taken up. Some of the natural branches (the Jews) were broken off for their unbelief; and wild branches (Gentiles) were grafted in among those that remained. But whatever changes took place among the branches, the root remained untouched and undisturbed. The church is one. The Abrahamic covenant is an everlasting covenant, just as God promised Abraham it should be. See Gen. 17: 7. And here we ought to thank God for the gracious intimation, that those natural branches shall not always remain withered and separated from the tree. "God is able to graft them in again," and in due time he will do it.

In the days of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the infant children of God's people were included in the covenant, and the males were circumcised at eight days old. Now what did this mean? the Apostle tells us: He says, that "Abra-

ham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the *father of all them that believe.*" When a covenant is made among men, as of matrimony, or of the exchange of property, there is usually a solemn, sealing act attending the transaction. So likewise when God entered into covenant with Abraham and all his seed, he gave circumcision as the sign and seal of that covenant. So says Paul.

But we have proved that all believers are Abraham's spiritual children, included in the covenant, and heirs with him, of the same spiritual blessings.

Now, then, as Abraham's natural infant offspring were included in the covenant, and considered as connected with the church, how can we resist the inference that the infant children of believing parents, under the Gospel, are in the same favored condition.

With this view accords the conduct and the language of the Saviour, when he took little children in his arms, and blessed them, and declared that of such was the kingdom of God.

With this view also accords the declaration of Paul, that "the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean," i. e. excluded from the covenant; "but now are they holy," i. e. relatively holy, included in the covenant. 1 Cor. 7: 14.

But though the covenant remains unaltered, the seal of that covenant has been changed.

When the Jews admitted Gentile proselytes to their church, they uniformly circumcised the males, and baptized all, males and females. Says Dr. A. Clarke, on John 1: 25; "Baptism was a very common ceremony among the Jews, who never received a proselyte into the full enjoyment of a Jew's privileges, till he was both baptized and circumcised."

And Dr. William Brown, in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, vol. 1, p. 629-630, while treating of the admission of proselytes to the Jewish Church, says: "And if the head of a family was, in this way, baptized, the infants and slaves were baptized at the same time, without asking their consent: the former, because they could give it, and the latter, as

being his property, and having no rights of their own: but sons come of age were not baptized unless they wished it. "Hence, no mention of children or slaves in the baptism of the first Christians. It was a matter of course in the baptism of houses." See also a note in Stackhouse's History of the Bible. London edition, vol. 3, p. 18. The writer there says: "Now baptism, we know, was no new or strange thing among the Jews. It was acknowledged and practised as an emblem of purification from past guilt, and a rite of entering solemnly into covenant with God." This writer states that the expositors of the Jewish law agree "that their custom, in all succeeding ages, has been to receive their heathen proselytes by baptism."

The testimony upon this point is so abundant, that no one who investigates the subject, can doubt for a moment that baptism was common among the Jews. We *know* that baptism did not commence with the ministry of our Saviour. John, the forerunner of Christ, administered this rite to thousands.

Now, our Saviour dropped the bloody rite of circumcision, and adopted baptism (then in use) as the future seal of God's covenant with his people, and as the rite of recognition in, or initiation into his church.

He dropped the eating of the flesh of the Paschal lamb, and all other ceremonies of the Passover, and took bread and wine, (which they always used at the Passover,) and instituted the holy Eucharist or Lord's Supper.

Both the Passover and the rite of circumcision, required the shedding of Blood. But our Saviour, having shed his own atoning blood, all bloody rites under the Gospel cease. Hence, Jesus Christ gave the command to his disciples, to go and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This command the disciples perfectly understood, and they endeavored to obey it. And what was their practice? Do we find them baptising whole households, in cases where we have not a particle of evidence that any member of the family was converted, except the head? We do, in the cases of Lydia and the jailer, already noticed.

Several instances of household baptism are mentioned in the New Testament. Is it probable, there were no children in any of these families? But you may enquire, Do we

ever hear the Apostles speaking of baptism, as if had taken the place of circumcision? We reply, we do in Col. 2: 11. Says Paul, "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Now, what does he mean by the circumcision of Christ? Read the next verse, and you will see: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead."

As circumcision was a sign, and a seal of the faith of believers under the former dispensation, so is baptism a sign and seal of the faith of believers under the Gospel. Baptism is Christian circumcision. The church, under the former, and under the present dispensation, is the same church. Some changes have taken place in her external rites and ceremonies, but it is the same church. So thought Paul, when he said to the Ephesians: "But now in Christ Jesus, ye, (Gentiles as they were,) who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us." "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the *Apostles* and *Prophets*; Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord."

Now, as Apostles and Prophets are all built upon the same foundation, they all help to compose the same building. See what strong proof we have that Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Daniel, belonged to the same church with Paul, and Peter, and John, and all the Apostles. But does any body doubt that we, if believers, belong to the same church to which the Apostles belonged? This point we have never heard questioned, except by Papists or High Churchmen. But, if we do belong to the Apostolic Church, then we belong to the same church to which the prophets belonged—for we have proved that the Prophets and Apostles belonged to one and the same church. Does not this settle the point as to the identity of the church under the ancient and the present dispensation?

The Abrahamic covenant is still alive. The church, as a spiritual temple, is one. It is composed of "lively stones," and its walls are gradually rising in beauty, grandeur and glory. Its foundation is a *rock*, a stone, elected by infinite wisdom; precious in the sight of saints and angels, and laid in Zion by the hand of Omnipotence; and we may rest assured that the gates of hell shall never prevail to move it, nor to shake the edifice which it sustains. Upon this rock, Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles built, and were never confounded. Here the holy martyrs built, and were sustained amidst all the howling storms and desolating floods of persecution. And here all true believers in Jesus may build in safety for time and for eternity. God dwells in this temple, and all is safe. He says—"I will dwell in them and walk in them."

Through the Lord Jesus Christ, if we are Christians, Abraham's God is our God, and the blessed spiritual promises he made to our father in the faith, are ours. Are not our children, then, included in the covenant? And may we not while they are young, like the Jailer, and Lydia, and Stephanas, and others, apply the seal of that covenant to these children? But you may ask, Why was not the command to baptize our infant offspring given in express terms? We reply, no such express command was necessary. It was a thing of course, as the Abrahamic covenant was never abrogated, but continued in full force. The change of the seal never affected the covenant, and this the Apostles well understood. The change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, took place without any express command. But, again, where is there any express command for female communion? And yet, who doubts that pious females have a right to come to the Lord's table? You may ask again, Why does the Apostle in Gal. 3:16, call Jesus Christ the seed of Abraham? How can he and believers both be called the seed of Abraham? We reply, Jesus Christ was *the seed* of the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head. And again, as to his humanity, he was a natural descendant of Abraham. And again, such is the vital union between Christ and his people, that they are represented by the Holy Ghost as one. "Both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, *are all of one* :

for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." He is the groom and they are the bride. He is the head and they are the members. He is the vine and they are the branches. Says Paul, "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." Both Christ and believers are the seed of Abraham. You may object again, and say, that formerly the seal of the covenant was applied only to *males*, but that now we apply the present seal to *males* and *females*. We reply, the Apostle has anticipated this objection and answered it, by saying, that now there is neither male nor female, but that all are one in Christ Jesus. With the doctrine here advocated, accorded the practice of the church in the days of the early fathers. It was a mooted question in the third century, whether children might or might not be baptized, before they were eight days old? Many thought, as baptism had taken the place of circumcision, that children ought to be baptized when they were precisely eight days old, the age at which circumcision was administered. But a council, held at Carthage in A. D. 253, decided that they might be baptized at any time after birth. Was there at that time any dispute about the propriety of infant baptism? None whatever.

Irenæus, who lived in the second century, was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the Apostle John; and this Irenæus says, that the church learned from the Apostles to baptize their children.

Origen, in the third century, declared that the custom of baptizing infants was received from Christ and his Apostles.

Cyprian, in the same century, said that infants might be baptized as soon as they were born.

Ambrose, in the third century, testified that the baptism of infants had been practised by the Apostles, and the whole church until that time.

Chrysostom, in the fifth century, said that "the Catholic church every where declared that infants should be baptized."

Augustine, in the same century, declared that he had "never heard or read of any Christian, Catholic, or Sectarian, but who always held that infants were to be baptized."

Pelagius says, "I never heard of any, not even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants."

You may ask, what possible benefit can result to our

children from their baptism? We reply, if it be God's institution, we have no right to call in question its utility. We might as well ask, what good did circumcision do? Or what good does it do for Christians to go to the Lord's table, and celebrate his sufferings and death? Our business is to obey God. Having ascertained his will, we have no right to entertain questions of utility. If the infant offspring of believers were included in the covenant in the day of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, why should they not be included in the covenant now? That covenant has never been repealed. This covenant was made 430 years before the law was given at Sinai. But neither the *giving* of the ceremonial law, nor its *repeal*, ever touched this covenant. See Gal. 3: 17-19, where this point is elucidated.

When God, in the 8th chapter of Hebrews, finds fault with the "*first covenant*," and says, he will make a "*new covenant*" with Israel; lest he should be misunderstood, he tells us expressly that he alludes to the Sinaitic covenant; (see verse 9th,) which was 430 years after the Abrahamic covenant. Through all those Sinaitic transactions, this covenant remained unimpaired and untouched. The Apostle expressly says, that the law which was 430 years after, can not disannul the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, that it should make the promise of none effect. Gal. 3: 17. That blessed covenant still lives.

Upon the subject of the utility of infant baptism, we would ask, Is it nothing for pious parents, publicly and solemnly to recognize their obligations to train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? Is it nothing to interest the hearts of the pastor and of the church to watch over and to pray for these children? Is it nothing for parents to be able to plead in humility and faith the promise of Abraham's God, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee?"

Of a baptized child, says an eminent living writer: "He is placed in a school, where he is to receive faithful instruction and discipline, and to be trained up for the service of Christ." Dr. Wood's on Baptism, p. 140.

Let pious parents by faith take hold of that covenant which God made with Abraham, as "the father of all them that believe;" and let them, like the pious jailer, bring their

infant children before God, and apply the seal of that covenant, and God will bless them. Would all Pedobaptist parents do their *whole duty* upon this subject — would they faithfully train up their children for the church, and not for the world, for heaven, and not merely for the pleasures or the honors of this transient life, infant baptism would occupy in the public mind a position much more commanding than it now does. We are decidedly of the opinion, that that the broken vows and the want of fidelity on the part of Pedobaptist parents, have inflicted deep and lasting wounds upon the church, and have brought more discredit upon infant baptism than all things else combined.

May God enlighten his people upon this interesting subject; and may He turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest He come and smite the earth with a curse.

ARTICLE V.

ON THE BDELLIUM OF THE BIBLE.

This substance is mentioned nowhere but in Gen. 2: 12, and Num. 11: 7. In each case it has the article, implying that it was something that really existed; definite and well-known to those for whom, more immediately, Moses wrote; if not conveying the additional idea of preëminence, as when we say "the Sun," "the Moon," &c.

From the connection, especially in Genesis, we should naturally infer that it was a substance belonging to the mineral kingdom, and among the most rare and valuable of its class, as it stands by the side of pure gold and precious gems. It has by common consent been taken for Pearls; but they are denominated in other parts of the Bible, and among the Arabians, Persians, &c., by a very different word; and laying these two passages aside, it is doubtful whether this word, or any that has any relation to it, is ever

applied to Pearls. And besides, they being a marine production, would not naturally come into notice so early as that which was found in the earth.

We propose to take the word Bdelium for something that has more connection with Gold, viz : Quicksilver. We are told that Moses was learned *in all the wisdom* of the Egyptians; and it has recently been shown by Sir J. G. Wilkinson and others, that long before the time of Moses, they understood the various arts and trades; particularly the working and refining of some of the metals; perhaps better than men of the present day. We cannot suppose then that Quicksilver was unknown to Moses and to the Egyptians of his day. It is a metal too, which, from its singular character, would naturally attract attention. There are even at this day but few countries that produce it. "Its most important mines are found at Almaden in Spain, at Idria in Carniola, in the Duchy Deux-Ponts, at Durasno in Mexico, near Azogne in New Grenada, and near Huan- cevelica in Peru. It also occurs in the Philippine Islands and China. The most ancient and productive mine is that of Almaden." From its rarity, from its great importance in extracting Gold and Silver from their ores, from its use in the arts, and in medicine, it may well be placed by the side of Gold, and mentioned together with that to identify the land of Havilah.

It "is a very brilliant liquid of a silver white color;" standing in direct contrast with Gold, the only yellow metal. It has a tendency to chrystalize in Octohedrons, when cold at 39° or 40° below zero, and the globules contract in size.

We will now examine some of the more special reasons for regarding "The Bdelium," as Quicksilver :

1. It is a great characteristic of that metal in its liquid state, when mingled with other substances, in general, to keep itself separate in the form of globules, "conglobed from dry," or wet. Every particle, great or small, rolls itself up in a ball as if to shun contact, as much as possible, with that on which it rests, or among which it is put.

2. Another great use and characteristic of it, is to separate Gold and Silver from the other substances with which they are mingled. This is the principal cause of its consumption. Without fear for *itself*, it passes about in the

water, and amongst the particles of earth and sand and pounded rock, and wherever it finds a particle of Gold, it lays hold of that and carries it along, quick to discern and seize what it is sent to search after. It is not only the *separated* and *selected*, but the *separating* and *selecting* substance.

Now let us look at the etymology of the name: 1. The verb, Bâdhal, according to the Lexicon of Gesenius, means to separate, or divide; e. g. two places, by a curtain or wall; or *things mixed together*; as when in Gen. 1: 4, God divided the light from the darkness. Then it is applied tropically to the wind, to discern between different things, to distinguish.

A third sense, is to separate from others, to select, to choose out in a good sense. And in the passive voice, to separate one's self from a place, to go, to depart. It is probable that the radical idea of the verb lies in the action of the organs in articulating the letters of the root separately.

2. The noun Bêdheel, means the alloy of Lead, Tin, or other inferior metals, combined with Silver in the ore, and *separated* from it by smelting, Isaiah 1: 25. It also means Tin, a soft metal of a silver white color, possessing considerable brilliancy.

It would then be very natural for the Hebrews to give to Quicksilver possessing qualities, and performing acts so exactly described by the verbal root; and having the color and brilliancy of Tin, a name derived from that verb, and similar to the word for Tin; and to distinguish it by the article as possessing, in a preëminent degree, both certain qualities of Tin, and those described by the verb.

And it may be assumed as almost certain, that they who used the Hebrew language, must have been acquainted with Quicksilver, in Egypt if no where else, and that they must have had a name for it; but if Habbêdholah does not stand for that metal, where is the name for it to be found in the language, or how can a *term be made* from any *root in the Hebrew* that *will describe that substance*?

But this word is qudriliteral; it is probably a primitive word, and it has the appearance of being a compound term. It may seem presumptuous for a mere tyro in that sacred tongue to make the suggestion; but yet we will venture one, and that is, that the last letter is the main consonant

in the word Hhay, alive. The preceding part of the word is precisely the infinitive construct of the Kal conjugation. Now when the two words form a compound, the lamed (L) will stand in the middle of it without a vowel; and preceded by the long vowel, hholen, (o). The pattah (a) is heterogeneous to the yodh, but homogeneous with the hheth. Its force therefore is spent in sounding that strong guttural, and is just the sound it needs. And the yodh, being a weak palatal, and left without any vowel, cannot be sounded, and so falls away.

There is nothing improbable in this supposition: and it being taken for true, then we shall have the infinitive of the verb, a noun, in the construct state with a qualificative adjective, which is also an abstract noun. Then, as the other verbal derivative means Tin, and Tin is in appearance so much like Silver, we shall have a word formed to denote Quicksilver, constructed almost precisely like that compound term in our language. Though according to the genius of the Hebrew tongue, found to be precisely the reverse of ours, (as we read in Nordheimer's Grammar, section 770) the qualificative adjective is placed *after* the noun to which it refers.

Quick, Live-Silver, and Tin of Life; just as in Gen. 26: 19, and Lev. 14: 5, we have "water of life," for running water. Liquid silver in English, is flowing tin in Hebrew. The resemblance of that metal is probably just as great to tin as to silver. And probably tin was more rare a metal than silver.

The use of the word in Num. 11: 7, when Moses is speaking of the Manna, helps to confirm the theory above stated. "The color thereof is as the color of Bdelium;" or the *eye* of it is as the eye of Bdelium. In Ex. 16: 14, this manna is compared to hoar frost, and of course, it was white, as it is more expressly said in the 31st verse of the same chapter. If the manna was white, like white clay, as the word there implies; and if it was like hoar frost, and also of the color of Bdelium, then of course this latter substance must be in color something like those other articles to which the manna is compared. This would make it to resemble quicksilver. But we apprehend, that when it is said the eye of it is as the eye of Bdelium, that more than the idea of mere color is intended. Very probably it is

meant that it was crystalline and pellucid; and perhaps so much so as to form an image, just like the pupil of the eye. This is the case with every globule of quicksilver, great or small. As the article in question has been believed to be pearls, we might remark that the color of quicksilver is not so far removed from that. But it would seem strange for Moses to speak of pearls, as *The Pearl*. So, too, we are told that "most of the ancient interpreters understood by *Bdellium*, a whitish gum or resin, which distills from a tree growing in Arabia, India, and Babylonia, pellucid, approaching to the color of frankincense; and with grains like frankincense, but larger. These drops, or tears of gum, exuding from the tree, would bear no slight resemblance to the globules of quicksilver. And it shows that they had the idea that it was something which existed, or might exist in that form and color. But all the probabilities are against its being a vegetable production; and the probability that it was pearl, or any marine product, is very slight. There might have been more ground for the supposition, if the ancient *error* that pearls were formed of dew drops, had been found to be the *truth*.

NOTE.—To the ingenious theory given above, we add the following, which we have translated from the *Biblische Alterthumskunde* of Rosenmueler, *Band 4, Zweite Theil*, S. 460-462. It gives, in a condensed form, the opinions which have been entertained respecting the *Bdellium* of the Scriptures.

"Most Jewish scholars, with whom Bochart also agrees,* hold the word *Bedolach*, which occurs twice in the O. T., as another Hebrew name of the Pearl. It is first found in Gen. 2: 12, in connection with gold and the precious stone *Schoham*, as the name of a product of the land of *Chavilah*." In another passage, Deut. 11: 7, 'the appearance of the same is as the appearance of *Bedolach*.' That by this word the pearl was denoted, is probable from the fact, that in Exod. 16: 14, 31, the *Manna* is described as round, like the *Coriander seed*, and white. Bochart thinks the word, if it is of Hebrew origin, signifies something *superior, especially beautiful or costly*,† and for these qualities, the pearl was valued by the ancients in the highest degree. Hence, in Gen 2: 12, it has an appropriate place between gold and a precious gem.

It is however worthy of remark, that none of the ancient translators renders the word *bedolach* by *pearl*.‡ The Alexandrians put for the Hebrew

(* Hieroz. T. III., p. 592 et seq.)

(† He takes *bedolach*, for *bedolah*, with paragogic *Heth* instead of *He*, from *badal*, to *separate*, to *sunder apart*; so that the Hebrew word denotes a selected pearl, like the Arabic synonyme *fariyd*, from *farad*, to *separate*, and the Latin *unio*.)

(‡ The oldest interpreter who translates *bedolach* by *pearl*, is Saadias, who lived in the tenth century. He puts for the Hebrew word the Arabic *lulu*, *pearl*.)

word in Gen. 2: 12, the term *carbuncle* or *ruby*,* and *chrysal*,† in Num. 11: 7. But the three other Greek translators, Aquila Symmachus, and Theodotion, concur in translating it by the word Bdelium.‡ This is a transparent, fragrant resin, which the *fan-palm*§ growing on the Persian Gulf exudes. We obtain it in small, roundish, ruddy and yellow, transparent, viscous pieces, glossy, when broken, and of a bitter taste; and when burning, of a myrrh-like fragrance, which is not unpleasant. With this resin, whose Greek name is very similar to the Hebrew,** can the Manna be compared, as that is a resinous and brittle, inspissated sap. It agrees less with the costly products of the land of Chavilah, Gen. 2: 1. For although Bdelium was popular as a perfume, yet it was not of so high a value that it could be placed in the same class with gold and precious stones."

E. M. (Michelson, Ph. D. of the University of Heidelberg,) in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, has decided against Bochart, Gesenius, and others in favor of the gum Bdelium, which issues from a tree growing in Arabia, Media, India, and various parts of Africa.—*Editors.*

(* Ανδραξ.) († Κρύσταλλον.)

(‡ Βδέλλιον, Josephus also, (Antiq. B. 3, c. 1, §6,) describes the Manna as ὁμοιον τῇ τῶν ἀρωμάτων Βδέλλῃ.)

(§ Borassus flabelliformis, the Arabic and Persian *Dum*, *Mokl*. See Kamfer's Amœnitt. exott. p. 668. Forskäl Descriptiones Plantarum, p. 126.)

(|| Compare Dioscorides, L. 1, c. 81. Plinius Hist. Nat., L. 12, c. 9, §10.)

(** Dioscorides says the Bdelium is also called μάδεκον and Βολχον, for which last, according to Salmasius' conjecture, Βδολχον must be read.)

ARTICLE VI.

ASSURANCE—WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT—AND THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

1. *A Treatise on Assurance, by the Rev. THOMAS BROOKS, Preacher at St. Mary's, Fish Street Hill, London, Author of Mute Christian, &c. &c. London, 1810.*
2. *The Forgiveness of Sin and the Possibility of Attaining a Personal Assurance of it, by Rev. S. EAST, Birmingham. Glasgow, 1847.*
3. *The Witness of the Spirit with our Spirit, by Rev. AUGUSTUS SHORT. Being the Bampton Lecture, for 1846.*
4. *The Doctrine of the Direct Witness of the Spirit, by FREDERICK A. ROSS. Phila., 1846.*

5. *What Constitutes a Call to the Gospel Ministry, in the Biblical Repertory, for 1831.* p. 196.
6. *The Necessity of a Divine Call. Ch. II. of the Christian Ministry, by the Rev. CHARLES BRIDGES. Fourth Edition. London, 1835.*
7. *Necessary Call to the Ministry. Ch. III. of the Christian Ministry, by J. EDMONSTON, a Wesleyan Minister. London, 1828.*
8. *On the Call of a Minister of Jesus Christ to the Sacred Office. Ch. IV. of EADE'S Gospel Ministry.*
9. *What is a Call to the Ministry? Tracts of the American Tract Society. Vol. 9, p. 333, and vol. 10, p. 285.*
10. *The Use of Preachers, and How to Obtain More, by the Rev. A. A. PORTER. Charleston, 1848.*
11. *A Call to the Ministry—What are the Evidences of a Divine Call? in the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, 1841.*
12. *A Discourse on Theological Education, and Advice to a Student, by GEORGE HOWE, D. D. New York, 1844.*

The works at the head of this article cover the whole extent of practical, personal, and experimental piety, with special relation to one department of Christian duty.

Assuming the fact of man's inherent depravity and conscious guilt, salvation from the power and the curse of sin becomes the most interesting and momentous of all possible inquiries—its attainment the chiefest of all possible blessings—and the assurance of its possession the most unspeakable of all possible enjoyments. Without this assurance, the very magnitude of the interests at stake would only render the anxiety of the mind the more intolerable—our own relation to God more fearful—and our indisposition to, and incapacity for, duty more hopeless. Salvation being provided for guilty man, the assurance of its actual enjoyment must be conceived as a part of its gracious pro-

vision, both as a ground of hope and love towards God, and as a constant and effectual spur and motive to self-denying obedience. And in proportion as any duty is arduous and responsible, such an assurance of obligation and acceptance becomes necessary to zeal, energy and success. The ministry, therefore, being confessedly the highest sphere of Christian activity, and the most momentous of human instrumentalities, demands for its warrant, motive and support, the most satisfactory assurance that it is undertaken in accordance with the will of God, by His authority, and under the promise of His all-sufficient and ever-present help and guidance. And the fact is, that just so far as ministers have been men of sincere, ardent and devoted piety, have they given all diligence to make their calling and election to this high and holy office sure and satisfying.

The Christian ministry is the principal human instrumentality and means which God is pleased to use in carrying on the grand design of His wisdom, love and goodness towards His church and people.*

Every minister, therefore, in order to be satisfied that he is not a "thief and a robber," laboring without divine authority, divine instruction, divine assistance, divine acceptance, and divine success, must enter in at the door of Christ's ordained appointment. That door is a divine call, mission, commission, and authority, approved by God the Father, — issued by God the Son, — and signed, sealed, and witnessed by God the Holy Ghost.†

* Matt. 28: 19; Act 10: 41-42; Eph. 4: 11-16; 1 Cor. 1: 17-31; 2 Cor. 5: 18-21; 1 Cor. 3: 9. See Mr. Porter's *Use of Preachers*, §4, p. 6-8.

† See 1 Cor. 12: 28-29; Rom. 10: 15; Heb. 5: 4-5; Exod. 28: 1; Numb. 1: 50; Deut. 10: 8, and 33: 8, comp. with Exod. 19: 6; Heb. 9: 6, and 1 Pet. 2: 5-9; Matt. 10: 1-7; Mark 3: 14; Luke 9: 1-2, and 10: 1-2; Acts 13: 2; Gal. 2: 7; Col. 4: 17; Acts 20: 28; Heb. 13: 17-24. Here would be pertinent all the passages in which the numerous titles of ministers are given, and which all imply special designation and authority. Also all the passages which define their special qualifications and duties, such as 1 Tim. 3: 5; 1 Peter 5: 2-3; 1 Tim. 4: 14-15; 1 Tim. 4: 2; 1 Tim. 2: 25; 1 Cor. 12: 15, and 9: 16-17; Heb. 13: 17, &c. &c. 1 Tim. 5: 7-21; Titus 1: 5, 9, 10.

See Eade's *Ministry*, p. 218, &c. Bridge's, p. 93.

Divine Right of the Gospel Ministry, Part I, ch. 4, p. 66, &c. London, 1654, 4to. Edmonson's *Christian Ministry*. Mr. Porter's *Sermon*, §5, p. 8-9. Palmer on the Church, vol. 1, p. 165-167, where he gives the testimony of the Reformers. The *Divine Right of the Gospel Ministry*, London, 1654, where the necessity of this call is largely proved, p. 68-115.

As the ministry is the highest, most responsible, and most arduous Christian calling, and also that in which a Christian may best promote the glory of God and the salvation of souls, to disobey the call of God and to neglect or reject it, must involve the deepest criminality and incur the heaviest infliction of divine wrath. And while, therefore, an assurance of their call is all important to those who *have* entered upon the work of the ministry, THE ASSURANCE THAT THEY ARE NOT RESISTING AND SHUTTING THEIR EARS AGAINST A DIVINE CALL TO THIS WORK, is equally important to those who have hitherto "taken their ease in Zion."

Our present object then, will be to inquire into the nature of assurance: the manner of the Spirit's witness in giving and preserving this assurance: and the special nature of that call by which any man is required, and therefore warranted, to enter upon the preparation for, and the actual discharge of, the work of the Gospel Ministry.

In doing this, some reference will be made to views already presented in this work, and upon which—in consistency with the free and open character of the work, and in the exercise of the most exalted estimation of the author of those views—we will freely animadvert. The discussion will, it is hoped, lead to a more careful examination of this subject, and to the adoption of opinions as remote from that low and carnal policy which derogates from the work and glory of the ever blessed spirit, as they are from such a standard of experience as will necessarily create distress and difficulty in the minds of those who are most sincere and conscientious. For the sake of those who wish to examine this subject for themselves, we have given in the Notes the chief authorities we have consulted on the various points, and with which, therefore, general readers need not trouble themselves.

I. WE INQUIRE THEN, IN THE FIRST PLACE, WHAT IS

ASSURANCE?

Assurance is freedom from care, anxiety or fear—a firm, confident, and sure belief of what is the object of our faith and hope. It is based upon evidence, and is thus dis-

tinguished from that counterfeit assurance, which is a groundless reliance upon one's own ability, opinion or character. Assurance may be an occasional feeling or an habitual state of mind.

Assurance, then, may be defined to be, *the certain knowledge of the reality of that of which we are assured*. It is a conviction produced by evidence. The certainty of this conviction is characterised by the nature of the evidence on which it is based, and may therefore be said to be of different kinds or degrees, in all cases, however, conveying that kind or degree of certainty which is sufficient to warrant the most undoubting confidence and the most unhesitating obedience.

In this discussion we assume that there is a God, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.*

We assume further, that God's veracity is necessary and immutable, so that whatever is in evident accordance with His will, whether this is made known in His works, His laws, His gifts, His providence, or His word, is and must be certainly true. The ordinary course of nature, therefore,—the constitution of our senses as organs of our minds,—the faculties by which the mind receives, compares and reasons upon ideas,—and the intuitive and necessary beliefs or perceptions to which we are thus led—in other words the reason and the understanding—these are all pledges of God's veracity and channels of God's divine communication. In knowledge and understanding we are made like unto God "so that it is in His light we see light." "He would not practice a mockery upon us by giving us constitutional beliefs at variance with the objective reality of things, and so as to distort all our views of truth and of the universe. We were formed in his image intellectually as well as morally; nor would He give us the arbitrary structure that would lead us irresistibly to believe a lie." † "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the

* See on this foundation principle of the intuitive reason, some beautiful thoughts in Morell's Lectures on the Phil. Tendencies of the Age, Lond., 1848, p. 36, 37, Lect. i, all.

† See Morell's Lectures on the Phil. Tendencies of the Age; Lecture ii, on Individualism, p. 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 81, 82, and p. 69, 71, and p. 111, 132, 133, 136, 142, 168, &c.

‡ Dr. Chalmers' Posthumous Wks. vol. 1, p. 2, 3.

Almighty giveth him understanding.”* And hence, whatever results from this natural constitution of our minds cannot but be true, and that which is contrary to it cannot but be false.† “These inbred principles of natural light,” as Owen says, “do sufficiently and infallibly evidence themselves to be from God.” We may, therefore, have a demonstrative, infallible, or certain knowledge, of everything, which, in the proper exercise of our natural powers we know to exist, since in these “God reveals Himself,” as really and as certainly as in His word.‡

Further, as the testimony of others is a means of acquiring knowledge which God has made it natural and necessary for us to use,§ it is equally evident that the knowledge founded upon competent human testimony is certainly true. For although men are fallible, and their testimony is fallible in itself considered, yet there may be such a combination of rational evidence, as to make it certain, that in the particular cases to which it refers, such testimony cannot be false, but is certainly true; because, in these cases, men could neither be deceived nor disposed to deceive. And this certainty is not moral but natural, being based upon the constitution of things and the veracity of God.||

It follows, further, that since the Scriptures present innumerable evidences founded upon the exercise of our own minds, and upon the testimony of others, which cannot but be received as true, we may have certain knowledge that the Scriptures are true, and are what they claim to be—the inspired and infallible word of God. The contrary supposition implies the want of certainty in all the processes of thought, judgment and conviction, which God has himself given, and is therefore contradictory to the very nature of God and man.**

* See Morell's Lectures, p. 138, 140.

† See Dr. Owens' Wks. vol. 3, p. 245, 246, 329, 325, and The remains of the reverend and learned John Corbet, Lond., 1684, p. 77, &c., of certainty, also Halyburton's Wks., p. 506, 517.

‡ Owens Wks., vol. 3, p. 326.

§ This is one province of the understanding as distinguished from the reason. See Morell's Lectures as above, p. 75, 82, 86. See this in this innate tendency, to repose confidence in the testimony of others, p. 103, Lect. iii.

|| See Corbet's Remains.

** Owen's Works, vol. 3, p. 349, 350, 351, 354, 356, 239, 241, 245, 249, 327, 329. Works of Rev. Thos. Scott, vol. 2, p. 25, 290. Dr. Jamieson's

Further, in the use of the same faculties and of all the means necessary, we can attain to a rational and assured certainty of what the Scriptures contain.* Our capacity to understand a book, does not depend upon the author or the origin of its contents, but upon our means of arriving at the certain meaning of its language.† To say, therefore, that because the Bible is an infallibly true book, we cannot understand it without an infallible human teacher to instruct us, is to destroy the foundation upon which its infallible evidences rest; to reason in a self-contradictory circle; and to make a series of infallible teachers necessary *ad infinitum*—in order that we may infallibly understand what each infallible teacher teaches, which is absurd.

It is further evident, that while we may *naturally* and *certainly* know that the Scriptures are God's inspired and infallible word, and what they teach, that nevertheless we may not be able *naturally* to perceive the whole truth of what is contained in the Scriptures, to receive and act upon them cordially, or to feel their power to produce saving and sanctifying impressions. Just as we may naturally believe in God, and yet not love and enjoy Him—so we may naturally be convinced of the truth of the Bible and understand its doctrines, and yet not love or enjoy them. They may even appear to be contrary to our reason, because so entirely above it, and so entirely opposed to the bent and current of our passions and pursuits. We may have a knowledge of subjects, and yet not of their relations and true bearings.‡ When the Apostle James says, "even the devils believe and tremble," he undoubtedly admits that they may assent to all the truths or propositions contained in the Scriptures.§ The true import and power of Scripture depends

Reality of the Holy Spirit's Influence, Edin., p. 68, 115, 75, 76. Halyburton's Works, 514, 532, 530, 535, 545. Bellamy's Works, vol. 2, p. 504, 509. Haldane's Evidence and Authority of Divine Revelation, vol. 2, p. 458, and generally all the works on the Evidences of Christianity and of the Bible. See also Confessio Helvetica Posterior in Niemeyer's Collection, p. 459. Works of Jonathan Edwards, vol. 4, p. 263. Life of Halyburton, by himself, p. 162, recent edition. Taylor's Spiritual Christianity, Lect. 1, and Edin. Pres. Review, June, 1846, p. 52.

* Owen's Works, vol. 3, p. 379, 380, 499, and ch. 9, p. 502; and Buchanan on the Spirit, p. 99, 101.

† Halyburton's Works, p. 505, 506, 525, 526. Owen's Works, vol. 3, p. 351, 353, 357.

‡ See Locke Hum. Underst., B. 4, ch. 3.

§ See Dr. Candlish on the Atonement, p. 154.

VOL. II.—No. 1.

"not upon the literal induction of the words, but upon the spiritual sense we attach to them, upon the religious intuitions they may serve to express—in a word, upon the whole state of the religious consciousness of the interpreter." "The real essential meaning varies immeasurably, according to the conceptions which lie under the words."*

God, therefore, may undoubtedly accompany the Scriptures with such an illuminating influence, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, as to impart to them a supernatural evidence, and thus, give assurance to the mind that "they are in the truth the word of God,"—that their doctrines are holy, just and true, and that they are "the power of God to the salvation" of the believing soul. That God *can* thus work in the hearts of men, and in this way present to them spiritual evidence as unknown to the natural mind, as light is to the blind, who will dare to deny? That God *will* do so, we know certainly by His promises and declarations, contained in that very word of whose infallibility we are already assured. That such influences *are imparted*, man is enabled by consciousness and his other faculties certainly to determine. And that such inward evidences of the divine truth, power, and efficacy of the Scriptures, are not only *attainable*, but are actually *attained*, every true believer proves to himself by his own experience, and to others by his life and conduct.†

The influences of the Holy Spirit, when thus exerted upon the mind, enabling it experimentally to know that the doctrines of Scripture are from God, produce that spiritual confidence which is more commonly called among theologians by the term assurance. This differs from natural assurance, not in its nature or exercise, nor in the faculties of mind by which it is exercised, but only in the nature of the evidence by which it is produced, and the power by which that evidence is presented. That evidence is the conscious exercise of such gracious affections, holy principles and spiritual operations, and such a perception of the self-evidencing truth and power of Scripture doctrines, as

*Morell's Lectures on the Phil. Tendencies of the Age, p. 91. See also p. 115.

†Owen, vol. 3, p. 310, 358, 289, 290, 333, 141, 410, 417, 433. Halyburton's, Works, p. 517, 527, 535, 536, and p. 165 of Life, and Locke's Hum. Underst. B. 4, ch. 18, §3 and §14.

are in Scripture attributed to the Holy Spirit, and which imply a divine Author, as certainly as the Scriptures themselves, or the other works of God. When, therefore, we are conscious of these exercises, we have assurance of that to which they testify,—the facts are ascertained by the evidence.* “Hereby we know that we are of the truth,” and and “that these things are true,” and hereby the Holy Spirit beareth witness to our spirit, and guides us into all necessary truth.

It is further evident that, as in its nature, saving assurance is analogous to natural assurance, so like it, it is of different kinds and degrees. As it regards the truths and doctrines of the Scriptures, it is *the assurance of the understanding*; as it regards the testimony of God concerning Christ and salvation through Him, it is *the assurance of faith*; as it regards the glory of the future inheritance, it is *the assurance of hope*; as it regards our particular occupation in life and our obligation to undertake and to discharge any particular duty, it is *the assurance of conscience*, “making our calling and duty sure;” and as it regards our outward condition, health, suffering, and affliction, it is *the assurance of comfort*, enabling our patience, confidence, and resignation, “to have their perfect exercise,” “so that in whatever state we are we may therein be content.” “All these are diversities of operations” of one and the same spirit working in us, to will and to do according to God’s good pleasure, and thoroughly furnishing the man of God for every good word and work.

In all these cases, the object of which we are assured is external to us, and these kind of assurances may be denominated *objective*. But as it regards our own personal interest in Christ and salvation through Him, the evidence is not outward in the word, but inward in the heart, and this kind of assurance, which may be denominated subjective, is *the assurance of salvation*†—or, as it is called, the reflex exercise of saving faith, the assurance of sense, or the assurance of experience.

* See Dr. McLeod’s True Godliness, p. 134, 145, 165. See The Morning Exercises, vol. 5, p. 631–632, where it is shewn by Traill to be grounded, not upon internal light, nor upon authority, as the Romanists teach, p. 612, but upon evidence, p. 618–619.

† See Dr. Williams.

These distinctions, like those of the various functions or powers of the mind—which is one and indivisible—will obviate difficulties, if we carefully remember that the difference exists not in the principle, but in its application. The *one* principle of saving faith operates in various ways, as it acts upon, and acts through, the different faculties of the mind. In the understanding it produces saving knowledge—on the will, an actual appropriation of the Saviour and all His benefits to the soul—on the conscience, that true repentance, which shall never need to be repented of—on the affections it becomes love—on the active powers, holy obedience—on the desires, hope, and on the whole soul, that godliness which is great gain.*

These distinctions will enable us to understand how the old Divines regarded assurance as essential to the very nature of saving faith in its primary and direct exercise. Viewed in reference to the evidence upon which it rests, saving faith consists, as all will admit, in receiving, with absolute confidence and trust, the testimony of God concerning Christ—in complying with the commands, invitations and promises of God—in confiding in the ability, sufficiency, and willingness of Christ as a Saviour, and in looking for the all-sufficient grace of the Holy Spirit to regenerate, sanctify and comfort the heart. This assurance of faith is, it will be perceived, altogether *objective*, and regards the outward evidence of salvation, and warrant of our faith, and was therefore carefully distinguished by these Divines from the reflex assurance of faith, or what they termed the assurance of sense, which is *subjective*, and regards the internal evidence of a personal possession of Christ, and an interest in him.†

* See Dr. Candlish on the Atonement, p. 147, 148.

† See the Marrow of Modern Divinity, Boston's long Note on p. 144—157, 20th ed. Berwick, 1811, and p. 160, 163. From the multifarious evidence adduced, this would appear to have been a distinction common to the Reformers, to the Westminster Divines, and to our standards, see p. 147—154. See also Robertson's History of the Atonement Controversy in Scotland, 1846, p. 29, 69, &c. See Zanchii Opera, Tom. iii, De. Fide. p. 7, 4. Dr. McLeod's True Godliness, p. 244, 169. "Thou hast, I say, a lively faith, both in that direct act whereby it justifieth, and also by a prudent observation of the work in thy soul—thou dost believe by faith that thou art justified by faith, thou hast also the attendant companion upon faith, that Christian hope," &c. Wks. of Bolton, vol. 4, p. 32, 33. See also Dr. Candlish on the Atonement, p. 148, 149—156, where he affirms the doctrine

This two-fold assurance of faith—the direct and the reflex—regards different objects. The former relates to the doctrine and the latter to the grace, of faith—the former to the foundation and the latter to the exercise, of faith—the former to the root, and the latter to the flower—the former to justification, and the latter to our knowledge of it as a sense of adoption—the former to our actual belief, the latter to our knowledge of having believed. The former is the direct act of faith on Christ and his righteousness, the latter is the reflex light of this faith in the heart.* The former cannot admit of doubt, while the latter is not inconsistent with many and frequent doubts. The former is the way of salvation, and the latter, of comfort; and the only way to secure, restore, or strengthen the latter, is by the former.†

The assurance of faith is the exercise of the mind, in actually receiving and resting upon Christ. The assurance of sense or experience, is the joyful confidence that we are in a state of gracious acceptance with God, from an examination of the work of God in our own souls.‡ The former is necessary and invariable, and of the very essence of saving faith, while the latter is desirable, is a privilege, and may and ought to be attained,§ but is manifested in different ways, and given in very different degrees to different believers. ||

Assurance, therefore, implies a spiritual understanding of

— shews that the difficulty arises from the nature of language which is always reflex, whereas faith is direct—and shows the essential agreement of Dr. Bellamy, Hervey and Anderson, and their apparent contrarieties. See also Luther and Melancthon, as quoted in Scott's continuation of Milner's Ch. Hist., vol. 1, p. 45, 46, and vol. 2, p. 240, 275, Calvin's views in do., vol. 3, p. 543, 550, and especially p. 549, or his Instit. B. iii., C. 11, §7, 15, 16, 17 and Milner's own admission, p. 546.

* See Marrow of Divinity, p. 292, Note, and Rutherford, as quoted on p. 293.

† See Dr. McLeod's True Godliness, p. 199—203.

‡ Dr. McLeod's True Godliness, p. 91, 92, 169, 224. Scott's Wks., vol. 1, p. 478, 5, 6, and vol. 2, p. 297. Ridgley's Body of Divinity, vol. 3, p. 263, 266, 267. How this is to be done, see Marrow of Divinity, p. 234. Owen's Wks., vol. 14, p. 112, 113, and vol. 6, p. 128, &c. East on, p. 65, 98, 118, 148, 149. See also the Morning Exercises, vol. 5, p. 613, 627.

§ See the works by Brooks and East. Shepard's Sound Believer, p. 159, in opposition to the Romish view, see p. 159, 162, and to the Armenian view, p. 161, 178, 190, 227. Bryson's Real Christian, p. 120, 123.

|| East on Forgiveness, p. 64, 161.

divine things, communicated by the Holy Ghost, which is supernatural and divine, and in the production of which the soul is entirely passive and recipient. Previous to its reception, the soul had no such spiritual understanding, and of course in the reception of it, it could have none. The greatest number of believers, therefore, know neither the time, or place, or manner, of their conversion, the change being wrought in many, doubtless, at a very early period of life.* It is only when the spiritual understanding is imparted, spiritual things become perceptible in their power and glory to the soul, giving it an assurance of their certainty; and it is only then, that holy affections, principles, and desires are produced, so as to constitute the sure ground and evidence of our personal interest in Christ. Assurance, therefore, is rational, and founded on argument, although the argument is immediate, and the evidence intuitive.†

II. This leads us to inquire in the second place, HOW THE HOLY SPIRIT IMPARTS THIS ASSURANCE TO THE SOUL, OR, IN OTHER WORDS, HOW THE SPIRIT WITNESSES TO THE SOUL.

WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.

The Holy Spirit, as Scripture teaches, works in the heart *personally*, and not merely through certain laws or agencies;—*directly*, and not through any intermediate cause;—*instrumentally*, in, by and with His word, His ministers, His ordinances, and every other means of affecting the mind and heart;—*rationally*, in accordance with our nature, as free, rational and accountable beings, so that while He gives origin to every holy principle, thought, determination, desire and obedience; “these,” as Bishop Butler says, “He performs *in* us, *with* us and *by* us,” so that while they “proceed from Him, they are still our desires, our counsel, and our works.”‡

* Ridgley's Body of Divinity, vol. 3, p. 263, Philip Henry blamed those who laid stress on such knowledge, which he thought with many was impossible. See Life and Works, by Sir K. Williams, p. 12.

† Works of Jonathan Edwards, (Williams' edition,) English, vol. 4, p. 193, and Morell's Lectures on the Phil. Tendencies of the Age, p. 30, &c.

‡ Bartlett's Memoirs of Bishop Butler, with some previously unpublished matter, p. 525; see also Charnock's Works, vol. 5, p. 209, 219, &c. Buchanan on the Holy Spirit, p. 98. See also Hosea 11: 4, and Life of Philip Henry, p. 44.

The Holy Spirit, as an omnipotent, omniscient, and infinitely wise Being, undoubtedly *may* cause His direct and personal presence to be evident to the soul.* This He did to Prophets, Apostles, and other holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.† Even they, however, appear to have had at first difficulty in assuring themselves that it was the Lord who spake to them, as in the case of Samuel, Gideon, and others.‡

While, however, some such communication of Himself appears to be necessary to the very supposition of the inspiration of supernatural truth,§ yet, now that He has completed the volume of inspiration, the Holy Spirit does not produce this assurance by any sensible or audible voice; nor by the communication of any truth to the mind;—nor by dreams or visions;—nor by emotional excitement and “bodily exercise which profit nothing.” The Holy Spirit produces assurance in the hearts of believers *now, in all ordinary cases, and in reference to all ordinary truths and duties*, only through the instrumentality of His word, His ordinances, and those holy affections, principles and desires, which by His personal and direct operation He implants within the soul.|| These are the means he is pleased to employ;—to which He has limited his influences;—and by which He gives evidences to ourselves and others, that we feel and act, “not after the flesh,” but under the direct guidance of the Spirit.**

We *savingly* believe in the Scriptures, not because of

*Halyburton's Life, p. 159.

†Halyburton, s do., p. 159.. Owen's Works, vol. 3, p. 235, and Corbet's Remains, p. 89.

‡Locke, B. 4, cap. 19, §14. Dr. Jamieson's Reality of The Spirit's Work, p. 227, 228.

§Owen says, he cannot tell by what infallible tokens inspired men might know assuredly they were not imposed upon, “for these are things whereof we have no experience.” See his opinion quoted approvingly also in Halyburton's Works, p. 511. Owen on the Spirit, 13: 2; do. 1, §10, and Works, vol. 3, p. 296.

|| The Word of God is the instrument, and the Spirit the agent. He only teaches and applies what is in the Bible. Buchanan on the Holy Spirit, p. 95, 184. Halyburton's Works, p. 531, 532, 534, 536, 539, and Memoirs of his own Life, p. 158–168. Owen's Works, vol. 3, p. 353, 321, 349, 350–352, 235, 239. Rutherford's Trial and Triumph of Faith, Sermon. xiv., p. 145.

** Owen's Works, vol. 3, p. 309, 413, 410, 421, 422. See also the Memoirs of Rev. James Hogg, of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1846, p. 90–91. He lived in the 17th century.

any private voice, whisper, or suggestion from the Spirit, separate from the written word, suggesting to our mind that they are the word of God. Such an internal testimony would be delusive, as it has ever proved to be, and would itself stand in need of testimony* — it would imply as many distinct reasons for believing as there are believers, and it would imply that no one is under obligation to believe the Scriptures unless he has received this internal testimony.

We savingly believe the Scriptures, therefore, to be the word of God, solely because of that evidence they give of the authority, veracity, wisdom and holiness of God, by which they were dictated. The *capacity* to discern this *evidence* is given by the Holy Spirit, but the evidence itself is in the Scriptures, and while the Holy Ghost is the author of that spiritual capacity by which we perceive and appreciate the evidence, it is the evidence and not the capacity which gives us the assurance of faith.†

In like manner it is by the Holy Spirit we are *enabled* to perceive the grace and glory of Christ, as He is set before us in the Gospel, as an almighty, all-merciful, all sufficient, and all-willing Saviour, and to receive and trust in God's commands, promises, and invitations concerning Him — but it is the actual exercise of faith, hope, and peace, in *believing* these things, by which an assurance of faith is enkindled in the soul. The assurance rests not upon the spiritual capacity imparted by the Holy Spirit in regeneration, but upon the evidence and warrant of personal faith,

* See Owen, vol. 3, at p. 421 and 422: "we persuade men to take the Scripture as the *only rule*, and the holy promised Spirit of God, sought by ardent prayers and supplications IN THE USE OF ALL MEANS appointed by Christ for that end, *for their guide*." "If we shall *renounce the Scripture*, and the instruction given out of it unto the Church, by the Spirit of God, betaking ourselves unto *our own light*, we are sure it will teach us nothing, but either what they profess, or other things altogether as corrupt."

† "The Holy Ghost gives a spiritual sense of the power and reality of the things believed — strengthens against temptations to unbelief, and in other ways confirms our faith — but the ground of our faith is the truth of God manifesting itself in Scripture." See this subject fully argued in Owen's Wks., vol. 3, p. 299—310, &c., 312—334, how the Scriptures give evidences of their truth, p. 334—344. See also Halyburton's Wks., Nature of Faith, p. 531, 532 and 534, 535, 539, 543, 545. Lord Barrington's Wks., vol. 1, 169, 178, vol. 2, p. 225, 230. See also Rutherford's Trial and Triumph of Faith, Sermon. xiii, p. 136, Edinb. 1845. Winslow on the Spirit, p. 269. Dr. Jamieson's Reality of the Spirit's Work, p. 41, 42, 46, 111, 238, 257.

and hope, and joy, which by that capacity we actually perceive in the word and feel in our hearts.*

In the same manner it is by the Holy Spirit, we are enabled to continue and to grow in grace, to live, and walk and triumph by faith; but our abiding assurance of faith and hope, and joy, does not arise from the spiritual capacity, which may be really strong while sensible feeling may be torpid or asleep, but it is by the sustaining, comforting, and enlivening power of graces in actual exercise, that this assurance is maintained.

In the same way, it is by the Holy Ghost, imparting to us "His own holy wisdom in that spiritual-mindedness, which is the spirit of power and of a sound mind," that we are enabled to discern between good and evil, truth and error, duty and disobedience, what is really *good* for us, and what is pleasing to us, what we would approve and enjoy hereafter, and what would seem to be immediately desirable, and are thus enabled to acquiesce in the divine will, to bear and to do what God pleases, to deny ourselves, to be active and devoted, to enter upon or continue any course of life, and, generally, to be "thoroughly furnished for every good work," so as to please God in all our ways. But it is in the actual experience of these things, in actually finding ourselves so directed, qualified, fitted, strengthened, sustained, satisfied, convinced, and blessed—that we have an assurance that we are doing God's will in that way in which He would have us to "serve the Lord."

The Holy Spirit, therefore, does not *ordinarily* make Himself known and felt in producing within us the capacity to believe, to know, to undertake and to do what He wills, but he makes Himself known in, by, and through the exercise of this capacity when we actually understand, know, will, and do. What the Holy Ghost imparts is a new principle, capacity, or disposition called "*spiritual*," because it is a participation of His holy nature. This principle is unknown to us naturally, imparted to us while passively recipient, and unfelt by us until we find it in actual exercise within us. It is demonstrated by its conscious exercise and effects. These are entirely different from, and above, any natural exercise of our faculties of mind. They

* Edward's Wks., vol. 4, p. 343. Winslow on the Spirit, 275.

must, therefore, have originated without us, and have been imparted to us.* And as only like can produce like, such a spiritual capacity and such spiritual exercises must prove their author to be the Holy Spirit. This they do, although we are altogether ignorant and unconscious of the time, place, and manner in which this principle was imparted and is still sustained in the soul. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

The meaning of this passage—*which is the most direct and intentionally didactic on the subject of the Spirit's operations in the whole Bible*—is evidently this. "The Holy Spirit is imperceptible and incomprehensible in the manner of His operations, but is clearly and incontrovertibly discerned in the effects produced by Him. The time and manner of His working are hid from us and inappreciable to our faculties, but His power and divinity are demonstrated by the work he accomplishes.† "Christ

* See Edwards, vol. 4, p. 343, 105, 108, 109.

† The word wind *may* be interpreted variously, as it *has been*, by referring it to the Holy Spirit, to man's spirit, or more properly to the wind, but the design of the analogy—to point out the truth that as a cause which is hidden and unperceived, and beyond our cognizance, may be demonstrated by its effects, so may the Holy Spirit be known by His effects, while unknown in the actual production of them—this we say is most evident, and has been admitted, as far as we can find, by all reputable commentators and critics. Bishop Butler has elaborated the argument in a discourse on this text, preserved and recently published by Mr. Bartlett, in his *Memoirs of Bishop Butler*, London, 1839, p. 517, 520, 223, 524, 526. "Hominis renati per spiritum actiones conspiciuntur admirabiles, ORIGO IPSA LATET." Poole's Synopsis. See also Poole's Annotations, The Westminster Assembly's Annotations, Bloomfield's Critical Digest and Greek Testament, Kuinoel, Koppe, &c. &c. Lampe, in his invaluable work on John, sustains the same view unhesitatingly, Tom. 1, p. 579, 580. See on the Analogy 1, K. 19: 11, 12. Cant. 4: 16; Ezek. 37: 11; Acts 11: 21; Ps. 29: 5; Is. 35: 5; Ps. 89: 16. On the doctrine, see 1 Cor. 12: 11; Rom. 11: 34; Eccles. 11: 5; 1 Cor. 2: 11; 1 John 2: 29; 1 John 3: 7-10, 14, 24; 1 John 4: 13, and 5: 19, &c. &c. As quoted in Bartlett's *Memoir of Butler*, 520, and 525, Butler says: "The work of Regeneration carries great resemblance to what is observed of the wind: for, as there we gather its blowing from its sound, and other effects, though we do not see the blast, nor its rise and passage, nor are acquainted with the cause that sets it on; so may a child of God know he is such, by the effects and characters of that relation; though he do not see the Spirit that renews him, though the operations, by which he is renewed, be such as fall not under the observation of his outward senses, nor is perhaps his own mind conscious to many things by which that change is wrought in him." "If, as hath been said, it act

means," says Calvin, "that the movement and operation of the Spirit of God is not less perceptible in the renewal of man than the motion of the air, *but that the manner of it is concealed.*"*

"The Spirit itself, therefore, bears witness with our spirit,"† and gives assurance of duty, and obligation, not by any immediate suggestion or impression, accompanied by a kind of internal light or noise;—nor by any distinct enunciation, in any way, of what is truth or duty in the case; not, in short, by way of *assertion*, but by way of substantial evidences and proofs. The Apostle here, as in other places, (e. g. Rom. 8: 15, and Gal. 4: 6,) declares the fact that the ever-blessed Spirit, "THE COMFORTER," does actually witness with our spirits, and imparts to them the spirit of adoption, but *how* or in what manner the Spirit operates, this the Apostle does not attempt to define here or elsewhere. We are, however, taught in many passages that it is by the results—the fruit, earnest, seal, and impress of the Spirit, we are assured of His saving work in our souls, and of our saving interest in the Redeemer. (1 John 2: 3, and 3: 23, 24; 1 John 4: 12, 13, and 5: 1, 9, 10, 11, &c.)‡ The Holy Spirit produces in our hearts those divine

upon us by the outward ministry of the word, by the inward dictates and reasonings of our minds,—if the *effects* only of his working be visible, *but the manner of it imperceptible, &c.*"

The Dutch Annotations, ordered by the Synod of Dort, and "published by authority," 2 vols. Fol. London, 1657, take the same view, and on Rom 8: 16, have these words—"witnesseth together with our spirit, which observes the evidences of our being the children of God, which our spirit by the Spirit of God finds in itself." Of exactly similar import is the explanation given in the Westminster Assembly's Annotations and Diodati's in loco.

Bishop Heber, in his Bampton Lectures on the Holy Spirit, also shews, that while the Holy Spirit and His work are undistinguishable by our faculties, the reality of His operation may be known from his precept and the perceptible effect. See p. 330.

Bishop Bull is very strongly of the same opinion. See Harmon. Apost. Diss. Post. as quoted in Williams' Def. of Modern Calvinism, p. 31, 32; and also in Richard Watson's Works.

* See Commentary in loco.

† Rom. 8: 16. See on this passage, in relation to the views of Calvin and the Reformers. Scott's Continuation of Milner's Ch. Hist., vol. 3, p. 548, 549, and 543-550. See a most explicit passage against all direct, sensible communications, as fanatical, in the Formula Concordantiæ, in Hase's Libri Symbolici, vol. 2, p. 672.

The particle *συν* in this passage, "*ad nos laborantes refertur*," says Beza.

‡ See Ross on the Direct Witness, p. 24-30, and p. 30-36, where he gives

graces, qualities, desires, convictions, zealous endeavours, and holy actions, which are the genuine evidences of His working and demonstrations of His power. He shines upon His own work thus produced, invigorates and strengthens it, and by bringing these principles into lively exercise, He assures our hearts of His will and of *our* duty. The Holy Spirit testifies to our spirits, convinces, satisfies, and removes all occasion of anxiety or fear. There are, therefore, two witnesses concurring in their testimony—"our spirit," that is, our mind or conscience, and the Spirit of adoption, (πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ v. 14). Both concur to the production of assurance: The one operates in the way of accurate examination of the state of the soul, the claims of duty and obedience, and the disposition and fitness of the soul in reference to them, in the light of the precepts, promises, and directions of God's word. The other gives efficiency to these efforts, by enabling the soul to discern in itself a mind and temper correspondent to what the word requires, and by imparting an assurance of God's favor and approbation, and of our being in the path of duty. "How this is done we cannot fully understand, any more than we can understand how He produces any other effect in our mind."*

The foundation of this argument is laid in the ultimate truths already specified,—the infallible truth of what is made known by the proper exercise of whatever faculties and capacities God imparts, and the power of God to communicate spiritual impressions to the soul. "The spirit of man which is in him, knows the things of man," 1 Cor. 2, 11. The renewed heart or "reason," has received a spiritual principle by which it can intuitively discern and judge spiritual things. By this "Spirit" we understand God's will as revealed in the Word, feel what is there promised, and exercise faith, and love, and obedience to God's will. Now of all this we are consciously assured, and cannot be deceived. The veracity of God is pledged for its certainty,

proof from Doddridge, Scott, Henry, and other Commentators. Many others will be referred to in these notes. Indeed, with the few exceptions, we specify, the testimony of Commentators is altogether against this theory. Pearson on the Creed, and Dr. Barrow, both state the fact without attempting to explain the rationale.

* Hodge's Commentary in loco. See also Dr. Mason's Disc. on Assurance of Faith, in Works, vol. 1., p. 325; and Sermons, by Dr. Andrew Thomson, of Edinburgh. Appendix on Assurance of Faith.

and "our own hearts have confidence toward God." Such spiritual exercises are the fruits and evidences of the Spirit, and are given in that Word — of which He has given us assured certainty — as infallible way-marks of His presence and of His will concerning us. And as our "spirits" assure us of the exercises themselves — the thoughts, feelings, emotions, and purposes — so do these exercises demonstrate the purpose and will of the Spirit concerning us. He is "the Spirit of truth," and cannot lie, (John 14, 17, Tit. 1, 2), — "He searcheth all things, even the deep things of God," and can "guide into all truth" and unto all duty, (1 Cor., 2, 10) — He is Lord and God, and worthy of infinite and implicit credit. His testimony, therefore, while it is secret and inexpressible, (Rev. 2, 17, 1 Pet., 11, 8, 2 Cor., 12, 4), inconstant, variable, and various in its sensible manifestations, is nevertheless certain and infallible, silencing objections, scattering temptations and removing all scruples.*

On the other hand, our views and feelings as evidenced by our spiritual consciousness, and judged by our spiritual understanding,† are not carnal and selfish, but have supreme regard to God's glory; are firm and abiding in their character, (Eph. 1, 13); give us settled purposes and hopes; lead the soul upward in the "cry" of earnest prayer;‡ fill it with love to God, and with willing and earnest desires of new obedience; lead to the diligent use of appointed means; are not presumptuous and confident, but anxious, and often scrupulously doubtful; sustain us under difficulty and hindrances; give a comfortable and abiding hope, persuasion, or joy; and thus, as well as by many other modes and operations, bear a sincere and infallible testimony to our hearts, that they are not the delusions of Satan, or the imaginations and desires of our own spirit.§ From this double testimony we have double assurance — the best assurance of the best blessing — "a witness with a wit-

* See Forty-Six Sermons on Romans, ch. 8, by Thomas Horton, D. D., Lond. 1674, Fol., p. 246.

† John 1, 12, Gal. 4, 6 — 14, 1, John 5, 10, Eph. 1, 12, Acts 15, 8, 9, 1 John 4, 16, 2 Cor. 1, 12.

‡ Calvin seems to place the witness very much in this, and in boldness to call God Father. See his commentary in loco.

§ See a Commentary on the Romans, by Rev. Thomas Wilson, Lond., 1627, Fol. Edn. second, in loco.

ness indeed." "Our rejoicing is this—even the testimony of our conscience," (2 Cor. 1, 12). "He that believeth on the Son hath the witness in himself," (1 John 5, 10,) "his conscience bearing him witness in the Holy Ghost," (Rom. 9, 1).

Such is the doctrine, as we have seen, of the Westminster Divines, and such, unquestionably, is the doctrine of the Westminster standards, as adopted by our own Church. This will be found at length in the chapter "on the Assurance of Grace and Salvation," (Conf. of Faith, ch. xviii.) and more succinctly in the Larger Catechism, (Q. 80, 81,) where it is said that "such as" *already* "truly believe in Christ, and endeavor to walk in all good conscience before Him, may, without extraordinary revelation, by faith grounded upon the truth of God's promises, and by the Spirit enabling them to discern in themselves those graces to which the promises of life are made, and "then" bearing witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, be infallibly assured that they are in a state of grace." In the chapter in the Confession, it is taught that "hypocrites and other unregenerate men may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes and carnal presumptions, that they are in the favor of God," &c. The hope of the believer, however, "is not a bare conjectural and probable persuasion grounded upon a *fallible* hope," *such as suggestions and extraordinary impulses*, "but an infallible assurance," &c., (as above) "attained unto in the right use of ordinary means."

The Holy Spirit, therefore, in bearing His testimony, and in inspiring assurance, does not operate independently of Scripture by an inward light, as the Quakers teach.* Neither does He do so by an immediate suggestion of the truth,—accompanied by more or less excitement,—that any individual is saved, is pardoned, is adopted, or is called by God to any particular privilege or duty. This is the view entertained by the Methodist Church, and by some others out of that Church.

The testimony of the Spirit, says Mr. Watson,† "is a direct testimony to, or an inward impression on, the soul,

* See the subject in this view ably handled in Dr. Wardlaw's Letters to the Society of Friends. Glasgow, 1836.

† See his Institutes in Wks., vol. ii, p. 255, Eng. Ed.

whereby the Spirit of God witnesses to my Spirit, that I am a child of God; that Christ hath loved me, and given himself for me; that I, *even I*, am reconciled to God."

"That a *supernatural conviction of duty*," says the writer in this Review,* wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost, is an essential element in the evidence of a true vocation to the ministry, seems to us to be the clear and authoritative doctrine of the Scriptures."

"The certain knowledge of God," says Barclay, "can be obtained by no other way than the inward, immediate manifestation and revelation of God's Spirit, shining in and upon the heart, enlightening and opening the understanding." And this manifestation he teaches to be independent of the Word, and to convey truths new and otherwise unknown.†

Now that the Spirit cannot impart such a witness or call, except in the way of actual inspiration, accompanied of course with miraculous attestation,—and that in all ordinary cases He does not in fact do so, we firmly believe.

1. Scripture no where warrants the opinion that He does.

2. Scripture, on the contrary, leads us, as we have seen, to an opposite conclusion. And if, therefore, it is not a **DIVINELY ATTESTED FACT**, that the Spirit does so operate, no graces, or convictions, or opinions, can make it a fact.‡

3. Such a witness, or call, carries with it no impress or evidence by which it can be traced to the Holy Spirit. Such suggestions, and such excited emotions, *might* arise, and often *do* arise from the operation of the mind itself, when the imaginative faculty has been long or deeply excited by sympathy, anxiety, or hope. Or they *might* be awakened by the delusions of Satan. They imply, *necessarily*, no divine impressions. They exert no holy, divine, or supernatural influence. They are not grounded upon any word or promise of God. They are, therefore, a most unwarrantable ground of evidence, and can lead to no true and abiding comfort.§

* See Southern Pres. Review, No. 3, vol. 1, p. 143, 144.

† See Apology for the Quakers, p. 19, 20, and Wardlaw, p. 43, 44.

‡ See Ross on the Direct Witness, p. 39.

§ See Edwards' Works, vol. 4, on the Affections, p. 131, 132, and Stoddard as there quoted.

Such suggestions are not *evidence* at all—they neither prove their own origin nor the fact they assert. They may, or may not, accompany saving and holy influences, but in themselves, they can only delude the mind with a false and groundless hope. It is only when the Holy Spirit gives such evidence as *proves* the truth of what is believed, that He is said to witness with our Spirits.* Then *alone* He imparts an evidence, or seal, or earnest—such as God alone *could* impress, and by which therefore we cannot be deluded.†

4. Such suggestions are in contradiction to the facts already established, that the testimony of the Spirit regarding truth, duty, and privilege, is limited to the word, and that it is rational and given in, through and by, our faculties.‡ The former is necessary to guard against endless error and delusions, and the latter that we may be led by “the cords of a man,” and have the witness within ourselves. Such suggestions, however, supersede and set aside the Scriptures, open up the way for every delusion,§ and are incapable of any rational evidence.

It cannot be said that such suggestions are intuitively believed, by the reason, and that they are, as they then would be, infallible, for they relate to what is supernatural and beyond the range of our natural reason; nay, they relate to things of which it is positively declared that “the natural heart receiveth them not, neither can it know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” Such suggestions cannot, therefore, be based upon the veracity of God, as evidenced in our constitution, and they are not warranted as we have seen by that veracity, as it is made known in His word. The understanding of spiritual and heavenly things, implies a spiritual capacity,—and the witness of the Holy Ghost, implies the existence of that “*Spirit*” within us, to discern, and of the work within us, which is to be discerned.

Conscience|| cannot attest the divine author of such sug-

* See Edwards' do., p. 133, and Heb. 2: 4; Acts 14: 3; John 5: 36; John 10: 25; 1 John 5: 8.

† 2 Cor. 1: 22; Eph. 1: 13; Rev. 2: 17, and 7: 3; and Edwards do., p. 133, 134, 136, 137. See also p. 343, and 2 Cor. 5: 5, with the context in Rom. 8: 16, as alluding to support under great trials.

‡ See Halyburton's Works. Nature of Faith, p. 525, 523.

§ See South. Presb. Review, do., p. 145, 146, 135.

|| See Southern Presb. Review, do., p. 135, 139, 146, 153.

gestions, because its office is the enforcement of truth or duty, and not their discovery, and because, as a natural power, it can only act naturally, and must have a rule by which to decide, and marks by which to determine. The convictions of conscience presuppose knowledge of the truth or object, of whose truth or nature it can otherwise tell us nothing.

Neither can consciousness* give such an attestation, since it can neither witness to what is past or future, nor to the *nature* of what is present. Consciousness only testifies to existing impressions or states of thought and feeling. It testifies, by intuitive belief, to what is in the mind itself, to states of mind, but not to objects external to it. The feeling, and the object which causes it, are entirely different and distinct. Mere feelings might be supposed to arise spontaneously, were it not for another intuitive and primary law by which we refer them to *some* object as their source. But whether this object is immediate or remote, bodily or spiritual, real or imaginary, we come to know in the exercise of other intuitive laws of mind in which the mind is active and not passive. In this way we recognize objects and determine their nature.†

A voice or suggestion can only make an impression on the soul. It cannot, however, lead either through consciousness or conscience, to the knowledge of its source or of the nature of that source. It remains, therefore, that the understanding should take up the impression or suggestion and bring it "to the law and to the testimony," knowing that if not warranted by this, "there is no truth in them."‡ But the understanding cannot act until the mind has been already supernaturally renewed, and gifted with power to discern spiritual things. It is only when so renewed and guided by the teaching of the Holy Ghost, the mind can apply the tests of the word and the tests of its own experience, and thereby know what is truth and duty. For, supposing the mind to exist in a state of blank spiritual unsusceptibility, and supposing truth to be then communicated to it in words, what effect could these words produce in such a mind?§

* See South. Pres. Review, p. 146. † See Mill's Logic, p. 34, 35.

‡ The Reviewer admits that the word gives three sources of proof, by which such suggestions are to be tested. See S. P. Review, p. 146-152.

§ See Morell's Lectures on the Phil. Tend. of the Age, p. 135-137.

This is the only rational way of receiving the Spirit's testimony, and that testimony or witness is, as we have seen, given in accordance with our rational powers. It is not then the *working* of the Spirit of which we are conscious, but the *result* of that work.* "We do not see, or hear, or feel the Holy Spirit working within us, but we are sensible of what *is wrought* within us.† There is neither a light, nor a voice, nor a felt stirring within, but there are convictions, and feelings, and desires, and the sensible graces which in Scripture are attributed to Him. The part which our own Spirit performs is, that with the eye of consciousness we read what is in ourselves—with the spiritual mind we read and clearly understand what is in the word, and feel its application to ourselves—by this also we discern the lineaments of truth or grace, or qualification for duty impressed by the Spirit upon our hearts. By the Holy Ghost also we are sustained in making a firm and confident application to ourselves, and a firm and confident conclusion respecting ourselves. And thus we are led by a most rational process and a most rational demonstration to a most rational conclusion,‡ and "that not by a tardy or elaborate argument, but with an evidence and a directness as quick and powerful as intuition." "Thus there is no whisper by the Spirit distinct from the testimony of the word. Thus there is no irradiation, but that whereby the mind is enabled to look reflexly and with rational discernment upon itself. And hence, there is no conclusion, but what comes immediately and irresistibly out of the premises which are clear to me, while they lie hid in deepest obscurity from other men. And all this you will observe with the rapidity of thought—by a flight of steps so few, as to be got over in an instant of time—by a train of considerations strictly

* See Dr. Chalmer's Lecture on Romans, upon ch. 8: 2. 16, in Works, vol. 24, p. 63. Bates' Works, vol. 4, p. 318.

† See Dr. Chalmers' do., where he illustrates from the analogy of the wind, of vegetation, and from the parable of the seed springing up we know not how, &c., p. 64, and from which we quote.

‡ Halyburton's Works, p. 523. "I observe that this light or objective evidence whereon faith is bottomed, has no affinity with, but is at the furthest remove from enthusiastic impulse or imaginations.

1. This is not a persuasion without reason. Here is the strongest reason, and the assent hereon passed leans upon the most pregnant evidence.

2. It carries no contradiction to our faculties, but influences them each in a way suitable to its nature and condition.

logical, while the mind that enjoys and is imprest with all this light is not sensible of any logic,—and yet withal by the Spirit of God.”*

5. Such suggestions are transient and variable, and are incapable, therefore, of giving abiding comfort or habitual guidance, since, instead of imparting assurance, they foster doubt and pave the way either for great presumption or great distress, according to the natural habit and temper of the mind. “The word that I have spoken,” says Christ, “the same shall judge you in the last day.”† John 12: 48. If, then, “we would judge ourselves” by this sure and all-sufficient testimony, “we should not be judged,” and “we should not be condemned with the world.” Our testimony and our judgment would be firm and abiding, and not driven about by every wind of doctrine, or made subservient to the state and condition of our feelings. But if sensible evidence of the direct and present influence of the Spirit is required, as a ground of comfortable assurance and hope, then, even when such feelings *are* present, we cannot possibly decide whence they come or whither they go; and when the saving fruits of the Spirit are beclouded, the heart is left without any anchor, and is overwhelmed with every fearful doubt.‡

6. The witness of Spirit can not be sensible, otherwise it would be felt in the case of regenerated infants, children and youth. But so far from this being the case, many of the most devoted and eminent Christians can give no account of the time or manner of their conversion or other spiritual changes.§ The same argument will apply to God the Father and the Son, to Angels and to Satan, who must all on such principles evidence their peculiar operation by peculiar impressions.||

3. Yea more, none of our faculties in their due use do contradict, or at least, disprove it. Whereas enthusiastic impressions are irrational.

4. This is not a persuasion, nor a ground for it without, or contrary to the word, but it is in evidence of the word itself, that by it we are directed to attend to, and improve.

5. Yea, it is what our other faculties in their due use will give a consequential confirmation to, as we have heard.”

* Dr. Chalmers' Lectures on Romans, p. 68, 69. See also Mills' Logic, p. 4, 5. Halyburton's Works, p. 523, 524.

† Brooks on Assurance, p. 98, 111, 112.

‡ See Ross on the Direct Witness, p. 48, &c.

§ Buchanan on the Spirit, p. 223; and Owen, vol. 2, p. 283, 482, 492.

|| See Halyburton's Memoirs, p. 157.

7. Such suggestions conflict with other tests of the Spirit's witness laid down in the written word. The evidences of a divine call to saving faith, or to any particular duty, such as the ministry, is made subject in the word of God—1st, to the evidence of its fruits, and 2d, to the judgment of those who are authorised to decide upon character and fitness. Now, can we believe that God would embody the infallible evidence of His call in a state of mind and feeling of which the recipient can give no account to others, nor any *rational* account whatever—an evidence which *might* be produced by the natural powers of the mind, or by Satanic influence—and to which *might* be opposed the authorised determination both of God's people, of God's officers, and of God's rule of judgment by outward fruits.*

8. Such suggestions are, to say the least, impracticable and useless. It is admitted on all hands, that they are and may be delusive; and that they are incapable of proof to others. They are, therefore, useless to God, who can discern the heart;—to their possessor, because he cannot certify their origin to himself or others;—and to others, because to them they are altogether inappreciable.*

9. Such operations of the Spirit must be either uniform or false. They must be uniform, because the Holy Spirit is the source of "that wisdom from above," by which we are directed in the choice, pursuit, and successful discharge of *every* calling in life—of every duty, and in every emergency. What is necessary in one case, is proportionately necessary in all, and a witness, therefore, which is only applicable in one case, cannot be divine, but must be illusory.†

10. Such evidence of the guiding influence and direction of the Spirit is contrary to the great mass of holy witnesses in every age of the Church, and is not, therefore, likely to be correct.

Mr. Watson's authorities‡ in support of his views, utterly

* See Ross on the Direct Witness, p. 40.

† The direct testimony of the Spirit is claimed by Mr. Wesley, the Quakers, and others, as peculiar to them. This, however, would prove that the doctrine cannot be that laid down in the Bible, since it would limit the testimony of the Spirit to a small portion of those who give positive evidence of His saving, sanctifying, and comforting influences. See Ross on the Direct Witness, p. 36, 44.

‡ See given in his Institutes Wks, xi. vol., p. 269, &c., and in his Life of Wesley, Wks. vol. 5, p. 178, &c.

fail. They all of them express their belief in the **FACT** of the witness and influence of the Holy Spirit, but they do not profess to believe in the self-evidencing manifestations of the Holy Spirit, nor in the direct and immediate suggestion of any fact or truth concerning our spiritual condition—nor in any other of his peculiar views.* With all our industry in making a somewhat extended research, we cannot find any writer beyond the Quaker or Methodist denomination, either patristic, Reformer, Puritan, Westminster Assembly, either European, English or Scottish, who adopt these views. That our assurance is, in all cases of a saving nature, produced by the direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, is undoubtedly the received opinion of all Orthodox Divines. A few are willing to admit, that when it pleases Him, the Holy Spirit may and does shed abroad in the soul, an illuminating influence, giving very perceptible and unusual experience,† but this they believe is done not by way of suggestion, independent of the reading or hearing of the word, and independent of our graces, convictions and feelings, but on the contrary, in, by, and through these. The established doctrine of divines we believe to be, that all such assurance is produced by the Holy Spirit shining upon His own word, His own ordinances, and His own work in the soul, and thus giving that “demonstration of the Spirit,” which is more conclusive and certain than even mathematical reasoning.‡

* By interpreting them in his own way, Mr. Barclay makes the same writers and others also teach *his* peculiar views. See Apology, p. 23, and Wardlaw, p. 45.

† These are Owen, Halyburton, Horton, Haldane, and in one passage, Mr. Brooks. The *real* and full sentiments of these authors, however, we have had and will have, occasion fully to present.

‡ These authorities have been mostly given in the previous references upon the various topics. Some others are here added. Short, in his Bampton Lectures, enumerates among “the enthusiastic pretensions,” condemned by the whole body of the Church, “special impulses, and extraordinary illuminations of the Spirit, for the personal assurance of salvation and comfort of the Christian,” p. 166, 165, &c. He quotes in proof of the position that the Church of England has ever denied “the necessity of a sensible illumination or impulse, whether instantaneous or otherwise, for assurance of salvation,” p. 173. A number of authors and a great number of selections from the Homilies, see on p. 166, 171, and p. 231–237. See on the doctrines of the Church generally, from the beginning, p. 153–171, and on the true principles as laid down by that Church, p. 171–175. The object of the work is to illustrate the witness of the Spirit, in the various manifestations of Christian piety. On the doctrine of the Church of England, see also

11. Such evidence is contradicted by facts, which, upon the supposition of its truth, are perfectly astounding and inexplicable.

1. It is found to be in readiness *just in proportion* to the demand made for it as a prerequisite to any office or duty in any Christian community.

2. It is found to be most confident where the judgment of others is most contradictory to it.

3. It is found associated with doctrines the most opposite and contradictory in different portions of the same body, (e. g. the Quakers,) and in different bodies.

4. It is found sustaining the same individuals at different times, in the inculcation and assertion of doctrines the most palpably contradictory to each other, and to the word of God.

5. It is boldly claimed by many, who, nevertheless, have proved utterly incompetent and unworthy. Swedenborg alleged that he was constantly under this immediate guidance of the Spirit.

12. If the Holy Spirit testifies to a fact not evidenced and propounded in the Scriptures, then whatever He thus testifies, must be as infallibly true as the Word of God itself. But it is affirmed that the Spirit testifies to the teaching of Romanists, Prelatists, Quakers, Irvingites, and innumerable sects, who all teach what is contrary to the Bible and to each other. The Spirit, therefore, only testifies to what He has made known in the Word.

a Summary of Faith and Practice, by Dr. Burrow, vol. 2, p. 4, 12, 37, 38, 40, 42, 79, 80, 93, 88. See Melancthon and Luther, as quoted in Scott's Continuation of Milner's History of the Church, vol. 1, p. 45, 46, and his own views also, and in vol. 3, p. 543-550. See quotations from the Fathers, and views of many Divines in the Synod of Trent, in *ibid*, vol. 2, p. 275, 276, 283. See the articles of the Synod of Berne, A. D. 1532, quoted in *do*. vol. 3. p. 249, and Calvin's views and others fully, at p. 543-550. Flavel's Wks., vol. 6, p. 402, 403. Bayne on the Ephesians, Lond., 1643, Fol. p. 142. Wks. of Rev. William Bridge, vol. 5, p. 167. Howe's Wks., vol. 1, p. 450. Williams' Defence of Modern Calvinism, p. 31, 32, 35. Bellamy's Wks., vol. 2, p. 503. Haldane on the Atonement, Ed. 2nd, p. 111, 157, Serle's *Horæ Solitariae*, vol. 2nd. Hurrioon's Wks., vol. 3, p. 312. Doddrige's Lectures, 4to p. 452. Waterland's Wks., vol. 10, p. 502. Bates' Wks., vol. p. 318. Winslow on the Holy Spirit, p. 239-243, 265, 300, 269-275. Bellamy's Wks., vol. 1, p. 455, vol. 2, p. 291-296, to which the reader is particularly referred. Dickinson's Marks of Saving Faith, see given in Tracts of the American Tract Society. Also the importance of distinguishing True and False Conversions, by Rev. Seth Williston, given in Tract No. 165, of *do*.

13. If the Spirit, by immediate and supernatural suggestion, imparts the knowledge of one fact or truth, He can impart the knowledge of all. And if the importance of the subject or duty makes this *necessary* in one case, then it is necessary in all, since all are of unspeakable importance and involve everlasting consequences, (Math. 5, 18, 19). Thus would the Scriptures be set aside as unnecessary, since, if texts may be pleaded for such suggestions, as it regards some truth or duty, they may be pleaded also for "all truth" and duty.

14. If the testimony of the Spirit given by supernatural and direct suggestion conveys the truth of any proposition or fact, then this truth or fact was either already in the Scriptures, or in existence, or else such a testimony is incredible, since God never required the belief of a proposition or fact which was not already true, nor does the Spirit ever testify to a fact which has not been already established. He first works, and then testifies to his own work.*

15. If it is said that this testimony of the Spirit is only by way of impulse or feeling, or shining, or voice, and not by the statement of any truth or fact—then we reply as before, that these constitute no evidence at all, and witness nothing.

Finally we remark, that such a testimony of the Spirit cannot be admitted, because its advocates are led to adopt positions, which we believe to be contrary to Scripture, and to fact, and to each other.

Mr. Watson, who has very ably and extensively written upon the subject, says we cannot love God, until we are assured by this witness of His Spirit, that He loves and is reconciled to us, since He alone knows the mind of God, and He alone can tell us that God loves us.† But we have seen that until we actually possess and exercise a spiritual mind, we cannot discern spiritual things, and cannot, therefore, either know or love God spiritually. He thus "puts us," to use his own words, "upon the impossible task,"‡ of knowing God before we are savingly enabled to do so, which is absurd.

To know that it is the Spirit of God who speaks to us,

* See Dr. Candlish on the Atonement, p. 153, 154, and Bellamy there quoted.

† Works, vol. 2, p. 214, 215, and vol. 2, p. 262, 263; vol. 4, p. 300, 301.

‡ Do. do.

on any occasion and in any manner, we must have some criterion by which to judge of His speaking, and so on ad infinitum. But when a spiritual capacity has been imparted, and spiritual things are understood and felt, and the Holy Spirit gives clearness to the outward evidence and power to the inward principle, then is the heart able to stand fast and rejoice in hope, and while the manner in which these gifts are bestowed is unknown, this spiritual mind enables us to love God in Christ, from whom they all proceeded.

The argument that "love to God directly implies a knowledge of His love to us,"* is therefore in one sense true, and in another untrue. Objectively or doctrinally, as it regards certain evidence of God "being in Christ reconciling sinners unto Himself, and not imputing their trespasses unto them," it is true. But it is not true, that to love God we must have a personal, direct attestation made by the Holy Ghost to our minds, that God has pardoned and adopted us. This is not faith, but sight and sense;—it makes this testimony and its fruit precede justification,† whereas the Apostle makes this "peace with God" to follow justification; (Rom. 5 : 1,) and to witness to this peace, therefore, before justification, would be to testify to what is not the fact;—it makes faith our work in consequence of this witness, whereas it "is the gift of God," and the first fruit of the Spirit;—it implies that there cannot be faith where there is not already assurance;‡ and yet, Mr. Watson says, "the faith that *brings* us into this state" of "comfortable assurance," must maintain us in it;§ thus, in one place making faith *precede* justification;|| and in another making assurance, which is an exercise of faith, precede faith.** The error, we conceive, lies in denying to faith the *instrumental* connexion with salvation, attributed to it in the word of God,†† and in making special love the ground of faith,‡‡ instead of God's warrant in the Gospel, made plain to us by

* Works, vol. 4, p. 300.

† See vol. 4, p. 293, where this is taught.

‡ See vol. 4, p. 301.

§ Do., p. 303, and vol. 2, p. 248, and vol. 6, p. 259, 264.

|| Vol. 11, 255.

** Do., p. 249; vol. 4, p. 293; vol. 11, p. 255.

†† Vol. 11, p. 262-264.

‡‡ Do., p. 267.

the regenerating influence of the Holy Ghost, "whose work is one," and who in enabling us to exercise faith, thereby produces at the same time saving faith, hope and joy.*

We agree with Mr. Watson, in believing that the Holy Ghost not only witnesses with, or in our spirit, but to our spirit;† but when he makes the Holy Spirit give "witness to the great fact that our sins are forgiven,"‡ &c., he makes *necessary* to saving knowledge what he admits the text on which he founds his doctrine may not require,§ which Scripture never asserts, and which we have shewn can never be proved to ourselves or to others. In fact, Mr. Watson admits that the *manner* in which this truth is communicated by the Holy Spirit, cannot be described, and is different in different individuals;|| — that it is open to the greatest delusions; — that it requires the fruits of the Spirit to test this test and make sure this assurance;** — that it is *necessary*, and that *always*,†† and yet that it conveys no certain assurance of final salvation,"‡‡ or of any permanent security; — it is according to him a direct witness of *adoption and pardon*, and is yet only "*a comfortable persuasion or conviction*," and "does not necessarily imply the absence of all doubt."§§

Such are some of the difficulties in which this theory involves its most skilful advocates. It leads ultimately to the endless circle — that we know that our feelings and convictions are saving, because of the direct witness of the Spirit assuring us that we are saved; and we know that this assurance is the testimony of the Spirit, and not of our own minds or of Satan, because of the fruits to which it leads.¶¶ And this theory, at the same time, substitutes an inward suggestion and experience of our minds for the only divine warrant given for our faith in the word and testimony of God.***

On both sides of this question, therefore, of the witness of

* See this admitted in do., vol. 11, p. 267.

† Works, vol. 292, and vol. 11, p. 261, 262, 255, 257.

‡ Do. do., 293, and vol. 11, 262, 263.

§ Works, vol. 11, p. 260.

|| Works, vol. 4, p. 301; vol. 11, p. 257.

** Do., vol. 4, p. 295, 305.

†† He admits also that this witness must be in accordance with the various modes in which it is represented in Scripture.

‡‡ Works, vol. 4, p. 303, and vol. 5, p. 175.

§§ Do., vol. 11, p. 254.

¶¶ See Ross on the Direct Witness, p. 46-52. *** See do., p. 52-61.

the Spirit, there are dangerous errors to be avoided — errors of excess — and errors of defect : — the error of the Sadducees who denied the doctrine and necessity of the Holy Spirit's influence, in order that we may in any measure and as it regards any duty — will and do what is holy and pure ;* — the error of the Pelagians who reduce the proffered help of the Holy Spirit to mere natural capacity, or the knowledge imparted by revelation ; — and the error of the Semi-Pelagians,† who attribute to man's ability the preparation of the heart, and who teach that the grace of willing and acting is given in consequence of this preparation.‡ So much for the errors of defect. But on the other hand, there are errors of excess which are as carefully to be avoided : — the errors of all, who, like Montanus, claim the special guidance and direction of the Spirit, to complete and perfect the doctrine and order of the church ;§ — the error of all, who like various sects at different periods of the church, claimed for themselves the illapses and illuminations of the Holy Spirit for guidance, instruction and ability to preach ; — the erroneous assumption also of the Romish church, in claiming the exclusive possession of the Holy Spirit for authenticating and interpreting inspired writings, and for imparting all heavenly grace ; — and, finally, the error of erecting as a standard of experience and a test of sincerity, a sensible manifestation of the personal and direct operation of the Holy Spirit, as is unwarranted and unrequired by the word of God. While such a standard may accord with the remarkable experience of a few, it is adapted to throw doubts, darkness and difficulties, if not absolute despair, in the way of the truly conscientious and sincere, while it offers no obstruction to the self-confident, hypocritical, or presumptuous, and which, therefore, can do only harm, and that to God's dear and most tender-hearted and spiritually minded children.

But to our doctrine on this subject of the witness of the Spirit, there is one objection not yet noticed, and which has been deemed of insurmountable difficulty. It is urged strongly by Mr. Watson, and by the Reviewer, and is this : If the witness of the Spirit is to be gathered from the conformity of our experience, and character, and motives, to those de-

* See Short's Bampton Lectures, p. 194, 137, 145, 139.

† Do. do., p. 141, 150, 141, 144, 148, &c.

‡ Do. do., p. 142. § Do.

scribed in the Scriptures as the work and operation of the Spirit, then the witness is in fact not that of the Spirit at all, but is only the witness of our own spirit.*

Now to this objection we have several replies.

1st. This objection does not give us credit for believing and teaching as truly as the objectors can, the direct and personal operation of the Spirit in the production of every holy principle, capacity, feeling, desire and purpose, and also in upholding, strengthening, and confirming them. What we deny, is not the direct and personal operation of the Spirit, but the *sensible and self-evidencing nature* of this process as a necessarily required test and evidence of the reality of what is thus produced. We believe in the necessity and fact of the Spirit's operation — we deny the capacity to discern the time and manner of His operation.

2dly. The term "*witness*," is itself metaphorical, and can only be explained, therefore, by what is taught elsewhere of the nature and incomprehensibleness of the divine operations.

3dly. The analogy of language and the actual usage of Scripture sustain the interpretation, that by the term "*witness of the Spirit*," is to be understood, the effect produced by the Spirit—the testimony given by Him in those graces of which he is the only possible author,—and this view is sustained as admissible by the construction and the context of that passage in which the words are used, (Rom. 8, 16,)† The objection, therefore, is founded upon a view of this passage, which is not necessary—nor sustained by the general doctrine of Scripture.

4thly. The testimony of our spirits to any thing within the range of our capacity, is founded on the veracity of God, and is therefore infallible, and hence the testimony of that "*Spirit*," which is "the gift of God," *imparted* for the very purpose of spiritual discernment, must be infallible, also,

5thly. This inward infallible testimony is rendered more assured by the infallible evidence and test of the outward word, made plain and applicable to us by the infallible teaching of the Holy Spirit. Nor is this reasoning in a circle. We are *conscious* and therefore certain of a spirit-

* See Watson's Wks., vol. 4, p. 295, 300, and vol. 11, 255, 256, 257.

† See Stuart's Commentary in Edward's Works, vol. 4.

ual capacity. The infallibility of this consciousness we assume, though "we cannot tell whence it cometh." And in the exercise of this capacity we discern the truth in the word and its application to us, and the actual existence of that grace which is there ascribed to the Holy Spirit, wrought *in* our hearts, and are therefore intuitively led to attribute that grace—whether it comforts, or directs to duty—to the Holy Ghost.

6thly. Scripture and reason both warrant us in saying, that those spiritual views, feelings, desires, and principles which could not be produced by our natural powers, and could only be imparted by the Holy Ghost, are a direct and literal witness given by Him to our "Spirits"—speaking more loudly and incontrovertibly than if we actually heard a voice from the upper sanctuary. Nay, so assuredly are these spiritual views, the witness of the Spirit, that in Scripture they are actually denominated the Spirit,* (John, 3: 6, Rom. 8: 5, 1 Cor. 2: 14, and 15: 49, 2 Cor. 5: 17, Gal. 4: 19, &c.)

In the language of Scripture and reason, therefore, these fruits of the Spirit are the Spirit Himself, witnessing with our spirits, and demonstrating that "He who hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God." "But how and in what manner He works these effects we know not any more than how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child. Therefore it is called a hidden life, (Col. 3: 3,) being in this respect unknown even to spiritual men, though they are themselves the subjects of it."†

* See Howe's Wks., vol. 2, p. 60, 61, and vol. 5, p. 8, 9, 12, who gives several arguments in proof. Also the Marrow of Modern Divinity, p. 295, 296, 297.

The Spirit witnesses to his operations already existing, and not by or in the operations, whether they are faith or hope, or a conviction of duty. See Shepard's Sound Believer, p. 231-237. Horton's Discourses on Romans, ch. viii, p. 245, 247. See also John, 14, 23, 21. Before He seals He writes. He renovates before He consoles, and qualifies before He calls. See also Brooks on Assurance, p. 214, 215, 216.

† Burkett on the N. Test., on John 3. 8, Lond. Fol. 16th edition, p. 235. See him also on Rom. 8, 16, p. 428. The Spirit witnesses, he says, "by laying down marks of trial in the Scriptures, by working these graces in us, and by helping us to discover this work in our souls... which testify by reflecting upon them," &c.; "all this He does not by way of impulse, &c., but in the way of argumentation." Haldane on Rom. 8, 16, strongly insists that the witness of the Spirit is distinct from this—that it is immediate, and that it is felt—but *how* it is felt, he admits, cannot be explained. And what is thus witnessed, he makes to be "the revelation of a truth consonant to the Word of God, and made to the believer in that blessed book."

III. Having thus cleared our way and obviated difficulties, we are now prepared, to lay down what we consider to be the nature and evidence of a call to the ministry. But the limits of this Review, and the length to which our remarks have already reached, compel us to reserve what we have to say on this subject for a future number.

ARTICLE VII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *The Work claiming to be The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, including the Canons. Whiston's Version, revised from the Greek; with a Prize Essay, at the University of Bonn, upon their Origin and Contents. Translated from the German, by IRAH CHASE, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1848. pp. 496. 8vo.*

In the book whose title is thus given, we have the so-called Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles, works which, as to the claim of an Apostolic origin which they set up, can be regarded only as stupendous impostures, but which still have exerted a powerful influence on the world. They are unquestionably of high antiquity—were written certainly before the fifth century—and as they contain regulations and precepts, covering the whole relations of the clergy to each other, and reveal the ecclesiastical usages which were in existence, or were sought to be introduced at the period when those books were written, they are of great interest in an archæological point of view. The Constitutions claim indeed to have proceeded directly from the Apostles, and to have been issued either by the whole College of the Apostles, or in some cases by an individual Apostle, prescribing a Constitution for the government of the Bishops, Presbyters and Dea-

cons. Though the Romanists have made use of these books to build up their hierarchy, and popes in past centuries have appealed to them, yet so glaring is the imposture, they have been perhaps almost as much impugned by divines of the Romish faith, in more recent days, as by the Protestants themselves. Two of their warmest defenders have been found among the Protestants. Whiston supposes them to have been delivered, as to their ecclesiastical laws, precepts and decisions, by our Saviour personally, during the forty days which he spent with the Apostles, between his resurrection and ascension. This distinguished man, successor to Sir Isaac Newton in the Mathematical Chair at Cambridge, was doubtless influenced by the Arian aspect of some portions of these Constitutions, he having adopted Arian views, for which he was compelled to resign his office. Bishop Pearson thinks that they were collected out of the teachings of the Apostles and Apostolic fathers, and strangely supposes that he sees in them the character of the Apostolic age. Grabe also, while he admits that the Apostles neither wrote nor dictated the Constitutions which are ascribed to them, yet thinks that this book was collected out of traditions which the several churches received from the Apostles, and that the collection was made towards the end of the first century, or at the beginning of the second. In these suppositions, Prof. Krabbe, of the University of Keil, whose Essay on the Constitutions is appended in the edition before us, does not concur. He shows that these Constitutions, though interpolated by a later hand, were the work of one individual, whose mistaken aim was to advance the interest of the church, by seeking to promote its visible unity, and by enhancing the prerogatives of the clergy, in the eyes of each other, and of the whole church. They came into existence, he supposes, "not long after Cyprian, towards the end of the third century, in some Oriental Church; and they proceeded from an author who had adopted the principles and ideas of Cyprian, and wished to transmit them in the Oriental Churches." There were additions made to them in the fourth century, and interpolations by an Arian or Semi-Arian hand. The *Canons* circulated in the name of the Apostles, before the Reformation under Luther, had great authority, constituted a

part of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, and were used by the Popes in confirmation of their own usurpations. Their authority was shaken, by the feeling of distrust which then gathered over all documentary evidences advanced by the Popes in defence of their claims, till finally it was entirely destroyed. These Canons, Prof. Krabbe, in his dissertation, shows, were called *Apostolical* originally, not because emanating from the Apostles, but because of the doctrine inculcated in them, or because formed in churches called *Apostolical*. "They arose," he says, "one after another in single churches of the first centuries, until, instead of being dispersed here and there, they were brought into one collection." He supposed these separate canons may have arisen in the second and third centuries.

The collection of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is ascribed to Clement of Rome, a companion of the Apostles. But the *Clementines* embrace an entire circle of spurious writings, and these may have been placed in the category of the pseudo-Clementine writings, after the imposture was discovered.

The well known frauds of the Christians of the second, third, and fourth centuries, which were ventured upon with the object of promoting a good cause, can never be sufficiently regretted or condemned. The writing of books to promote what was believed to be man's best good, and God's highest glory, and then ascribing them to some revered and perhaps inspired author, for the purpose of gaining greater authority for the sentiments inculcated, was a short-sighted policy, which recoiled with unspeakable disaster upon the church. It accorded well with the doctrine of Plato, mentioned by Prof. Chase, in his preface to this volume, who says that "it belongs to the governors of the city to make a lie, with reference either to enemies or to citizens, for the good of the city; but all the rest must abstain from what is false," and with the doctrine still professed, that it is lawful to deceive a public enemy, and that every thing is right in war. It followed from such maxims, that the greater the truth and the more valuable and needful for man, the more might fraud be used in promoting it. The doctrine itself shows a degenerated state of the church. Paul shrunk back with inexpressible loathing from the princi-

ple, "Let us do evil that good may come." But at this period of time, in which the Constitutions were published to the world, there was a flood of false Gospels, and other spurious writings poured forth. The Apostolic Constitutions are still appealed to as authority in the Oriental Church.

Prof. Chase has performed an acceptable service in making this book accessible to American scholars. We can see in these Constitutions, as we can in all prelatical forms of church government, that Presbyterianism, and not Independency, was the original Apostolical government, from which, in the process of departure from the truth of Scripture, prelacy has sprung.

2. *Francisci Turretini Opera.* 4 vols. 8vo. ROBERT CARTER.
New York: New Edition. 1848.

Mr. Carter deserves the gratitude, and will certainly receive the thanks of American divines, for bringing out from their deep concealment these theological treasures. The first three of the above volumes contain the great work of the elder Turretine, his "*Institutio Theologiæ Elencticæ*," which has been so long recognized a standard in Systematic Theology, and, to our fathers at least, was so familiar as a Manual in the study of Divinity, that to praise it would be as idle as to eulogize the sun. The fourth volume embraces various "disputations," by the same author upon subjects of the gravest import. The titles of some of these we give: "*de Secessione ab Ecclesia Romana*;" "*de Satisfactione Christi*;" "*de Concordia Pauli et Jacobi in Articulo Justificationis*;" "*de bonorum Operum necessitate*;" "*de tribus testibus Cœlestibus*;" "*de Spiritu, Aqua, et Sanguine in terra testantibus*;" "*de baptismo nubis et maris*," etc.

It does a scholar's heart good, in this age of paraphrases and translations, to see an original work of the 17th century reproduced in its native Latin dress. And if it be a happy omen for the theology of our times, that a demand is created for these

elaborate writings, does it not augur equally well for the rising scholarship of the country, that these volumes come to us in the "ipsissimis verbis" of the author, and not diluted into a translation. In a young country like ours, where active exertion threatens to exclude quiet study, the standard of theological learning is ever prone to decline. But we cannot repress the conviction, that a higher taste begins to prevail: and we cherish the hope that the day is not far distant, when the publication of elaborate works, like the present, will cease to be hazardous. Indeed, we anticipate for Mr. Carter a very rapid sale of the work now before us. The theological world has been hungry for these works of Turretine, which for years have been with difficulty commanded, even in the European market. We devoutly hope its sale may be such as to encourage the enterprising publisher to reproduce other standard works, which are now almost inaccessible to American students. The wish has long been upon our hearts to see a cheap American edition of the works of John Owen. The English edition of 21 volumes, even in boards, does not reach us in this country, except at a cost of some \$50. Could they be compressed into 8 or 10 volumes 8vo., and furnished at the price of about \$20, they would be as saleable as any works that could be offered. We commend this suggestion to Mr. Carter, as worthy of his enterprize: should he undertake and successfully accomplish it, a higher service could hardly be rendered by him to the cause of sound theological learning. Meanwhile, we call the attention of clergymen and divinity students to this largest Latin work ever published in this country. Only a limited edition has, we understand, been printed; and a long period must elapse before it will be issued again. It is beautifully gotten up in cloth, in clear type, with copious indexes and Scripture references, and is prefaced with a careful syllabus of subjects. As Mr. Carter has thrown himself thus freely upon the learning of the clerical profession for patronage, we undertake to say these will not suffer themselves to be dishonored before the world, by withholding their support.

3. *Germany, England and Scotland; or Recollections of a Swiss Minister.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D. 12mo. pp. 371. Robert Carter, N. Y. 1848.

This is a book of gossip, and herein lies its charm. We have had its respected author so fully associated with the 16th century, that to see him shaking hands with Chalmers in the streets of Edinburg, and sitting by the side of Gordon and Brown in the Free Church Assembly, wakes us up as though we had stumbled over an anachronism. One feels, too, a pardonable curiosity to know how a man so long familiar with the spirits of Calvin, Beza, Luther, and the long beards of the Reformation, will jostle through the crowd of living and busy men: It is pleasant to find with what a warm heart and kindling eye he looks upon events that are to be the staple of history three centuries hence.

The work before us is divided into two parts; the former being devoted to *travelling*, the latter to *historical* recollections. The notice of Germany, although the most meagre portion of the book, interested us the most: For though it told nothing absolutely new, it impressed more vividly upon us the exact condition of parties, and gave a better insight into the leading minds of that country.

The moment however our author touched the English soil, all the novelty of his book ceased, so far as facts are concerned. The relations of this country with both England and Scotland are so intimate, that we feel at home both with their history and their heroes. Yet it gives the reader pleasure to follow Dr. Merle through these old haunts, and witness the keen relish with which he enjoys every thing. We should doubtless look with a much severer eye upon both the English and Scotch Establishments: yet he reminds us of what we should not overlook in judging him, that he looks upon the Christianity of both those systems in comparison with the lifeless and withered national churches of the Continent: from this low point of view, no doubt both these Establishments seem upon a higher level, which lifts

them into comparative purity. Received too with the enthusiasm which the prestige of his name secured, and possessing a kind heart, easily attracted by the good he met with, it is not strange that his good nature makes him indulgent to errors we should be constrained severely to condemn.

The historical recollections are manifestly added to eke out the book—yet as Scotland was the object of his visit, and the Scottish struggle was just in his eye, the transition into history was easy—certain it is, the recollections are confined to Scotland's previous sufferings and strugglings. D'Aubigne falls here into his peculiar province: he groups together the successive eras of Scottish history, and shows what progress has been made. The facts, indeed, are all familiar; but the selection and disposition of them, and the elimination of the great principles contended for at each stage of the long struggle, together with a vivacious style of writing, impart a deep interest to this portion of the work.

We have said this is a book of gossip; but it is the gossip of a philosopher—of a man who knows that great principles underlie facts, and who understands the process by which they are to be educed. A deep strain of true, Christian philosophy pervades all the chit-chat of the book—so that the reader rises up from its perusal as much instructed as amused: and well pleased to have turned out before him the benevolent heart of a writer, whose profounder historical writings have already provoked his admiration.

4. *Christ and Anti-Christ.* By Rev. S. J. CASSELS. 12mo. pp. 348. Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia.

This book, from some cause, was long in reaching us, and through inadvertence has been lying some time upon our table: these two facts will explain the delay of this notice, which is due alike to the merits of the work, and to the claims of the author

upon our personal regard. It is divided into two nearly equal parts: the first aims to prove Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah; the second, to show the Papacy to be the Anti-Christ predicted in the Scriptures. The two parts are independent of each other, yet mutually react, since the same line of proof is pursued in both. The advantages of this mode of discussing two parallel subjects has been perceived by other writers: a familiar example is found in Leslie's short method with the Deists and with the Jews; in which the same course of argument is made to bear upon both these classes. The reader first assents to an author's reasoning in a case which does not enlist his prejudices, and cannot then without a blush resist the same evidence, when it confronts his own error. In this manner, the two parts of this book afford alternately a fulcrum to the lever which shall lift from its foundations a dangerous heresy.

Mr. Cassels evidently does not put this forth as a profound work: of this its exceeding brevity is sufficient proof. A well read man can hardly expect to be much informed by a discussion which settles up in five pages the prophecy of Daniel, supposed to fix the period of Messiah's advent, and which disposes of the whole question of Christ's resurrection, in all its aspects, in eight pages. So in the second part, fifteen pages suffice to fix the era of the rise of the Papacy, and ten pages more cover the great doctrinal errors which prove her to be "the Apostasy." We do not say this in complaint of the author, but to show that he has written not so much for the master as for the pupil. To the general and less informed reader, it will prove a valuable and instructive book. All the leading topics in the two great controversies, the Jewish and the Romish, are presented with precision; the argument is exceedingly simple and plain, and the general arrangement of the work particularly lucid. The facts, too, by which it was necessary to illustrate his subjects, and those which form the material of his discussion, are full and pertinent, and will convey quite a body of history to those whose reading has not lain in this direction. Occasionally, the author digresses too far from the particular argument before him, and goes at large into a field which it is only needful for him to skirt.

An instance of this will be found in chapter 12, part first, where in proving Christ to be the Messiah, from the Prophecies which relate to Him as King, he inquires somewhat fully into the particular form of government he established in the church. Yet, as the topic possesses intrinsic interest, and the writer is not prolix, the reader is not wearied.

The style is simple, well adapted to the discussion, and is never at fault, except, perhaps, when the metaphor is attempted. We heartily commend the book to the perusal of all: We are glad that it is written; and that being written, it is committed to such a channel for its diffusion as the Board of Publication.

-
5. *The Theses of Erastus touching Excommunication. Translated from the Latin, with a Preface. By the Rev. ROBERT LEE, D. D. Old Greyfriars, Edinburg. Edinburg: Myles Macphail. 16mo. pp. 175.*

This beautifully printed little volume has been occasioned by the frequent charges of *Erastianism*, made by the adherents of the Free Church of Scotland against the Established Church. Stung by this charge, as embracing all that is heretical and apostate in the Christian Church, Dr. Lee has sought to destroy the spell, and, by informing the reader who Erastus was, and what his views, to deprive the word Erastianism of its occult and malign virtue. This man, whose name has become celebrated by its association with the form of church government he advocated, was born at Baden, in Switzerland, A. D. 1524. He was eminent for his medical skill, and was called by the Elector Palatine, Frederic, to a medical chair in the University of Heidelberg, and became his chief physician and counsellor. He was afterwards connected with the Academy at Basil, and died there in the year 1583. He contended that there are "not two diverse judicatories concerning manners, the one politic, and the other ecclesiastic;" that

“there are not two heads upon the one body of the visible church;” that excommunication is an ordinance of man and not of God; that the sins of Christians are to be punished “by the civil magistrate” alone, “whose special office it is;” that where the government is Christian, God has appointed no other power to repress and chastise the sins of the members of his visible kingdom; and that “under an ungodly government” alone, “e. g. Popish or Mohamedan, grave and pious men should be chosen according to the precept of the Apostle, to settle disputes by arbitration.” These, in conjunction with the ministers, may admonish those who live unholy lives; may recall them to virtue, by refusing to hold private intercourse with them, or by a public rebuke. “But from the sacraments which God has instituted, they may not debar any who desire to partake.” The same views, for substance, had been advanced by Melancthon, Bullinger and Musculus; but, judging from Erastus’ own preface to his Theses, were now received with every demonstration of dissent by the divines of the Calvinistic churches. Beza, though highly esteeming Erastus for his remarkable gifts, at length wrote against him.

Dr. Lee, in his preface to the Theses, specifies three theories of church discipline. 1. That of the Congregationalists, who hold what is termed *pure communion*, maintaining that the sacraments are designed only for those who are truly the children of God, and that the church must refuse admission to all who want the spiritual character. 2. That of Erastus, who maintained that the sacraments are *a means of grace*, and that therefore the church rulers can no more exclude those desirous of partaking, than they can exclude them from hearing the word or joining in public prayer. 3. That of the Church of Scotland, who takes upon herself not to say who are and who are not true Christians; but the much lower office of excluding those *whose open conduct* makes it manifest that they cannot be, according to the most charitable judgment, the children of God. Dr. Lee contends, and rightly, that no church can be national which proceeds on the theory of the Independents. He charges upon the Free Church greater laxity in discipline, and a nearer approach to

Erastianism, than is manifested by the Established Church of Scotland, which they are continually reproaching with being an *Erastian Establishment*. Non nostrum tantas componere lites. Our sympathies are with the Free Church of Scotland, but our practice in this country in the particular now mentioned, coincides with that ascribed by Dr. Lee to the Independents. For any thing we see, Erastus was a good and well-meaning man. But he became greatly embittered against those who opposed him, and unquestionably took an entirely erroneous view of the discipline of the Christian Church.

6. *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Association for the Religious Instruction of Negroes in Liberty County, Georgia. Printed by order of the Association. Savannah: 1848. pp. 68.*

The Association for the Instruction of the Negroes in Liberty County, though local in its character, has taken the lead in the Presbyterian Church, in this good work. The Report before us embraces an account of the labors of their Missionaries for the past year, with suggestions on the moral discipline and culture of the negroes; a review of the work in the Southern States, as it is conducted at the present time, I. Among the Baptists; II. Among the Methodists; III. Among the Episcopalians; and IV. Among the Presbyterians, in the Synods of Mississippi, Missouri, West Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia. The Report, therefore, is one of more than usual value and interest. It completes the thirteenth *entire* year of Dr. Jones' connection with the Society, as their Missionary. In the conclusion, he enumerates the various purposes which it was hoped originally might be accomplished by his efforts among the coloured people, and the motives which influenced him in devoting himself to this field of labor. This

portion of the pamphlet gives us a view of his own struggles and difficulties, and of the supports which have been vouchsafed to him in this work. They awaken a responsive feeling in every minister of Christ, who has toiled for years in the midst of obstacles apparently insurmountable, "cast down, but not destroyed." It will, doubtless, be a source of deep regret to the Society, that they are forced to part with one who has labored so long and faithfully, and with such manifest success among them. And in the regret caused by his removal, all would join, if it took him entirely away from this general branch of Christian effort. We trust his connection with the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, will only remove him to a still wider field of influence, and enable him to accomplish still more for those whose debtors we are.

7. *Our Saviour's Example: a Discourse delivered at La Grange, Georgia, before the Students of the La Grange Female Institute, Nov. 28th, 1847. By the Rev. SAMUEL K. TALMAGE, D. D., President of the Oglethorpe University, Milledgeville. Grieve & Orme, 1848.*

This is one of the Baccalaureate discourses of President Talmage, delivered, we believe, before the graduating class of Oglethorpe University, on the Sabbath preceding the last Commencement, and now repeated before the La Grange Institute, and published. It possesses the great merit of being appropriate to the occasions on which it was delivered, and being written in a terse, pointed, and forcible style. The human aspects of our Saviour's character, too often overlooked by Orthodox Divines, are brought forth to view, and he is held up as an example in the various relations of life, as a pattern of industry, of humility, of benevolence and compassion; of forbearance and forgiveness, and of piety towards God. Under these various heads many

salutary and noble precepts are given, with an authority and force well suited to impress the youthful mind, and are illustrated by occasional and happy references to the example of the great and good in past ages. We are glad to say that the fear we at first had, lest the proposing of Christ as an example of social and civic virtue, should seem unsuited to the sacred and exalted character in which we ought ever to view Him, was not realised as we read through the discourse. Still, while He was an "example to us that we should follow his steps," he was fairer "than the children of men, the chiefest among ten thousand."

8. *General History of the Christian Religion and Church : from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated from the first, revised and altered throughout according to the second edition. By JOSEPH TORREY, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Vermont. Volume second ; comprising the Second Grand Division of the History. Boston. Crocker & Brewster, 1848. pp. 768.*

The publication of the second volume of Torrey's Neander, whose title is above given, we chronicle as we did the first, as it makes a portion of that important work accessible to English readers, which has hitherto been locked up in the intricacies of the German language. The present volume covers the second period of Church History, from the end of the Dioclesian Persecution to the time of Gregory the Great, or from the year 312 to the year 590. It carries us over a succession of years, in which the Church passed through some of the most important controversies which have ever agitated it. The Arian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Monophysite, Pelagian, and Semipelagian heresies, lift up their heads and are rebuked by the sounder portion of the Church. These and all other topics belonging to those times, are treated in Neander's own way, with which the

theological world is becoming more and more familiar. He has earned the name of the first living Church historian, and his learning, piety, and independence none can dispute. He lives amid the scenes which he describes, and his extensive reading in all the literature of those early ages, and his quick sympathy with the state of communities, and with the individuals of whom he speaks, make him a feeling and engaging writer. His acuteness, and power of philosophical analysis, enable him, often happily, to discover the hidden causes of public acts, and states of society. He is eminently a philosophical historian, and is far from satisfying himself with the bare statement of facts, or chronicling of events. He admits most fully, the difference between the spiritual and invisible Church, and the outward body of professed believers, and conscious that there is an inward life in religion, he is ever tracing its developments in the visible Church. His own inward experience is to him a reality, and he carries out his own subjective views and feelings over the whole field which he is exploring, till they even colour and tinge the objects he describes. He professes and exhibits an absolute independence of all party influences, and aims to be wholly candid in every thing he says, yet errs, as we often feel, from too great a spirit of liberality towards those who diverge from the truth. He sometimes too, rests an opinion on a basis of facts altogether too scanty to sustain it. His style is too diffuse, and as is the fault of all philosophizers of his nation, he is too abstract and too much involved in metaphysical fogs, for a plain mind to comprehend. He is himself in the fog most sadly on the subject of inspiration, miracles, the Trinity, the Sabbath, and it is to be feared, will not live long enough to emerge on the side of the simple, practical, and straight forward truth. While this history is valuable beyond all others, for the light this remarkable man sheds around him as he traverses those distant ages, and while we are in love with his child-like simplicity, deep piety, and enlarged charity, and thankfully avail ourselves of the illumination which his torch affords, we would prefer to pick our own way, rather than blindly follow after. For the causes which have been mentioned, we are to receive with a degree of caution the conclusions at which he arrives.

9. *The Life of Jesus Christ, in its Historical connection and development.* By AUGUSTUS NEANDER. Translated from the *Fourth German Edition.* By JOHN MCCLINTOCK, and CHARLES E. BLUMENTHAL, Professors in Dickenson College, New York. Harper & Brothers, publishers, New York, 1848.

Another of Neander's writings, which Professors McClintock and Blumenthal, with the consent of Neander himself, have given to the American Scholar. In this volume we recognize the same characteristics, which appertain to the distinguished author as a historian. He appears here more as an *interpreter* of the evangelical history; and in the department of exegesis is scarcely less at home than in that of history. Indeed the two departments, so far as the early history of the Church is concerned, are very nearly allied. We find in this book much judicious criticism, many things with which we agree, and in which we are happy to find support to opinions we have long held; and some things also from which we must dissent. It adds to the value of this work, that it succeeded in point of time, Strauss's "Life of Christ," a book which treated everything miraculous and supernatural in the life of Jesus as a *Myth*, and which produced a sensation through Germany and throughout Europe. The views of Strauss and Bauer, Neander designedly combats, and more especially in the notes which are appended to the body of the text. While we recognize the deep piety and spirituality of the writer, and acknowledge the general soundness of his views on the essentials of Christianity, we see him struggling amidst the shadowy forms of skepticism, fighting his way inch by inch towards the truth, now meeting it, and heartily and with full soul embracing it, now feeling for it in the cimmerian night, if haply he may find it. When he states his own conclusions, the statement seems to us often shadowy and unsubstantial. It is not plain, straight forward, sturdy English, which we can grasp, and feel that it has shape, distinct outline, and solid substance. It melts away as we look at it, amid the thick standing errors in opposition to which it is set up. We are forcibly reminded of a motto which we

met with in one of our cotemporary journals a few years since, said to be selected by himself: "Wir sehen jetzt durch einen Spiegel in einem dunkeln Worte, — denn aber von Angesicht zu Angesicht," which is Luther's translation of the passage. "We see now through a glass darkly, but there face to face." His vision of some important truths, is dim beyond what others of God's children, of less ability than he, have attained, though we are willing to believe that of others, he has enjoyed a higher and nobler revelation. We are sorry to see that he clings so tenaciously to the development theory, a vicious principle in theology, but are on the other hand glad to find him in the same connection, affirming his unfaltering adherence to the "creed-believers," with whom, in the fundamental doctrines of the corruption of human nature, and justification by faith in Jesus as the Redeemer, he is found to associate himself, notwithstanding the obloquy he thereby incurs.

10. *Thoughts on Family Worship.* By Rev. JAMES W. ALEXANDER, D. D. 12 mo. pp. 260. *Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia.*

The peculiar merit of some theological works is, that they reach far into the recesses of Christian doctrine, and inform while they expand the understandings of those who are the teachers of Christianity; the merit of other books consists in laying open the broad duties of the Christian life with so much unction and power, that they become household books, and win their way into the family and closet of retired Christians. Dr. Alexander's book belongs to this latter class. It is a work which makes pious men grateful to him, to love rather than to admire him — a work which, for its practical value, a Pastor would desire to place in every family belonging to his charge. As it is issued by the Board of Publication, we cherish the hope that, by means

of the effective system of Colportage, now so generally adopted, it will be very widely diffused. And that, with God's blessing, it may do much to call the attention of the Church to family worship.

11. *Now and Then.* By SAMUEL WARREN, F. R. S., pp. 290. *Harper & Brothers, N. Y., 1848.*

It is a sufficient introduction to this little work, that it is the product of the same pen with "The Diary of a Physician." Yet, gratified as we were in its perusal, we cannot but think that, like all his later writings, it falls below those vivid sketches which first won for the author his proud preëminence among the contributors of Blackwood.

The tale is simple in its structure, is felicitously told, and in its progress draws largely upon the sympathies of the reader. Its main excellence is the portraiture of individual character. A finer example of Christian faith supporting one in the most intense and protracted sorrow, can hardly be imagined than is found in Adam Ayliffe, the elder. His son, the younger Adam, exemplifies the strong, oak-hearted, English yeoman. Goaded almost to desperation by the petty oppressions which it is sometimes in the power of game laws, and the agents of non-resident lords, to inflict, and almost fatally entangled in a web of circumstances which seem to prove him a man of blood, under all the violence of his swelling passion, we discover a substratum of religious principle and feeling, which ultimately works out his salvation. The Rev. Henry Hylton presents the pattern of a Christian Pastor, mingling together the various offices of that difficult station. We admire him most in his interviews with the haughty Earl of Milverstoke, meeting and overawing his bitterness with calm and lofty Christian rebuke. In the back ground of the work is seen the figure of the English Earl, stern and

gloomy when composed, and stormy in his wrath; while to relieve it, and still deeper in the shadow, are the gentle and drooping forms of his daughter and daughter-in-law.

The united moral impression which these several characters make upon the reader, is extremely happy. The minute providence of God, and the certainty of just retribution for transgression, fill his reflections as he closes the book.

This work is not exempt from the characteristic of the modern novel, which aims, under the mask of story, at the establishment or overthrow of some great principle: a trait which brings this species of writing more legitimately within the range of serious criticism. It is doubtful whether anything is gained to the cause of justice or truth, by the attempt in this book to write down one of the great principles of Common Law — the value of circumstantial evidence in judicial cases. The reader must not suffer a winning story to seduce him into a legal heresy.

12. *Thoughts on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes of this Country.* By WILLIAM S. PLUMER: pp. 30. Princeton, 1848.

This pamphlet of Dr. Plumer appeared first in the Biblical Repertory, as a review of Dr. Jones' Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes of the Southern States, and has now very properly been issued in a pamphlet form, for more general distribution. It exhibits the interest which the author feels in this great mission of the Southern Church, and is a valuable, though not designed to be a complete, digest of what has been done for the religious interests of those held in servitude on the Continent of America. We entirely agree with the author on the necessity of furnishing these people with competent and safe religious instructors. He quotes, to show this necessity, the following striking passage, written by Dr. Rice in 1825, and which ought to be impressed on the minds of all Southern Christians.

“Without pretending to be a prophet I venture to predict, that if ever that horrid event should take place, which is anticipated and greatly dreaded by many among us, some crisped-haired prophet, some pretender to inspiration, will be the ringleader as well as the instigator of the plot. By feigned communications from heaven, he will arouse the fanaticism of his brethren, and they will be prepared for every work, however desolating or murderous. The opinion has already been started among them, that men may make such progress in religion, that nothing they can do will be sinful, even should it be the murder of those whom they are now required to serve and obey.” The striking fulfilment of this prediction in the Southampton tragedy, is mentioned by Dr. Plumer, and was noticed by many at the time. The facts which he adduces, and the observation and experience of the ministry, generally, who have reflected on the subject, lead us to the conclusion that the great body of religious teachers for these people, must now and for many years hence, be white men, and these it is the first duty of their masters to provide for them.

13. *Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, Past and Present, including a Notice of the Origin, History, and Present State of the Waldenses.* By ROBERT BAIRD. Second Thousand. Boston, 1847.

All we can do at present, is to bring this volume to the attention of our readers. The subject is one of deep and romantic interest, both in relation to the past, the present, and the future. The sources of information on this subject are few and scattered, and the present volume, therefore, will be found eminently useful and very satisfactory. We hope more fully to review the subject and the volume, and can only assure our readers that they will find this handsome volume every way worth its purchase money and an attentive perusal.

14. *Memoir of Rev. David Abeel, D. D., late Missionary to China.*
By Rev. G. R. WILLIAMSON. 12 mo. pp. 315. Robert Carter,
New York, 1848.

We rejoice to see this Memoir added to the list, daily lengthening, of Saints who have "finished their course," and have "kept the faith." It records the private exercises and the public labours of an excellent servant of God, the tone of whose piety, as it impressed all those who knew him in life, so may it continue through this Memoir to influence many who shall only know him as "dead," and "yet speaking."

It is not every religious biography that we recommend: but Dr. Abeel was earnest in religion without being fanatical: he was devout without being sanctimonious. The book before us presents the same characteristics, and therefore we present it to the perusal of the reader. It will prove a very grateful remembrancer to the many and devoted friends whom it was the singular fortune of Dr. Abeel everywhere to attract to him.

-
14. *The Power of the Pulpit; or Thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers and those who hear them.* By GARDINER SPRING, D. D., Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York. New York: Baker & Scribner. 1848. pp. 459. 12mo.

There are few books which we take more interest in reading or from which we have derived more profit, than those which have been written by men who have seen service in the work of the ministry, and who have favored their brethren with the results of their own experience, or have addressed them in the language of fraternal and faithful warning. Bishop Burnet's Pastoral Care, Baxter's Reformed Pastor, Herbert's Country Parson, Bridges on the Christian Ministry, Smith on the Sacred Office,

are books from which we have derived great advantage, and which we have repeatedly recommended to the notice of our younger brethren. To their number another is added in this volume, addressed by Dr. Spring to Ministers and their hearers, on the power of the pulpit, "the most important and effectual guard, support, and ornament of virtue's cause." The book reaches us too late to give it more than a brief notice in our present number. It treats, we perceive, of topics of the greatest importance to the Church and to the Christian Ministry, and in a tone of earnestness which well befits the sacred theme. The veteran soldier of the cross, whose ministerial life has spanned no small part of the present century, who has broken the bread of life to thousands, and who hastens to give us these words of counsel, under the impression that "his own days of active service are rapidly coming to a close," is certainly entitled to be heard. "These lips," says he, "will soon be silent; dust will be upon them. Compared with the past," he adds, "his days of labor must be few, his steps faltering and slow, his pilgrimage confined within narrow bounds." To our younger brethren in the ministry, we especially commend the present volume, hoping, in some future number, to revert to some of the important subjects it discusses.

16. *Usefulness: An Oration, delivered before the Euphemian and Philomathian Societies of Erskine College, S. C., at the Annual Commencement. By Rev. WILLIAM T. HAMILTON, of Mobile, Alabama. Charleston: Burges & James: pp. 36.*

From the pursuit of happiness, as a great, though subordinate end of our existence, and from the fact that our highest happiness consists in being useful; from the continual tendency to an useful end, of the ever varying changes of nature; the author

forcibly recommends his important theme to the youth he addresses. His counsels are appropriate and wise,—his language flowing and vigorous.

LETTER FROM GUTZLAFF.

The following communication from this beloved Missionary, was received before the issue of our last number, but to our regret, through some oversight, it was omitted in the publication. Our present limits forbid our adding any thing to the appeal he makes to the liberality of the church.

MESSRS. EDITORS,—The undersigned received the other day a letter from Mr. Gutzlaff, one of the German Protestant Missionaries in China, and though its contents are in a most particular manner a call upon the Lutheran Church to aid in the dissemination of the Gospel of our dear Redeemer, still, all Christians, whatever may be their external name, are equally interested in the great work of evangelizing that great empire; and, therefore, we hope you will admit it in the columns of the Review, and accompany it with such remarks as the contents of the letter and the importance of the subject may suggest to you. Yours, with Christian affection,

ERNEST L. HAZELIUS.

—
HONG KONG, August 1, 1847.

Dear Sir,—The certainty that such an immense people like the Chinese could by their countrymen only be brought to the knowledge of the Gospel, gave in 1844, rise to the formation of the Chinese Union, a body of native Christians, who joined heart and hand in the promulgation of the Redeemer's glory in this extensive empire. The Most High graciously listened to their

humble prayers and very paltry efforts, so that not only in Kwang Sung Province, but also in Kwangse, Tokëen and Hoonan, small congregations were formed, and the number of converts increased to above 300, a very trifling amount. The grand object was to evangelize this empire, and the Messengers of Salvation were therefore sent, besides the above mentioned provinces, to Yunnan, Kweithoo, Szithuen, Hoojah, Gunhway, Honan and Shunse, over a very extensive surface. The preachers now employed by the Union are above seventy; and four Europeans—all Lutherans, have likewise joined them. One of the grand objects, was to spread the Word of God throughout the whole breadth of the land; and, besides publishing 9 editions of the New Testament on the outskirts, 11 have been ordered in the large cities of the interior, but are not yet finished. The object is to publish it so cheap, as to allow the poorer classes to buy it. As many learned men and several Mandarins have joined this body, it was resolved to make a commencement for creating a native Christian literature. The efforts for this purpose have hitherto been very dwarfish, only two essays are yet published; of the one 30,000 copies were thrown off, and three more are in the press. As soon, however, as God deigns to pour out his Spirit in a rich measure, there will be more; for now, already, above thirty papers are written every week, and one amongst a hundred is chosen to be printed; and the Lord has called some giants in literature to himself.

You will consider this a very trifling beginning for affecting such an immense mass of people, and so it is really; and the whole number of converts during July last, was only fifty-three. Still, we perceive an abiding influence from above, and some increase of success upon our very humble labors, than which nothing can be more insignificant.

This Society does not possess either the approval or the coöperation of any other, both Bible and Tract Societies having refused to give any aid; from Germany and Holland some support has arrived. The principle laid down, is to work in the most disinterested manner, and to employ as much as possible native resources, without asking the aid of any one. The Bâle and Rhenish Missionary Societies, will likewise take about sixty la-

borers in their own employ; but, as soon as this is done, the efforts of the Union will be directed with considerable energy towards the other provinces, which will involve a far greater expenditure.

At present, it amounts to about \$400 per month, the Holy Scriptures and Tracts requiring above one-third of the whole. To meet this, the Union has only debts, not one third of the current want being met by contributions. There is a certain prospect that 5 to \$600 will be monthly required, before half a year is elapsed.

Not the most distant wish exists to ask a farthing, where the labor of love can effect anything. But as China, with its myriads, is the field chosen for the Christian enterprise, to communicate the unsearchable riches of Christ, the converts are not yet able to meet the exigencies of the case. In this view of the matter, they ask some support from your churches, for the first foreigners who joined the body were Lutherans. They ask this for Christ's sake; and only so long as they will be unable to defray the expenses. They leave it to you, whether their very humble labors are worthy of your regard, and whether this miserable commencement, the first ever entered upon by natives, is deserving your regard. The earnest desire is to preach Christ, the crucified, our salvation, through the length and breadth of the land, and to make the word of God accessible to all who will read. Ask your congregations whether they feel any interest in this; and, if so, whether it will be shown by actual assistance.

May the Lord bless you and your congregations, and ever abide with you. This is the wish of the Chinese Union.

In the name of the Union,

CH. GUTZLAFF, Assist. Sec'ry.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER II.

SEPTEMBER, 1848.

ARTICLE I.

THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY—ITS NATURE AND EVIDENCE.

1. *What Constitutes a Call to the Gospel Ministry, in the Biblical Repertory, for 1831: p. 196.*
2. *The Necessity of a Divine Call. Ch. II. of the Christian Ministry, by the Rev. CHAS. BRIDGES. Fourth Edition. London, 1835.*
3. *Necessary Call to the Ministry. Ch. III. of the Christian Ministry, by J. EDMONSTON, a Wesleyan Minister. London, 1828.*
4. *On the Call of a Minister of Jesus Christ to the Sacred Office. Ch. IV. of EADE'S Gospel Ministry.*
5. *What is a Call to the Ministry? Tracts of the American Tract Society. Vol. 9, p. 333, and vol. 10, p. 285.*
6. *The Use of Preachers, and How to Obtain More, by the Rev. A. A. PORTER. Charleston, 1848.*
7. *A Call to the Ministry — What are the Evidences of a Divine Call? in the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, 1841.*

8. *A Discourse on Theological Education, and Advice to a Student*, by GEORGE HOWE, D. D. New York, 1844.

The nature of the ministerial call depends upon the nature of assurance and the witness of the Spirit,—of both which it is an eminent exemplification. Having, therefore, endeavored to state the doctrine of Scripture on these subjects, we are now prepared, without farther introduction, to lay down what we believe to be the doctrine of Scripture, concerning the Call to the Ministry, directing our readers to some of the most accessible works in which this subject is specially discussed. A call to the ministry, like all other saving influences, must, as we have seen, be imparted by the Holy Ghost, and an assurance of His having given it, must be imparted to the soul, in order that it may become effectual and operative. The Holy Spirit must impart those qualifications of natural fitness which are essential, in order to prepare for, or to engage in, the work;*—He must open up the way for such a course of preparation;—He must give ability and success to our endeavors;—He must inspire the heart with that desire for the work, which cannot be satisfied without the utmost effort to carry it into execution;—He must give that singleness of heart and purpose, which looks only to the glory of God and the salvation of souls;—He must bestow that “spirit of wisdom, of power, and of a sound mind,” which alone can lead to that prudence which will give offence to no man, and to that boldness, which will contend for the truth if needs be, even unto blood;—He must open a wide and an effectual door to the individual called, for an entrance upon this high calling;—He must, therefore, dispose the hearts of his appointed officers to ratify His call, and the hearts of his people to attest the fitness and capacity of the individual so called to edify and instruct;†—He must crown his labors with a saving and sanctifying blessing to them that hear;—and He must continue to uphold, direct, instruct, and comfort his servant while engaged in his arduous labors. The whole work of the ministry depends, therefore, upon

* Owen's Works, vol. 20, p. 400. Princeton Review, for 1831, p. 199, &c., where these are well stated.

† 1 Tim., 3: 1. Titus 1. 1 Peter 5: 1-2.

the Holy Ghost for *its* authority, and for *our* obligation and fitness to assume it.

The term call is a metaphor,* referring both to the command or summons by which a person is verbally invited and directed to any duty, and to the vocation or employment to which he is summoned. It is, therefore, that command—addressed to any individual through His word, by the Holy Ghost,—to engage in any work or duty, or to enjoy any privileges and blessings. It is used in the Scriptures generally for every state and condition of life to which any one is destined by God—for which He gives the requisite capacity and qualifications, opening the way for an entrance upon it—and blessing and supporting those who engage in it. The Holy Ghost is represented as the efficient agent in carrying out, in reference to every individual, the *providential* purposes of God, as well as the dispensations of His grace.† To every such state, condition and duty, whether in the family, the church, or the commonwealth, the Holy Spirit calls, and his people are called; and hence, these employments are termed callings, or a man's vocation.‡ A call, therefore, is necessary to the proper discharge and enjoyment of any business or occupation, and this call is the more clear and evident, in proportion as the duty is peculiar, responsible, and attended with temptation and difficulty.§ A Christian is, therefore, to expect such a call, and a comfortable persuasion or assurance of duty in all that he undertakes.||

* Dr. Jamieson's *Reality of the Spirit's Work*, p. 293.

† See Bishop Heber's *Bampton Lectures on the Holy Spirit*; Owen on the Spirit; Hurriion on the Spirit; Buchanan on the Holy Spirit, &c. 1 Cor. 7: 24. Eph. 4: 28. 1 Peter 4: 10. Gal. 5: 13.

‡ On this subject the old divines are full, though now the term call is more commonly restricted in books to the effectual or saving call of the Gospel, or to the call of the Ministry.

§ Perkins' *Works*, Fol., vol. 3, p. 61; vol. 1, p. 64; vol. 2, p. 50. See *Commentary on Revelation* by the celebrated James Durham, author of the "Sum of Saving Knowledge," 4to., Glasgow, 1788, p. 78. No man, he teaches, ought to become an author without such a call, and every one may know that he has it, p. 77-79. See also Bucani *Theol. Instit.*, Geneva, 1612, p. 492. Bayne on the Ephesians, Fol., London, 1643, p. 4, 350. Hildersbram on John, chap. 4, Fol., 1632, p. 238-240. *Works of Rev. William Bridges*, vol. 5, p. 75-77.

† That he may ascertain this and how, see Perkins, vol. 2, p. 159, &c. Corbet, in his *Remains*, makes a state of continence or single life one of these. See p. 231-236, &c.

The terms call and calling are, however, most generally applied to the commands and invitations addressed to sinners by the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures, and through the preaching of the truth, and to the effectual application and power with which the Holy Ghost makes them "the power of God to their salvation," sanctification, and devotion to His service.*

In all cases the calling of God is two-fold, *outward* in His word and providence, and *inward* in those qualifications and desires which enable the believer to judge of his calling.† These inward qualities, fitness and desire, are given by the Holy Spirit, and wherever they exist, prove that the person is chosen by God, and fitted and called to the work for which they qualify.

Now, so it is with regard to the work of the ministry—which is a part of the great field of Christian work and duty to which the Holy Spirit calls, and for which He fits and prepares. The call to this work is also external and inward. The *external call* to the ministry, is that testimony, command, precept, promise and invitation of the word, which makes known the duty and the privilege of the Christian ministry, together with all other means by which the mind is led to feel, to understand, and to become personally sensible of this duty. The *internal call*, is that supernatural influence, communicated by the Holy Ghost, by which the soul is freely persuaded and enabled to obey the command, to believe the promises, to desire the privileges, and willingly undergo the self-denial and the labor of the Christian ministry.‡

This *combined* call to the ministry, that is, the outward and the inward call, are in the present state of the church, *ordinary*,—that is, it is effected according to the general order laid down in the word, and established in the church,—and is not *extraordinary*;—and it is also *mediate*, that is, it is made through the coöperation of men, and not directly and solely by God.§

* It often means chosen, as in Rom. 8: 28. 1 Cor. 1: 2. 1 Cor. 1: 1. Rom. 1: 6. Isa. 48, and vol. 3, p. 67, Calvin's Trans., soc ed.

† So teaches Calvin; see Institutes, vol. 2, p. 591-592; the terms there used are the universal and the special call.

‡ See Stapfer, vol. 1, p. 363, &c.

§ See Divine Right of the Gospel Ministry, p. 116, where the Provincial Assembly of Westminster Divines (the authors of this work,) make super-

In both aspects of the ministerial call, the only efficient and authoritative source from which it flows, is the triune covenant Jehovah, by whom the church has been constituted, and more especially God the Son, in the exercise of His sovereign dominion over the church through the Holy Spirit.* The ultimate AUTHOR of the ministerial call is, therefore, the Triune God, and the proximate author, the Holy Ghost.

The ESSENCE of the *external* call is found in the whole doctrine, precept, promise, and order concerning the ministry laid down in the word of God; and the essence of the *internal* call, consists in the operations of the Holy Ghost, by which we are persuaded of the duty; led to desire it; endued in some measure with spiritual fitness for it; and made willing to undertake it.† Of these "gifts that are in Him, which are given by the Holy Ghost," every one is and must be conscious; of their conformity to what the Spirit in the word has promised and made necessary, he may be and is convinced; and being sensible that he is actuated by no avaricious, ambitious, or worldly motives, but by a sincere spirit of love and obedience to God, and a desire to edify the church and proclaim the Gospel for the encouragement of sinners, he is assured, by a conviction more or less powerful, that he has the witness of the Spirit with him, that he is called of God to the work of the ministry. Under his guidance, a spiritual application of the command to preach the Gospel, gives to the soul a relish for the holy and divine work commanded; an adoring view of the sweet and wonderful grace of Christ, in instituting and entrusting it to men; a sense of the all-sufficiency of Christ to fulfil His promise in enabling us to discharge the duty; and a conviction of our title to, and interest in, the work prescribed.

A conviction of a call to this work, arising from an audible voice, or an immediate suggestion, is, for the reasons already given, a blind call, not founded upon the truth in the word, but upon what is within the power of imagination, or of Satanic influence to produce. Such a call is,

natural endowments and evidence necessary to an immediate call, and deny its present existence. In confirmation, they there quote Chemnitius, p. 120; Zanchius, p. 120; Gerhard, p. 121; Luther, 122; Zuingle, p. 123, 124.

* See this very fully developed in Eade's Gospel Ministry, ch. 1.

† See Bucani Theol., p. 492; Edward's Works, vol. 4, p. 124, 125, 127.

therefore, either a gross delusion, or, if from God, it is the *accompaniment*, but not the *essence* of the call. Such suggestions or sensible signs are not, therefore, to be expected or trusted in—first, because they are extraordinary and unwarranted; second, because they are beside and independent of the Scriptures; and, thirdly, because they do not necessarily imply, or require, or produce, those holy desires and qualifications which are spiritual, supernatural and divine, above nature, and altogether beyond the power of Satanic influence.*

The EVIDENCE of an *external* call to the ministry, is the possession of the natural qualifications fitting for it—and of those spiritual and acquired habits which are laid down in the word as actually necessary. And the evidence of an *internal* call is the conscious exercise of these qualifying graces and gifts, with a conviction more or less free from doubt, assuring us that they were given by the Holy Spirit, and that by them God testifies to the personal application of His command to our souls.

The OBJECT which a heavenly call to the ministry presents to our minds, is in both cases Christ, the head and legislator of the church, whose ministry it is; by whom it was given; by whom it is directed and sustained; and for whose glory it was and is maintained.

The GROUND OR WARRANT of this call, or authorized engagement in the ministry, is the command, institution and promise of Christ, making this office permanent in the church, calling men into it, and securing to them assistance in it.

The NECESSITY for such a call, is founded upon the supernatural and divine ends contemplated by the ministry—the glory of God and the salvation of men—which can only be secured by divine appointment, divine warrant, divine authority, divine assistance, and divine blessing.

The ACCEPTANCE of a call to the ministry, is the actual submission of the whole man,—body, soul and spirit,—to the Lord Jesus Christ, in obedience to His command to preach the Gospel, looking to Him for grace and help to fulfil it; an actual entrance upon that course of study which is necessary to prepare for the work;—and the

* Edwards' Works, vol. 4, p. 127, 128, 130, 131.

actual discharge of its duties, when so prepared. In this act, the soul looks neither to itself, nor to the effects which are to follow, but only to the word and to Him who there speaks.

The **END** aimed at in a call to the ministry, is not our glory, honor, or comfort, but the glory and honor of the Triune God, as in Christ Jesus He is reconciling the world unto Himself, through the Gospel preached unto them.

The **LIFE** and **POWER** of a call to the ministry, consists in an abiding conviction of the divine authority; glory, and infinite importance of the work; of our fitness in some measure to discharge it; of our single and sincere desire to glorify God in it; and of His presence, comfort and blessing in the work. **THIS** is "that secret call of which," as Calvin teaches,* "every minister is conscious before God, but has not the church as a witness of it; I mean, the good testimony of our heart, that we undertake the offered office neither from ambition, nor avarice, nor any other selfish feeling, but a sincere fear of God and desire to edify the Church. This, as I have said, is indeed necessary for every one of us, if we would approve our ministry to God. Still, however, a man may have been duly called by the church, though he may have accepted with a bad conscience, provided his wickedness is not manifest. It is usual also to say, that private men are called to the ministry when *they seem fit and apt to discharge it*; that is, because learning, conjoined with piety and the other endowments of a good pastor, is a kind of preparation for the office. For, those whom the Lord has destined for this great office, he previously provides with the armor which is requisite for the discharge of it, that they may not come empty and unprepared." Thus reasonably speaks this immortal man.

We have ourselves made extensive research into this question, and so far as we have done so, have found—beyond the writers of the Methodist Church, and we need hardly except even them,†—an undeviating uniformity of

* Institutes, vol. 3, p. 67, chap. 3, B. 4, sec. 11.

† Mr. Edmondson, one of their writers, in his Treatise on the Ministry, represents the call of the Holy Ghost as being *sensibly* felt, but when he explains *how* this is experienced and proved, he says it is "the inclination of the heart," (p. 78,) "which inclines and draws such persons as are fit to take upon them," &c. He refers to Mr. Fletcher, of whom Mr. Benson says, "he was pressed *in Spirit* to exhort others to seek after the same

views. In no one writer have we found the doctrine of the Reviewer, that "a *supernatural* CONVICTION OF DUTY, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost, is an essential element in the evidence of a true vocation to the ministry"—sustained.* Any such immediate, direct, and self-evident operation of the Holy Spirit, convincing an individual of his duty to enter the ministry is, so far as we know, universally regarded by all judicious writers, as unwarrantable, unattainable and delusive.† Indeed, the same

blessing," "and there can be no doubt in the mind of any one," says Mr. Edmondson, "who knows the character of that great man, that this *pressure of Spirit* was the work of the Holy Ghost. Mr. Edmondson makes the call, therefore, subject to evidence and tests, and in quoting as proofs, Luther, Gilpin, Walsh, and Dr. Leland, only Gilpin *alludes* even to any thing like an *immediate* voice, and he, as well as the others, judged by the effects and results, of the reality of the supposed operation of the Spirit. See p. 65, 71, 74, 78, 80-85.

* On the dangers resulting from making marks necessary, which are not so made in that word, and of erecting them into tests. Edwards' Works, vol. 4, p. 349, 350, and Ross on the Direct Witness, p. 64, &c.

† As to the Reformers, we believe they unanimously concurred in placing this call *inwardly* in a pious and otherwise qualified mind, and *outwardly*, in what the Augsburg Confession calls "a canonical and regular ordination." See the Article in the Apol. for the Augsburg Confession, Article xiv., in Hase's *Lybri Symbolic*, vol. 1, p. 204, and in the Conf. itself; see p. 13. See again authorities from the Reformers to the same effect in the same author, p. 150; also, p. 11, 144, 156, and 554 and 353, 294, 499. See the views of the Reformers treated of in full by Voetius, in his *Politicae Ecclesiasticae*, Tom. 3, 529, 530, 535, 539, &c.

See also Palmer on the Church, vol. 1, part 1, chap. 8. Lazarus Seaman, a member of the Westminster Assembly, has fully examined into this subject, in his "Vindication of the Judgment of the Reformed Churches concerning Ordination," Lond. 1647. He there shows, that according to them an *internal* call is evidenced by gifts and the people's acceptance, p. 5, and p. 2, Prop. 2, with the proofs, and p. 26, 51. He quotes Zanchius, p. 4, and other Reformers, at p. 14, 28, 29. See also Turretine's Theol., Tom. 3, p. 235, 238, 240, 241-246; Mastricht Theol., vol. 2, p. 788; De Moor's Commentary on Markii Medull, Tom. 6, p. 282-284. See further Bucani *Institutiones Theol.*, Geneva, 1612, locus 40, 2; Wollebius's *Christian Divinity*, London, 1656, second edition, p. 218. Pictet's *Christian Theology*, Book 6, chapter 7, p. 448, 446, &c. Spanheim is very strong; see Works, Fol., Tom. 3, p. 791. Stapfer's Theol., vol. 1, p. 363, 432, and vol. 5, p. 36. As to the English Reformers, see in addition, Burrough's *Summary of Christian Faith and Practice*, vol. 2, p. 370, &c. The opinions (taken from all works of authority in that church) are given; see p. 80, 82. Cranmer, p. 400-404; Jewell, p. 410; Nowell's Catechism, p. 412, 419. The *Reformatio Legum*, p. 421. The *Forms of Ordination*, p. 31, 32, 96, 97. The *Homilies*, p. 37, 38. The *Collects*, p. 93, &c. The *Articles*, p. 98. See also Hooker's View at length in *Eccl. Polity*. Bridges on the *Christian Ministry*, illustrates the doctrine we have stated from Bernard, Quesnel, Calvin and others. See p. 93-103.

views as we have maintained, are advanced, for substance, by our most orthodox divines. "In God's ordinary calls" "to the Gospel Ministry," says Dr. Owen,* "there is the same sovereignty, though somewhat otherwise exercised. For in such a call, there are three things: 1. A providential designation of a person to such an office, work, or employment. When any office in the house of God, suppose that of the ministry, is fixed and established, the first thing that God doth in the call of any one thereunto, is the providential disposition of the circumstances of his life, directing his thoughts and designs to such an end. And were not the office of the ministry in some places accompanied with many secular advantages, yea provisions (for the lusts and luxuries of men) that are foreign unto it, this entrance into a call for God thereunto, by a mere disposal of men's concerns and circumstances, so as to design the ministry in the course of their lives, would be eminent and perspicuous. But, whilst multitudes of persons out of various corrupt ends, crowd themselves into the entrances of this office, the secret workings of the providence of God towards the disposal of them, whom he really designs unto his work herein, are greatly clouded and obscured. 2. It is a part of this call of God, when he blesseth, succeedeth and prospereth the endeavors of men, to prepare them-

As to the Scotch Reformers and Divines, see the Books of Discipline of that church.

As to the Puritans, see the works of Anthony Burgess on John, p. 497. Hildersham on John, chap. 4, p. 261.

As to the Westminster Assembly and its divines, see "The Divine Right of the Gospel Ministry," by the Provincial Assembly of London, 1654. The work of Lazarus Seaman, as above. The Pulpit's Patronage, by Rev. Thomas Ball, London, 1656, 4to. The works of Rutherford and Gillespie. Baxter's Five Disputations on Ch. Gov., London, 1659, 4to. Disp. 2, p. 109-266. Owen's Works on the Hebrews on chap. 5, vol. 4; vol. 3, p. 38, and in his general works; vol. 19, p. 39, &c. and p. 53. Corbet's Remains, 63-66. See also Owen's Works, vol. 20, p. 400. Here Dr. Owen especially discusses the subject. He shows that there are first, prerequisite qualifications, p. 400; second, an outward call by the church, p. 403, 404; third, inward indications of the mind, given by God; see p. 401-403, &c. See also a Plea for Scripture Ordination, by Rev. James Owen, 2d ed., Lond., 1707, p. 7.

See also Andrew Fuller on the Ministerial Call and Qualifications in Works, vol. 5, p. 207. Bishop Hopkin's Works, vol. 1, p. 495, 496. His interpretation of John 20: 22, 23, as referring to "nothing else but their solemn mission to the ministry," deserves attention, p. 497, 498. Short's Bampton Lectures, p. 209-211.

* Owen, vol. 24, p. 38.

selves with those previous dispositions and qualifications which are necessary unto the actual call and susception of this office. And hereof also there are three parts. First, An inclination of their hearts in compliance with his designation of them unto their office. Where this is not effected, but men proceed according as they are stimulated by *outward* impressions or considerations, God is not as yet at all in this work. Secondly. An especial blessing of their endeavors for the due improvement of their natural faculties and abilities, in study and learning, for the necessary aids and instruments of knowledge and wisdom. Thirdly. The communications of peculiar gifts unto them, rendering them meet and able unto the discharge of the duty of their office, which in an ordinary call is indispensably required as previous to an actual separation unto the office itself. 3. He ordereth things so, as that a person whom he will employ in the service of his house, shall have an outward call according unto rule, for his admission thereunto. And in all these things, God acts according to his own sovereign will and pleasure."

To all this the objection will, we know be presented, that as the work of the ministry is especial and extraordinary, and not an ordinary duty, the call to this work must also be extraordinary, immediate and direct from the Holy Ghost.

But we can see no force in the objection :

1. In the first place, the work of the ministry is only one department of that wide field of Christian obligation, effort and usefulness, which is under the direction and control of the Holy Spirit, into which, as we have seen, He calls, and for which He qualifies.

2. The whole work and operation of the Holy Spirit is conducted upon a uniform plan—so that, however various the field, the work, or the effect to be produced—it is one and the same Spirit that worketh all, in all, and by all. The manner of this working of the Holy Spirit in one case, will therefore be His manner in all ordinary cases ; and if that manner in one case is secret and unknown, and only evidenced by the state produced, and not by the operation producing it,—then this will be the manner in all cases.

3. This view is sustained by the analogy between the work of the ministry and every other Christian work, and

between the call to the ministry and the call to every other duty and privilege.

In regard to all such cases, there is no difference in the NATURE of the duty, but only in its *degree* of importance.* All spiritual duties depend alike upon divine appointment and divine assistance. Entire consecration to God is the spirit and principle of all piety, and entire devotion to Him and to His service, is the full and perfect manifestation of piety. The obligation to this entire consecration of all our powers and efforts to the promotion of God's glory in the salvation of men, arises from our relation to God in Christ, and rests, therefore, equally upon all men. As it regards any *particular* duty, the obligation springs from the command of God in His word; and the qualifications for it are to be *determined* by that word, while they can only be *imparted* by the Spirit. In all cases, our knowledge of duty arises from the Scriptures; in all cases saving and sanctifying impressions come through them; and in all cases the Holy Spirit is the efficient agent in opening the understanding to perceive and the heart to obey. The Word of God is, therefore, in all cases the guide to duty, the standard of duty, and the warrant of duty. And when our own hearts testify to the existence within us of the qualifications prescribed in that word for any office or duty; of the dispositions it requires; and of the desire and willingness it demands; then, that word assures us that these are the gifts and fruits of the Spirit, and that having given them, He has thereby fitted us for, and called us to, the duty in question.†

No duty is obligatory upon the conscience of a Christian that is not made binding by the Word of God, since the Scriptures "thoroughly furnish unto every good word and work." This word, therefore, is the *external* call to any work. And its call is as general and as extensive as the

* See this analogy admitted in the Southern Presb. Review, No. 3, p. 143, 144.

† The divine influence, says Eade, in his truly spiritual and admirable work on 'The Gospel Ministry, is known not by direct, immediate intuition or knowledge, but first, by its influence and results in the partakers; and second, in the qualities ascribed to it; see p. 99, 223, 208, 215, 216, 303. At the same time, he dwells constantly on the truth, that the call to the ministry in all its parts is certainly from the Holy Ghost, as its efficient cause, root and fountain. See p 304, 309, 312, 323, 324, 351.

field of Christian duty, and includes within its range every specific requirement.* The *internal* call is in every case the operation of the Holy Spirit in the soul, by which this external call is made to commend itself to the heart, and to produce an internal compliance with it.†

The application of passages of Scripture enforcing any *particular* duty—as for instance that of the ministry—is in accordance with a general rule pursued by the Holy Ghost, in His illuminating and saving operations. In such cases the truth is special, the duty special, and the application special, but the power by which an application is made, and the manner in which it is made, is in all cases analogous.‡ Truths referring to special persons and to special cases, are, therefore, as a universal rule, only accompanied by special illumination and enforcement in the case and circumstances designed.§

The ministry, however, is no more special as a privilege and duty than the Christian calling, or than any other particular Christian duty.¶ All are permitted and bestowed by sovereign goodness. The proper discharge of all is beyond mere natural ability and capacity. All are unwarranted, except to those specially called to undertake them. As is the case with all other Christian duties, therefore, the ministry depends upon divine appointment; its qualifications are measured by divine requirements; fitness for its discharge proceeds from the divine bounty; obligation to use the gifts thus bestowed is created by the divine command; and the sense of *individual* responsibility, is an inference from our actually possessing these gifts, wrought in us by the Holy Ghost, and from our opportunity of engaging in the work.

The ministry is an instituted and permanent means of grace and “labor of love.” And as the Holy Ghost instituted and ordained it, so He continues it to the end of time, by an ordinary and regular method of procedure.**

* See Turretine, Tom. 3, p. 240.

† See Bellamy's Works, vol. 2, p. 537, 538.

‡ Halyburton's Works, p. 543.

§ Jamieson's Reality, p. 23, 84.

¶ For instance, the office and work of Deacons, Elders, Teachers, Professors, Missionaries, Evangelists, &c. &c. On the doctrine of the general calling of Christians, in reference to all duty, see also, in addition to the authors already quoted, Baxter's Works. Index, term Calling.

** See Hurron's Works, Vol. 3, p. 304, 305, 306.

The ground of a call to it, is found in the whole doctrine of Scripture, concerning the nature and necessity of the office, and the obligations to fulfil it.* This doctrine is general and unlimited in its application, except to persons of the female sex, or of natural incapacity, or such as are destitute of the required qualifications to whom it does not apply.† The ability to apply this doctrine of the ministry to himself individually, and to assume the actual discharge of its functions, is the result of its special application by the Holy Ghost to his soul, which application is to be sought and secured in this, just as it is in every other case of Christian privilege and duty.‡

To make a call to the ministry depend, therefore, upon a direct and immediate suggestion of the Spirit, constraining an individual to engage in this work, is to teach that the Scriptures are not the only infallible guide to duty, and that they are not able “THOROUGHLY TO FURNISH FOR EVERY GOOD WORK,” since the ministry is expressly described as “A GOOD WORK;”—it is to teach that God immediately, directly, and independently of His own Word, which is perfect as a rule of duty, reveals and imposes duty; it is to teach God does this through evidence, which opens up the way to the greatest possible delusion, and which is incapable of certain authentication;§ it is to substitute for an authentic and infallible directory and rule of duty one that is variable, uncertain, delusive, indeterminable,—one which even Mr. Gurney admits only *mature* Christians can discern, and which *all* admit, must be tested by the only sure test, and proved genuine by its subsequent results:—and unless, therefore, this evidence of a ministerial call is resolved essentially into the combined testimony of the Word, its saving application and effects, and the secret but effectual operation of the Spirit leading to a comfortable persuasion of duty, it is *vitally* different from what we must believe to be rational, scriptural, and attainable.|| The

* See Owen's Works, Vol. 3, p. 352, 351, 239, 240, 248, 297, 296, 299.

† Do. do., vol. 20, p. 406, 419–421.

‡ Do. do., vol. 3, p. 352, 239, 240, 299.

§ See Dr. Wardlaw's Letters to the Society of Friends, p. 328, 329, 330, 332, and Durham on Revelation, who shows that the supposed impulse of the Spirit is no sure sign, p. 72, 73.

|| See Dr. Wardlaw's Letters to the Society of Friends, p. 337, 341, 345, 350.

Scriptures nowhere promise such a call, and nowhere give rules by which to ascertain and determine it.*

On the contrary, while the person claiming such sensible evidence of his call, may be himself deceived,—and while no other individual on earth can ascertain or test its existence, God, by express appointment, has made it the duty of his people and of his officers to judge of the call to the ministry *in every case*, by tests which must supersede and set aside any inward impression whatever, if not in accordance with them. Were then such a direct and sensible call necessary, God would thus be made to require evidence of a divine call from the individual who seeks the ministry, which is beyond the possible scrutiny of the parties whom He has nevertheless appointed judges of His call, and distinct from, and often perhaps contradictory to, the evidence which these judges are required to demand.

Nor is this the only absurdity implied in such a theory of the ministerial call, for as the ministry can only be delegated to such as are authorized by Christ, His people and officers must have as certain evidence that Christ has called the individual as the individual himself. And, hence, if a conscious, supernatural, and direct call is necessary to him, it is equally necessary to them; and this is true as it regards Ruling Elders and Deacons, just as much as in the case of Ministers, all being alike of divine appointment and divine calling. But can we believe that God would subject either the individual or his church to such uncertainty and painful contrariety; or, that He would place the evidence of a call to such a duty as that of the ministry in a state of feeling which enthusiasts have ever been ready to claim; which is found to exist just in proportion to the demand made for it; which is found generally as strong in calling to the preaching of error as to the preaching of the truth; which becomes stronger the more erratic and changeable its subject becomes, (e. g. Montanus, Swedenborg,† Joe Smith, &c.;) which is wholly unnecessary to the clear and certain determination of duty; which is dangerous and delusive to the individual and to others; and which, while it encourages the self-confident and pre-

* See do. do., 342, 343, 371.

† He had no doubt of his sincere call by immediate suggestion of the Spirit. See *New Englander*, Oct., 1847, p. 500.

sumptuous, discourages or repels the humble, the conscientious and the sincere?* For ourselves, we must regard such a supposition as derogatory to God, to the Holy Ghost, to Scripture, to reason, and to the ministry itself.† And when we know that a mediate call and appointment to the ministry, through the instrumentality of men, is expressly declared by God himself to have been nevertheless determined efficaciously and purposely by the Holy Ghost, and to have been the gift of Christ,‡ (Acts 20: 28; Acts 13: 2 and 4; Acts 14: 23; and 1 Tim. 4: 14,) we may well shrink back from originating or imposing tests of duty which may keep back many from this work to the injury both of themselves and of the church.§ For, let it be borne in mind, that while it is true, that to enter the work of the ministry uncalled is presumption, it is equally and emphatically true, that to refuse to enter it when called—however feebly that call may be expressed, if given at all—is dangerous rebellion.|| “The communication of gifts unto men,” says Owen, “is ordinarily accompanied with a powerful and effectual inclination of the minds of men to undertake the work and engage in it, against those objections, discouragements, oppositions and difficulties, which present themselves unto them in their undertaking. This is so, I say, ordinarily, for there are more instances than one, of those who, having the word of prophecy committed unto them, instead of going to Ninevah, do consult their own reputation, ease, and advantage, and so tack about to Tarshish. AND THERE ARE NOT A FEW, WHO HIDE AND NAPKIN UP THEIR TALENTS, WHICH ARE GIVEN THEM TO TRADE WITHAL, THOUGH REPRESENTED UNTO US UNDER ONE INSTANCE ONLY. BUT THESE MUST ONE DAY ANSWER FOR THEIR DISOBEDIENCE UNTO THE HEAVENLY CALL.”

The Holy Spirit, as has been seen, is pleased to carry on

* On the lawfulness of this argument, see Southern Presb. Review, No. 2, p. 136, 147.

† See Wardlaw's Letters, *ibid.*, p. 49, 50, 53. See also Durham on Revelation, p. 69, and Hooker's Eccl. Pol., B. 5, chap. 57, sec. 9.

‡ See all the passages requiring a regular order of introduction by a Presbytery, and Durham on Revelation, p. 68. See also 1 Kings 19: 19, where Elijah is made to call Elisha.

§ Biblical Repertory, 1831, p. 197, 199-205, 208, 209.

|| Owen, vol. 24, p. 238.

His operations in and by His own word, and in and by our faculties. The only other point to be noticed, and on which we think the Reviewer's theory most seriously wrong, is that He does this *instrumentally*. He works in and by *means*. This He does in perfect consistency with His sovereign, free and divine character, as the Lord and giver of spiritual life and power—"the Father of lights from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift."* The use of means on the part of the Holy Spirit in nature and providence, and in the ordinances and other instrumentality employed in working out saving results, is no more inconsistent with the divine prerogatives and glory of this ever blessed agent in one case than in another.

According to the general opinion of writers, therefore, the distinction between the *extraordinary* call of prophets and apostles, and the *ordinary* call of ministers under the established order of the church is, that the former was generally (for it was not always and certainly so†) immediate, direct and independent of the word and of existing officers, while the latter is always mediate, that is, through and in conjunction with, the instrumentality of man.‡ The use of means in leading to this call, has reference to the internal as well as to the external call, and to the evidence of that call as appreciable by ourselves and others. The Holy Ghost employs such means, in order to influence a man's views preparatory to his engaging in the work, by leading him to think of it, to desire it, and to shape his course of life and study with a view to it; and they affect also his final conviction of duty, and his actual determination to engage in the work itself. The manifestation of the Holy Spirit's operations are also, it is to be remembered, different in different individuals, so that what is the evidence of a sincere guidance to the work of the ministry in one case may not be in another. The circumstances of the case, and the character and condition of the individual, will diversify the character of the Spirit's operations, and the nature and degree of that evidence by which they are attested, and

* See Perkins' Works, vol. 3, p. 483. Heber's Bampton Lectures, p. 326, 327, 334, 328: "In no part of the divine word is this influence represented as operating or taking effect, except in connection with the employment of means." Henderson on Inspiration, p. 52, &c.

† 1 Kings 19: 19.

‡ See Turretine, Tom. 3, p. 241.

hence individuals in "*desiring* this office," are not to look for all *possible*, or even for all *desirable* evidence of the Spirit's work leading them to it, but only for that degree of evidence which is *sufficient*. And who will deny that one clear mark of such a call, specified and imparted by the Holy Spirit in his own word, is sufficient, however it may be clouded with doubts?*

The call to the ministry, therefore, is not less connected with, and dependent upon human instrumentality, than a call to any other Christian duty. The obligations requiring it, taken in connection with the express limitations of the word of God, as it regards sex and fitness, is general, resting primarily upon the whole church, and secondarily, upon every member of the church not thus specifically excluded from it. Means must, therefore, be used by others and by themselves, and preëminently by parents and pastors, in order to ascertain the will of God concerning the children and youth of the church.

In calling persons into the Christian ministry, there is a great work to be done by the church. The commission of Christ is general, and is made specially and savingly applicable through the instrumentality of the church to whomsoever the Lord our God shall call.† The Christian ministry was given by Christ to the whole body of the church, and the entire doctrine concerning it was, and is addressed to that church. Believers generally, therefore, are under obligation to see to it that this ministry is perpetuated and maintained, and to use every proper means to secure this end. Hence, they are bound to "pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into the harvest." But THEY MUST DO MORE THAN THIS, OR THEY ARE VERILY GUILTY CONCERNING THIS MATTER. Prayer without effort is presumption. The nature of the ministry—its necessity—its design—its permanence—its qualifications—its obligations and demands—these all constitute a part of what Christ has taught, and what concerns His glory, and these, therefore, must constitute a part of the teaching of the church. All these things ought to be diligently en-

* See Dr. M'Leod's True Godliness, p. 152-166, 174, 167, 199, 201-211.

† See Presbytery and not Prelacy, the Scriptural and Primitive Polity of the Churches, p. 72-88. See Owen's Works. Turretine, Tom. 3, p. 235, 239, 245, 246.

forced, and brought before the minds of her youth, and before the minds of parents and instructors. Parents ought to dedicate their children to God and to the work of the ministry. They ought to study the natural bent and gifts of their children, and when they see a hopeful capacity for this work, they ought to train up such children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, with a special view to the ministry.* Timothy, among Apostolic preachers; Origen and Athanasius, among the Fathers, and a host of the most burning and shining lights of every age, have been thus consecrated and trained up for the ministry.† A call to the ministry is often given in infancy, and is manifested by the bent and inclination of the mind, and implies in all cases, so far as is necessary, a call to those studies and pursuits which will fit and prepare for the actual discharge of the ministry,‡ not being *primarily* but only ultimately to the work itself. The ministerial call, is primarily a call to diligent preparation for the work, in order that those qualifications which are the result of supernatural grace, or of human industry, may be sought, and by God's blessing, obtained. And the latter class of qualifications, not being now miraculously bestowed, such diligent preparation and study, as Durham teaches, is in every case, absolutely and by evident divine appointment necessary.§ Where, therefore, the Spirit truly calls any man to the work of the ministry, it may be laid down as a certain rule that He leads to all the preparatory means necessary for it.||

Hence, pastors and elders should carefully look out among their youth for such as give evidence of natural fitness for this work; and in addition to the teaching of the pulpit, they ought to bring the subject of the ministry before their minds and advise them to pursue a course of study in reference to it, if peradventure God may open up to them an effectual door of entrance.**

* See Perkins' Works, vol. 1, p. 759. For parents to neglect this duty, as it regards every calling, he makes a positive sin. See also Owen's Works, vol. 3, p. 339, 340.

† See De Moore's Comment. on Mark. Tom. 6, p. 282, 283. Mr. Porter's Discourse, p. 14.

‡ De Moore, Tom. 6. p. 282.

§ On the Revelation, p. 216.

|| Do., p. 72, 73, and Dr. Howe on Theol. Education.

** Do., and Greenham's Works, Fol. 1605, p. 24, 726.

The church is under special obligation to use diligently all the means and agencies appointed in the word and by the church, to "commit this ministry to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also," and "to lay hands suddenly on no man," but first to train them up under her own direction in the schools of the prophets in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, that they may be "proved," and "thoroughly furnished for this good work." Such was not only the doctrine but the practice also of the reformers, and of our venerated fathers. And it is still the universal practice, as it regards the calling of deacons, ruling elders, Sabbath school teachers, professors of theology, &c. who are all called to their work and persuaded to enter upon it—not because they seek the office, and urge their call and fitness for the work, but because the church, judging that they are competent, calls them to the work, and by moral suasion "compels them" to engage in it.

"It were useful to the church,"* says Durham, "and conducting exceedingly for the clearing of entrance to the ministry, that there were some choice and way of trial, both of such as might be presently found fit to enter the ministry, and also of others that might be advised to study in reference thereunto; and that it might not be left unto men themselves alone, whether they will offer themselves to trial in reference to that charge or not. For so many may, and no question do, smother good gifts, which might be useful, thereby prejudging the church thereof, who, by this grave, convincing, and (ere it fail) authoritative way, might be brought forth, and would more easily be made to yield thereunto, when the burden thereof were not wholly left on themselves; whereas, now, partly from shame and modesty, partly from custom and undervaluing of the ministry, none ordinarily, who otherwise have a temporal being or any place, do betake themselves to this calling: and it is hard to say, that either none such are gifted for it, or that such gifts should be lost." "There is no question but the church might call a member, upon supposition of his qualifications, to trial, and (being found conform to what was supposed) might appoint him to the ministry; and that member ought to yield to both, from that duty that

* Durham, 73, 74, 75.

lyeth on every member in reference to the whole body, which is to be preferred to any particular member's interest:" "And seeing all incorporations and commonwealths have this liberty to call and employ their members, without respect to their own inclinations, so as it may be most useful for the good of the body; this which nature teacheth, and experience hath conferred in them, cannot be denied to the church, which is a body and hath its own policy given to it by Jesus Christ for the building up of itself. This way is also agreeable to Scripture, and to the practice of the primitive times:" "By all which it appears like the Apostolic way to enquire for men that may be found qualified for the ministry: and also, that shunning or repining to enter the ministry in any person found qualified for it, and thus called to it, hath never been supposed as allowable by the Apostles; but it was looked upon as a duty for those that were so called to obey, as it was the duty of others to enquire for such. To this also may that exhortation of Peter relate, 1 Peter 5: 2, "Feed the flock of God which is amongst you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly," &c. whereby it would seem, that he is pressing obedience from those that were called, that willingly they should undertake the oversight of God's flock. Which words, if well considered, would pinch exceedingly a tender conscience of any man, if a call were thus pressed upon him. And indeed, if it were at men's option arbitrarily to refuse such a call, the directions that are given to people and ministers for searching out, calling and ordaining such, were to no purpose, for thus they might all be frustrated." "This is also the established doctrine of our church in the first Book of Discipline, in that head that concerneth prophesying and interpreting Scripture, whereof these are the words, 'Moreover, men in whom is supposed to be any gift, which might edify the church, if they were employed, must be charged by the ministers and elders, to join themselves with the session and company of interpreters, to the end that the Kirk may judge, whether they be able to serve to God's glory and the profit of the Kirk, in the vocation of ministers, or not. And, if any be found disobedient, and not willing to communicate the gifts and special graces of God with their brethren, after sufficient admonition, *discipline must proceed against*

them, provided that the civil magistrate concur with the judgment and election of the Kirk; *for no man may be permitted as best pleaseth him to live within the Kirk of God*; but every man must be constrained, by fraternal admonition and correction, to bestow his labors, when of the Kirk he is required, to the edification of others. Which, if it were zealously followed, might, by God's blessing, prove both profitable and honorable to the church."

Such means, used by pastors, elders and parents to press upon the minds of youth the nature and obligation of the ministry, do not as some object in any degree conflict with the sovereign purpose and intention of God, because they only present to the minds of the young a work which God has appointed—the requirement and duty God has commanded—and the promise which God has imparted. And as it is only in God's name this is done, so it is only to His Spirit all parties look for ability to make these means effectual.* In using such instrumentality in the calling of His ministers, God eminently displays His sovereignty, dignifies His church and people, glorifies Himself by making use of His creatures, and at the same time secures the order, harmony, efficiency, and perpetuity of His church. And that God is pleased with such efforts on the part of his church and people, appears from the fact, that many of the most eminent ministers in ancient times, as for instance, Chrysostom and Ambrose, and among the moderns, as in the case of Calvin, were led to enter the ministry through the urgency of ministers.† The case of Mr. Durham, to whom, as has been said in connection with Professor Dickson, "The sum of saving knowledge" is attributed,‡ and who was in his day a burning and a shining light—may be given as an illustration of the practice of the Scottish church at that day.§ "His call and coming forth to the holy ministry, says his biographer, was truly remarkable, which was this: The Scots army being to engage with the

* See Turretine, vol. 1, p. 458.

† See also the case of Elijah, 1 Kings 19, 19.

‡ Formerly bound up with the Confession of Faith, as it is still in Scotland.

§ The work to which his life is prefixed (on the Revelation) is introduced by Baillie and Carstians. See p. 8, 9. Mr. Dickson, was himself six years a Professor before he was appointed a Minister. See Select Writings of, vol. 1, p. 8.

English army in sight, he judged it meet to call his company and soldiers, (for he was in the army,) to prayer before the engagement. And as he was beginning to pray, it happened that the Rev. Mr. David Dickson, Professor of Divinity, then at Glasgow, came riding by the army, who seeing the soldiers addressing themselves to prayer, and hearing the voice of one praying, drew near and lighted from his horse, and joined with them, who was so much taken with Mr. Durham's prayer, that after prayer, Mr. Dickson called for the captain, and having conversed with him a little, he did solemnly charge him, that so soon as this piece of service he was engaged in was over, he should devote himself to serve God in the holy ministry, for to that he judged the Lord called him. But though as yet Mr. Durham had no clearness to hearken to Mr. Dickson's desire, yet two remarkable providences falling out just upon the back of Mr. Dickson's solemn charge, served very much to clear his way to comply with Mr. Dickson's desire."

..... "Accordingly, in pursuance of this his resolution, he very quickly after went to Glasgow, and studied divinity under Mr. Dickson, then Professor there, and made such proficiency in his studies, that in a short time (being called thereto) he humbly offered himself to trials, anno 1646, and was licensed by the Presbytery of Irvine to preach the Gospel."

Equally striking and confirmatory of our views, is the testimony of Halyburton, as given in his own Memoirs, in the chapter on his entrance into the ministry: "It was," says he,* "like hell once to entertain a thought of preaching to others what I did not believe myself; but now things began to alter, and the Lord led me on to that which I declined before; and I find the steps of his providence about me in this matter do deserve to be remembered by me. 1. My mother did devote me from my childhood to this work, and often expressed her desire to lend me to the Lord all the days of my life, to serve him in the Gospel of of his Son. This has often had its own weight on my spirit. 2. The course of my studies had looked that way;"

"He brought me under a lively sense of that forcible tie that was hereon laid on me, to lay out myself in

* Memoirs, Part 4, chap. 1.

any way that he should call me to be serviceable to him ; and I was made to think that I should be the more happy the more directly my work should look that way. While, like Peter, I was musing sometimes on these things, about the month of April, 1698, two ministers were sent to my great surprise, from the Presbytery of Kirkaldy, urging me to enter on trials : I did altogether decline the proposal, because I had no reading, wanted the languages, and had been much diverted from study." "The ministers continued to solicit me, and press home their desire ; but while I stood out against their solicitations, though not without some secret struggle, and doubting whether in so doing I might not be declining duty, I began to observe the Lord raising a storm against me ;" "While I was in this case, Mr. Riddel did, May, 30, come to the Wemyss, and, after much converse and many reasonings, charged me to try and have my thoughts on my text, and then do or stand off, as the Lord should clear duty ; which I did consent to. But after this, I still did shift and decline, and could not think of a compliance ; and then, December 28, Provost Ramsay wrote earnestly desiring me to take the charge of my Lord Maitland." "Having at Mr. Forrester's earnest desire, undertaken a homily in the new college, which I was to deliver next week, I took time to consider of it : and after that I had, on Feb. 28, 1699, delivered my discourse on Job 28 : 28, I went to visit my acquaintance, worthy Mr. Shiels, who did urge me to enter on trials, with that gravity and concern that had more weight on my spirit than all that had been spoken to me." "The Presbytery of Kirkaldy, March 16, 1699, urged me to try a common head, and if I was not, after that, clear to proceed, promised to leave me to my choice ; whereupon I consented, and delivered it April 20, when I accepted of a text." &c.*

* Investigation will shew that these examples are not exceptions to a general rule, but are themselves illustrations of it. We have noted some to which we will refer, selecting that very valuable history of the Reformers, Puritans, and other eminent English divines, Middleton's *Evangelical Biography*, 4 vols., 8vo. Æcolampadius changed his designed profession of law for that of theology, "being led and guided thereto by love of the truth," which he had been led to embrace. (Vol. 1, p. 86.) Zuingle appears to have been early designed and trained for the work, (vol. 1, p. 100.) Bilney abandoned the law when converted to the truth, and devoted himself wholly to the study of divinity, (vol. 1, p. 104.) Such was the case

If, then, it is manifestly the duty of parents, pastors, and elders to use efforts to bring the subject of the ministry to the proper consideration of such as appear to be suitable for it—it is manifestly the duty of all those who have reason to think they possess in any degree the necessary qualifications for the work, to examine into its claims upon them, and God's purpose concerning them. Hence, the office of the ministry is declared by the Apostles, (1 Tim. 3: 1,) to be "a good," a useful, and an honorable "work." "He who desireth it," that is, reaches or stretches out towards it,—he who longs after and tries to gain this office, (for which he the Apostle lays down the social, moral, and ecclesiastical qualifications,) is commended by the Apostle.* In his word, God in effect says to every one whom he has suitably qualified, "Whom shall I send, who shall go for us?" and to this they should be found replying: "Then said I, here Lord am I, send me." He who cherishes an inclination to this work, with a proper sense of its nature, and of the necessity of seeking it in that way of orderly preparation and trial which God has ordained, manifests

with Frith, (p. 123,) with Tindale, (p. 128,) with Lambert, (p. 139,) with Urbanus Regius, (p. 145,) with Capito, (p. 148,) Grynaeus, (p. 149,) Myconius, (251,) Bucer, (264,) Hooper, (317,) Bradford, (353,) Justus Jonas, (374,) Latimer, (378,) Ridley, (403, 404,) Peter Martyr, (500,) Calvin and Jewell were both early devoted to the ministry, and on receiving the truth, began to preach it. Knox was led to the ministry by the bent of his inclinations, (vol. 2, p. 133,) and on conviction of the truth, became a Protestant minister, (p. 134.) Such was Gilpin's history also, (p. 192 and 196.) Ussher, from infancy, had a fondness for study, and gave up a paternal estate in order to pursue divinity, vol. 3, p. 313. Bishop Reynolds was also early inclined to the work and prepared for it, (p. 424;) and Manton, (429,) and Herbert, who refers his call to God, "who put into my heart," he says, "these good desires and resolutions, (p. 56, 54, 50, 49.) Sibbes entered the ministry as soon as converted, (vol. 3, p. 70.) Bishop Hall was from infancy devoted to the ministry, and educated for it, (vol. 3, p. 352.) So was Charnock trained, (445, 446.) Owen was diverted to the ministry from other pursuits, as soon as he received a spiritual change, (462.) So also Jacomb, (vol. 4, p. 314.) Leighton was educated for the work, (vol. 4, p. 487.) This was the case with Baxter, (p. 16, 17,) with Flavel, (48,) P. Henry, M. Henry, Burkitt, Harvey and Watts, (see p. 110, 240, 241, 265.) Doddridge, without assistance, could not have entered the ministry, (283.) Davies was devoted to this work before his birth, and then trained for it, (341.) So with Whitfield, (419,) &c. &c.

* See all the Commentaries on this passage. See also Hooker's Eccl. Polity, B. 5, ch. 77, sec. 13; Perkins' Works, vol. 1, p. 759. Greesham's Works, p. 24, 726.

a commendable spirit,* and need not hesitate to act upon his desire, for says Owen,† “There are invariable rules to try men and their ministry at all times, whether they are sent of God or not. The doctrine which they teach, the ends which they promote, the lives which they lead, the circumstances of the seasons wherein they appear, will sufficiently manifest whence such teachers are.” A desire for the work of the ministry, if sincere and directed to the glory of God, is placed by the Rev. Robert Trail, among the leadings of God in calling to the ministry, which call he considers as made clear, when this desire leads to diligence in the use of all the means of attaining fitness for it, and to some edifying success in it. “So that, indeed a man ordinarily can never be so well confirmed, in the faith of his being called of God, until he make some essay in this work.” (1 Tim. 3:10.)‡

Every young man, therefore, not naturally incapacitated, is bound to investigate this subject. The ministry is a good and glorious work—it is a most worthy object of desire—it is a work which all are bound in some way to uphold, maintain and elevate, and it may therefore be the duty of such a young man, or such a man even if of mature years, to do this by becoming ministers themselves. This question every individual must examine and decide in the fear of God. They must ascertain the *natural* qualifications for it, and examine whether they possess them. They must inquire into the *special* qualifications laid down for it by the Apostle, and see how far they may hope to attain to them. They must consider the *duties* of the ministry, and examine how far they can hope willingly to discharge them. They must look at its *trials*, and “examine themselves” how they can hope to bear them. They must analyze its *motives*, and ascertain how far they are actuated by them. They are to pray, to read, to take advice, and *in every other way*, according to the Scriptures, to seek by “doing God’s will to know the mind of the Lord.” NO YOUNG MAN IS GUILTLESS WHO HAS NOT DONE

* See Turretine, Tom. 3, p. 238. Dutch Annotations. Diodati. The German Bible, and Tonson’s Bible, with Notes.

† On the Hebrews.

‡ See his Discourse on the Ministry in the Morning Exercises, vol. 3, p. 202, 203. See Dr. M’Leod’s True Godliness, p. 167.

ALL THIS AND MORE. If he has done all this, and then finds himself conscientiously excluded from the work, by natural, providential, or any other *certain* hindrances, then, and NOT TILL THEN, can he rest satisfied that he "may sit down and take his ease in Zion." But, if a young man has never considered this subject, and its claims upon his attention;—if he has *taken it for granted*, that he cannot serve God in this work;—if he has *made light* of the whole subject, and regarded it as unworthy of his investigation;—and if he has considered the work itself as beneath his ambitious aspirations; then may the curse of God rest upon him and upon his whole course of life, "because he came not up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord, against the mighty." That many do thus suffer, because of their unwillingness to hear, and answer God's call to this work, made to them in his word and providence, we verily believe. That many, who ought to "prove their own selves," whether or not God would have them to enter the ministry, "care for none of these things," and are heinously guilty before God, we verily believe. That inadequate views of the true dignity, honor, and importance of the ministry, and of its paramount claims, above all other kinds of service, to an ample and sufficient support, encourage this indisposition on the part of many to think of the ministry as a business for life, we also verily believe. And that all views which foster this Gallio spirit are necessarily and very fatally injurious to the church and to the individuals themselves, and are therefore most earnestly to be deprecated and contended against, we do also most earnestly believe.

In conclusion, let us say that if in this condition of the general Christian mind in reference to the subject of the ministry and its paramount obligation, God makes it evident by putting the desire into their hearts—that he "has chosen the poor of this world," and called them to this "good work"—then most firmly do we believe that IT IS THE PRIVILEGE AND DUTY of the church to encourage and sustain them;—to rejoice that the Lord of the harvest has sent them into his vineyard;—to rejoice in being permitted to coöperate with Him in preparing and fitting them for the work;—and to feel assured that God can still glorify himself, by selecting, as his ambassador, the more humble members of his church. "Because the

foolishness of God is wiser than men ; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For you see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called : But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty ; and base things of the world, and things which are despised hath God chosen ; yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are : That no flesh should glory in his presence. (1 Cor. 1 : 25.)

POLEMIC THEOLOGY.

1. JOH. FRID. STAPFERI, V. D. M., *Helv. Bern. Institutiones Theologicae Polemicae Universae ordine Scientifico dispositae.*
2. *Lectures in Divinity, by the late GEORGE HILL, D. D., Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. Edited from his Manuscript, by his Son, the Rev. ALEXANDER HILL, Minister of Dailly.*

The former of these works has been before the public for more than a century ; the latter for only twenty-seven years. These two authors were comparatively little known, until by these writings they attracted attention, which, in the case of the Scot, was after his death. The Swiss had felt all the influence of the old systems of belief, and was greatly devoted to the Wolfian mode of philosophising. The modes of thought and argument of preceding ages, had left on the minds of his cotemporaries an influence which it would have been marvellous if he had not felt. The terms of the schoolmen are found in his work, though not to the extent that some might expect. He is remarkably clear and logical on most subjects. We can easily pardon the occasional introduction of "casus purus" and like terms, on account of other great excellencies. His work has never been translated into English, nor is it very important that

it should be. Its Latinity is indeed not highly classical nor elegant. It would not compare in general with that of Milton or Calvin. But it is far from being the low and uncouth style of some, whose attainments were otherwise respectable. The chief difficulty that any one would find in reading him is overcome by reading thirty pages, and learning his rather peculiar use of some of the particles. He too often turns Greek words into Latin; yet, at times he is even elegant, and almost always clear. He was familiar with the best writers of his day, and his quotations are pertinent, judicious and striking, though not at all numerous. We commend the study of his work to all who love logical acumen and solemn, reverent discussion of great truths. The work of Principal Hill is of course in English, in a good style, free from meretricious ornament, with a rich vein of originality running through it, and conducted with a degree of candor hardly equalled, and perhaps not surpassed by any for the last century. Indeed, at times, the friend of truth almost trembles for orthodoxy, while he sees presented in their full force the strong points of the impugners of a sound theology. But, when he has read all, then he rejoices that his author was so fair and so full. We ourselves once read some twenty pages, and had occasion to lay the book aside for a few weeks, and the impression left was one of fear that he had yielded too much to his opponents; but when we had time to complete the chapter, we were rather better pleased with it than we had been with any of the preceding.

We, therefore, confidently recommend both of these works to our readers, and especially to our clerical readers, not only as containing a large amount of able discussion, but as models of controversy, worthy, almost without exception, to be followed — Stapfer's mode of philosophising always excepted. The subject of *Polemic Theology* is one not only of great intrinsic importance, but to the American theologian it has peculiar interest. In our country, who will may preach, and what he will, who will may publish, and what he will, who will and can may found a sect in religion. This results from the perfect freedom of thought and speech and printing in our country. To one who has grown up in this state of things, this freedom presents no strong or peculiar temptations; but to per-

sons whose birth or parentage was foreign, and who have felt the galling oppressions of the old world, such freedom is often bewildering and intoxicating. Accordingly the impulse given to their minds is very powerful, and they vend amongst us all manner of crude opinions and dangerous doctrines. Some of these dealers in bad doctrines are no doubt designing men, and some of them are very shrewd. A few of them have considerable learning. The number of this latter class will probably increase. It is manifest, therefore, that many a hard battle for the truth must here be fought. It is not worth while to groan over heresy and fanaticism, and do nothing to arrest them. It is not worth while to quarrel with our age and country. It is far better to take them as we find them, and deal with them according to our ability and their peculiarities. But how shall this most effectually be done? is a question of high practical interest. In reply, many things might be said; but we shall confine ourselves chiefly to one subject, viz: the true and proper rules of controversy. These are always substantially the same. They are applicable to all times, and nations, and subjects. They are clearly laid down by Stapfer in the second chapter of his first volume, which treats of the CAUTIONS TO BE OBSERVED IN CONTROVERSIES ON THEOLOGY.

In a system of polemic theology, says he, there is need of the rules of prudence. And it is not possible to proceed with too much care in a matter which so closely respects the divine glory, the defence of saving truth, the eternal salvation of man and the destruction of error. Therefore, in this science all things are to be so set in order, that nothing may be omitted, which tends to the attainment of the ends proposed, which are *first*, the demonstration of saving truth, and *then* the conviction of the erring. On the other hand all those things are to be avoided which can hinder the attainment of this end. Therefore, only the best means are to be used. In this consists real prudence. The rules of prudence to be used relate either to him who engages in a discussion, or to the manner of conducting it. Certainly it is the part of a wise man above all things to propose to himself the best end. But in religious controversy, there can be no other lawful aim than the love of the truth itself, that thus the truth may be shown, error refu-

ted, and the erring convinced. For all that we have said tends to the truth, that the purity of God's word, which is truth itself, may surely be preserved and vindicated. The *first* rule is this :

Let him who would engage in controversy, thoroughly examine himself, and see to what end and with what desire he seeks it, whether from ambition, or from a lust of condemning others, or from other depraved passions.

For if a sincere love towards the truth governs the minds of all those who are employed in sacred things, very soon a great part of the controversy falls of itself, and quiet, so much to be desired in the church, is restored. But, if learning is preferred to piety, and out of religion comes craft, only strife and discord can follow. But no one can convince another of the truth, who, being imbued with false opinions, has no firm persuasion of the truth. For he who would prove anything, must have clear convictions concerning it, and those based upon proper evidence. But if he doubts of the truth of a matter, it is because the proof is not sufficiently clear to himself; and consequently he cannot have hope of his adversary or of himself that by the evidence of the truth he may be rendered certain, or, which is one and the same thing, be convinced. Therefore, the *second* rule of prudence is this :

Let no one engage in a controversy with others concerning the articles of religion, unless he, having laid aside preconceived opinions, and being convinced of the truth by proper proof, has acquired clear and settled views of it.

It is certainly the part of prudence to avoid all those things, which in the use of means may be a hindrance to the attainment of this end. Therefore, he who engages in controversy, should in regard to himself avoid all those things which can hinder his design. This rule respects both his mind and his will and affections. It is true that the human mind, by reason of its great weakness and corruption, is so very much imbued with false opinions and prejudices, and is by these so much biassed, that it errs from the truth, and very often in lieu of it defends error. For the prejudices which spring from sloth, or a bad education, or rashness, or authority, do so prevail with many, that very often they who count themselves learned, assent to the truth for no other cause than that human authority adds

weight to it in their minds. For whoever draws not the truth from its own fountains, and does not take pains in acquiring certainty, is led only by the prejudices of authority, and so holds any proposition as true, either because he has heard it from some man of great name, or because it is extant in the writings of a distinguished man, or because he reads it in creeds and confessions. Nor can superstition arise but from a blind assent. Nor can he who is borne away only by such blind assent, clearly see the connection and binding force of truth, or in what manner it flows from his principles; and, therefore, he cannot convince another by a demonstration of the truth. Nor has he seen the value of the truth to be defended, unless he has clearly seen its connection with foundation truths. Whence oftentimes a controversy of no moment springs up, or it degenerates into a mere war of words. As the end of polemic theology is the preservation of the truth pure, all those things are to be laid aside, which injure the truth. Whence arises the *third* rule:

As the affections of a depraved will, especially ambition, the hatred, which has by some been thought peculiar to Controversial Theologians, [odium Theologicum,] and the love of sect, do so greatly injure the truth, they must be laid aside before we engage in discussions concerning religion.

From the will, depraved affections, such as ambition, the hatred of theologians,* and excessive love of sect, do very greatly injure the truth. For he who is swollen with ambition, does not seek truth, but praises. Hence, those unhappy strifes concerning religion, where neither yields to the other, lest he should seem formally to have erred. Hence, we see so many logomachies and strifes of words; hence, the seeds of new controversies; hence, the love of contradiction, and pertinacity in defending error; hence, nothing is esteemed in respect of truth, except as thereby a name is sought to be gained. So that some who are strangers to the love of truth, are impelled by a desire of contention, which springs from the hatred of theologians, with which, if a man be imbued, he cannot tolerate those who disagree with him, but whatever they say seems to him suspicious,

* Odium Theologicum.

and by exaggerating their errors, heresy is fabricated out of any thing, although it does not overthrow the foundation of faith. Hence, new disputes arise. How greatly such conduct makes against the truth can hardly be told. In this way, the minds of men are soured rather than convinced. Besides, the greatest part of men are so imbued with the love of the religion in which they are born, that they defend opinions early received, although they themselves never clearly saw their truth. Therefore, in matters of faith they yield more to human than to divine authority. From this source arise a certain blind zeal and a love of sect, so that we condemn those who have not the same ideas with us concerning the points in controversy.

But truth is rather to be sought as if we had not yet found it. So our discussions should be conducted, as if we were not much bound to any sect. These are the chief rules or cautions which respect him who would engage in controversy. But in the controversy itself, or in the mode of conducting it, the necessity of the rules of prudence is equally great, lest we wander from the end proposed. These two things are to be sought in a discussion, viz: the establishment of truth and the refutation of error; hence, both are to be so conducted that the conviction of the erring and the defence of the truth, the true end of polemic theology, may be attained. To this end, it is above all things requisite that we use no fallible principles. Hence arises this *fourth* rule:

In Polemic Theology, truths are to be established, so that they may become certain. Hence, nothing is to be trusted to authority, our own, or that of another, because that is a fallible principle.

Because proof ought to rest upon certain principles, it is necessary that there should be such principles either of reason or of revelation, or that there should be on the earth some infallible man, whose authority, that cannot be deceived, may decide concerning any articles of faith, even without argument or proof. But, laying aside the testimony of Scripture, and taking experience only as the test, there never was such a man,—a man, who was himself the truth, or the embodiment of truth, and incapable of deceiving or of being deceived. Hence, in religion, nothing is to be granted to human authority, our own, or that of another, if

it be unaccompanied with proof. But we must always recur to the principles of reason and revelation only, both of which acknowledge God as their author, and there we may safely plant our feet. Hence, that the truth may be established, another rule is to be observed, which is the *fifth*, viz :

If one would make the truth clear to another, such an order is to be observed in delivering it, as that conviction may follow, unless the adversary purposely closes his eyes.

For when we would convince another by presenting the proper evidence of truth, it is right that an order in the proof be observed, so that certain rules being first laid down, other things by a fair process of reasoning may be drawn from them. Thus rules or principles being always first given, their consequences may be understood and proven. Hence, in a treatise concerning the dogmas of faith, such an order is to be used, lest the work fall into a confused method, and lest the truth be built upon premises concerning which our opponents are still in doubt. Nothing, more than this course of proceeding, hinders conviction. Therefore, in teaching the articles of belief, such a connection is to be observed, that one may always rest upon another, and the latter always receive light from the former. For if those things which are chiefly fundamental in religion are taken for granted, and the rest built upon them, all things flowing from them cannot but be doubtful to a stranger to the truth. But the foundation being rightly laid, the structure of the whole edifice will be most firm. To him who errs concerning the foundation of the Christian religion, all dogmas of faith are uncertain, unless the truth both of natural and revealed religion, and the great foundation of the religion of a sinner, viz., that Christ is the only and the most perfect way of salvation, be first demonstrated. But on these truths as foundations all the rest may be built. Therefore, those things on which the certainty of all other articles depends ought not to be noticed merely in a passing way, lest all things which follow from them become uncertain also. In an argument which has in view the conviction of another, it is fit that the evidence be distinctly given. Hence arises the *sixth* rule :

In Polemic Theology all obscurity is to be avoided, so that by proper proof your opponent may become certain concerning the proposition to be proved.

The reason why a man assents to the truth is, that he sees the force of the evidence, or that it is clear to him ; but as long as he does not clearly perceive the force and connection of the reasoning, he cannot be brought to assent, and without this clearness there can at best be but a blind assent. Therefore, in reasoning all obscurity is to be avoided, and as far as possible, simplicity is to be studied, lest any doubt should remain. It tends to this end, first, that the simplest language be used, and no place be given to vague terms. Obscure words deceive rather than persuade, and are suited only to sow strife, and produce a war of words, and thus do much injury to the truth, especially when under them lie concealed several senses. In the next place, the connection is to be maintained in drawing out truths, so that others may clearly see that the predicate agrees with the subject ; for on this rests the evidence of the argument. If this be wanting, certainty concerning the matter in hand must be wanting also. These are the principal rules which must be observed in arguing for the truth, if we would attain the end proposed. In refuting error, all these means are to be no less used, for they conduce to the right end ; and in like manner all those things are to be avoided which could hinder the proper effect of truth. But above all, unless we would lose sight of our design, the state of the controversy, or the errors to be refuted must be well understood, and that in the manner before stated. Hence, the *seventh* rule to be observed is this :

In refuting errors, the whole system of a sect must be well understood in its connection, so that the state of the controversy may thereby be rightly given.

Doubtless, each sect has its own peculiar prejudices and hypotheses, to which it is much inclined. But among these hypotheses are certain primary prejudices, which serve as a foundation to the rest. But the whole system of errors must be considered, that we may know in what way one error is connected with another, and how each of the remaining errors contributes its part to the establishment of the primary hypothesis. For in this way only can the mind of the erring be well understood, and the foundation being destroyed, the whole edifice falls of itself. Therefore, in treating controversies, they act amiss who separately unfold and confute single errors standing by themselves, and

have no respect to the whole system and mutual relation which they have to each other. For very many errors cannot be thoroughly understood, except by their connection with others. And when the errors of others are to be confuted, and the erring convinced of the truth, it is required that the system of error itself be thoroughly understood by him who undertakes the task. Hence arises this *eighth* rule :

No one can refute the errors of another and establish the truth in his mind, unless he knows those things on which the truth rests, and so knows the whole system of truth.

For as it is a matter of much importance that the mind of an opposer be clearly understood, so it is not less needful that the truth in all its connection be known, before we attempt to confute any one, and in the way which we have previously pointed out. And *first*, the divine oracles themselves, the fountain of all saving truth, are to be diligently read and studied. In these and from these is wisdom. If we thus act, all murmurings to the contrary, all sciences of a false name, all objections, all the sophisms of factious men will be easily scattered. And for that cause, truths are to be so learned that we may know in what way any one truth agrees with the truth on which it rests, and so that we may know in all its connection saving truth, and in what way it flows from its own first principles. And *secondly*, there are also some to be refuted in argument, who deny any revelation, and cannot be vanquished otherwise than on the principles of philosophy. Therefore, the knowledge of that also is of the greatest use in polemic theology. For it greatly aids the mind of man in the investigation of truth ; it teaches men to form clear and distinct notions ; it accustoms the mind to caution in deciding. A knowledge of it also aids the mind both in the right perception of truth, and also in the more ready detection and consequent overthrow of error. These general uses of philosophy are to be the more sought for by the theologian, as he is the more bound to beware of errors, and as he labors to acquire undoubted certainty. But philosophy also teaches those truths, which revealed theology presupposes to have been proven ; such as the existence of God, his attributes, especially his righteousness, which is the

foundation of all religion, his providence and government of all things, the nature and liberty of the soul, although subject to the divine control, the immortality of the soul and other points. It is so much the more incumbent on the theologian to make himself thoroughly acquainted with philosophy, as errors may the more effectually be confuted by things learned from nature. It is also not a little helpful in attaining a clear knowledge of saving truth, if also the systems of the ablest theologians, and also the books of creeds be read. Polemic theology is not concerned about all errors. Hence, we form this *ninth* rule:

In the selection of errors, there is need of the greatest prudence, lest we either attempt to refute those which are of no moment, or, falling into the other extreme, spare those which most of all injure saving truth, or, finally, lest we hold for error those things which are a part of the very same truth.

For there are various kinds of error, some of which lie buried as it were with the ashes of their authors, and others of them are of no moment. Besides, many things appear to be errors, which are not truly so, but rather are a part of the truth. Hence, both in view of the authors and of their sentiments, a selection must be made; nor are errors to be, as it were, raked together from all quarters, although they may at some time have been set forth; but it is better sometimes to refuse to know them than to recall them from their grave. We might here give examples, which prove that errors are often only the more widely spread, and received by a multitude of men, in consequence of an attempt to meet them in a serious way. Hence, also, in refuting any error of recent origin, care must be taken lest in that way we give a handle to its further dissemination. For human nature is such, that as soon as the reading of any bad book is prohibited, or the supreme magistrate forbids the bookseller to vend it, or any one makes a serious attack upon it, some persons will desire to read it, whether they understand it or not, whether they were previously established in the truth or not. In this way the ignorant are easily led astray. It would, therefore, in my judgment, be best if the reading of such a book were not forbidden, lest the common people should by that means become the more desirous of procuring and reading it. This can hardly be prevented after all

the efforts made. But it would be best, if forthwith learned and pious men would prepare an edition furnished with notes, completely overthrowing the errors contained in the book, so that the reader might have before his eyes the truth opposed to the error, and thus become enlightened on the subject. Sometimes we must spare those prejudices which are no great damage to the Christian church, lest in refuting them we neglect more important errors, or in confuting them we give a handle to greater errors. But this is not to be so understood, that if we undertake to refute the entire system of any sect, any thing in it is to be omitted, lest we should seem only to attack those things which appear to be the most easily refuted. This would argue a bad cause or want of skill. But in a system of errors, those are to be specially attacked, which constitute the primary hypotheses of the sect, affect the very foundations of faith, threaten the greatest loss to the cause of truth, are most agreeable to carnal wisdom, and exclude men from spiritual life and salvation. These must be met, and torn up by the roots. But, as on the one part the moderation becoming a theologian should be manifested, so on the other hand the articles of religion are not to be pared down to suit the carnal mind, lest in seeking to avoid Charybdis we fall upon Scylla, and make ourselves guilty of religious indifferentism, or at least of latitudinarianism, and in this way extend a friendly hand to all forms of religion. We must also take heed, lest we hold that for error, which is perhaps a part of the truth. This may be done, especially in those articles which exceed the human understanding, and on the one part are so very high that the sight of the eyes of the mind cannot reach so far, and which on the other part are so very broad, that the capacity of our feeble intellects cannot comprehend them all. And how this may be the case in the high points of truth, such as, for example, the divine decrees and predestination, any one may easily understand. Of other matters of the same class, we say nothing at present. When we desire to convince others, the rule to be observed is this *tenth* :

If we wish not only to vanquish but to convince the erring, we must so deport ourselves towards them, that they shall see that we are actuated by no bad passion, no love of sect, but solely by the love of truth.

Because, in Polemic Theology, we not only seek that divine truth may be preserved pure, but also that others may be convinced; therefore all those things are to be shunned, which can hinder the conviction of another. Above all things, therefore, care must be taken, lest the opponent conceive an evil suspicion concerning him who conducts the discussion on the side of truth, as if he were so steeped in prejudices, that laying aside all reason he wishes to play the judge or arbiter, and alone decide every thing by his own authority. But in a disputation with others, we ought rather so to behave, as to ascribe nothing to our own opinions and judgments, and so as to shew that we lay aside the authority of even the greatest theologians, yea, of the church itself, because fallible, and that we manifestly grant nothing to the love of sect, lest we appear to wish to prescribe laws to the mind or conscience of another. Something also is to be yielded to the reasons of an opponent; nor are they to be instantly condemned, but rather weighed, and difficulties are to be examined. For so soon as we speak with contempt of the arguments which another offers, we appear either to condemn his mental endowments, or at least we seem to be strongly prejudiced against his views, or we seem reluctant to give just place to the examination of his arguments. Hence, a discussion should be conducted as if we had previously no blind attachment to any form of religion, and were entirely free from all love of party. For it often contributes much to conciliate an opponent, if, where it can be done with a good conscience, we even for a little while seem to him to doubt to which opinion the preference is to be given. Therefore, Minutius Felix, in Octavius, section 5, says: Although it is proper that your mind be so enlightened that you may hold the balance of a perfectly just judge, yet you must not lean strongly to the other side, lest it should appear that the decision did not spring from the discussion, as well as from your own views. From what has been said arises this rule, which is the *eleventh*:

In polemic theology, the conviction of the erring is to be sought, and conviction can be had only by strong proof.

Therefore, if we would convince another, we must not rage and be violent towards him, but must seek a conquest by arguments alone.

If in polemic theology, the real object be the establish-

ment of the truth, so as to bind the conscience of another in favor of the ground we maintain, then all external force must be kept at a distance. For that cannot be done by coercion, which from its nature ought to be done in the exercise of the highest liberty of mind, that is, that one should by degrees lay aside his former ideas concerning great matters of faith, and clearly embrace others. For the intellect cannot be influenced by force, so as thenceforth to hold as false the things which it has hitherto believed, and to receive as true those things which it has formerly regarded as false. And as no man can have dominion over the thoughts of another, so neither can the mind of another be brought to agree with us, except it be led by solid reasons. Or, if a man should be influenced by threats and coercion to profess with his mouth the same faith with us, it would not be faith, but mere hypocrisy. Neither can any other than a voluntary profession be pleasing to God, inasmuch as every where in his word he demands a voluntary worship. Therefore, although a man may by force, by the sword, by exile, or by other punishments, be brought to say the same thing as we do, yet he cannot be forced to believe as we do. But if, as every one may easily grant, not only the external profession of the lips, but the conviction and assent of the heart constitute religion, then it follows also that a man cannot be coerced to embrace another religion. And if to the professors of one religion, there should be granted any right to persecute those who are attached to another religion, war would continually rage every where in the earth, which is now cut up into so many sects and parties. And in this way we should be employed, not in vanquishing errors, but errorists. And that the mind of the erring may be rightly understood, he that would confute a proposition ought to treat it according to the views entertained of it by him who affirms it. Whence this *twelfth* rule is formed:

Nothing is to be invented or feigned concerning errorists, and we are to charge upon them only what they hold; and we must abstain from urging those dangerous consequences, which are not formed for the purpose of convincing, but of annoying or injuring an opponent.

For in this science, we must chiefly labor for the promotion of the love of truth, and the conviction of the erring.

Therefore, on the one hand, we must proceed with candor and sincerity, and on the other hand, not use means which might hinder conviction, such as exciting an opponent to anger or rousing his passions. For, if we frame false consequences from the words of an opponent, we do not so much manifest a spirit eager for the truth, as a desire of impairing the esteem in which he is held. But we act fairly with an opponent, when we truly state the meaning of his words, and do not, by falsely ascribing to him any thing, pervert his words to a worse sense than they naturally bear. But we do not deal candidly, if in ignorance of his opinions in their connection, we allege something detached and out of the connection. This may be done, if we have not thoroughly read all the books of our opponents, but judge of the whole by a part, or, if we bend our minds more to words than to a liberal interpretation of them, or if we press the mere propriety of the language used by opponents. Those who leave untouched the foundations of errors, and, slighting the love of truth, draw from the doctrine of an opponent consequences by which they endeavor to bring into doubt his good name, or draw consequences which are not consistent with his views, or which he rejects denying that they flow from his received opinions, are called inference makers. [Consequentiarii.] Such make at will the first inference, and from this they draw many others, and study to affix to the words of an opponent many dangerous doctrines full of poison. But all consequences are not to be rejected, if in drawing them the proper rules be observed. The chief rules to be observed are, that consequences be not formed from the naked words, but from their true sense, neither may we garble them, but must take them in their connection. For, in the words of another, "in condemning a book, we are not to pretend a scruple about one or two phrases, but the train of remark is to be considered; for it is never possible to say all things at once; and there are some things, which, taken separately, can be opposed; but when all are justly examined, those which at first seemed fit only to be rejected, are for the most part made good and fortified by the design of the context, or the scope of the whole." "And heresy is in the sense, not in the writing; and the sense, not the language, is the fault." It is necessary, that a consequence, to be fair, must flow not

it be unaccompanied with proof. But we must always recur to the principles of reason and revelation only, both of which acknowledge God as their author, and there we may safely plant our feet. Hence, that the truth may be established, another rule is to be observed, which is the *fifth*, viz :

If one would make the truth clear to another, such an order is to be observed in delivering it, as that conviction may follow, unless the adversary purposely closes his eyes.

For when we would convince another by presenting the proper evidence of truth, it is right that an order in the proof be observed, so that certain rules being first laid down, other things by a fair process of reasoning may be drawn from them. Thus rules or principles being always first given, their consequences may be understood and proven. Hence, in a treatise concerning the dogmas of faith, such an order is to be used, lest the work fall into a confused method, and lest the truth be built upon premises concerning which our opponents are still in doubt. Nothing, more than this course of proceeding, hinders conviction. Therefore, in teaching the articles of belief, such a connection is to be observed, that one may always rest upon another, and the latter always receive light from the former. For if those things which are chiefly fundamental in religion are taken for granted, and the rest built upon them, all things flowing from them cannot but be doubtful to a stranger to the truth. But the foundation being rightly laid, the structure of the whole edifice will be most firm. To him who errs concerning the foundation of the Christian religion, all dogmas of faith are uncertain, unless the truth both of natural and revealed religion, and the great foundation of the religion of a sinner, viz., that Christ is the only and the most perfect way of salvation, be first demonstrated. But on these truths as foundations all the rest may be built. Therefore, those things on which the certainty of all other articles depends ought not to be noticed merely in a passing way, lest all things which follow from them become uncertain also. In an argument which has in view the conviction of another, it is fit that the evidence be distinctly given. Hence arises the *sixth* rule :

In Polemic Theology all obscurity is to be avoided, so that by proper proof your opponent may become certain concerning the proposition to be proved.

Therefore, on the one hand, we must proceed with candor and sincerity, and on the other hand, not use means which might hinder conviction, such as exciting an opponent to anger or rousing his passions. For, if we frame false consequences from the words of an opponent, we do not so much manifest a spirit eager for the truth, as a desire of impairing the esteem in which he is held. But we act fairly with an opponent, when we truly state the meaning of his words, and do not, by falsely ascribing to him any thing, pervert his words to a worse sense than they naturally bear. But we do not deal candidly, if in ignorance of his opinions in their connection, we allege something detached and out of the connection. This may be done, if we have not thoroughly read all the books of our opponents, but judge of the whole by a part, or, if we bend our minds more to words than to a liberal interpretation of them, or if we press the mere propriety of the language used by opponents. Those who leave untouched the foundations of errors, and, slighting the love of truth, draw from the doctrine of an opponent consequences by which they endeavor to bring into doubt his good name, or draw consequences which are not consistent with his views, or which he rejects denying that they flow from his received opinions, are called inference makers. [Consequentiarii.] Such make at will the first inference, and from this they draw many others, and study to affix to the words of an opponent many dangerous doctrines full of poison. But all consequences are not to be rejected, if in drawing them the proper rules be observed. The chief rules to be observed are, that consequences be not formed from the naked words, but from their true sense, neither may we garble them, but must take them in their connection. For, in the words of another, "in condemning a book, we are not to pretend a scruple about one or two phrases, but the train of remark is to be considered; for it is never possible to say all things at once; and there are some things, which, taken separately, can be opposed; but when all are justly examined, those which at first seemed fit only to be rejected, are for the most part made good and fortified by the design of the context, or the scope of the whole." "And heresy is in the sense, not in the writing; and the sense, not the language, is the fault." It is necessary, that a consequence, to be fair, must flow not

PAGES 197-204 MISSING

But such ideas, so far as we can see, would be prejudicial. The powers of infancy, if they may be called such, are exceedingly feeble. To overburden them is virtually to destroy them. Were the knowledge of a man suddenly communicated to a child, his intellect would become a wreck. Against an evil of this sort, nature, as a kind guardian, disposes the mind to recoil from subjects beyond its comprehension. Now, if the mental structure be at first so frail, as after the lapse of years to be in danger from overtaxation, how exceedingly deleterious to the understanding of an unborn infant would be his stock of innate ideas! Would not such a natural outfit, so far from expediting subsequent progress, prostrate the mind in embryo, and transmit derangement even from the womb?

Such ideas are also impossible. The only methods by which we obtain ideas are, sensation and consciousness. Before, therefore, any ideas whatever can exist, these powers, that is the soul, must exist. The process of filling the mind with knowledge is in the very nature of the case posterior to the existence of the mind itself. A house is first built, then replenished; a ship is first constructed, then loaded. Just so it is with the mind: it must first exist before it can become the proprietor of knowledge. No one doubts but that the faculties for obtaining ideas, exist naturally in the mind. But, to conclude from this, that the ideas also exist, would be to deny the legitimate office of the mental faculties themselves; for of what use are they, if our knowledge can exist anterior to their exercise?

Nor is there a solitary witness in the whole world of the existence of such ideas. Who remembers them? Who can tell us what they were? No one, not even the greatest philosophers. Nor is it any objection to this, that very many thoughts and ideas, known to exist in our earlier years, are afterwards forgotten. Innate ideas must be of a very different character from those obtained in the ordinary way. They are written on the soul by the hand of God himself. Like the letters, therefore, of the decalogue, they ought to remain permanent. But no one can now read or find them! Certainly, then, they had no existence.

On the contrary, whatever ideas we now possess, have all come to us, not by being concreated in us, but wholly through sensation, consciousness and subsequent reflection.

Now, if all the knowledge of which we are conscious, has been derived from these sources, it is certainly a matter of just inference, that whatever knowledge we have at any time possessed, has been transmitted through the same media. What notions have we of light, save those that have been awakened by our organs of vision? What conceptions have we of sounds, except as they occur to us by means of hearing? Just so, the ordinary channels of knowledge being sensation, consciousness and reflection, we can predicate its existence only where such faculties are in operation.

But even should there exist a class of innate ideas, it is not likely that the being and character of a God should be among them. When we consider the intrinsic value of things, this might appear natural enough. But the mind does not pursue knowledge in this way. It notices, at first, only those things which are nearest, and which more immediately concern its well-being. Its attention is arrested by suffering, or the demands of appetite. It observes countenances that are near—it returns a cheerful smile. All the subjects of philosophy, government and religion, lie wholly beyond its comprehension, unnoticed and unknown. Probably there never was a very young child, who possessed at that age, the faintest idea of the existence of a Deity. Such conceptions are wholly the acquirements of later years.

It may also be stated here, that persons who by being deprived of some of the bodily senses, have not enjoyed any religious instruction whatever, have had no idea at all of a God. Shut up in their dark intellectual prisons, that great conception has never dawned upon the gloom with which they were enveloped, till science and art have introduced the knowledge of revealed truth. Now, if the idea of a God be innate—if it exist as a natural inheritance in every mind, such a result as this would never occur. But, according to the printed statements of many who have taught such persons, previously to the communication of Scriptural truth, the mind was wholly unconscious of the existence of any such transmitted legacy by the hand of creation.

From what we have here stated, it is surely not too much to say that our ideas of the being and character of a God, have not been derived through an act of concreation with

the mind itself. If enjoyed at all, they must come from some other source.

II. Did our ideas of a God, then, originate in logical deduction from the works of creation? This point has been very generally conceded by theologians to the advocates of natural religion. The reason of this is, as we conceive, because no discrimination has been made between facts as they exist under revelation, and facts that must have existed had no such revelation been made. From the very creation of Adam to John, on Patmos, there have been successive communications of the divine will to men. Our race has never been destitute, even in its most fallen condition, of some of the instructions and benefits of such communications. Not only the Hebrew and Christian modes of worship have been based on them, but they have been the platform of all the mythological and fabulous religions that have existed in the world. Now, to prove that all the facts of nature harmonize with the idea of a God, as made known by revelation, is certainly a very different thing from proving that the knowledge of those facts has originated the idea of such a being. The one is the discovery of a great truth; the other its application to things around us. The one is a labor comparatively easy; the other, as we conceive, a task superior to the human intellect.

Some advantage has already been gained on this subject, by disproving the innate idea of a Deity. This was one of the methods by which such an idea might be supposed to arise. If, then, this mode of reaching such a conception be impracticable, it is at least possible that the process of rational deduction may be no more successful. The idea, we admit, is an important one—yea, a necessary one. It stands at the foundation of all philosophy and religion. This, however, does not prove that a course of logic is the only, or even the best mode of originating such a conception. And as God is pleased to pass over helpless infancy in such a communication, it certainly can be no reproach to his character, if he also pass over helpless manhood. Neither the existence of reason in the child, nor its development in the man may have been designed for a work of this kind. The office of reason may be to apprehend the conception when revealed—to trace out its evidences when communicated. The discovery may be a work peculiar to

Deity, and to be communicated by divine teaching. And as reason cannot stand reproached at the threshold of its existence for the absence of such knowledge, so it is not to be condemned as useless afterwards, because it does not grasp a truth too remote and indefinite for its powers of comprehension.

The idea of a God, we remark, is not a matter either of consciousness or sensation. These, as we have seen, are the inlets of our knowledge. But it is through neither of these that we primarily arrive at the existence of a First Cause, consciousness bears testimony to the operations and exercises of the human mind. Now, if the notion of a God be not something already in the mind, it is impossible that consciousness should testify concerning it. We have an inward persuasion of our own existence, we experience the ebullitions of passion, we notice the order of our thoughts, the phases of our fancy: but in all these exercises, we apprehend nothing of the existence and character of a God, unless such a conception has been introduced into the mind in some other way, than by mere consciousness. Through sensation, we apprehend the material world around us. Our eyes, our ears, our senses of taste, touch and smell, are all so many means of intercourse with external nature. But here their offices terminate. The whole world of spirituality lies beyond their grasp. They neither see, touch nor hear a Deity. All that their instrumentalities can accomplish on this subject, is to furnish the materials from which the great idea may be deduced.

But is it probable that such a deduction would have been made without revelation? The materials of all the sciences have existed from the creation; but the discovery of the great principles of those sciences are comparatively of modern origin. The revolution of the earth around the sun, the motion of the heavenly bodies, the ebbing and flowing of the tides, the circulation of air, the growth of plants and animals, the chemical agents which originate the form and character of bodies—all these have been in existence since the days of Adam. Yet how many centuries passed before the physical laws that control these elements were discovered? During this whole time too, these various agencies were in perpetual operation before the eyes and senses of the whole world of mankind! We certainly overrate hu-

man reason, if we imagine that with suitable data, it necessarily infers the truth of which such data are the basis. It is quite probable, then, that with all the light of nature around him, man destitute of revelation, would have passed ages on ages, in utter ignorance of the existence of that Great Principle on which all other principles are based.

Nor is the existence of a First Cause, as some may imagine, one of those first truths, that would naturally flash upon the mind in the contemplation of physical nature. In our deliberate judgment, if reached by a process of reason only, it is the most remote, and the last to be attained of all the truths discovered in this way. The process of philosophical investigation is the following. A certain class of facts are observed to exist. After due investigation, these are referred to a certain cause or principle. Another class is taken up, and placed like the former under some general law. Thus, the ascertaining of facts, and their reference to specific causes, constitute the very essence of human philosophy. Now, the inquiry concerning some great principle or agent, in whom all these subordinate principles meet, and from whom they derive their efficiency, is a subsequent investigation, if indeed it be inquired into at all.

Nor does any supposed dependence of man upon his Creator for life, and breath, and all things, relieve the difficulty in the least. Philosophy abundantly teaches that a certain great law in nature may be a sort of nursing parent to our race for ages; and yet men remain during all this period in utter ignorance of its existence. Gravity had given to men years, months and days; it had loaded their barns with plenty, and scattered contentment around their fire-sides; it had given stability to their dwellings and security to their persons—it had, in short, made the world tenantable—and yet, till the days of Newton, this great physical law, in which men may be said “to live, move and have their being,” was not even known! Now, if this be so of a physical principle, which exhibits itself at all points and to all men, what sanguine expectations should be entertained, as to the discovery of a still greater principle, less in contact with man, and even more mysterious in its being?

There is something also in the incomprehensibleness of the Divine Being, which would ever make the discovery of his existence by mere reason, a formidable task. If the

author of all things, then God must have existed before all things. If the upholder of nature, then his presence must encompass nature. If the all-efficient cause of life and action, then must he be invisible, though every where acting. An eternal, ubiquitous Almighty, yet invisible Deity, certainly presents something not very congenial to the limited and erring faculties of the human mind. Hence, the universal tendency among all heathen nations, while they retain the names and titles of the Deity, to lose all the just ideas of the Being to whom they are applied.

There is, therefore, great probability that in their reasonings about a first cause, in the absence of revelation, men would make such first cause to be either chance or necessity. There are many things which occur under the observations of men, to which the specific causes cannot be assigned. These have been generally supposed to exist fortuitously. There are also many things that exist in nature, the antecedents of which are unknown. These, in like manner, may be assigned to accident. Thus, from ordinary and partial beginnings, the theory of chance might so gain ground, as to be considered altogether adequate to the various effects produced in the operations of nature. Nor is this mere conjecture. The doctrine of chance has had its advocates in almost all ages and countries. With some philosophers this has been a favorite theory. Another class of persons would go to the opposite extreme, maintaining the eternity of matter, and the fixed necessity of effects in the order in which they occur. But, whether the one or the other of these hypotheses be adopted, the result would be the same as to the doctrine under consideration. Either effectually displaces, or rather anticipates the belief in a wise and Intelligent Ruler of the universe.

But suppose a different theory advanced. Suppose there were those who should infer from the works of creation, the existence of an intelligent and all-powerful author. How could such inference be proved? Especially, how could the conception be so realized, as to be made the foundation for obedience and worship? Columbus inferred, and inferred truly, the existence of a western continent. Had he not however made the discovery, his inference would have gone down with him to the grave in silent obscurity. Herschel inferred, from some irregularities in the motion of

Saturn, the existence of another planet revolving beyond him. But had he not by actual experiment brought that body to the knowledge of men, his reasonings would have been of little or no value. Precisely so, the deductions of philosophy, merely, concerning the being of a God, in the absence of proof, that is, in the absence of revelation, would have amounted, at most, to mere intellectual speculation. The argument may be well arranged and the result apparently conclusive, still the human mind experiences the need of something more than deduction in a case of this sort. It requires certainty—it seeks after positive proof—it demands an all-pervading conviction. Such proof philosophy could not give—has never given.

There is another difficulty. The idea of a God, or certainly of the true God, as strange as it may seem, has ever been a matter of aversion to mankind. The whole system of idolatry proves this—the disbelief of infidels in Revelation proves this. Now, if after the idea of a God has been communicated to men, “they do not wish to retain it in their knowledge,” but seek by every possible method to divest themselves of it, what is the probability of their discovery of such an idea, in the absence of all supernatural communication? The love of knowledge may prompt to difficult investigations on other subjects. The love of fame or gain may stimulate to the most dangerous and laborious enterprises in some earthly pursuit. But where would the man be found who would inquire after a Being, whom his imagination had clothed only in the garments of terror and wrath?

But our inquiry is one concerning a fact. Who then, we ask, is he that originated the idea of a God? Where can so great a philosopher be found? To what country does he belong? In what age did he live? So far as we know, this idea has always and invariably been communicated. It originated in Divine Revelation, and is transmitted by successive instructions from age to age. The notions the heathen entertain of a Creator, gross as they often are, have thus originated; and the ideas men in Christian lands possess on this subject, have had the same origin. The greatest theologians and the acutest philosophers, are indebted to early instruction, and not to personal discovery for this sublimest of all truths. True, that after the con-

ception once occupies the mind, it is so coincident with all that we see around us and feel within us, that it is received with all the force of a demonstration. True, that with a little study, we can so collect and arrange proofs from nature, as to bring ourselves and others to the conviction that every other hypothesis is absurd. Still, all this takes place after Revelation has disclosed the conception, and maternal love, with many a kind word, has sealed the lesson on our hearts.

There is another consideration on this subject of some force. The ideas men entertain of a God have usually been clear and influential, or the contrary, as they are relatively situated at a nearer or remoter distance from the source of revealed truth. Among all heathen nations, such ideas are exceedingly indistinct. Among those who enjoy the Scriptures, they are luminous and controlling. Now, what makes the difference? If our conceptions of a Deity are the result of reason only, then ought those conceptions to be uniform throughout the world. The sun shines, the showers fall, the heavenly bodies are seen in every part of the earth. If, therefore, our notions of a Deity are communicated by nature through reason, then ought all men to have equally or nearly equally distinct ideas of the being and character of a God. But so far from this being the case, the conceptions of men on this subject are clear or obscure, precisely in the ratio of their acquaintance with a direct revelation from heaven.

If a great number of persons were located at different distances from some luminous body, and it had been ascertained that those who were nearest to it could see with the greatest facility, and those who were farthest off, could see but obscurely; and if it were also shown, that all intermediate distances had more or less light, as they were at a nearer or remoter point from the luminous body, it certainly would be rational to conclude that the light they all enjoyed was communicated from the same source. Just so here. If Christian nations have a full and clear perception of the being and character of an unseen Creator, it is not because the works of God around them speak a different language from what they do elsewhere; it is not because they possess more sagacity and stronger intellectual powers than other nations; but solely is it owing to their more intimate ac-

quaintance with that revelation which God has given. On the contrary, if heathen nations have duller apprehensions of the character of the Supreme Being than their more favored brethren, it is not owing to the fact that nature does not speak within and around them, or, that they are destitute of those powers necessary to interpret her works, but wholly to the remoteness of their position from the Holy Scriptures.

If, then, we place all these considerations together, it certainly will appear true, that as a matter of fact, men have not originated the idea of a God by reasoning; and that, as a matter of speculation, they never could have originated such a conception.

III. We must therefore look into the Scriptures, not simply for the remoter parts of our theology, but for its fundamental idea—the being of a God. Here the great truth is revealed—is written—is made clear. The Great Unheard here speaks in the language of men. The Great Unseen turns aside the curtains of invisibility, and manifests himself to us as our God and Father. The types and symbols of uninterpreted nature are laid aside, and God comes forth to us as a teacher and a friend. The great machinery of creation, if not suspended, is apparently forsaken, while its Author and Manager exhibits to our admiration and faith Himself, his character, his will, his grace!

The first notion of a God was evidently *revealed* to Adam in paradise. He did not find it in the storehouse of his intellectual treasury, as a sort of legacy by creation. He did not institute a course of reasoning on nature for its discovery. No. It came to him in a manner better accommodated to his apprehension—more simple—more certain. God was exhibited to him in a form, he spake to him with an audible voice.

All men, save our first ancestors, have had parents to teach and guide them during the period of infancy and childhood. This, however, was not the case with Adam and Eve. Their early days were watched over by no parental eye; their immature faculties were trained by no parental lips. But were they altogether orphans? Was there no one to guard, no one to protect, no one to teach them? Has God furnished all their descendants with these necessary blessings, while he left the first and most needy

of our race to roam amid forests and beasts, destitute of care, destitute of sympathy? Certainly not. In truth, every parent has fallen, so to speak, into God's primeval office. He was himself the parent, the guardian, the friend, the instructor of our great ancestors. Into all the secrecy and tenderness of this original parentage and guardianship we may not enter. The fact, however, is obvious, and its necessity palpable.

Here, then, *began* the notion of a God. It was communicated in a way best adapted to the nature of the human mind; and it was communicated divested of inference, unattended with speculation, unobscured by doubt. It was clear, definite, certain.

From this original source, the idea of a God has been transmitted from parent to child, from age to age, even to our own times. Subsequent revelations have made it more palpable and complete—all nature has been called upon to support and maintain it—its echo is heard on every breeze, and its thunder rolls in every storm. Still, as of man himself, paradise was its source, and God its Author.

Let not science then boast of a triumph it has never achieved, or vaunt itself of a crown it has never won. Human reason has accomplished wonders. It has proved itself almost divine. It has erected its monuments on sea and land; amid the thunders of heaven, and the infinitudes of space. There are fields of thought, however, over which it may not pass—there are truths too remote or too mysterious for its comprehension. In these it needs a guide—not philosophy, but revelation—not man, but God. Let it bow at the feet of so competent an instructor—let it light its brightest fires at the altars of the Eternal.

Nor can we conceive upon these principles, on what ground the doctrines of the three-fold existence of God, or of his unfathomed decrees, can be rejected. These doctrines stand on the face of Revelation, as the mysterious outlines of a revealed Deity. They are there presented as inseparable from the communicated idea of a First Cause. What liberty have we then of removing, from our conception of a revealed Jehovah, those inseparable adjuncts of his nature, as made known in the Scriptures? To doubt that they coexist in Revelation with the announced idea of a God, is to doubt that the great idea itself is there. Nor

can we throw ourselves back upon the incomprehensibility of the subject. We had known nothing of God at all, save as he is revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures. If, then, we entertain the idea thus communicated, we should entertain it, not as distorted and violated, but in its entireness and sanctity.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PLATONIC TRINITY.

For not less than fifteen hundred years, the question of the Platonic Trinity has been agitated in the Church of Christ. Not a few theologians, learned and orthodox, both in ancient and in modern times, have acquiesced in the belief that Plato taught something very nearly resembling the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. How he came to a knowledge of this doctrine, whether from the light of nature, or from tradition, or from the sacred writings of the Jews, to which he is supposed to have had access in Egypt, has not been so clear; but that he learned it *somehow*, and did actually teach it, quite a number have been ready to affirm. Thus, Cudworth, in his *Intellectual System*, (Book 1, ch. 4,) tells us "that Plato really asserted a *Trinity of Divine hypostases*." Again, he says: "In Plato's second epistle to Dionysius, he mentions a *Trinity of Divine hypostases all together*."* And Dr. Cave, in his *lives of the Fathers*, (In Vit. Athan., sec. 1,) speaks of "the ancient doctrine of the Platonic Trinity, as asserting *three Divine hypostases*, all eternal, necessarily existent, undestroyable, and in a manner infinite, and which had a common $\tau\omicron\ \delta\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ or Divinity."

Other orthodox divines have stated the matter less strongly. They have represented Plato as teaching, not a Trinity of hypostases or persons, but a Trinity of *Divine princi-*

* Cudworth enlarges on the subject of the Platonic Trinity, devoting to it some 50 pages.

ples." "The system of Plato," says Dr. Knapp, "may be thus stated: God first produced *the ideal world*; i. e., his infinite understanding conceived of the existence of the world, and formed as it were the plan of the creation. The *real world* was then formed after this *ideal world*, as its model; and this was done by uniting the *soul* of the world, which proceeded from the Divine Being, with matter, by which the world became an animated, sensitive, rational creature. The three principles of Plato were thus—(1.) *the Supreme God*; (2.) *the Divine Understanding*, sometimes called *the logos*, and (3.) *the soul of the world*. These views are fully developed in his *Timæus*, and elsewhere. It appears, then, that Plato believed in a *Trinity*, or *three principles* in the Divine Being; but whether he actually *hypostatized* these principles is doubtful."—(Vol. 1, p. 289.)

The same views, substantially, are presented by Dr. Dick: "I shall only add, what has chiefly engaged the attention of critics on this subject, the *Platonic Trinity*, as taught by Plato himself, and more fully by his followers. These philosophers held that there were *three principles* in the Divine nature; the first το αγαθον, the second ο νοϋς or ο λογος, and the third η ψυχη, corresponding to the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. These were all included in the το θειον, or the Divine nature." (Vol. 1, p. 288.)

While orthodox divines have made these assertions respecting the Platonic Trinity, thinking to derive from them, indirectly, an argument in support of the Christian doctrine, Socinians not unfrequently have asserted the same thing, and drawn an argument in just the opposite direction. "The Christian Trinity was unknown to the Apostles and to their immediate successors; nor was it ever heard of in the church, till the fathers of the second and third centuries borrowed it from the Platonic philosophers."*

The most recent advocate of the Platonic Trinity among ourselves, is a writer in a recent number of the Southern Quarterly Review. Prof. Pond, of the Theological Seminary in Bangor, had published a concise review of all the writings of Plato, designed (as he states in his preface,) "not so much for the benefit of the professed student and critic, as of the common reader." In this little work, Prof.

* See this argument drawn out at length in Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity.

P. had said: "Plato believed in no Trinity, at least in the Christian acceptation of the term. He taught the existence of several *triads* among the gods. The one concerned in the work of creation is called the *fabricative* or *demiurgic* triad. But Plato's triads consist of *three distinct gods*; and they are all of them *inferior divinities*—emanations, directly or indirectly from the One Supreme." (Pond's Plato, p. 120.)

In an article in the Southern Quarterly for April, 1847, there is a severe attack upon "Pond's Plato," of the personal reflections contained in which we shall take no notice; but as the views of the writer in respect to the Platonic Trinity, thrown out with much confidence, and with no little show of learning, come fairly within our province, we propose to bestow upon them a few moment's attention. "The question," says the Reviewer, "is not how Plato acquired his doctrine of the Trinity,* but *whether or not he was a Trinitarian at all, in the sense in which the Trinity is understood by orthodox Christians. We maintain that he was*; and here we regret that we are at issue with Dr. Pond as to a question of fact. We admit that the Doctor has more or less authority on his side, but the weight of testimony seems to us clearly to be with those who advocate the orthodoxy of Plato, or his near approximation to it. It is doubtless true, that the later Platonists were not orthodox in their opinions on this subject, but it is equally true that Plato and his genuine disciples were, in the main, as orthodox Trinitarians as any of the fathers of the church of the first three centuries, including St. Athanasius himself."—p. 415.

It will be seen that the Reviewer here lays down his position very distinctly and strongly; and how does he propose to sustain it? He "takes pains to consult Brücker, Mosheim, Cudworth, Dupin, and other ecclesiastical writers and historians of the first authority in relation to this ques-

* The Reviewer had before intimated that Plato might have derived his knowledge of the Trinity from the Jews. "It is certain," says he, "that Plato pursued the study of philosophy in the schools of Alexandria in Egypt; and it is highly probable that he might have borrowed the doctrine of the Trinity from the Jews, a colony of whom were residing there at the time."—p. 415. At what period does the Reviewer suppose Plato lived? Has he forgotten, or did he never know, that this great philosopher lived and died many years before Alexandria was founded?

tion."—p. 416. And what do these learned authors say? The testimony of Cudworth we have given above; and from him the Reviewer seems to have gathered about all that he professes to know on the subject. Brücker touches the point but very briefly, and his testimony (what there is of it) is directly contradictory to the assertions of the Reviewer. "It is evident," he says, "from the preceding account of the doctrine of Plato concerning God, and the soul of the world, that it *differs materially* from the doctrine of the Trinity afterwards received in the Christian Church. Plato *did not suppose three subsistencies in one Divine essence,*" &c. (Enfield's Brücker, p. 133.) Mosheim, in his *History*, has not a word on the subject. In his *Commentaries*, we find but a single sentence; and this implies (what is true) that all the resemblances between the Platonic and Christian Trinities, were manufactured by the New Platonics, some six hundred years after Plato's death, (Cent. 2, sec. 34.) In Dupin—if his Ecclesiastical History is the work referred to—we have not been able to discover a particle of testimony, one way or the other. If the Reviewer can find any, and will be good enough to refer to it, we will be very much obliged to him.

But the Reviewer professes to have consulted Plato himself, and he assures us that "Plato maintains more distinctly even than the Nicene fathers, the doctrine of *three hypostases in the unity of the Divine Nature*, answering to the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in our modern definitions of the Trinity."—p. 416. We wish he had condescended to inform us where, in the writings of Plato, all this is to be found. He refers, indeed, as Cudworth had done before him, (whom he servilely follows,) "to the sixth book of Plato's Politics," i. e., of his Republic; but this contains nothing to the purpose. Plato here speaks of what he calls "*the Good*," whom he describes as "not essence, but *above essence*, transcending it both in dignity and in power." But, does Plato represent "*the Good*," as one of the hypostases of a Divine Trinity? Nothing of it. By "*the Good*," he evidently means the *One Supreme*, of whom he thus speaks in the Parmenides: "The One therefore, in no respect *is*. For to say that *he is*, would be to ascribe to him *being* and *essence*; whereas, he is *above being itself*."

We are referred, also, to the second epistle to Dionysius, where, as Cudworth affirms, "Plato mentions a Trinity of Divine hypostases all together." The passage alluded to, in its connection, is as follows: Dionysius complained that Plato "had not sufficiently demonstrated to him the particulars respecting *the First Nature*." In reply, Plato says: "I must speak to you *in enigmas*, that in case the letter should be intercepted by land or sea, he who reads it may not understand this part of the contents. All things are situated about *the King of All Things*, and *all things subsist for his sake*, and he is *the cause* of all excellent things. But second things are situated about that which is second; and such as are third in gradation, about that which is third. The human soul, therefore, stretches itself in order to learn the quality of these things, and looks to such particulars as are allied to itself, none of which are sufficient for the purpose," &c.

If it is not easy to interpret these enigmatical expressions, and say precisely what they do mean; it is easy to see what they do not. Here, surely, is no obvious reference to "a Trinity of Divine hypostases" in the one essence of the Godhead. Plato's "King of all things," who is "the Cause of all," and "for whom all subsist," is no other than "the *First Nature*," the "*One Supreme*," while his second and third, if they refer to Divinity at all, can only be inferior gods. Accordingly, Proclus, in his comment on this dark passage, says: "Plato calls the first God *King*; but does not think proper to give this appellation to the rest. He likewise calls him not only the King of all things, but the Cause, at once, of all being and of all beauty. Hence, the Supreme God precedes the other causes in a distinct and uniform manner, and is not celebrated as *coördinated with them*, or as *the leader of a triad*."

Again, we are referred to the Timæus, and the Parmenides, in proof of the Platonic Trinity; but here we find no such Trinity as that described by Cudworth, and after him, by the late Editor of the Southern Quarterly Review. "The One" of the Parmenides, who is represented as "above being itself," who "can neither be named, nor spoken of, nor conceived in thought, nor be known, nor perceived by any being," is not *the Artificer of the world*, spoken of in the Timæus. The latter, as Professor Pond has shown, is a

subordinate divinity—an *emanation* from “the One Supreme.”

In short, those who go, not to Ammonius, or Plotinus, or Cudworth, but to *Plato himself*, will find in his writings no proof of a Trinity at all resembling that of the New Testament. He taught, indeed, the existence of several triads among the gods; but each of these consists of *three distinct gods*, and they are all of them *inferior divinities*,—emanations, directly or indirectly, from the first Great Cause of all. In proof of this, I quote the following passage from Taylor, who gloried in the name of Platonist, and who, whatever else may be said of him, was a diligent and devoted student of his master. “A superficial reader, who knows no more of Platonism than what he has gleaned from Cudworth’s Intellectual System, will be induced to think that the genuine Platonic Trinity consists of the *First Cause* or the *Good*, of *Intellect*, and *Soul*; and that these three were considered by Plato as in a certain respect *One*. But the *Good* or the *One*, being *superessential*, cannot be *consubsistent* with Intellect and Soul.” Hence, Taylor adds, “the *Platonic Trinity* is totally different from the *Christian*; since the former (the Platonic) is a triad *posterior to the First Cause*, which (*First Cause*) is *not coördinated or consubsistent with any being or beings whatever*.” (Works of Plato, vol. 3, p. 167.)

But, if Plato did not teach the doctrine of the Trinity, in any thing like the Christian acceptation of it, how comes it that so many learned divines have been deceived in regard to this matter, and that so much has been said and written on the subject of the Platonic Trinity? The proper answer to this question has been given, in few words, by Professor Pond. “The notion of Plato’s Trinity, as bearing any resemblance to the Christian, seems first to have originated with the New Platonists, in the second century after Christ—some six hundred years after Plato. They were a sect of philosophers, who held that all religions are very nearly the same, only differently expressed, and who, of course, were interested to *trace out as many resemblances between Platonism and Christianity as possible*.” (Pond’s Plato, p. 120.) The founder of this sect was Ammonius Saccas, who was educated a Christian, and who seems never to have renounced, altogether, the Christian name. He was

followed by Plotinus, Proclus, Jamblicus, Porphyry, and others of the same school, who, in their attempts at a general amalgamation, corrupted alike both Platonism and Christianity.

Whether Cudworth ever read Plato for himself, it is impossible to say. We only know that, in justification of his statements, he continually quotes the philosophers above named; and if he relied implicitly on them, it is no wonder that he was deceived.

The best mode of satisfying inquirers with regard to the Platonic Trinity, will be to send them directly to the acknowledged writings of the philosopher himself. And in order that this may be the better done, we unite in the call which has recently been issued from the other side of the Atlantic, for a new English translation of these remarkable productions.* We cannot speak so disparagingly, indeed, as do the Edinburgh Reviewers, of the translations of Sydenham and Taylor. To the mere English reader, who can put up with their barbarisms, they are better, far better, than none. Still, we can hardly think of a literary labor that would be more truly acceptable to scholars generally, than a new and readable translation of Plato.

The statements which have been made, furnish a complete refutation of the pretence of the Socinians, that the Christian fathers of the second and third centuries borrowed their notions of the Trinity from Plato. How could they have borrowed them from Plato, when it seems that he had no corresponding notions on the subject? Besides, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is much older than the fathers of the second and third centuries. We trace this doctrine directly into the New Testament; and further still, into the Old. It is just as easy to prove, from the writings of the prophets, the proper divinity of the promised Messiah, as to prove the existence of the God of Israel.

The influence of a *quasi* Platonism upon the doctrine in question, was in precisely the opposite direction. This primitive and fundamental doctrine was modified and corrupted by the New Platonics; and their corruptions gradually infected the church. The Christian fathers of that age, more especially those of the Alexandrian school, emu-

* See an able article on the Genius of Plato, in the Edinburgh Review for April, 1848.

lated the name and fame of philosophers. They assumed the philosophic garb, and were accustomed to speak of Christianity as a divine philosophy. They associated with the philosophers, imbibed their errors, and incorporated them with the Gospel of Christ; and thus a foundation was laid for the subsequent disputes and heresies on the subject of the Trinity, long before these heresies had ripened into maturity.

ARTICLE V.

FAVORABLE INDICATIONS FOR THE INTRODUCTION AND SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN AFRICA.

BY REV. J. L. WILSON.

Missionary at the Gaboon, West Africa.

When God is about to make any special manifestation of his glory to his church, or is about to confer any extraordinary spiritual blessings upon mankind, he uniformly prepares them, in some signal manner, to witness that manifestation or to receive those blessings. The great event of our Saviour's incarnation, furnishes a striking illustration of the soundness of this position. The dispensing of the law from Mount Sinai, was another occasion when this work of preparation was rendered equally conspicuous; and indeed, so intimately is this fact interwoven with all the recorded dealings of God with mankind, that it would be little else than a waste of time to multiply proofs. The inference that may be legitimately drawn from this general principle is this, that wherever the hand of God is clearly discerned in removing obstacles to the spread of Christianity, or is otherwise engaged in preparing the hearts of a heathen people to receive his messengers favorably, we have reason to conclude that "the redemption of that people draweth nigh;" and it follows, as a matter of further and undoubted inference, that the responsibilities and obli-

gations of the Christian church to that people, whoever they may be, are proportionably increased by every such movement of Divine Providence.

We believe that the hand of God has been stretched forth to prepare the people of Africa for the reception of the Gospel; and it will be the object of the present Article—

1st. To point out some of the features in the present state of society in that country, which may be regarded as favorable to the introduction of Christianity; and 2d. To show what must be the probable consequences, if the Gospel is not communicated in the present crisis.

I. Our first observation is, that the *social character* of the Aborigines of Africa, is preëminently favorable to the spread of Christianity in that land. It is not meant by this, however, that the natives of the country are now living in the enjoyment of domestic peace and social happiness. On the contrary, there are no people on the face of the earth, perhaps, who are so utterly destitute of all social enjoyment, as the unfortunate inhabitants of Africa. Nor is it implied by our general remark, that natives of that country are less addicted to deeds of cruelty and inhumanity than other savage tribes in the world. On the other hand, it is freely admitted, that deeds of cruelty are committed there, not only upon foreigners, but upon their own flesh and blood, that scarcely have any parallel, even among the most savage and brutal races on earth. But, to what are these cruelties generally to be ascribed? Not to a disposition naturally cruel and ferocious, for this the world knows is not characteristic of the African race. It may be ascribed, in part, to mistaken notions of the principles of natural justice, but chiefly to the influence of foreigners, who have associated with them under the sacred name of Christians. It is from white men, engaged in the slave trade, that the simple hearted natives of Africa have received their first lessons in the rudiments of cruelty and oppression—and to the same source are they indebted for certain refinements in vice, that could never have found a place in that country in any other way. At the present day, when it is but reasonable to suppose that the Spanish and Portuguese slave-trader feels the restraints of public indignation, atrocities and cruelties are, nevertheless, perpetrated by them upon African soil, that fill the natives, heathen though they be,

with unutterable disgust and abhorrence; and if the terms *cruel, treacherous and bloody-minded*, are befitting characteristics of the one, where shall we find language to portray the character of the other?

Nor are the robberies or massacres, sometimes committed on the crews of vessels trading on that coast, to be regarded as a just index of the natural disposition of the people, or as forming any exception to the general principle advanced above. During the last twelve or fifteen years, these outrages have seldom occurred; and when they have, they have invariably been provoked, either by the crews of the vessels themselves, or by some one else, who it was supposed would be made responsible for the death of the murdered. The paramount international law among the different tribes of Africa, and the great conservative principle of peace and justice, (so far as they have any,) is to hold all the inhabitants of any one community responsible for the acts of each individual. This principle, though obviously unsound in many important respects, is nevertheless so universal in its application, and is of such long and unquestioned standing, that it has all the authority with the native mind of natural justice and undoubted right. When, therefore, they fall upon a white man and strip him of his property, or take away his life, for an act of lawless violence, committed by some other white man, they suppose themselves to be acting in accordance with an undisputed principle of international law and natural justice—and in the majority of cases, it is done with the express intention of bringing down accumulated vengeance upon the original offender.

Apart from these acts of violence, that are perpetrated either from mistaken notions of justice, or from cruelties that have been suggested to their minds by the example and influence of reckless white men, it may be affirmed of them generally, that they are *mild in their dispositions, peaceful in the choice of their pursuits*, and extremely *sociable in their* intercourse with each other. No people in the world have, by nature, stronger social propensities. Free, unrestrained intercourse with each other, seems to be the very essence of their social being. All their hours of rest and relaxation are spent in the social group, in the nocturnal dance, and in parties of festivity. The pleasures of

the African, his comforts, his enjoyments, and every thing he can call his own, he is ever ready to share with his fellow man. His house is always open for the reception of strangers, and no man among them may suffer from hunger, so long as others have the means of supplying his wants.

It requires but little reflection to perceive that this ardent and social nature of the African, will not only readily unfold itself to the mild influence of Christianity, but under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, it will become a powerfully efficient means in diffusing that religion abroad.

No native African, whose mind has once been thoroughly imbued with the benign and life-giving influence of the Gospel, can be content to be inactive, whilst his fellow men around him are wholly given up to ignorance and idolatry. His social feelings will be awakened into redoubled activity, and his ardent temperament, now sanctified by Divine influence, will impel him to extraordinary deeds of activity, self-denial and benevolence. In the prosecution of his work, there will be no want of ardor — the prevalence of caste, the fear of persecution, and the insalubrity of the climate, will throw no obstacles in his way. His agency will be just the thing needed, and with the blessing of God, it must result, ere long, in the entire conversion of that land of darkness and death.

II. Another circumstance, not less favorable to the cause of Christianity, is the high estimate in which the white man is held by the aboriginal inhabitants of the country.

In this statement, we are not misled by the extreme obsequiousness of the maritime tribes, who seem to study little else than to perfect themselves in the art of dissimulation and flattery. The feeling to which we allude, lies deeper than any motives of mere selfishness. Traverse the country in any direction, or to any extent you please, and you will every where encounter the same intense curiosity to see a white face, the same readiness to meet your wants, the same acknowledgments of conscious inferiority, and were it not for the predominance of their cupidity, and their jealousies of each other, the white man might expect uniform kindness and unbounded hospitality in every region of that country.

Nor is it surprising that the natives of Africa should entertain such views of the superiority of the white man. All the intercourse they have had with him, has tended but to confirm and strengthen this feeling. The stately vessel that has carried him to their shores, the skill, dexterity and ease with which that vessel is managed, the mysterious art by which he traversed the trackless ocean, the daring and the enterprise that has brought him with but a handful of men into the very bosom of the largest and most savage communities, the skill, energy and system with which he transacts his ordinary business, and still more, perhaps, the beauty, elegance and perfect finish of such articles of merchandize as he offers them in exchange for the crude products of their own country, all conspire not only to fill him with admiration and respect for the white man, but they are such as utterly extinguish in their own bosoms all hopes of rivalry or competition. They look upon the men who have fabricated such articles of merchandize, as beings endowed with superhuman wisdom; and indeed the name of a white man, every where in that country, is synonymous with whatever is marvellous and superhuman.

This feeling of spontaneous inferiority on the part of the natives, places the white man, whoever he may be, in a commanding position, and gives him an immense influence for good or for evil. In the hands of ungodly men, it has heretofore been perverted almost entirely to the most unhallowed purposes. But perverted as this influence *may* have been, in the hands of the faithful missionary, it may hereafter be turned to the happiest account. He commences his labors among a people whose natural feelings prompt them to hold him in the highest veneration; he encounters no systems of false religion to brand him as a heretic or an outcast; the natives soon discern in him superior intelligence, and they will not be reluctant in acknowledgments of their own inferiority; his personal apparel and the furniture of his house, however simple they may be; the system and order with which he performs his daily duties; the uniform courtesy he observes in his intercourse, even with the humblest of his fellow men; the order and decorum which pervade every department of his household arrangements; his singleness of purpose and exclusive devotedness to the great

work of beenvolence he has undertaken, *all combine* to awaken in the native mind feelings of the most profound respect for the office and the character of the missionary.

This feeling of veneration is not a little enhanced too by a tradition, which I believe is universal in Western Africa, that the white man owes all his intellectual superiority and worldly prosperity to the fact, that he has never abandoned the religion that was given by God to the original progenitors of the human race; whilst they as uniformly ascribe their own poverty and inferiority to the defection of their forefathers from that standard. This belief which is deeply inwrought into their moral constitution, gives the missionary an immense advantage. The native listens to his instructions, as of one who enjoys the special favor of God. His depraved heart may flinch from the bold and uncompromising demands of the Gospel, but he will never question the truth or authority of what he hears. He may not at once become a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, but he cannot, he never will deny his obligation to do so. And whatever may be the state of his heart, the missionary may, under all circumstances, press the claims of the Gospel, with the perfect assurance that the better judgment of the native, the convictions of his conscience are on the side of truth.

III. Another consideration of greater importance perhaps than either of the preceding, is *that the Pagan tribes of Africa have no well defined systems of false religion, to which they are blindly attached, and from which they must be divorced, before they can be expected to embrace the Gospel of Jesus Christ.*

It does not argue very favorably for the intellect of the African, that he has no well defined religion of some kind or other; but who knows what energies the African mind may put forth under the awakening power of Christianity?

The belief in *One Great Supreme Being* is, I believe, universal; but commensurate with this impression, is another, which places Him at the outskirts of creation, and denies Him all participation in the government of the world. Their conceptions of his character are extremely gross, ascribing to his spotless Majesty, the same kind of sinful motives and

feelings that belong to themselves, without offering to him any species of religious worship whatever.

The belief in a future state of existence is equally prevalent; and it is not a little affecting sometimes, to see multitudes of this simple hearted people cluster around the dying couch of one of their fellow men, to transmit messages of filial or fraternal regard to the spirits of their deceased friends.

They also believe in a plurality of evil spirits, about the origin of which, however, there is some variety of opinion. The more prevalent belief is, that they are the spirits of dead men, especially of those who were most famous for their wickedness whilst living. These spirits, or as they are generally termed *Devils*, are supposed to frequent the habitations of the living, and sometimes inflict the severest punishments, both upon their bodies and their souls, in the form of bodily sickness or mental derangement.

It is in the worship of these evil spirits alone, as the only form of religion, that the inhabitants of Africa can be said to be generally united. It is a species of religion that has its origin in the guilty fears of men; and as it possesses no hold upon the heart or affections, it may easily be displaced by any other religion that will afford them a surer and stronger foundation of hope. The practice of wearing *charms*, or, as they are more generally called, *feteishes* or *gregrees*, is common to every part of Africa. It is one of those broken cisterns, which human weakness has devised, to replace the foundations of living waters that they have forsaken. Feteishes are not only worn about their persons, they are suspended over the doors of their houses, at the entrance of their villages, and along all their highways. They are supposed to possess powers of a very varied character. They are expected not only to ward off every species of evil, as sickness, poisoning, witchcraft, death by drowning or lightning, war, theft, and the like; but they are supposed to possess the active virtues of creating wealth, a good name and a plentiful harvest. These foolish and extravagant expectations, of course, expose them to all sorts of vexation and disappointment. Hence, it may easily be inferred that their adherence to this system, is the result of long established custom, and does not arise from any abiding conviction of the intrinsic worth of their *feteishes*.

Indeed, during a residence of more than twelve years in that country, with the exception of a solitary case, I never met with a man who seemed to have unshaken confidence in the virtues of his *gregrees*; and in relation to the exception just made, that man saw the futility of his completely demonstrated, and freely acknowledged that the whole was a system of downright falsehood.

Such, then, is an outline of the fragmentary religion of Pagan Africa. Is it possible that a system so frail, so incoherent, and so inconsistent with itself, could oppose any serious obstacle to the progress of the Gospel? Whatever difficulties the missionary may encounter in rousing into life the dormant energies of the native mind; however formidable he may find the deep-seated depravity of his heart; no matter what obstacles may arise out of his natural indolence and irresolution, of this he may feel assured, that he will encounter no system of idolatry firmly entrenched in the hearts of the people. He carries in his hand in the Gospel, a simple instrument, which with the blessing of God, will enable him to triumph over every obstacle, put to flight every trace of idolatry, and achieve for the Saviour a conquest of surpassing glory.

IV. *The present crisis in the commercial affairs of Western Africa, is another favorable indication for the introduction of Christianity into that country.*

For more than two centuries the *slave trade* has maintained undisputed and almost exclusive sway over the destinies of Western Africa. The people have borne its brutal impositions, without uttering a murmur, or making the slightest effort to throw off the intolerable burthen. They submitted to traffic with men, whose dispositions for the most part, were nearly as cruel and ferocious as the wild beasts of their native woods; and they consented to barter their own sons and daughters, as the only conditions upon which they could receive the commodities of the civilized world. Christianity sat silent by, aye! that which bore the name of Christianity, lent her sanction to this nefarious trade, and it was many a long day of sorrow and suffering to Africa, before humanity lifted up her voice against these unparalleled enormities. But we have fallen upon better times. A better and brighter day is beginning to dawn

upon that unhappy land. The voice of humanity has been heard, and her influence may be seen in the combined efforts of civilized nations, to put an end to a traffic that is alike disgraceful to the white and the black man. The European capitalist has learned that injustice and fraud are not the highways to honor or wealth, whilst the natives of Africa are realizing for the first time, that there are other ways and means of procuring the comforts and conveniences of life, than by trafficking in human flesh. The opinion is common, that little or no impression has as yet been made upon this trade; and there are not wanting those who confidently affirm, that all that has heretofore been done, is little else than a waste of life and money; and that all future efforts must prove equally futile and chimerical. But we as confidently affirm that this opinion, whether it be regarded with reference to what has already been achieved by the English navy, single handed, or what is likely hereafter to be effected by the combination of other navies with hers, is utterly unfounded. We do not mean to affirm that the Portuguese have less disposition to carry on the slave trade now than they have always had; nor would we intimate that a naval cordon has been drawn along that coast, so strong and so compact, that it is impossible for vessels to escape with cargoes of slaves. Undoubtedly, the means of the Portuguese to carry on this trade have been greatly diminished; and the embarrassments thrown in its way are so numerous now, that but few other capitalists like to venture largely in so uncertain an enterprise. But these are not the special tokens of encouragement. There is a movement going on in the affairs of Africa itself, in the minds of her people, which furnish a much surer pledge of the extinction of this trade, as well as her general amelioration. On all the principal rivers of the bight of Benin, on the Ivory Coast, and along the whole of what is called the Gold Coast, formerly the most extensive slave marts on the Western coast of Africa, that trade has been entirely superseded by lawful commerce—and so decided have been the advantages reaped from this change in their commercial affairs, that it is doubtful whether the people would ever again return to it, even if all outward restraints were removed.*

* At the present time, there are not more than twelve or fifteen points along the Western Coast from whence slaves are shipped; whereas, twenty-

Similar changes it is believed are silently but steadily going forward in the views and feelings of the majority of the natives in that country, so that it seems necessary only that present efforts be continued awhile longer to effect a complete triumph over this demon of darkness. Especially may this boon be permanently secured to Africa, if the Church of Christ will do her duty, by following up this undertaking with the blessings of Christianity. The restraint imposed upon the slave trade has given rise to an amount of lawful commerce that is almost incredible. We have no statistical information, by which we can give certain results, but it is perfectly safe to say, that it has more than quadrupled itself in fifteen years; and we scarcely know any assignable limits to its future developement. An important crisis has thus been formed in the affairs of Africa, not more remarkable for the physical improvement it will be likely to introduce, than for the moral and intellectual influence which it is destined to exert upon the character of the people. Incentives to industry, activity and fair dealing are felt now, that never could have been experienced by those who trafficked only in their fellow men. Sentiments of self-respect, the endearments of kindred ties, and feelings of patriotism, have recently sprung up in hearts that were once wholly given up to the most unnatural and ferocious passions that ever agitated the human bosom. The introduction of lawful commerce has brought the natives in contact with a better class of foreigners, and in many instances, has awakened laudable desires to adopt the habits and conform to the usages of civilized life. In short, all their dormant energies have, in some measure, been called into life, so that the people begin to feel that they have almost emerged into a new state of being. Now, the most casual observer cannot fail to perceive, that this *crisis* is eminently favorable to the cause of missions. The African mind is fairly awake, and is now better prepared than it ever was before to examine any topic of interest that may be submitted to its consideration. The mental activity, resulting from this great change in her outward condition, cannot fail to have impressed the people with the utter futility and insufficiency of their existing systems of super-

five or thirty years ago, they were embarked from more than double that number of points.

stitution and idolatry ; and possibly it may have originated a sincere desire for a system of religion, more rational and substantial than any they have at present.

These statements, however, should not be made without qualification. As sincerely and as heartily as we rejoice in the prospect, that the slave trade will be entirely superseded by lawful commerce, we cannot look forward to the progress of the latter, without feelings of the deepest anxiety. If Christianity does not go forth at the same time and exert her influence over the people, there is cause for serious apprehension that the evils resulting from lawful trade will be more ruinous to the peace and welfare of the country, than the withering influence of heathenism itself. The reader need scarcely be reminded that we allude to the free, profuse and almost universal use of ardent spirits in this trade. Up to the present moment, commerce is greatly in the advance of the cause of missions ; and the missionary, wherever he goes, even at this early stage of commercial enterprise, finds this evil of intemperance already at work, and has to regret that he was not earlier on the ground to have checked it at the commencement of its career.

V. The desire which is now generally felt by the maritime tribes to have Christian teachers settle among them, is another feature in the present condition of Africa, that may be regarded as decidedly auspicious for the cause of Christian Missions.

Fifteen or twenty years ago, a feeling just the reverse of this, was prevalent on the greater part of that coast. The mysterious art of reading and writing, was regarded with superstitious dread ; and a few natives who had learned to read on board of vessels or in foreign countries, had to conceal the fact from their countrymen. It is possible that feelings of jealousy may have had as much to do with this as their superstitious fears ; and possibly the influence of a certain class of white men, who shrink from all contact with light, might have operated more profoundly than either. But, be the cause what it may, that prejudice has entirely disappeared, and I know of no community on that coast now, who would not gladly welcome a Christian missionary. This change in their views and feelings has been

effected mainly by the joint influence of missions and commerce. Missions have been conducted among them, so as to confer many substantial benefits, without inflicting any of the evils that had been apprehended; and they have been equally convinced in the developement of their commercial resources, that the art of reading and writing are indispensable in the successful prosecution of this department of business. We would carefully guard against making the impression that this desire to have Christian teachers, arises from an enlightened conviction of the importance of the Gospel. That such feelings should exist among any people, where the Gospel has never been preached, is altogether improbable. Their importunities cannot be attributed to any higher motives than the secular benefits which they hope to derive from being instructed, and possibly to the sheer mortification of being left in the back ground of improvement, by those of their countrymen, who are favored with the presence and instructions of the missionaries. But be the origin of this feeling what it may, the Christian cannot look upon it in any other light, than "as a door of usefulness opened to him by the Lord;" and he will gladly enter it, relying upon the omnipotent influence of the Holy Ghost to convert these desires, whatever may have been their origin, into the means of their spiritual welfare and eternal salvation.

VI. But we pass to another, and to the concluding thought, which we regard as a still surer pledge that God is about to visit Africa in great mercy. We alluded to the *decided success* with which he has been pleased to crown the labors of his missionary servants in that country. We are not ignorant that a deep feeling of discouragement rests upon the minds of Christians in relation to this cause. We are not unaware, too, that preserving and systematic efforts have been made, not only to underrate and detract from the labors of the missionaries now on the ground, but likewise to demonstrate the undemonstrable fact, that white men cannot live upon that continent. But in spite of all this discouragement and all these misrepresentations, God is vouchsafing to his servants there, a measure of consolation and success in their labors, that enables them to move forward with unwavering steadiness. This is not

the place to enter into a lengthened defence of the practicability of carrying on missionary operations in Western Africa. All that we can do at present, is to offer a few general statements about what has been done, and leave it for others to say whether the work be of God or not.

The history of missionary operations in Western Africa, at least along the greater part of that coast, is of very recent date. Previous to the year 1833, no Protestant mission had been permanently established any where between Sierra Leone and the Cape of Good Hope. Between the former place and Benguela, a distance coastwise of something little less than 3000 miles, the country is densely populated, and yet the soil had scarcely been trod by a single Protestant missionary. Since that period, however, no less than ten distinct missions have been established on the West Coast, at the distance of two, three and four hundred miles apart, embracing now perhaps four times that number of stations, and a still greater number of out-stations. And yet all these missions, with one or two exceptions, are in a flourishing condition. Eight thousand children have been gathered into the schools connected with these missions, and have been taught to read the word of God; some of the more advanced of whom are now qualified to go and bear the glad tidings of salvation to more remote and still darker regions of Africa. Houses for the worship of God, (most of them very humble to be sure,) have been reared in many an idolatrous village, and the sound of the Gospel has been brought within the hearing of thousands of our fellow-men, who have heretofore "sat in the region and shadow of death," and been immured in the deepest debasement of heathenism. More than six thousand have been hopefully converted to the Lord Jesus Christ, and are this day employing in his service hearts and tongues, that once knew only cursing and impurity. A still greater number, it is believed, are convinced of their need of salvation; and perhaps the great mass of those who have come within the reach of the missionaries' influence, are to a less or greater extent impressed with the value of the Gospel. Including the labors of the missionaries of Sierra Leone and Gambia, as many as ten dialects have been studied and reduced to writing, and are now used as easy and direct channels of conveying religious truth to the native mind. Obstacles

arising from ignorance of the character, habits and customs of the natives have been overcome; whilst those interposed by insalubrity of the climate, have been greatly modified by a better understanding of the fever, and a more experienced mode of treating it.

These, then, are some of the features in the present conditions of Africa, which we regard as favorable for the introduction of Christianity. Whether taken separately, or regarded in combination, we do not see how any one could reasonably expect stronger evidence that God is about to visit that land in mercy; nor can shun the obvious and unavoidable conclusion, that it is the imperative duty of the Christian church to coöperate heartily with the providence of God in bringing about her speedy regeneration.

Her social capabilities, the high regard in which white men are held, from whom alone she can expect to receive the Gospel; the absence of all false religion, to which she is superstitiously attached; the interesting crisis now forming in her commercial affairs; the desire which is generally felt to have Christian teachers settle among them; the success which has thus far attended missionary operations in that country, are so many indubitable pledges on the part of Jehovah, that no efforts made in obedience to his commands, to reclaim that land from sin and misery, shall be thrown away.

We are not speaking on the presumption that missions there will not still have to encounter their full share of discouragements, difficulties and reverses. Perhaps the conflict "with the powers of darkness" will be sharper and more protracted on the Continent of Africa, than any where else in the world. Here the adversary has exercised more entire and undisturbed sway than any where else—this has been the theatre upon which have been enacted his foulest deeds of darkness, and it is altogether improbable that he will abandon this favorite portion of his realm, without resistance to the utmost extent of his powers.

What we urge is, that God has made bare his arm for the salvation of this people—the crooked paths have been made straight—the mountains have been made low—and the valleys have been exalted; and we need only enter upon the work, under the guidance of the great captain of our salvation, to be sure of ultimate and triumphant success.

But let us, in the second place, look at the consequences that must ensue to Africa, if the Gospel is not communicated to her in the present emergency.

On this point we shall be very brief:

Should the religion of Christ be withheld from the inhabitants of Africa, or should the efforts of the church be confined to the present contracted scale of operations, there are three foes to which they will be exposed, viz: 1st. *The influence of Popery*; 2d. *The spread of Mahomedanism*, and 3d. *The prevalence of intemperance*; possibly they may become the victims of these combined enemies of God and man.

Mahomedanism has already made herself mistress of two-thirds of the Continent of Africa. Almost every day she is adding some new trophies to her conquests. Her ambition and her enterprise will not be satisfied, until she has made a conquest of the whole. Christianity alone can stay her impetuous march; but if Christianity is not thrust forward at the present moment, then she must rear her standard, if ever, over the ruins of an enemy, ten-fold more formidable than any with which she would have to deal at present.

Anti-Christ, too, has his eye upon Africa, as a victim almost within her clutches. Catholic Europe, it would seem, has given her pledge, that the most eligible points, if not the whole country, shall be placed at the feet of Rome, and she is fulfilling that pledge by the most unjustifiable measures. Her schemes of political ambition and national aggrandizement, so far as Western Africa is concerned, are doomed to unavoidable disappointment. God has surrounded that otherwise helpless people with barriers too powerful even for the ambition of Europe. What Rome shall be able to effect, without the aid of the strong arm of power, is a problem which time alone can solve.

But *the evils of intemperance* are still more to be deprecated. The welfare of the country is more seriously endangered by this than by either of the others; and we feel that we cannot lift up our voice too strongly against this impending evil, especially as it has been its chief source in this country. The natives crave the article of alcohol intensely, without any proper conception of its injurious influence upon their constitutions, or without seeming to be sen-

sible of the devastation it is making in the ranks of their fellow men; whilst the great mass of white men engaged in the trade, are too intent upon their own interests, to withhold from these ignorant natives what they crave and desire, even though they are fully aware of the destruction which it is making among them. Already, the wasting influence has made itself visible, by thinning out the ranks of the maritime tribes, and we greatly fear, that what is called *lawful commerce* with Africa, if not speedily restrained and controlled by the presence of Christianity, will prove but one *great vortex of ruin*, that shall number more victims, in the course of time, than the foreign slave trade itself.

The presence of the missionary and the influence of Christianity, alone can stay these evils and save the people from irretrievable ruin. Their highest hopes, indeed their only hope, is to be found in what the Gospel of Jesus Christ can do for them. Give them this, and however degraded they may have been, they will become virtuous, happy and prosperous — withhold it from them, and they will become more ignorant and wretched than it is possible to conceive.

And now, if such be the condition and the prospects of Africa, how can any sincere friend of the Redeemer feel other than the deepest interest in every effort to impart the Gospel to these benighted people? What consistent Christian can close his ears and heart against the claims of these perishing millions?

The duty of laboring for their salvation, is not only placed beyond all doubt, by the command of the Saviour: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature;" but is now rendered still more emphatic, by that remarkable providence which has laid open every portion of this vast Continent for the reception of the Gospel.

The conversion of Africa will be realized. The first steps towards the attainment of this great object have already been taken. Insignificant as our first efforts may seem, they are, nevertheless, the beginning of a series, that shall experience no cessation, until the undertaking be fully accomplished. Many may regard our views as chimerical. Some may turn away from this work, as an enterprise altogether disproportioned to the resources of the Christian Church. A few feeble missionaries may be left to toil, un-

noticed in that field, for years to come. Men of the world may pity them for the self-denial which they must practice; infidelity may adduce their lives as proof of the power of fanaticism. But, after all, the missionary *will* feel, that he is only acting in obedience to the command of his Saviour — that he labors for those, for whose salvation the Redeemer felt it no dishonor to lay down his life — and whatever may be the coldness and apathy of an unfeeling world, he knows that the sympathies of heaven are heartily enlisted, and that the power and veracity of Jehovah are alike and indubitably pledged for the accomplishment of the undertaking. It is freely granted, that the work is one of extraordinary magnitude. To reclaim from the deepest ignorance and heathenism, one hundred million of immortal beings, will be an event of importance, for which all past history furnishes no parallel. But is any thing too hard for the Lord? Is it not in this way, that we may expect Him to magnify the power of grace? It is freely admitted also, that this enterprise calls for the exercise of extraordinary self-denial on the part of the people of God. It will require resources, and faith, and self-denial, and courage, such as the Christian church has scarcely ever put forth. But let the friends of the Redeemer feel as they should; let every Christian understand the full extent of his obligations to the Saviour, and put forth efforts befitting his high calling, and our great object, the conversion and salvation of Africa will be realized — if not fully in our day, yet we shall, if faithful, witness such tokens of coming good, as will enable us to lie down in our graves, with the comforting and confident assurance, that ere long, the name of our Saviour shall be honored, even in the obscurest habitation on the Continent of Africa.

ARTICLE VI.

THE BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST, AND THE
SIN UNTO DEATH.

AN EXAMINATION OF MATTHEW XII: 31, 32, AND I JOHN V: 16.

BY THE REV. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M.,

Dallas County, Ala.

The Sin against the Holy Ghost; the Unpardonable Sin; the Sin unto Death—are phrases which are found in the mouths of many at the present day, without any very definite idea being attached to them; and scarcely any words in the whole volume of Holy Scripture, have given more alarm and pain to weak and timid believers, than those which we have placed at the head of this article.

It is not our intention, even if we had the ability, in the present short discussion, to enter fully into this important subject. A volume would not contain all that has been written, *pro* and *con*, on these disputed passages of God's Revelation. We are well aware that difficulties surround them, yet we do not think it proper with the learned Grotius, to soften the severity of their explication, by saying that what is *absolutely* spoken by the Lord must be *comparatively* understood, and only intimate that it is very difficult to obtain the pardon of this sin, not that it will admit of no forgiveness. We have just said that there are difficulties in explaining this subject. Men have often shrouded the plainest truths in profound mystery, and then left the inquirer to grope his way, "puzzled with mazes and perplexed with error."

Our intention is to pursue a different course, and to endeavor to comfort the minds already prostrate under the conviction of past sins, and the notion that they have committed the unpardonable sin, or the "sin unto death." The current of authority is obviously against the awful doctrine of there being *now* any sin that is beyond the reach of the peace-speaking blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. For the

blood of Christ, the Son of God, cleanseth from *all* sin. 1 John 1: 7.

On entering upon our exposition, we would remark, that there is no such phrase in the word of God as "the sin against the Holy Ghost." There are several sins against *the Spirit*—such as "quenching the Spirit," "lying to the Holy Ghost," &c. But the unpardonable sin, as stated in Matt. 12: 31, 32, is *evidently confined to the case of imputing the miracles of our Lord to the agency of the Devil.* The sin unto death, mentioned by the Apostle John, is a very different offence from the one declared to be unpardonable, as we shall show before we close.

We should not confound these offences, as has been too often done. For the one relates to punishment here and hereafter, while the other extends to this life only, and induces the penalty merely of temporal death.

A few extracts from the writings of distinguished and pious theologians, will set this subject in its proper light. Among the ancient writers, the explanations of this subject were often very indefinite. Athanasius wrote a whole dissertation on this subject, in which he states the opinion of Origen, that "all sins committed after baptism were against the Holy Ghost." But in the writings of Origen, now extant, he places this sin in the denial of the divinity of Jesus Christ. Theognostus, of Alexandria, Hilarius, and Ambrosius, hold to the same belief. In the *Pastor* of Hermas, this sin is explained to be blasphemy in general. Chrysostom (Hom. 42, in Matt.) and Hieronymus, (Comm. in Matt. 12,) maintain that one commits this sin, who asserts that the miracles performed by Christ, were done by the agency of an evil spirit. Pfaff, Schubert, Baumgarten, and other German theologians, are of the same opinion.

Limborch maintained that only *eye witnesses* of Christ's miracles, as the Pharisees were, could be guilty of this offence, because no other had equal advantages for attaining to a full and undoubted conviction of their certainty.

The learned and judicious Dr. Campbell, in his translation of the Gospels, thus renders our Lord's words in Matt. 12: 31, 32—"Wherefore, I say unto you, though every other sin and detraction in men is pardonable, their detraction from the Spirit is unpardonable; for whosoever shall inveigh against the Son of Man may obtain pardon, but

whosoever shall speak against the Holy Ghost, shall never be pardoned, either in the present state or in the future."

Mr. Charles Thompson, Secretary of Congress during our Revolutionary war, in his translation of Matt. 12: 31, 32, renders them as follows: "Therefore, I say unto you, that all manner of sin and slander may be forgiven men, but this slanderous speaking against the Spirit, is not to be forgiven men. Even though one speak against the Son of Man, it may be forgiven him, but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, is not to be forgiven, either in the present age, or in that which is to come."

Dr. A. Clarke, one of the most learned commentators on the Holy Scripture, in a note on this chapter, has the following remarks: "Even personal reproaches, revilings, persecutions against Christ, were remissible, but blasphemy, or impious speaking against the Holy Spirit, was to have no forgiveness; i. e., when the person obstinately imputed those works to the Devil, which he had the fullest evidence could be wrought only by the Spirit of God. That *this* and *nothing else is the sin* against the Holy Spirit, is evident from the connection in this place. Here, the matter is made clear beyond the smallest doubt; the unpardonable sin is neither more nor less than ascribing the miracles Christ wrought by the power of God, to the Spirit of the Devil. Let it be here observed, that no man who believes the divine mission of Jesus Christ, ever can commit this sin.

The late Rev. Dr. Kollock, formerly Professor of Theology in the College of New Jersey, in his sermon on "the sin against the Holy Ghost," vol. 2, sermon 52, uses the following language: "This sin consists in ascribing the miracles wrought by Jesus Christ, through the power of the Holy Ghost, to the Devil, while those who thus blasphemed were actuated by envy, malice, pride, and other malignant passions, or spoke against conviction, and the light of their conscience. Every gross sin committed against knowledge and conscience is not this sin; nor every denial of Christ's miracles; nor every denial of the divinity and the personality of the Holy Spirit; nor every blasphemous suggestion of Satan; nor every sin against grace received; nor every malicious persecution of Christianity; nor every resisting, opposing, quenching the motions of the Spirit; for many

thousand persons who have committed these sins have afterwards repented and been forgiven—have become ornaments of the church on earth, and received the crown of glory beyond the grave.”

The following comment is given by the learned Dr. Porteus, late Bishop of London, in his Lectures on the Gospel of Matthew: “From this interpretation, which I believe is generally admitted to be the true one, it appears that there is no just grounds for the apprehensions entertained by some pious minds, that they may have committed the unpardonable sin—the sin against the Holy Ghost, for we see that it is confined *solely* and *exclusively* to the case before us, that is, to the crime of which the Pharisees had just been guilty—the crime of attributing to the agency of evil spirits those miracles which were plainly wrought by the Spirit of God, and which they saw with their own eyes.

Archbishop Tillotson discusses this subject in his seventeenth sermon, vol. 1. From a full investigation, he draws the following conclusion: “The true nature of this sin, did consist in a malicious opposition to the utmost evidence that could be given to the truth of any religion. And herein lay the greatness of their sin, in resisting the evidence of those miracles, which were so plainly wrought by the Holy Spirit, and which, though themselves saw, yet they maliciously imputed to the Devil, rather than be convinced by them. No person has a right to extend it beyond the case to which the Saviour applies it, therefore, I cannot see how any person *now* is capable of committing it.

Dr. Doddridge, in his “Family Expositor,” paraphrases these verses thus: “Verily, I,—the Lord Jesus Christ,—say unto you, that all other sins shall be forgiven to the children of men, and even the other blasphemies with which they shall blaspheme; but the blasphemy against the Spirit of God, in this most glorious dispensation of it, shall not be forgiven to those impious and incorrigible men, who shall dare to impute to diabolical operation those glorious works of divine power and goodness. And I add, that whosoever speaks a contemptuous and impious word, even against the Son of Man himself, while here on earth in his obscure form, he may possibly be brought to repentance for it, and so it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall maliciously speak any thing of this nature against the Holy Spirit, when the

grand dispensation of it shall open, in those miraculous gifts and operations that will be attended with the most evident demonstrations of his mighty power, it shall never be forgiven him, either in this world or in that which is to come."

We have seen from the above quotations, "that reference is to the conduct of the Pharisees in ascribing miracles wrought by divine power, to the agency and power of the devil, and not to the ordinary resistance done to the motions of the Holy Spirit, and thus the pain and anguish of mind which now attend so many respecting this sin, might have been spared. When taken in connection with the context, it unquestionably means that because the Pharisees had attributed to the agency of the devil, the miracle wrought by our Lord, they had been guilty of a sin for which no forgiveness could be possible. And, unless it can be shown in the instance of any inquirers after eternal life, or of any believer in Jesus, that this conduct has been exhibited under circumstances at all similar to those under which the Pharisees committed their sin, we do not see that it can be at all committed now." See *Princeton Review*, for 1846, pp. 391-393.

Although we are inclined to the opinion that the sin under consideration, cannot be committed *now*, yet many able and good men hold to the contrary view. The late venerable Dr. Ashbel Green, in the "*Christian Advocate*," vol. 1, p. 180, maintains that this sin can be committed at the present day. Dr. Chalmers holds to the same view, in a sermon "on the Nature of the Sin against the Holy Ghost." (See his *Sermons*, Amer. ed., vol. 2, Ser. 12.) His language is: "The sin then against the Holy Ghost, so far from conferring any rare distinction of wickedness on him who is guilty of it, is in fact the sin of all who, living under the dispensation of the Gospel, have, by their rejection of it, made it the savor of death unto death. It is a sin which, can be charged upon every man who has put the overtures of forgiveness away from him. It is a sin, which, if on the great day of examination you are found to be free from, will argue your acceptance of the Gospel, in virtue of which its forgiveness is made sure to you. And it is a sin, which, if found on that day to adhere to you, will argue your final refusal of this same Gospel, in virtue of which your forgiveness is impossible, because you are out of the only way

given under heaven whereby men can be saved. So that this sin, looked upon by many as the sin of one particular age, or if possible to realize it in the present day, as only to be met with in a few solitary instances of enormous and unexpiable transgression, is the very sin upon which may be made to turn the condemnation and the ruin of the existing majority of our species."

If we do not mistake the Doctor in this quotation, he means to say, that if the sinner has accepted of the overtures of salvation, he will stand acquitted "on the great day of examination;" on the other hand, if he has despised the offers of pardon, and set at naught the blood of atonement, he will stand condemned. How this casts any light upon the Scripture under review, we leave the Doctor to answer.

Dr. Whitby, in his Appendix at the end of the Gospel of Matthew, says, "that this blasphemy of the Holy Ghost neither was nor could be committed, when our Saviour spake these words, or whilst he was upon earth, because the Holy Ghost was not yet come. Though, therefore, our Saviour entered upon this discourse upon occasion of that saying of the Pharisees—He casts out devils through Beëlzebub—yet his design seems chiefly to be this, to terrify them from going on from the blaspheming of the Son of Man, and of that Spirit by which he wrought his miracles, to the blaspheming of the ensuing dispensation of the Holy Ghost, which was the last he ever would vouchsafe to call them to that repentance which would procure the remission of their sins."

Bishop Tomline says, it is plain that the sin against the Holy Ghost could not be committed while our Saviour was upon earth, since he always speaks of the Holy Ghost as yet to come.

Augustine defines it to be an obstinate perverseness, attended with a despair of pardon, and continued till death.

Calvin, in his Institutes, book 3, ch. 3, says it is committed by those who, though they are so overpowered with the splendor of divine truth, that they cannot pretend ignorance, nevertheless resist it with determined malice, merely for the sake of resisting it. This then is "blasphemy of the Spirit," where the presumption of man deliberately strives to annihilate the glory of God.

Pictet says, it is "a wilful rejection and total renunciation of the Gospel truth once known, joined with a confirmed hatred and contempt, and often persecution of it, and this not for a time, but constantly even to the end of life; and that it may be seen in the present day committed by many."

Grotius thinks the unpardonable sin to be that of a hardened, impenitent, and insolent sinner, and gives for examples, the sin of Korah, Pharoah, Simon Magus, &c.

Notwithstanding the high authority that is against us, we still adhere to our former position, namely, that this sin cannot be committed in the present age of the church.

It may not be out of place to make a few remarks upon the phrase, "Neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Dr. A. Clarke is fully satisfied that the meaning of these words is neither in this dispensation, viz., the *Jewish*, nor in that which is to come, viz., the *Christian*. *The world to come* is a constant phrase for the times of the Messiah in the Jewish writers. In this sense, the Apostle Paul seems to speak, Heb. 2: 5, and 6: 5.

The sin here spoken of by our Lord, ranks high in the list of presumptuous sins, for which there was no forgiveness under the Mosaic dispensation. See Numb. 15: 30, 31. When the Lord says that such a sin has no forgiveness, is he not to be understood as teaching that the crime shall be punished under the *Christian* dispensation as it was under the Jewish, namely, by the destruction of the body? The punishment for presumptuous sins under the Jewish law certainly did not extend to the damnation of the soul; therefore, we conclude there was no forgiveness, so as to absolve the man from temporal death, yet, on *repentance*, mercy might be extended to the soul.

Dr. Whitby translates οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ αἰῶνι, οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. Neither in this age, nor in the age to come.

Though the original will admit of either the above renderings, yet we agree with Bloomfield who supposes the whole may be taken as a strong negative, frequent in the Jewish writers.

This expression of the Saviour, has led many (the Papists) to believe that there will be pardon for sins in the other world. It is observed, both by Lightfoot and Grotius, that the Jews, through a mistaken notion of the final hap-

piness of all the seed of Abraham, supposed there were some sins that had not been forgiven here, that would be expiated by death and forgiven after it; and that the Lord designed by this language to assure them that there was no forgiveness either before or after death for this sin. See Lightfoot *Hor. Heb.*, and Grotius *in loc.*

This was a common mode of speaking among the Jews, and simply means, *never*. Thus R. Eliezer proves that the Samaritans have no portion in the world to come, because it is said, it belongs not to you to build with us in this world, nor in the world to come. Though the Jews believed that the *pangs* of death might expiate sins, yet they held, *nullam esse peccati expiationem post mortem*, and therefore could not use this phrase in the Popish sense.

Our next inquiry is, to ascertain what is meant by the expression, "a sin unto death." It is difficult to discover this sin, although it has been generally thought to coincide with the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, but the language of the Apostle does not afford data for pronouncing them one and the same.

The Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, alone describe the *blasphemy* which shall not be forgiven: from it the "sin unto death" stands apart, and must be determined without any aid derived from the former. See Lücke's *Commentar. über die Briefe des Evangelisten Johannes*.

We cannot perhaps do better than present Dr. A. Clarke's views on this subject.

The Doctor observes that there are three principal opinions on this verse:

1. It is supposed that there is here an allusion to a distinction in the Jewish law, where there was "a sin unto death," and "a sin *not* unto death:" a sin, to which the law had assigned the punishment of *death*, such as idolatry, incest, blasphemy, profanation of the Sabbath, &c.; and a sin not unto death, i. e. transgressions of ignorance, inadvertence, &c. That such distinctions did exist in the Jewish Synagogues, both Schoetgenius and Carpzovius have proved.

2. By the sin not unto death, we are to understand transgressions of the *civil* law, some of which must be punished with *death*, according to the *statutes*; others *might* be punished with death, but the magistrate had the power of com-

muting the punishment, of changing death into *banishment*. To intercede in the former case would be useless, because the law would not relax; therefore, they need not "pray for it;" but intercession in the latter case might be prevalent, therefore they might pray, and gain their suit.

3. The *sin unto death*, means a case of transgression, which God determines to punish with *temporal death*. The disobedient prophet, 1 Kings 13, is a case in point. This view of the subject is that taken by Wesley, in a sermon, entitled, "A Call to Backsliders."

Dr. Kollock is of the same opinion. He says: "You must recall some circumstances in the history of the primitive church, which are frequently mentioned in the New Testament. At this period, God often punished with sickness and disorders, those who had violated their duty and fallen into sin; I need produce no other example of this than the Corinthian church, in which Paul teaches us, there were many sick, and many dead because of their profanation of the Lord's Supper. The case of Ananias and Sapphira, is also directly in point. Here was *a sin unto death*, in consequence of using *deceit*, or as the Apostle Peter calls it, "lying to the Holy Ghost."

The sin unto death, spoken of by the Apostle, has a reference to sundry offences, called "presumptuous sins," under the Mosaic dispensation, for which there was no sacrifice, but which were punished with *temporal death*."

Dr. William Brown, in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, vol. 2, p. 109, says that in consequence of the Corinthians' improper observance of the Lord's Supper, many were weak and sickly among them, and many slept, or died by the visitation of heaven. And perhaps it is to this visible judgment of God in the Apostolical age against egregious offenders, rather than to the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost, that the Apostle John refers in his first Epistle 5: 16.

According to Dr. Benson, the sin not unto death, is any single sin which a good man commits through infirmity, or surprise. The sin unto death, therefore must be the reverse.

Dr. Doddridge confounds it with blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and says it is "such an apostacy from Christianity, as is attended with blaspheming the operations of the Spirit of God, and ascribing them to Satan.

Dr. Whitby remarks very justly, that those who interpret this phrase, "a sin unto death," of a sin on which *eternal death* will certainly follow, by the decree of God, make the duty here enjoined impracticable; for who can know when his brother's sin is unto death or not? Who is acquainted with any decree of God? They make the Apostle say, he dares not encourage them to pray for the salvation of them who are at present in a state of death and condemnation, which is against the tenor of the Scripture. See Romans 10: 1.

Dr. Macknight says, the "sin unto death," is a sin obstinately continued in, or at least not particularly repented of, the punishment of which is therefore to end in the sinner's death—not *his spiritual death*. This the spiritual man,—one who was endowed with the gift of healing diseases—knowing, by his not being inwardly moved of the Holy Ghost to pray for his recovery, the Apostle forbade him, in such a case, to ask it of God. According to Macknight's view, John is treating briefly of the subject concerning which James has treated more largely in his Epistle, chapter 5: 14, &c.

Another learned Commentator, Mr. Burkitt, in his exposition of these words, has the following observations. "Now in the verse before us, he—the Apostle—relates the benefits which others receive by their prayers, as well as themselves, assuring them that if any did pray for an offending brother, they should be heard in what they desired, unless the person they prayed for had sinned the sin unto death; by which we are to understand, *apostasy* from the Christian religion unto idolatry."

Calvin, with Burkitt, makes this sin to consist in apostasy. His words are, "*Est peccatum ad mortem*—Jam dixi, ita vocari peccatum, cui nulla spes veniae reliqua est; sed quaeritur, quale hoc sit, valde enim atrox esse oportet, quod Deus tam severe ulciscitur. Ex contextu colligi potest, non esse partialem (ut vocant) lapsum, nec praecepti unius transgressionem; sed *apostasiam*, qua penitus homines a Deo se alienant."

Dr. Knapp, in his Christian Theology, agrees with Clarke, that it means "punishment with death at a human tribunal, *a crime worthy of death, a capital crime.*"

In the consideration of this subject, which every Chris-

tian must deem most highly deserving of the closest examination, we have presented the foregoing extracts from the writings of the most learned and judicious theologians, both ancient and modern; and not of one, but of various religious denominations, and we are forced to the conclusion that the "blasphemy of the Spirit" (τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία,) is a sin that was confined to the days of the Saviour. We have seen what are the objections to this view of the subject, but we will not urge these objections in their full force against the several opinions which have been mentioned, as they would lead to a discussion far exceeding the due limits of a quarterly periodical. We have stated both sides of the question, unaided by any comments, and abstracted altogether from the arguments which embarrass the contrary opinion to which we have already alluded. We leave then the intelligent reader to form his own conclusion. But we wish him to form it in view of impartial testimony, and the clear teachings of the divine record. Then may we hope to find, with the pious Bishop Porteus, that the construction we have adopted of the sin against the Holy Ghost, is "*the one now generally admitted to be the true one.*" Surely this construction is far less practically dangerous, than the one which would attach irremissibility to the many offences of which weak mortals are capable, and which they are often so strongly tempted to commit. Many learned and pious men have believed and taught that there are various sins which men might commit, which, because of some seeming resemblance in point of aggravation to the sin of blasphemy against the Spirit, must incur a like punishment. But this is mere matter of inference. There is no authority for it in the word of God, and therefore we must see how little foundation there is for the scruples and qualms of conscience which many tender minds have felt, and which have unhappily kept so many in bondage and fear of death all their life time.

Neither can we agree with those who make the twelfth chapter of Matthew, and 31, 32 verses, and the fifth chapter of first John and 16 verse, refer to the same offence. We believe that the Apostle John speaks of persons and things to which the Saviour had no reference, when he uttered the words recorded by Matthew. We have thus briefly stated our opinion of these two disputed passages; and we close

with the wish that the unerring Spirit of the living God, may lead both writer and reader into all truth, and that we may obtain everlasting happiness through the merits of a crucified Redeemer.

ARTICLE VII.

JOHN THE BAPTIST, THE UNITARIAN JESUS.

OR, OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, ON THE UNITARIAN HYPOTHESIS, A
SURPLUSAGE PERSON AND CHARACTER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

INTRODUCTION.

Our Saviour certainly invites us to a confidence in himself, personally; a confidence of a very prominent and peculiar kind. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."† "Dost thou believe in the Son of God?"‡ "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."§ He requires of us a parity of confidence, in express terms (apparently) with that which we accord to his heavenly Father. "Ye believe in God, believe also in me."|| He speaks of himself, as one impossible to be known; as fully comprehended by any man: equally so with His Father. "No man knoweth THE SON, but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son hath revealed Him."**

His Apostles, and all the first preachers of the Gospel, seem to have required, and to have professed this kind of confidence: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of

* REMARK.—It will be observed that the parallel here drawn, is not between the New Testament Jesus and His Harbinger, but between the Unitarian Jesus and the New Testament John the Baptist. The point meant to be established is, that Unitarians denude and bring down the true character and present claims of the Lord Jesus Christ to a level with, if not below, the Scripture character and present claims of John.

† John 6: 20. ‡ Ib. 9: 25. § Ib. 8: 24. || Ib. 14: 1. ** Mat. 11: 27.

God.”* “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.”† “I know *whom* I have believed.”‡ “We have believed on Jesus Christ, that we may be justified by the faith of Christ.”§ There is throughout the Bible a remarkable absence of any such requirement, or such phrases, respecting any other of the messengers of heaven. Men are no where thus required to believe in Moses or in Joshua, in Isaiah or in Paul; their writings, as testimony to God’s truth, are repeatedly distinguished from *them*. But the whole Christian creed is described by inspired writers, as “the faith of,” or respecting “our Lord Jesus Christ,”|| “believing in God’s Son, Jesus Christ, as he hath given us commandment.”** No other messenger, so to speak, is to be trusted personally, or as a whole, but officially only; only so far forth as his message and the proofs of *it* go. We find sometimes a special reserve or warning of this kind interposed: “When a prophet speaketh, if the thing follow not, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken.”†† “Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.”‡‡ “Though we as an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that we have preached, let him be accursed.”§§ There are no distinctions, warnings, or reserves of this kind interposed respecting the Lord Jesus Christ and his message. Each is to be received as a whole. Every thing about Him and His message is peculiar and unique.

It would seem, therefore, to be the last stage and step of a retrocession from the Gospel system, to exclude Christ personally from that system; or to suppose, with his place in it vacated, that the system could proceed; that while his most gifted and best instructed servants make him “all in all,” we may safely make him nothing at all in our religious views. With this, however, is it not equivalent to suppose that any other messenger of heaven might *fill* his place? Or only to ascribe to him such virtues and distinctions as other messengers have exhibited; such a combination of moral excellences (however great) as we may point to in some other person or character? He is the Sun of religious righteousness, according to the sure word of

* Acts 8: 37. † 1b. 16: 31. ‡ 2 Tim. 1: 12. § Gal. 2: 16. || James 2: 1. ** 1 John 3: 23. †† Deut. 18: 22. ‡‡ 1 Cor. 11: 1. §§ Gal. 1; 9.

prophecy. Is any man gifted to see *two* such suns? Well might he spare one.

We have honestly, and for many years, investigated the claims of the Unitarian Jesus. We have consulted the most approved and popular statements of those claims. These statements we shall quote. They present to us, as Unitarians do not affect to deny, a different Jesus, undoubtedly, from Him who is acknowledged by other professed Christians, and differing in the sense of a material diminution of his claims. The difference is just immeasurable, strictly infinite. He is our "Lord," so that we worship him—not theirs. They can give him no such homage. He is possessed of infinite resources and infinite excellences, according to our creed, but not according to theirs. All those of their number, who have exchanged an Orthodox or Trinitarian faith, for an Unitarian, have (*de facto*) from whatever cause, been induced to think of him, infinitely less and lower than they did. We appreciate him far too highly, according to their views; while the whole current of the learning, logic and eloquence of all their writers, as such, goes, as they must admit, to depreciate him in the very general public opinion; to bring him down duly, as they would contend, from the point of improper elevation at which he has been placed.

The result is, that with them he is at best but a most perfect creature, and there are many such creatures; with an influential number, perhaps the majority of them, he is but a most perfect *Man*; and there is a strong presumption of reason, together with positive testimony of Scripture, that man is not of the highest order of intellectual creatures. Dr. Channing speaks of that other order, the angels, as "those pure flames of love, who need not our atonement for sin to confirm their loyalty to God."* The angels are with him—"mans elder brethren in heaven."† If only a man, then he is expressly said by both Testaments, to be altogether of a lower nature than the angels. Nor is it irrelevant here to add, that the great enemy of God and righteousness, he who is still not

"Less than archangel ruined,"

* See the Note at the end of this Article. † Channing's Review, &c., 8vo., p. 225.

is certainly by the Scriptures clothed with greater natural powers than any mere man; and if still, as many of the Unitarians contend, a spirit (with all his compeers) recoverable to glory and virtue, he is a being that may yet be destined to take precedence in honors, as in power, over every one of our race, the Unitarian Jesus not excepted. That is, the "old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan," may yet come forth the superior and the teacher of such a Christ!

But another result is, that there are patterns of human piety and virtue on the records of the church, which approximate clearly to the Jesus of every Unitarian. Very little to be distinguished from him, is a Joseph, a Jeremiah, a Daniel, or John the Baptist — of whom, respectively, there is no recorded departure from the line of piety and virtue; not a single fault on record. We see in fact no difference of moral moment, between the last of these noble sons of the church and the Unitarian Jesus. With the sole exception of a delegated power to work miracles, there is no honorable distinction of the latter but what the former possessed, and the fair theological consequence of this is: That the whole personal and official character of the Lord Jesus Christ becomes *surplusage*, upon the face of the New Testament; that "holy thing" born of the virgin, a redundant and unnecessary thing. For what is he wanted there? In what is he greater than John the Baptist?

(1.) John was a commissioned servant of the Most High. What is the Unitarian Jesus more? John had a divine mission. Jesus, say they, had no other divinity. (2.) John afforded one of the highest examples of piety and virtue. In no other way, since his decease, does the Unitarian Jesus seem to influence *our* piety and virtue. (3.) John was considered worthy of some distinct and very honorable prophecies respecting his person and office, which call him Elijah or Elias, for the fearless boldness of his reproofs; Jehovah's own messenger or angel, to mark the direct heavenly origin of his commission. What more do Unitarians claim for *their* Lord and Master? (4.) The birth of John is semi-miraculous, the announcement of it attended by several miracles. To that of the Unitarian Jesus, scarcely so much of miraculous honor is given. (5.) John preaches the very same doctrine of thorough repentance with Jesus; and administers a similar initiatory rite, or

divine ordinance, that of baptism: one, as to the material parts and intention of it, we should contend, identically the same. (6.) He dies, too, a martyr's death. What more is the death of the Unitarian Jesus? The son of Zecharias pays the price of his own blood to establish the faith of his disciples, and the honorable consistency and completeness of his own prophetic character. What more does their Son of God?

The true issue is, that the creed of Herod's fears respecting John the Baptist, should supersede on this hypothesis the ordinary creed of the hopes of Christians. It is but John the Baptist, in point of character and dignity, "that is risen from the dead, and mighty works do show forth themselves in him."

In the present paper, we design to pursue this parallel more particularly, and to compare with the recorded moral excellences and high official claims of John, the denuded and reduced character (as we must esteem it) of the Unitarian Jesus.

SEC. I. *John the Baptist was a Commissioned Servant of the Most High.* What is the Unitarian Jesus more?

The Evangelist St. Luke, clearly adopts as strictly true, the exulting testimony of Zacharias respecting his remarkable son. The pious father was filled, we are told, "with the Holy Ghost," when he said: "Thou child shall be called the prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways. His name is John,"* he decided, according to the dictation of the angel, who had announced his birth—John, signifying mercy, or by the idiom of the ancient Scriptures, a decided manifestation of the mercy of God. He was to turn or convert the hearts of fathers, with those of their children (according to the angel, as well as the prophet,) and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just. He was to impart the knowledge of salvation to God's people, (something far beyond any of their former temporal deliverances,) "by the remission of their sins."

"There was a man sent" (commissioned expressly) "from God, whose name was John," says the beloved dis-

* Luke 1: 76, 63.

ciple,—“So to bear witness of the true light, that all men through him might believe”* in it. . . . “All men believed John to be a prophet,” so unimpeachable were his character and claims. His baptism was from heaven; those “justified,” or duly honored God, who were baptized of him; he was “a burning and a shining light;”† “a prophet and more than a prophet,”‡ says the faithful and true witness. In other words, John had an undoubted divine mission. Its origin was—heaven, and it received the highest practical sanction of heaven during his whole life on earth. He came “from heaven,” according to the Unitarian exposition of that phrase.

“We believe firmly in the divinity of Christ’s mission and office,” says Dr. Channing, “that he spoke with divine authority, and was a bright image of the divine perfections. God dwelt in him, manifested himself through him, taught by him.” This writer has the temerity to add, that this is the sense in which “many, perhaps a majority of Christians, believe in Christ’s divinity.”§ . . . Did he not know that a majority of Christians believe in the divinity of Christ’s person; that they are perfectly familiar with the distinction between this and that of his mission, and that they chiefly apply the term divinity to his person?||

Mr. Jared Sparks, says: “Whenever he is spoken of as God, it is in a sense which he himself defined, when he said—‘those are called God’s, to whom the word of God came.’” Of course, the writer means *only* in this sense, and “the word of God,” as he truly says, “came to Moses, the prophets,” &c. So St. Luke, “The word of God came to John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness.”** Then John, the son of Zacharias, could, with equal propriety, be called by the Unitarians, God. Is it too much to call him the Unitarian Jesus? He is an Unitarian divinity.

Dr. Carpenter, in like manner, “considers,” (as he is quoted by Mr. Sparks,) that Thomas was expressing his

* John 1: 6, 7. † John 5: 35. ‡ Mat. 11: 9. § Channing’s Reviews, &c. p. 571.

|| Unitarian writers sometimes indulge a surprising latitude of assertion with regard to facts. Thus, Dr. Priestley says, unqualifiedly, in his letters to Mr. Burn, “In no sense whatever, not in the lowest of all, is Christ called God in the New Testament.” Did he expunge from his John’s Gospel, the often quoted exclamation of Thomas?

** Luke 3: 2.

conviction of the divine authority only of Jesus, which he before doubted, when he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God!" But the baptism of John, was it not from heaven or of divine authority? These gentlemen claim no more for Jesus, certainly, than he claimed for John. So far as the great question of Christ's divinity is concerned, he is only divine as John and Moses were divine; either, therefore, may be regarded as having *all* the divine qualifications of Jesus to fill his place. Just so far as "divinity" conveys to our minds the idea of moral and spiritual dignity, (and we may here take it for what degree of dignity we please,) these favored precursors of our Saviour possessed that dignity, as much as he. Nay, Mr. Sparks would bring down his Lord, wherever he is called God, yet lower. He says, "The use of the term, *exactly coincides* with the sense in which it is applied to the prophets (also;) the rulers of Israel, and in a greater or less degree, to every good man."* Or, the Unitarian Jesus, was not more truly divine (in the common acceptance of the word) than St. Stephen, who died praying to him to receive his spirit, or the fickle Barnabas, for "he was a good man!" But will not plain people be disposed to ask, why then accumulate all these epithets, that look like peculiar and essential divine honors upon Christ? As also, whether any terms of spiritual honor *can* be accumulated beyond those appropriate to divinity? We have heard a plain man say, that if Jesus were not truly divine, the New Testament would be the most ensnaring book to idolatry that ever was written; where every attribute or feature of Deity, would seem trifled with or perverted; and the pretensions put forth by or for Jesus, made more dangerous to religion than those of Mahommed; so much more seems to be claimed for him.

Unitarians have never found it convenient to meet another allegation from a peculiar quarter. A modern Jew of England, Mr. Levi, expressly rejects the Messiah of the Orthodox, on the ground of his pretensions to being "more than a prophet." "He preached himself," says this writer, "as the light of the world, an instance not to be paralleled in Jewish Scripture; for the duty of a prophet consisted in the

* Letters on Episcopacy, 12mo., 180.

delivering of God's word or message to the people, not in presumptuous preaching of himself. Again, in John 14, we meet with the same example, where Jesus preaches himself, as "the way, the truth, and the life."* The Unitarian Jesus is clearly not exposed to the spirit of this gentleman's objection. He goes no further than the delivery of God's message to the people. It may be added, there was something more peculiarly *prophetic* in John's habits, dress, and entire manner of life, than in those of Jesus; this, connected with the cessation of the spirit of prophecy for four centuries previous to his appearance, drew more quickly a marked attention to him, than Jesus at first received, as a teacher; and eventuated in a popularity, a degree of personal success, greater than even attended the personal preaching of Christ. Of the latter, nothing is said equivalent to the phrase, "there went out to him, Jerusalem, and all Judea, confessing their sins."

SEC. II. *John the Baptist affords one of the brightest Examples of Piety and Virtue.* In no other way, since his decease, does the Unitarian Jesus seem to influence our piety and virtue.

We may here resume the remark, John is without a recorded fault. The angel announces that he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, from his mother's womb, and where does he resist, or disgrace, the heavenly influence? He modestly disclaims all honor, not strictly his own, alike before the messengers of the Sanhedrim, (John i: 15, 28,) and before the multitude, (John ii: 27,) faithfully exhibits the paramount claim of his Lord and Master, and is more than willing to decrease in influence and popularity, so that He might increase. He can describe, with the utmost power of eloquence, with burning words and a glowing heart, the newly incarnate Bridegroom of the Church; and claim to be his friend, as his own abundant honor, when thousands would readily have received *him* as that Bridegroom. All his virtues are characteristic, finely proportion-

* Levi's Letters to Priestley, (as quoted by Fuller,) Fuller's Works, vol. 1, 281. This Jewish unbeliever asks a question, also, to which none of the Unitarian writers have applied an answer. "What they" the Jews, "shall do more by embracing (Unitarian) Christianity than they already do?"

ed; and, ere we part with him, fully matured. The language of the successor of his great prophetic type, "Is it a time to receive money, and gardens, and olive-yards, and vineyards, and sheep, and oxen, and man-servants, and maid-servants?" seems transcribed in his life and habits. He passes his youth in a desert region, is never found in a city or town, but when he comes there to reprove vice on a throne — and die. He preaches the crucifixion of all sinful appetites and affections, and begins by denying his own. He seems a personification of the strict moral doctrine he inculcates: temperate to abstemiousness, disinterested to utter poverty and self sinking; bold in the condemnation of the only great earthly friend he ever made, until his life is placed in the power of a harlot, as he must have expected it would be. This is not a place to enlarge on his nobly cast example, in its separate features. It is of the utmost manly beauty and consistency. He had cases and counsels for all ranks; entered into the multifarious temptations and endless duties of the multitude; rebuked the poor and the middle classes, the peasant and the prince. We may be sure that his example pressed as affectionately on every ordinary and extraordinary point of human life, as did his counsels and rebukes. Placed, by the highest authority, in a position the most dignified and influential, he exhibits no tinge of egotism or pride. "The great, the God-like feature of his character," as Neander well says, "was his thorough understanding of himself and his calling." An Apollos could teach diligently all the weightier matters of God's law and Christ's gospel, "knowing only the baptism of John." He was an eloquent man, and mighty in the the Scriptures, when John was his chief theme, to a degree that Christ is not that of Unitarian ministers. Unitarians add, in reality, nothing moral or spiritual, to this scriptural picture of John's example, in that of *their* Messiah. He is not God, touching and glancing in any more personal or direct way than this, upon our moral difficulties and temptations, our mental and corporeal sufferings. To enforce his example as that of a mere man, they regard as one of the highest ends of preaching the gospel. "This spotless example is to warm and quicken, as well as to guide us to perfection," says Dr. Channing.* But one spotless example,

* Discourses, 8 vo., Boston, p. 317. Id. 318.

(and John's is spotless,) must, in the nature of things, be as efficacious as another. *There are no degrees in negative virtue.* Even the death of Christ, as many Unitarians suppose, contributes to our pardon, only as a principal means of confirming his religion, and that "it procures forgiveness, by leading to that repentance and virtue which is the great and only condition (faith of all kinds peremptorily excluded,) on which forgiveness is bestowed"! For near a century they have been teaching, as "The Scripture doctrine of Remission," that "Pardon is dispensed solely on account of a personal repentance in the sinner."*

We shall return to the topic of our Saviour's death. "Other good men have their faults," says Mr. Pitkin, of Baltimore, "Jesus is unchangeably sinless."† So, as far as the testimony of Scripture goes, is John the Baptist. "Other kind, zealous and wise men, sometimes suffer their benevolence to relax, their zeal to faint." But where do these virtues give way in the harbinger of the Messiah? "Jesus exhibited a beneficence, which no malevolence from others had power to chill; a zeal, which no difficulties or toils could tire, and a wisdom always bright with the illumination of truth." All of which could be said of the man Moses, with a slight exception. (Very consistently, therefore, as a Unitarian, does Dr. Priestley speak of his Jesus Christ, being as fallible and peccable as the man Moses.) All of which, without any known exception, can be said of John the Baptist.

SEC. III. *John was considered worthy of some very distinct and honorable prophecies respecting his person and office. He is termed the Elijah of his day—the Messenger or Angel of Jehovah.* What do Unitarians claim more for their Lord and Master?

Our Saviour's Harbinger is one of a small group of illustrious characters, who are named of God in prophecy before their birth—Isaac, Solomon, and Cyrus, are others. But considerable emphasis is laid on the prophetic cognomen *Elias*, or *Elijah*, as applied by the prophet to John. The Prophets, the Scribes, and the Saviour, agree in say-

* Title of one of Dr. Priestley's early Tracts.

† Pitkin's Objections to Baker's Sermon. Balt. 1834: p. 18.

ing, "that Elias must first come" (before Christ,) and *this*, says the last high authority, "is Elias who was for to come."

He is called by this well qualified interpreter, a "Restorer of all things," and he fulfilled his course. Elijah, in a period of great declension, and in a region of peculiar darkness, as to the knowledge and worship of the true God, suddenly demands of the people and King of Israel, a practical return to that worship. He was left alone (comparatively) to make this demand, and in the face of all opposition, and of male and female iniquity, in the highest places, obtains universal attention and obedience. He confronts and subdues, for a time, by anticipation, a Herod and a Herodias, in the persons of King Ahab, and his Jezebel. To verify his commission, the fire descends from Heaven, on the altar of sacrifice; as, to sanction that of his great antitype, John, it reaches and rends the hearts of men by thousands. "There went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." The church was to study in the Tishbite's character and office. that of the son of Zacharias. It was a character and office greater than that of any other prophet, no one of whom was the subject of prophecy before his appearance. The Unitarian Jesus is commonly represented as a *mere* prophet, *if* the highest, *but* the highest of God's commissioned Teachers. Particular statements need hardly be quoted here. John, as the prophetic Elijah, is something more, *far* more, as said Jesus; and more therefore, than they ordinarily make Jesus himself. "Preaching Christ," says Dr. Channing,* "does not consist in making Christ perpetually the subject of discourse, but in inculcating, on his authority, the religion, which he taught. Jesus came to be the Light and Teacher of the world." So, undoubtedly, may we not add, did John the Baptist come? And may we not adopt every word of this Unitarian Leader's highest description of preaching Christ, and apply it to John? "In this sublime and benevolent character he unfolded many truths relating to the Universal Father, to his own character, to the condition, duties, and prospects of mankind, to the perfection

* Discourses, p. 240.

and true happiness of the human soul, and to a future state of retribution, to the terms of forgiveness, to the means of virtue, and of everlasting life."

John is the messenger or angel of *Jehovah*. We dwell not here, on the fact that the Evangelists quote this very prophecy, as announcing him to be the herald of Christ, and so in truth, make the Lord Jesus Christ, the Jehovah of hosts of the prophet; but do Unitarians even accord to the Lord Jesus a higher office than that which the Jewish prophecy means to indicate by the Angel of Jehovah? The text of Malachi reads: "Behold I will send *my* messenger, (angel,) and he shall prepare the way before *me*, saith the Lord (Jehovah) of Hosts; Jehovah, being well known to be the most peculiar or idiomatical name of God; His proper name, in distinction from all names of mere office or relation; and Jehovah of *Hosts*, the only form of construction with another noun, into which that name is ever brought. Such is the glorious and Supreme Being whose messenger John was to be.

It is clearly relevant to this argument, to remember *what* the Jewish Scriptures (according to the most approved commentators, Jewish and Christian,) regard *as* the nature and qualifications of an angel. He is certainly a being of super-human powers. His proper abode and standing is in the more immediate "presence of God." He is gifted occasionally with a very extensive agency, and a command independent of other creatures over physical nature. Without multiplying instances in proof, he moves with a kind of infinite care, in a sphere altogether above that of mortals, and without supposing the son of Zacharias to be identified with this high order of intelligences, strictly or permanently, must not something far more elevated than it has ever fallen to the lot of ordinary mortals to accomplish or to possess, he meant by declaring that any man shall act as emphatically the Angel of the Lord of Hosts? However difficult it may be to assign the exact sphere of these agents, or the degree of divine power they are capable of exercising, the idea is certainly throughout the Old Testament conveyed, that they exercised the highest under God. What more does the Unitarian Jesus? John *could* have done all the wonders we find recounted of these heavenly agents, and still have been only Jehovah's Angel. What more

than this, can any mere creature (and their Saviour is but a creature) by any possibility perform? The Jesus, then, of the Unitarian, in the zeal of this party, to reduce him to a due inferiority to God, is rarely left by them, equal to the Scriptural John.

SEC. IV. *The birth of John is semi-miraculous—the announcement of it is attended by several miracles.* To that of the Unitarian Jesus, scarcely so much honor is given.

Our Lord Jesus Christ had no human father. Two of the Evangelists dwell in detail upon this, and both connect it with the doctrine of his divinity. Well was it known by the ultimate Author of the Bible, that Infidels would sneer at this circumstance, and that Rome-Papal would unite with it some of her most revolting and idolatrous perversions of the truth; but St. Matthew plainly insists that *this* best accounts for his name, Immanuel, or God with us. He was brought into the world by a stupendous miracle; in a manner no other man ever was, and setting aside the course of nature in every other instance. While this alone had been no proof of his proper divinity, in proportion to its splendor, as a miracle, it prepares us to expect such a human birth, as in no other case has transpired. It is remarkable how very little Unitarians have found it convenient to treat of this circumstance. Equally remarkable is it, that the Improved Unitarian Version of the New Testament, published some years ago in England, printed the whole first and second chapters of Matthew in italics, (with the corresponding part of St. Luke's Gospel,) expressly to intimate in the face of all sound criticism, the doubtful character of both accounts of our Saviour's miraculous conception. Doctor Priestley indeed avows plainly, in a shocking account of his retrograde faith already alluded to, that he had come to regard Christ as a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary, and "naturally as fallible and peccable as Moses or any other prophet."

The birth of John, then, is more than miraculous enough for the Unitarian Messiah. Here, as we submit, is the reason why Dr. Channing avoids the topic; and Priestley and Belsham reject the miraculous conception of the New Testament Jesus. More decided attention, was called on the hypothesis of Dr. Priestley to the birth of John, than to that

of Jesus. The latter was the son of a youthful pair. Quite of this learned polemic's mind, were the sceptical hearers of our Lord, lettered and rude: "We know this man whence he is." There is no kind of mystery about his birth or origin: "His father and mother, we know." But the parents of John have been long married, and are childless; both are advanced in life. Like the birth of Isaac, of Samson, and of others, it was a circumstance that would attract considerable notice to "the manner of child" he should be. If only the mutilated Gospels of Unitarian critics are taken in evidence, John must have been the son of aged parents, and Jesus, that of young people.

SEC. V. *John preaches the same doctrine of Repentance with Jesus—administers the same significant Initiatory rite of Baptism.*

He certainly preaches that repentance and virtue, which Dr. Channing says are the only conditions of our forgiveness. What other preacher, then, what plainer or more authoritative exhibitor of virtue or repentance can we want? He requires not only the contrition and confession of repentance, but the practical fruits, "the change of life," that evinces a change of mind—(μετάνοια). Scribes and Pharisees shall neither seduce nor intimidate him from his stern demand of "fruits meet for repentance." His popularity with the multitude, (which, if equalled by his Saviour, was not exceeded,) shall not blunt the edge of his faithfulness—the axe laid now to the root of "every tree." The publicans, the soldiers, the people at large, have all and severally, their appropriate moral lessons, from this true reformer. He makes ready an entire people, for the coming of the Lord. And as the religion he teaches, is thus accompanied by sound morals, he accompanies moral requirements, on the other hand, with strictly religious rites and duties. His disciples are taught to pray—they fast oft—he administers the holy rite of baptism on repentance. Adopted or not from any previous Jewish ceremony, it was in his hands, with full authority "from heaven." Until the day of his imprisonment, he continues to demand this ritual submission to the approaching kingdom of God.*

* John iii. 23. How much is implied in this simple collocation of facts. He continues to resort to the most convenient waters, or "much water," to

The Scriptural Jesus adopts, in the first instance, both personally and officially, this baptism of John. His doctrine is the same with that of his harbinger; his language the same — “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” If both are merely human teachers, and servants of that kingdom, to the son of Zacharias belongs the honor of its earlier conception and announcement. Hence, the freer German school of Unitarians assert, that it was “*he* (John) who first led Jesus to think of it;” and “John having been put to death, at an early period of his labors, Jesus completed the plan which the former had commenced, and then the Church was called after him. So that there is the same relation between them as between Columbus and Americus!”† That is, the Jesus of this school is obtruded upon the world, if he did not obtrude himself, as the manifest usurper of the honors of another! This writer further adds, with truth, “John was engaged in the same calling with Jesus, he preached the same kingdom of God, delivered the same serious and sacred instructions with regard to duty, and exhibited similar zeal for the truth, and the thorough reformation of his people.” Nor can we deny the following historical allusion, its truth and relevance here, while we disclaim, of course, the insinuation it is meant to sustain. “John’s school rivalled that of Christ, and continued for a long time (?) the sole opponent of the Christian Church, a fact which betrays a suspicion, that John himself expected to lay claim to the Messiaship.” So John (to call a spade a spade) was the dupe of a dishonest disciple. It is perfectly true that John was authorized to establish an intermediate kind of religious school, and to place himself at the head of it. He forms his disciples into a very interesting class or body. They defer to his judgment — they attend upon his person — they are called by his name. We trace them in Holy Writ, to a remarkably late period, in the establishment of the kingdom of God. Nor can we at all discern why the *Unitarian* Jesus might not have been, as Voltaire and Frederic of Prussia have asserted, of the sect of the Essenes, or of John. Denude him, personally, of the divinity, and you destroy all the originality, authori-

the latest days of his personal liberty. He is popular to the last, faithful, diligent — in Heaven’s service to the last.

† Johannes v. Jesus; Henke’s Neues Magazin, quoted by Reinhard.

ty and honesty of his character. Nor is it irrelevant here to recollect, that as a reformer, John did more than Jesus, on this hypothesis, in a much shorter time.

Baptism, in the hands of its first authorized administrator, was to indicate a high degree of moral improvement and religious decision of character. As soon as a man submitted to it, he took upon himself an obligation "to practice every virtue, and abjure every vice." It made religion intelligible, and the religionist known. There was no burial unto the death of Christ, it may be granted; no planting of the new religious character in the likeness of his death. And why should there ever be, if that death be a mere martyrdom? Why may we not be said to be buried by baptism, as much into the likeness of the Baptist's bloody death, as unto that of Christ? The former is a quite competent leader; the institutor of baptism, and the bold inculcator and exemplar of a faultless confession of religion.

SEC. VI. *He dies a Martyr's death, and what more does the Unitarian Jesus?*

We have now arrived at the capital point of New Testament doctrine respecting Christ—that aspect of his character and work, in which a St. Paul so much gloried, ex gr. Christ and him crucified; and that at which Dr. Channing and his friends are so much scandalized. In no part of his works, has this writer exhibited so much zeal to write forcibly and eloquently, as in caricaturing the sentiments of orthodox Christians on this point. He is rabid in the attack upon us. We allude to that passage in his discourse at the Dedication of the Second Congregational Church, New-York, in which, with a kind of Walter Scott mannerism, he is pleased to represent the popular doctrine of the Atonement, as "busying the Creator in erecting a gallows in the centre of the universe," &c. and "publicly executing upon it an Infinite Being, the partaker of his own Divinity." The whole is one of the most disgraceful exhibitions of party miscoloring, and almost malevolent misrepresentation, with which forty years reading in polemical divinity, has made us acquainted. We print it, reluctantly, in a note.*

As a whole, it plainly demonstrates the offence of the Cross to have ceased with Unitarians, for strictly, and in Paul's sense, they have no Cross whatever in their creed,

What can be meant by "a central gallows, and the horrid spectacle of a public execution thereon," but actually to load with the opprobrium of our modern feelings at a felon's death, that of *Jesus*, our Lord, and to express utter disconnection with one thus dying?* No man beside Dr. Channing, ever placed his Creator directly in the position which he here occupies; that of erecting a gallows, and becoming a public executioner. But can any caricature obliterate the fact from history, that on the Roman gallows of a cross, "*by wicked hands*," the true Messiah was slain, and that the Creator of all, the ever active and omnipresent Governor of the world, was cognizant of this — permitted all this — at all this was himself present?

The Unitarian Jesus is a spotless, innocent being, the very image and pattern of moral perfection upon earth, as this party will sometimes contend; "an unsullied image of God's purity and love," says this same libeller of Christ's Atonement. And could not a less able pen than Dr. Channing's, sketch as revolting a picture of the purposeless, outrageous sacrifice of such a Being, *permitted* by a competent Governor of the world? Consistent men, of high moral feelings, will find a purposeless permission of this kind, infinitely more revolting, than this great transaction, taken in our views of its connection with "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God!" The earlier Socinians would have relieved Dr. Channing of this difficulty — they denied the prescience of the Deity.

But we return to our more direct object — to exhibit the martyrdom of John the Baptist, as offering all the Atonement a Unitarian needs. The son of Zacharias is "a just man and holy," even in the estimation of those who cruelly murdered him. "Above all," a Herod's crimes, the inspired writer places this — that he shut up John in prison. But now he sends the midnight assassin to shed his blood. His

* There is a curious passage in the xi. Epist. of Paulinus to Sulpicius Severus, which shows in what light the Christians of his age would have regarded such views of the death of Christ. He is complaining of the desecration, by the Emperor Hadrian, of the supposed spot on which our Lord suffered. *Et super crucem (ad quam orbe concusso, et sole refugo, et dissilientibus mortuorum excitatione monumentis, rerum natura nutaverat) stabat simulacrum dæmonis, et acra simulacri fundum bustis fumabat; et Dei nomen deferabatur statuis mortuorum, cum Ipse vivorum Deus, Qui et resurrectio mortuorum est, non solum moriri, sed et crucifixi hominis blasphematur opprobrio.*

purity of doctrine was never questioned — his faithfulness in the general application of that doctrine, nor his perfect correctness, in the particular decision against the king, which he boldly pressed. Herod felt all this, and might be partially succumbing to the pressure of it upon his conscience. No man ever more clearly, therefore, than John, died the martyr of pure truth, and faithfulness to the truth. Nor was this thing done in a corner. It was a national, in some sense, a world-wide exhibition of the Baptist's faithfulness and truth. And did not the God, whose he was, and whom he served, "dwell in *him*," and sustain him through all these scenes? The Holy Spirit was in him, and filled him from the womb. In his words of faithful rebuke, do we not hear "God speaking"? Did not even Herod hear this? In his noble doings and sufferings, do we not behold God acting, and actuating his servant? In his character, life and death, have we not an unsullied image of what a faithful witness to the truth should be?

More than this, the Unitarian would shudder, according to Dr. Channing, to find in his Messiah — "The memory of his love, the exhibition of his divine virtue, the preaching of that truth which he sealed with his blood," are their chief views of the claims of Jesus. All these, undoubtedly, might the disciples of John cherish, and doubtless did cherish, respecting their martyred master. It is only remarkable, upon Unitarian principles, that no social feast, like that of the Christian Lord's Supper, should have been instituted, to commemorate *this* splendid martyrdom, and express faith or communion with him in his blood.

The friendly article "Unitarian," in the Penny Cyclopaedia, says: "Unitarians believe in the Atonement — or, being reconciled (to God) by the death of Christ, that is, by the New Covenant of grace and mercy, *ratified* by his death; in as far as they have been reclaimed from sin to a life of righteousness." But Dr. Channing states a difference of opinion to exist among Unitarians, on this great point. "I mean," he says, "in regard to the precise influence of Christ's death upon our forgiveness. Many suppose that this event contributes to our pardon, as it was a principal means of *confirming* his religion, and by giving it a power over the mind. Many of us are dissatisfied with this explanation, and think that the Scriptures ascribe the remis-

sion of sins to Christ's death, with an emphasis, so peculiar, that we ought to consider this event as having a *special influence on removing punishment*, though the Scriptures may not record the way in which it contributes to that end.* The latter opinion has surely a "special" vagueness about it—"an influence on removing punishment"! With whom it has this influence is not said; and "the way," altogether, in which it removes it, is confessedly inexplicable! Few, we have reason to believe, are the Unitarians that would subscribe this latter creed; although, by the phraseology, Dr. Channing would seem to include himself. Yet, how shall we reconcile this with his rejecting the entire mediation of Christ, in either part of his works? He complains that our view of the Saviour's rights and merits, more than divide the glory of our rescue. "Nothing should stand between the sinner and God's mercy. Nothing should share with mercy in the work of our salvation." (Unitarianism) will not hear that God needs any foreign influence to awaken his mercy.† The former is certainly the more current statement of Unitarian writers and preachers. Christ confirming the religion he taught, by his death; "ratifying" the new declaration of grace and mercy, &c. But does not the son of Zacharias thus confirm the religion he taught, and ratify all his communications as really received by him from Heaven?‡

We have done. The Unitarian may tell us that he admits all the features of divine power and benevolence which shine in the *miracles* of Christ, and "John did no miracle." Here, we grant, is a seeming superiority of the Unitarian Jesus. But to what does it amount? The lips of the faithful Witness tell us, John was superior to all born of woman before him; and Moses and Joshua and the ancient Elias, have splendid attestations of this kind, to their respective missions; and greater works than these, (his own miracles,) did the same faithful Witness declare should his own dis-

* Discourses, p. 217-8.

† Channing's Discourses, p. 419.

‡ "This spirit of martyrdom is the perfection of Christianity, and it is the noblest inspiration which his followers derive from him. Christ on his Cross has taught it with a perfection unknown before, and his glory consists of the power with which he breathes it. We consecrate this institution, (Divinity Hall, Cambridge,) to that spirit of martyrdom."—Dis. p. 508.

ciples do. While, of the doctrine of immortality, and its entire results, the Apostles were certainly more specific, and far more successful ministers than Christ personally. If, moreover, Unitarian views of the far weightier claims of our Saviour, as to unity with God, and being the propitiation of our sins, be correct, these miracles attested but the subordinate office of a teacher sent from God, as was John, Elijah, Joshua and Moses, respectively, and as the unregenerate Master in Israel, who could not see the kingdom of God, admits him to be. They are all a mighty maze "of wonders," without a plan or anything like an adequate purpose. After all, we must return to the doctrine of Herod as true, although its application by him was premature, (and although the Scriptural Jesus declared that he would raise up the temple of his body — that he had power to lay down his life and power to take it again.) It is essentially, and far more nearly John the Baptist, that is risen from the dead, than any other being or character in heaven or earth. The Unitarian Jesus has not a characteristic shade of spiritual dignity, excellence or authority, that might not be claimed for John the Baptist. "The whole secret of the system," as said Robert Hall long ago, "is a cold negation — it *consists* — in thinking meanly of Christ."*

* Review of Belsham's *Memoirs*: Wks. ii. 327.

NOTE.—This doctrine of an Infinite Substitute, suffering the penalty of sin, to manifest God's wrath against sin, and thus to support his government, is, I fear, so familiar to us all that its severe character is overlooked. Let me then set it before you in new terms, and by a new illustration. Suppose then, that a teacher should come among you, and should tell you that the Creator, in order to pardon his own children, had erected a gallows in the middle of the universe, and had publicly executed upon it, in the room of the offenders, an Infinite Being, the partaker of his own supreme divinity; suppose him to declare, that this execution was appointed as a most conspicuous and terrible manifestation of God's justice, and of the infinite woe denounced by his law; and suppose him to add, that all beings in heaven and earth, are required to fix their eyes on this fearful sight, as the most powerful enforcement of obedience and virtue. Would you not tell him that this central gallows threw gloom over the universe; that the spirit of a government, whose very acts of pardon were written in such acts of blood, was terror, not paternal love; and that the obedience which needed to be upheld by this horrid spectacle, was nothing worth? Would you not say to him, that even you in this infancy and imperfection of your being, were capable of being wrought upon by nobler motives, and of hating sin through more generous views, and that much more, the angels, those pure flames of love, need not the gallows, and an executed God, to confirm their loyalty? You would all so feel at such teaching, as I have supposed, and yet, how does this differ from the popular doctrine of atonement?"—*Channing's Discourses*, 8vo., p. 423-4.

ARTICLE VIII.

The Power of the Pulpit ; or Thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers, and those who hear them. By GARDINER SPRING, D. D. New York.

Since the brief notice of this work in our last number, a second edition of it has been published. It has not only been extensively read, but has called forth animated criticism. The interest and attention it has awakened are not to be referred, however, to the intrinsic merit of its discussions, for these are not marked with any peculiar originality or force, that we can discover ; but partly to the character and position of the venerable author ; partly to the fact, that ministers are always ready to hear and read counsel and exhortation in reference to the duties of their calling ; and other people generally like to hear one minister lecturing his brethren ; and chiefly, we have no doubt, because Dr. Spring has advanced views in regard to the character of the present ministry of the church in general, and the present system of preparatory education for the holy office, which will excite feelings of warm approbation in many — of violent disapprobation in many more — and of deep and anxious interest in all who love the church. He declares his opinion, that the ministry of the present day are inferior to those who preceded them ; and that this deterioration is to be referred, in part, to the plan of education in Theological Seminaries. This is a subject, on which no man of Dr. Spring's position can speak at this time, without having many to hear, some with pleasure, more with zealous resistance and denial.

We do not intend to enter this discussion with the author and his opponents, nor to present our readers with a critical review of his work ; but rather to embrace this opportunity, to present for their benefit and our own, wherein we believe lies the real "Power of the Pulpit," and whereby its efficiency, if it has been impaired, may be refreshed and restored.

We ought to say, however, that Dr. Spring does not condemn Theological Seminaries, without qualification ; and

their friends ought not, as they seem inclined to do, to let loose all their wrath upon him, as if he had declared a war of extermination against these institutions. While he maintains that the former plan of training students for the ministry had its peculiar advantages, he confesses the present system has also its own. He says: "It is quite obvious that *something* has been lost by the change, and it is equally obvious that *something* has been gained. If I were called on to strike the balance, I frankly confess I should be not a little embarrassed." And again, he declares: "These, and other considerations, would lead to the conclusion that our Theological Seminaries *must be sustained*." He then points out some of what he considers the evils and dangers of this mode of ministerial education; and proposes two means of prevention and safety: first, "by a watchful eye over the young men who are there pursuing their theological education;" and, secondly, by selecting as "teachers of those who are being educated for the ministry, men of no inconsiderable experience in the pastoral office." This last point, he illustrates at considerable length and with a good deal of earnestness. It may kindle the zeal of a few whom it hits, but we believe the church generally will sanction and sustain it. We would be the last to say there should be no exception to such a rule, but that in the general, it would be wise and good, we think does not admit of argument.

Whether in fact the ministry of the church generally has deteriorated, is a startling question. It is a question which will run over the whole extent of the church in this country, — which will find its way to the bosom of every conscientious minister in the land, and set him on careful meditation and earnest prayer. Dr. Spring is not the first to propose it, or to answer it in the affirmative. He quotes Dr. Miller, and Professor Park, of Andover, as declaring the same opinion. We notice in a contemporary Review, the following remarks: "It is manifest that serious doubts begin to be felt by many of the best minds in the church, in regard to the present mode of educating the ministry, and the existing character of pulpit teaching. We know that the thoughts of many are turned to this subject, and a rigid investigation is being made. There is a seen and felt deficiency of moral power in the evangelical pulpit of our day,

and how to supply that want is one of the gravest, most vital questions that pertains to human duty and destiny." It is a solemn question, whether these things are so? We shall content ourselves with answering, that we fear they are too true of the pulpit in many parts of our country, but less so, we believe, in our own Southern Church, than any where else. We do not mean to boast; but we thank God, *here*, both church and pulpit have been far less corrupted and disturbed by external influences and inward dissensions than in other localities; and we believe have been preserved in greater simplicity, purity and power. We say not, there is no degeneracy among ourselves. In some respects, we fear there is; but we shall reserve our animadversions on this point, as matter rather for our own confessions and our humble prayers before God.

But, if the present ministry is inferior to the generation of holy men who went before them, what are the causes of the evil? We are satisfied they are not to be found solely or chiefly, if at all, in the present mode of theological education. That is "a mere circumstance." The present system wants no important part found in the former. Every advantage Dr. Spring enumerates as peculiar to the former may be, and often is, secured by the present plan, while many very valuable ones are furnished by it, which "our fathers" sighed for in vain. We believe the real causes of this degeneracy, are to be found in evils altogether different. Among the first of these, we would mention the tendency and results of the modern contrivance of "Education Societies." We give to the men of faith and prayer, who originated and have conducted these institutions, all honor due. And much it is, for their faith, and prayers, and labors. We also confess, they have been the means of accomplishing much real good. There are many ministers, a blessing to the world, an honor to the church, and among the very first rank of the ministry, who have been assisted in their education by these societies. But we may not disguise it from ourselves, nor ought it to be concealed from the church, that these good results have not been unaccompanied with evil. On this point, we will quote Dr. Spring, believing our readers will agree with us that there is much serious truth in his remarks:

“Nor is it any marvel, nor ought it to be any serious disappointment, that in an enterprise so untried, and conducted upon so large a scale, there should have been some unhappy failures. There have been not a few; we confess they have been unhappy.” “So much has been said and done of late years, on the subject of educating poor and pious young men for the Gospel ministry, that the obligation of furnishing the pulpit from any other classes of society, seems to be in a great measure lost sight of. Now, we enter our solemn protest against some modern views of this doctrine. It were a calamity greatly to be deplored, should we act upon the principle, that poverty and low birth, are essential qualifications to the Christian ministry; and that a well-bred man, is disqualified from becoming a minister of the Gospel, because he is well-bred, and the son of a rich man, because he is rich. Yet such is the strong tendency of the public mind: The church of God, and ministers themselves, scarcely think of looking for men to serve the Lord Jesus in his sanctuary, save to the poor.” “There is something wanting in this class of men: Even not a few of them, who have gone as missionaries to the heathen, have given more trouble, and more expense, than those who have found their way to the pulpit, unaided. They expect too much; they have, to too great an extent, the habit of dependance on others. If we look over the land, too, we shall find the leaders of new measures, and that fearful radicalism which has distracted the churches, among those who were low-bred men; who have been brought up from their youth to be jealous of clerical influence, and who have not grown up with those sentiments of respect for the Gospel ministry which it deserves. Let me not be misunderstood. A poor young man, is not necessarily a low-bred man; it is not because he is *poor*, that he may not be entitled to high confidence. If we doubt the expediency of introducing *low bred* men into the pulpit, it is because ‘the Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the leopard his spots.’ It is a sure way to bring the office into contempt, when the church makes to herself, ‘Priests of the lowest orders of the people.’”

These remarks are plain and to the point—to some, they will be extremely unpalatable, but the only question is, are they true? We are satisfied to fortify our opinion by the experience and authority of the venerable author, and thus submit it to our readers.

Another evil, to which we believe the present inefficiency of the pulpit may be traced, is the view which many have taken of the nature and warrant of a call to the ministry.

We refer to the notion that a man should decide the question of his duty to preach the Gospel, on the same rules and principles on which he would decide to enter the profession of law or follow the trade of a blacksmith—that is, by a consideration of his abilities and the indications of external Providence, his means and opportunities. The necessity of an inward, direct, special and supernatural operation of the Spirit of God calling him to the work of the ministry is denied. Every pious young man, it is said, is bound to inquire whether he has the natural qualifications necessary to fulfil the sacred office, and whether the Providence of God furnishes him with the opportunities and means of preparing for and entering upon it. If these questions are answered in the affirmative, he is to conclude himself *called of God* to the work. According to this view, when followed out to its legitimate results, the nature and warrant of a call to the ministry, are precisely the same as those principles and rules of Christian duty which would lead a man into any secular avocation. A call to preach the Gospel, and an obligation to plant cotton, are exactly of the same nature, and to be determined in exactly the same way. We are convinced these views are pregnant with mischief as well as error. Where they are insisted on, and become current, they must inevitably introduce many into the ministry who ought never to have entered it. But that is not all. A moment's reflection will show that they tend to degrade the sacredness of the office; to bring it down in the view of preachers and people, from its holy eminence to the level of *common things*; to lessen the sense of responsibility in those who fill it; and to cripple all energy, zeal and confidence in discharge of its duties. We regret to see the apparent agreement of Dr. Spring with these erroneous views of the subject. We say *apparent*, for he does not directly discuss the question; but he too plainly indicates that such are his own conceptions of the nature of a call to the ministry. Thus in chapter viii., he ascribes “the divine authority” of a minister, to the fact that he has been regularly set apart to the office by the church, and to the commission given by Christ to the Apostles, previous to his ascension. On page 134, 1st edit. he says:

“It is sufficient to our present purpose, to assume that the Christian ministry is a distinct order of men; and that every man

who possesses the necessary qualifications, and is approved and set apart to the office, by the express judgment of *the Church*, acting either in her own capacity, or by her official representatives, be those representatives a Presbytery, or an Ecclesiastical Council, or a single Bishop, is a divinely commissioned minister of Christ."

"The *commission*," then, is not *direct* from the Spirit of God, but comes through *the Church*; and to possess it, one needs only to have the requisite "qualifications," and regularly belong to "*the order*." Again, p. 130, he says, "the commission is but a recorded one." But his view of the subject is still more plainly indicated, in Chap. xix. On p. 335, he affirms the question ought to be deliberately presented to the mind of every well-qualified young man,

"Whether he can *the better serve God and his generation*, by engaging in some one of the other learned professions, or in the ministry of his Son? *This is the only question* which a conscientious man will look at."

This question, then, will decide whether he *is called* to the ministry. If he is convinced that he can best "serve God" in the ministry, then he is to conclude that he is called to that work. This is precisely the question which every conscientious Christian man is bound to put to himself, in view of any and every trade, profession, or avocation of life. The humblest mechanic is bound, before he determines on his trade, to question and decide, "whether he can the better serve God and his generation" in that trade or in some other? In our opinion, Dr. Spring's question is preceded and answered by another, viz:—Whether he is called of the Holy Spirit of God to the ministry? And the answer to it is to be found, not in the man's education and abilities, not in external Providence, alone and of themselves. It is to be sought, first and chiefly, in the inward operations of that Spirit. If he is thus called to the work, then he can "best serve God and his generation" in the ministry. If he is not so called, he can better serve him and them, any where else. Our author goes on to say, "There is no miraculous call at this age of the world, to the work of the ministry." Here he loses himself and his readers in the fog of the word "miraculous." Will he say there is no

supernatural and *Spiritual* call? This is the question. He might as well say, "there is no miraculous call" to repent and believe the Gospel. So there is not, in some of the many senses of that vague word. But there is a *supernatural* and an "effectual call" of the Holy Spirit. And this call is no more comprehensible and cognizable, than his call to the ministry. Dr. S. proceeds to remark, "Whether one is called to it, is neither more nor less, than whether, upon a full view of the subject, it is his *duty* to enter it." This is precisely the theory which places the nature and warrant of a call to preach the Gospel, on the same ground as a call to any secular avocation. The man whose duty leads him to make pins, has as really and as truly a *divine call*, as the most God-honored minister in the Church, and a call of precisely the same nature and warrant. We would say, "the question, whether it is one's *duty* to enter the ministry, is neither more nor less than *whether he is called* to enter it?" Dr. S. continues :

"Like every other question of duty, this is to be decided by those leadings of divine Providence, which indicate, to an ingenuous and obedient mind, what his heavenly Father would have him to do. What are these indications? Are they not, a heart sincerely devoted to the service of God — an honest purpose of living to his glory — a willingness to be devoted to him, in that way in which we may probably perform the most essential service — together with those natural talents and opportunities and means that fit us for this employment."

Here, then, according to Dr. S., are all the elements which constitute a call to the holy ministry. We perceive nothing more than the same principles and rules which ought to guide every Christian man in choosing the business of his life. We believe that we see in them a theory, the prevalence of which, in many parts of the Church, has done much to deteriorate the ministry. In the practice of it, many have come into the ministry who give sad reason to fear the Spirit of God came not with them. Its baleful influence has degraded the office in the eyes of the Church — weakened the hearts, and diminished the efficiency even of many, also, who *have* been called to the work by the Spirit of God. Its general application would bring every respectable Christian man into the office. Every real Christian

has all the "indications" Dr. S. enumerates. No man is a Christian if he has not the "heart," and the "honest purpose," and the "willingness" he describes. As for the "natural talents," it is undeniable, that men with very few have been eminently useful in the Church; and so far as "opportunities and means" are concerned, it is well known, that with the facilities now provided for the purpose, they are within the reach of any man.

We will only remark further, on these views, that we regard them as a chief source of another great evil, of which we shall speak immediately. It is because men have entered the ministry with no sense of a special and direct call that they have turned aside in such numbers from its appropriate work.

Another fruitful cause of the inferiority of the present ministry, is to be found in the want of devotion to the great object of preaching the Gospel. See chap. x. Dr. Spring has forcibly illustrated this point. We thank him for the earnestness with which he has pressed it. It seems to be a prevalent impression, that men are called into the ministry, not only to preach the Gospel, but to be teachers, editors, professors, agents, secretaries; and many who make it their work to preach, preach a great deal besides the pure Gospel of the grace of God. Many have lost sight of the great object for which the ministry is appointed and called, viz. — for the conversion of sinners to God, and the spiritual edification of his believing children. If we were required to point out the grand cause of inefficiency in the ministry of the present day, we would be disposed to fix on this one thing — the want of devotion to the great work of converting and saving the souls of men. We do not recognize ourselves as *called* and set apart to this one great end. We do not live and labor and pray and *preach* for it, as the one main thing we have to do. Our ministry is divided and diverted, and frittered away and expended on a multitude of collateral and subsidiary ends. We are not known and *felt* by the world, as men consecrated and devoted, with ever-living zeal and unwearied diligence, exclusively, and with our whole power, to the work of saving men from an eternal hell. The ministerial call is a simple and a single one. It is the very same given to the Apostle: "I send thee to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to

light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me." "God sent me" says the same Apostle, "to preach the Gospel." To convert the impenitent, to instruct and edify believers, constitutes the end of the ministry. In order to this, they are to "preach the Gospel." Any design hostile to this, or in any way inconsistent with it, or *beneath* it, or only indirectly subservient to it, or a mere accessory and subsidiary work, is a departure from its intention, and faithlessness to its duties, if it be made the main business of the ministry.

"God called them to the sacred office, that they might coöperate with his once suffering and now exalted Son, and his mighty and condescending Spirit, in converting a great multitude, which no man can number, intercepting their course to the gates of death; overthrowing the empire of darkness and sin, and establishing, extending, and perpetuating the kingdom of truth and righteousness, and peace and joy. Whatever subordinate ends, therefore, the Christian pulpit may secure in this or the coming world, its legitimate, paramount aim, is the glory of God in the salvation of men." "It is the *soul* that a faithful minister is thinking of—the deathless *soul*; it is this that he is praying for and preaching to, that he may present it to his great Lord, as 'his joy and his crown.' Such is the high, the grand aim of the the Christian ministry. It is this which gives such grandeur and power to the pulpit. Such it will appear to have been, when the joys of heaven and the torments of hell, are felt in their everlasting weight, and reality, and when the magnitude of God's redemption, and the wondrous results that have flowed from it, shall be unfolded." "It is but for the salvation of men to become the great object of the minister. His thoughts are but to dwell here, and his desires centre so habitually, so tenderly, so solemnly on this great object, as to make it the paramount passion; and his pulpit would read different lessons from those it often reads. Let this be wanting, the preacher's heart freezes, and his pulpit is but an icy tablet." "Is it any marvel that it should be powerless, when it seeks not to be powerful?" "Never forget," says the youthful McCheyne, writing to one of his brethren in the ministry, "that the end of a sermon is the salvation of the people." "We would have our minds imbued with this truth, and are greatly desirous that the minds of others should be more deeply imbued than our own. This is what our pulpit so imperatively demands." "It is a melancholy fact, that so far as

it regards the great object of preaching, the American pulpit is not on the advance. Not a few preachers there are whom it would seem captious to complain of, but who, at the same time, do not satisfy an intelligent and spiritual auditory. There is something wanting in their discourses; they are not full of light and power; the unction of the priesthood is not there. They are not so absorbed in the great object of preaching, that their hearers perceive the object they are aiming at; nor so intent upon it, that they themselves are cheerful or depressed, joyful or sad, as the pleasure of the Lord prospers or does not prosper in their hands." "The great deficiency in the church of the present age, is the want of a spiritual and urgent ministry." "Other professions are on the advance, but the pulpit is retrograde. There are more learned things and more beautiful things uttered from it than were once uttered; but it is fast losing its energy. It has more touches of the German artists, but less of plain dealing with the conscience; less of tenderness and love. It has more of transcendentalism, but less of Christianity."

Doctor Spring's weight of character, his experience, his known piety and judiciousness, give these remarks which we quote from him, a force that will compel attention and respect. It is indeed, we fear, a lamentable fact, that the pulpit has very far fallen short, or turned aside from its grand aim. Just so far as it has, it has lost power. How many pulpits have become "chairs of philosophy," or of science, or of literature? or arenas for strife and argument, in a thousand questions besides the Gospel?—places for far read scholars and champions of logic, to display themselves, and make the vulgar stare? How many ministers of the Gospel harangue their hearers with the principles of one *philosophy* or against those of another—on the morals of war, or of commerce, or of politics? with scraps from the learned, or quotations from the poets—discussing and quoting the wisdom of Bacon, or the sentiments of Shakespeare, as often as the doctrines of Paul or the teachings of John? How many, forsaking the preaching of the Gospel traverse the country "from Dan to Beersheba," advocating some new or old contrivance "for doing good?" Thank God, in all these respects, things are better than they were, and we see gathering signs of still further improvement. May they be multiplied and fulfilled a thousand fold! The command of God and the need of the world,

are not for men to wanton with the muses, wander in the Elysian fields of fancy, play fantastic gambols among the flowers of literature and science, or to waste their breath in blowing up the bubbles that amuse the babies of the world, or uttering the Babylonish jargon of some incomprehensible metaphysics—but for men far seen in Bible doctrines—who having been taught of God, are sent by him to speak of judgment and eternity; of a Saviour, and a heaven, and a hell:—for men, who, whether they can display the learning, the courtly elegance of style, and the classic diction of the schools or not, can yet preach the Gospel “in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.” We may be able to waken on the lyre of genius, strains of melting melody, to cause its silken strings to speak forth harmonies of angelic sweetness; we may enter the very penetralia of science and philosophy; explore and reveal their secret mysteries; amaze and dazzle the world by the splendor of our intellectual achievements; but what is it all, if we do not preach in its simplicity the Gospel of a crucified Saviour, foolishness indeed to man, but the wisdom and power of God? We tickle the ear of men, we gain their empty applause, we destroy their souls and our own.

We will conclude what we have to say on this point, by one more quotation from Dr. Spring. He points to an evil under which the church every where groans, and often indignantly rebels—one which degrades it in its own eyes and in the eyes of the world:

“The too prevalent impression that candidates for the office are to be sought, and found exclusively among the poorer, if not the lower orders of society, and the consequent multiplication of ministers, many of whom are not fitted for their office, the loungers about our large cities, of men with too large expectations, or too little industry; the numerous applications of ministers for public charity in every part of the land, which accomplish little more than the defraying the expenses of the applicant, some of which are undertaken for this sole object, together with the whole system of *secularizing* the pulpit, by making those who occupy it, quite as much the solicitors for money, as they are the preachers of the Gospel, are things that are not a little degrading to the ministerial character. A strange minister scarcely comes among us, but the people at once suspect him to be a beggar.”

No part of our author's work pleases us so much as that contained in chapters xi., xvi., and having reference to the *personal piety of ministers*. No other portion of it will be so profitable to his readers. Dr. S. thinks the ministry of the present day deficient in piety, when compared with "our fathers." None will be more ready to confess this than the ministry themselves; but we do not see the propriety or advantage of such invidious and wholesale comparisons. "Judge not, that ye be not judged." But while it is for no man to condemn his brethren, there is no doubt room for improvement in this particular, as there has been in the ministry of every generation. We question if any have been so conscious of the fact, as those whom Dr. S. rebukes. No men are so afflicted with their manifold imperfections as the ministry of the Gospel; and none are more ready to hear an exhortation from even the humblest of the Lord's servants. We shall make no apology, therefore, for devoting the remainder of this article to a more particular consideration of this subject, for their sake and for our own. Our brethren will be the last men to retort on a preacher with "Physician heal thyself;" or to judge of a truth by the character of him who proclaims it. He who has them for an audience, may bless himself that he has those to hear, who will receive his message according to its own merits; judge the word he utters with candor, and himself with charity. To this audience, we desire now to address ourselves, in the fear of God, and in the love of the Lord Christ. Would that we were able to press our thoughts upon their souls, with a love tender and earnest as the Saviour's, and with a power irresistible as that wherewith he wakes the dead!

If we are indeed called to this high work of the ministry, the first desire of our heart, is therein to glorify the Divine Master in the salvation of souls—to preach to the conversion of men and the perfecting of the saints. If we have the true spirit of our calling, we regard nothing with such dismay,—no contemplation crushes our souls with such anguish and agony,—as the thought of appearing before the Lord with our solitary talent laid up in a napkin, to hear the sentence, "Thou wicked and *unprofitable* servant!" On that dreadful day, when he shall come in power and great glory, to gather all people and nations before him, if

in all that company of shameful sinners, there be one more overwhelmed with shame and confusion than the rest, it must surely be that unhappy minister who can present no fruit of his high commission—who must stand naked and solitary in his guilt and dishonor—and when required to show the results of that great work entrusted to his hands, must remain silent and condemned in the consciousness of failure and neglect, and utter unprofitableness.

There, at that judgment seat, in a little while *we* shall appear. Inquiry will be made for the fruits of our holy calling. Between *this* hour and *that*, lies the scene of our labors, the history of our performance, the record of our success. If we are not utterly unfit for the work, we regard it with trembling anxiety. With souls burdened by the weight of eternal responsibilities, we are inquiring how they should be met, and sustained—wherewithal, shall we be so endued and furnished, as to stand successfully beneath the duties laid upon us, and appear approved in that day when we are to give account of our stewardship, and meet the reckoning of that God, from whose searching scrutiny there is no concealment, and no escape. To ourselves and to our brethren, we offer the answer, that the *main thing, the one great, all-important thing, is a work of grace in our own hearts, of extraordinary power and perfection*—all other gifts and qualifications are secondary; all others come behind at an immense distance. Our success in the ministry, depends first and most—not on our talents—not on our learning—not on our eloquence—not on our powers of argument, instruction, or persuasion; but first, and most, on our *personal piety*. Be our other gifts as great as they may, without eminent personal piety, we shall never be eminently useful to the church. We may think we are. Others may think so. But it will be a mistake. On the other hand, be our other gifts small as they may, with eminent piety, we shall be eminently useful. The world may not notice us, we may not be honored by the church, men may bestow upon us no reward. But angels will know and love us, all heaven will know and rejoice over our work, the divine Master will smile upon and bless us, and eternity crown our head with everlasting glories.

Personal religion is the inward life of faith, love and power, through the operation of the Holy Ghost. It reveals

itself to consciousness *in faith*, and is developed in love, joy, peace, and all fruits of the spirit. *Eminent* personal piety, is a special and extraordinary unction of the Holy Ghost, whereby the Lord "fulfils in us all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power." It consists in a *faith*, which gives to things unseen and future, the power and effect of things seen and present; which converts convictions into experiences, hope into assurance, doctrines into facts and realities; which thus purifies the heart, works by love, and overcomes the world. It consists *in love*—all devoted, constraining, supreme, and sanctifying love to the divine Jesus—love which suffereth long and is kind, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, and never faileth. It consists *in joy*—joy in God, in doing and suffering his holy will—joy in infirmities, in reproaches, in dishonor, in pain and weary travail, in watchings and fastings, in labors and perils, and tribulations,—for His sake, that He may be glorified. As the general grand result and effect of it on the minister, it consecrates him wholly, body and soul, to the glory of Christ in the work of the ministry.

That the connection of such piety with a minister's success may be apparent, we will illustrate first, its effect on himself; secondly, its effect on his fellow men; and in the third place, its relation to the promised presence and power of the Lord Christ.

And in the first place, let us consider its effect on the merely mental and intellectual powers of the soul. Its absorbing aim and purpose, the presence of its vast conceptions, will concentrate the powers of the mind, wake up sleeping energies of thought, and quicken into life and vigor faculties, which but for it, would have slumbered forever. Such religion will urge the mind onward to new fields of thought, and to intellectual efforts, of which otherwise it would never have been capable. This unction from on high will rouse the soul into activity and power; purify and clear the mental vision, and reveal new worlds of thought. When the stupendous revelations of divine truth break forth out of clouds and darkness and become facts and realities to faith, they will expand the powers of the mind, enlarge its understanding, arouse its dormant faculties, call forth its latent energies, and develope whatever of intellect, or of elo-

quence, or of logic, or of feeling, or of fancy, it may possess, and concentrating them all, on the accomplishment of its grand purpose, clothe the minister with might and with power to convince and to persuade.

Personal piety is the *reflection* of the truths of religion in the experience of our own souls. It is an experimental and spiritual *sense and knowledge* of them, without which they cannot be properly known or understood at all. Until the divine Spirit writes them in our hearts, we are in fact altogether ignorant and untaught in the truths of God. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned." If, therefore, we imagine a mere intellectual acquaintance with the truths of the Gospel—ability to explain them systematically—to prove them by logic—to enforce them with argument and eloquence, qualify us to preach them, we have made a miserable mistake. We cannot be said to know any one of them, unless it has been reflected in our own experience, with life and power, by the Spirit of God. We must be able to preach it from our own heart, as well as from the divine word. We must be able to say, in a spiritual sense, with the Apostle, "that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us." We may preach orthodoxy, and the true philosophy of religion—deal in arguments, convictions, illustrations, sentimentalities, but we will carry our hearers no farther than we have gone ourselves. If we preach a philosophical, intellectual, poetical, or merely doctrinal religion, such inevitably will be all *their* religion. *Experimental* religion, alone, is true and real, and we can preach it no farther than we have it ourselves. Said the godly Brainard, on his death-bed, "When ministers have these gracious influences on their own hearts, it wonderfully assists them to come at the consciences of men, and as it were, to handle them with their hands; whereas, without them, whatever reason or oratory we may use, we do but make use of *stumps* instead of hands." And who of us will not bear witness, with all who have gone before us, that it is only when the truth has its power on the soul of the preacher, that it has power on the hearts of his hearers. It

is not ideas, abstractions, philosophies, doctrines, the world needs, but facts, experiences, life and power.

Consider, also, the effect of such piety on the moral character of the preacher. This, alone, will furnish him with the *moral power* necessary for the successful fulfilment of his work. It is that moral power itself. By moral power, we mean in its broad and general sense, *a will* for his work. Without a high degree of piety, that will we have not, and we cannot have. Nothing else can give us a heart to encounter, and carry us successfully through, the labors and difficulties, and toils and trials, and self-sacrifices, the day after day, year after year, wasting and wearisome cares and burdens of the ministry. If his soul is not strengthened and upheld, and borne forward by a religion of extraordinary life and power, a minister will fail constantly. Nothing else can supply that patience and perseverance, and courage and energy, which he must have in order to succeed. It is not enough to be a sincere Christian; he must be an eminent Christian. Mere piety will not do. The work demands piety of high perfection and power.

This moral strength consists, mainly, in an overcoming faith and a fervent love. First, it consists in faith—faith in God, in His promise, His presence, His power; a faith which makes these *facts*, which realizes them to the inward soul; which, when we stand up before men to preach, throws us back upon God, and arms us with the assurance that Almighty strength and love are with us. It is *faith in our Gospel*—in its truth, its preciousness, and its power—a confidence that we hold in our hand a rod of divine efficiency, and that our message is the everlasting and invincible truth of God, which must prevail against all opposition of earth and hell. Nothing but this faith in God and in his word can sustain the preacher against the despondency and discouragements he must inevitably contend with. This alone can prevail against the spirit of indolence or of self-dependence. Nothing else can deliver him from the temptation to rely on his own power to convince and persuade; nothing else arouse him from that indolence and sloth which will creep upon him, silent as sleep, but strong as an armed man. This faith will sustain him in conscious weakness, ignorance and mistake; make him strong, cheerful, courageous to do and to endure; strengthen him against inward fears and outward trials; en-

able him to cast his burden on the Lord; relieve him from wasting anxiety and consuming care; keep him humble in success, recover and restore him in defeat, and in every time of need, prove a never-failing source of strength and salvation.

We need this faith, to realize the things which are unseen and eternal—to transform them from abstractions and mere cold convictions, into vivid and all-important facts. Besides the natural indifference of the soul to things invisible and future, and the constant and insidious intrusion of the seen and the present—the perpetual occupancy of the preacher's mind with the thoughts of divine things, and his daily familiarity with their contemplation, tend to dull and deaden his apprehension of them, and thereby to make him callous and cold and indifferent about them. He needs, therefore, a faith which will *substantiate* them to his mind, which will keep them before him as vivid realities, and press them upon his trembling soul, with all the power of things seen and present. This will impart an energy and a zeal and a confidence to his labors, which nothing else can give. It will infuse a tenderness, solemnity and power into his preaching, beyond the reach of the highest human talents. A faith which will reveal in power, to his startled consciousness, the Almighty God—the divine Saviour—his dreadful judgment—eternal heaven, and everlasting hell; will stand him in stead, where every human principle and power would faint and fail. "This faith," says Cecil, "is the master-spring of the minister. Hell is before me, and thousands of souls are shut up there in everlasting agonies. Jesus Christ stands forth to save men from rushing into this bottomless abyss. He sends me to proclaim his ability and love. I want no fourth idea. Every fourth idea is contemptible. Every fourth idea is a grand impertinence."

This faith is also necessary to a minister, in order to an assurance of his own salvation. While the question of this is involved in fear and uncertainty, it will cut the sinews of his strength, and cripple all the energies of nature. Doubts of his own interest in Christ, will make him feeble, timid, inefficient and unhappy. "The joy of the Lord," the joy of pardon, of acceptance, of assured hope, "is our strength." It converts toil into pleasure, duty into privilege, labor into love. No language can express the importance of this one thing to a minister, or describe the infinite difference be-

tween preaching a Saviour seen, known, felt and loved as the joy and strength of his own soul, and preaching a Christ who is an object of fear, doubt, and uncertainty. The inconsistency, presumption, difficulty, danger and sin of preaching a Gospel which has not brought a sure salvation to our own joyful heart, should make us pause at the threshold, and enter the pulpit, if we enter it at all, on our knees. Now we know not any way to arrive at this settled and stable assurance, but by a work of divine grace in our hearts, of such clearness and power, as shall make itself manifest and indubitable to our own consciousness. This *may* be enjoyed — it ought to be — and it *must* be, if we wish to fulfil the duties of the ministry with much success. We say not that a minister cannot be useful without it. We say he cannot be *as* useful without it as with it. We say it will be to him, joy, strength, power, success. We say, without it, he will find his ministry toil, grief, fear, drudgery — a daily bondage and a living misery.

We mentioned *fervent love*, as the second constituent of the piety which will furnish us with the moral power needed for our office. The ministry is a life-time service to the Lord Jesus; and without a heart ardently devoted to him, it cannot be rightly fulfilled. It is not that *love of the truth*, or that *zeal for doctrine*, or for *the right*, for *the Church*, or for *party* and *sect*, which many exhibit, flaming and furious, and full of noise and pride, but it is a *personal affection* for the divine Saviour, of which we speak. This must be the principle and the power of our success. Nothing else can enable us to endure the work, with its wasting cares, its exhausting toils, its humiliations and sacrifices, and manifold temptations. Love for the right and the true will not sustain us; zeal for the Church or a party will not; earthly ambition and self interest will not; nor a human philanthropy, a desire to “do good;” nor convictions of conscience; nor fear of perdition; nor pleasure in intellectual efforts — *nothing*, but a holy, fervent love of the divine Jesus — a love which can bear all things for his sake, pass victoriously through flame and flood, and triumph over the weakness of nature, the temptations of the world, the oppositions of hell — a love which will strengthen us when weak, refresh us in weariness, arouse us when lukewarm, and with invincible power bind us, body and soul, to our holy work. What is a minister without ever-glowing zeal, in-

domitable perseverance, perpetual activity, and invincible patience? And from what but fervent love of his divine Master can these spring? Who can succeed in any calling without an ardent love for it? and how can we love the work, but as we love the master? Some of us are bending all our energies to master the science of religion — to store our minds with all the furniture of knowledge — to acquire all the arts of oratory. What are we doing to perfect our hearts in the love of Christ? Learning and human skill will not do it — nothing but the power of the Holy Ghost shed abroad in the heart, received by prayer and faith at the mercy seat. We do well to equip ourselves in whatsoever armor knowledge and skill can give us; but of what advantage is it without strength and power to use it? *Love*, holy, fervent, consuming love is that strength and power. Without this, we will be as David in the panoply of Saul, encumbered with our own weapons. It is not absolutely necessary that we be gifted with eminent talents, learning and eloquence, but that our hearts should be filled with the love of Christ — with a love ardent, devoted, constant, absorbing, full of joy and power, is essential. If we have it not, we enter the ministry with peril to ourselves and to the Church. We will find its duties intolerably irksome; we will be the most miserable of men — toil through our work with reluctance, distaste, listlessness, horrible and loathing weariness; or we will neglect it, forsake it, cast it away, and be cast away ourselves. “Simon, son of Jonas, *lovest thou me?* Feed my sheep. He saith to him the third time, *lovest thou me?* Feed my sheep.”

Let us consider, in the second place, the effect of a minister's piety on his fellow men. Nothing can be more certain, than that a pastor will reflect himself in the people of his charge. — “Like priest, like people.” They take the type, tone and temper of their religion, not from *what* he preaches, but from *how* he preaches; not from the doctrine of his religion, but from its life, spirit and power. There is something that goes along with a man's words, call it feeling, spirit-tone, or what you will, which has more effect than the words themselves.

The religion of which we speak, will make a preacher of eloquence and power out of any man. His experimental knowledge of the truth, will give him clearness of doctrine, cogency of argument, fertility of invention and illustration,

insight of the nature and working of human hearts, boldness, authority, earnestness, feeling, affection, tenderness and pathos.

It will give him something different from and superior to all these — something which nothing else can give — which nature cannot acquire or even imitate, a certain *heavenly, holy unction* — a supernatural spirit, investing every utterance, living and breathing in every look, gesture, word and sentence; full of heaven of holiness, of God, and of eternity. This is not mere earnestness, animation, fervor, feeling or tenderness. A preacher can imitate all these, and force himself into the appearance of them, when they are not real. But this of which we speak, cannot be imitated. It is the living Spirit of God dwelling in the preacher's heart, and enabling him to speak in "demonstration of the Spirit and of power." It flows from a soul full of faith and love, glowing with experience and enjoyment of the truth. Wherever it exists, it gives to the preacher a power over his hearers and a success in his ministry, to which no human genius and acquirements could ever attain. In some humble, unlearned, simple-hearted minister of Christ, have we seen it hold in breathless attention, both the philosopher and the peasant, bending all alike to his will, and with irresistible effect, sealing upon their consciences the truth of God."

Explain it how we may, it is undeniable fact, that where we find most of this, we find most success in the ministry, and the largest number of souls converted to God. We may travel over the world, and take the preachers of the Gospel one by one, and we shall find that it is not according to genius, learning, eloquence, or aught else, but this grace of which we speak. We may find men who dazzle the world with the splendor of their talents, but whose brilliant powers are blessed to the salvation of but a few; while, by their side, some unnoticed, ungifted, humble minister, is winning many to righteousness, by the power of holiness, by the eloquence of that spirit which lives in his words of simplicity and godly sincerity.

"Covet earnestly the best gifts, yet show I unto you a more excellent way." Genius, and learning, and eloquence may win gaping followers for ourselves, but nothing save a piety which shall pervade, with the Spirit of Heaven, all our ministrations, and prevail prominently above all other qualities of our preaching, can win disciples for Christ. We

may convince men, and compel them to believe in the philosophy, the doctrine, the history, and the morality of the Gospel, but we do little to convey to their souls its life and power, unless these preëminently imbue and characterize our sermons. Be a minister's other gifts what they may, without this unction from on high, he is, in fact, nothing. He may gain the applause of men—he may crowd his church with admiring hearers—he may have his name sounded about through the world—but, he is nothing. His ministry will, in the end, be barren and unfruitful; the bubble he has blown up will burst, and the result of his noise and labor will be emptiness and nothing.

Need we dwell, also, on the effect of a minister's religion, in his private and personal intercourse with men? Here, emphatically, is the all-important point. Here is a wisdom which we had better be dead than not understand.

We consider it of incalculable importance to remark, that the impression a pastor will produce on the whole, by his preaching, will be exactly according to that which he makes on his people in daily and social life. His hearers will hear him through the medium of his life and spirit in private; by these, his preaching will be interpreted and understood; his example will be taken as a commentary on his sermons—a commentary read, remembered and applied. He may try to make his preaching better and more powerful than his life, but he cannot. No solemnity and seriousness in the pulpit, will prevail against worldliness, levity and trifling out of it; no zeal there counteract his indifference in the parlor; no forced and affected earnestness and pathos in public, supply the want of them in private. No godly tones, no professional demeanor, no sanctimonious manner, no fire and urgency on the Sabbath, will have any permanent effect against a worldly, lukewarm, carnal spirit and manner through the week. Do what he may, he will be to his hearers the same man one day as another. They will come to regard his zeal on the Sabbath as merely professional, as good acting, as very becoming the time and place, as some like to see the minister put on a gown when he goes into the pulpit.

“It is said that wealth is power; that knowledge is power; but to the minister, *character is power*. Without this, he is impotent and useless. It is his character for piety, which measures the power of his preaching. Let it never

be forgotten, too, that he cannot permanently establish a character for more piety than he really possesses. He cannot long appear more holy than he is in fact. The truth will out. He may act a part for a while, but in spite of himself, the inmost secrets of his nature will be revealed, and men read him through and through. It is a fearful thing to preach the Gospel. It is a more fearful thing to be set up as an example of the grace and power of the Gospel; to be looked up to as a specimen, an illustration, and a pattern of its fruit and effect. He may protest against this, and tell men not to regard *him* as a copy. It will be in vain. *They will.* How often has the world seen a preacher of almost superhuman power, swaying, with a breath, his enraptured hearers, touching, at will, any chord of the thousand stringed heart, and fixing the truth, like barbed arrows, in the very vitals of the soul — and yet that preacher is not blessed in his labors to the conversion of men. Would we know the reason; follow him on the Monday morning, as he mingles among his people, and as he meets them through the week, and we will find it — find it in the dreadful fact, that he is not the same man out of the pulpit he is in it. All the effect of his preaching, is nullified by his levity and trifling, or by his indifference and lukewarmness, or by his worldliness and love of money — by his practical irreligion and ungodliness. The life and power of religion, its zeal, activity and fervor, must be seen and felt in our every day walk, in all our intercourse with men — pervading every word and deed, with a heavenly spirit, with a tone and temper full of God and of the powers of the world to come; with an unction and a sanctity which will be felt where they are not seen. If we think any thing can supply the want of this, if we hope to do much good without it, if we suppose we can be better ministers than we are Christians, we are most miserably deceived. God grant that we may hearken and understand.

We were to consider, in the third place, the relation of eminent piety in the minister, to the promised presence and power of Christ; but the length to which this article has already extended, leaves us room to say but very little on this point. It is apparent, from what has already been said, that there is a natural adaptation, in the possession of such piety by a minister, to the successful discharge of his office; but we must remember that, after all, our ministry will be

blessed with success, only so far as it is made successful by the effectual grace of the divine Spirit. It is our clear conviction, that this is usually given to his hearers, according to the measure of it in the preacher's own soul. There may be extraordinary cases, which are exceptions. But no minister is warranted to hope for the peace and power of salvation to attend his labors, except as he experiences them in his own soul. Explain this and philosophize about it as you please. We are concerned now only with the fact. And we say again, the piety of the preacher, his faith and love and holiness, have an important connection with the exercise of the grace and power of Christ, for the salvation of his hearers. He is Christ's *instrument* — the rod of his power, and he is useful or worthless according to his holiness. We may bewilder and blind ourselves with speculations about the divine sovereignty and decrees. But the Lord works by means, and *according to means*. The whole Gospel plan, as we have to do with it, is a system of means, in harmonious connection with divine power. Ministers are his means, for the salvation of those to whom they are sent; and if they are not saved, let us take care how we fling back the cause and reason on the holy God of love and mercy. We are commanded and charged to seek the salvation of every sinner within our reach, and we may pray and hope for it according to our fidelity. And if we suppose this is inconsistent with the highest and most Scriptural views of the divine sovereignty and foreordination, we only betray our own lamentable ignorance. In the true sense of the word, the minister's faithfulness is the condition of the divine blessing on his labors. His devoted piety is the condition of his faithfulness. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit on his own soul, must precede his outpouring on the souls of his hearers. The dispensation of the day of Pentecost, illustrated the nature and principles of the whole Gospel dispensation. On that occasion, the Holy Ghost descended *first* on the Apostles, and wrought with power on their hearts. Not one word is expressly said, of his influence on the hearts of the people.

Of Stephen it is said — "Full of faith and power, he did great wonders and miracles among the people, and they were not able to resist the wisdom and spirit with which he spake." It is written of Barnabas, that, "he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith; and much

people was added unto the Lord. Paul testifies of himself, "by the grace of God I am what I am : and his grace, which was bestowed upon me, was not in vain ; but I labored more abundantly than they all ; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." "I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God, given unto me by the effectual working of his power." "Whereunto I also labor, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily."

All these Scriptures clearly connect a successful ministry with the special and abundant grace of God in the soul of the minister. They reveal wherein lies the power of the pulpit ; and if its efficiency in our day has been impaired, they teach us whereby it may be restored and increased. The divine Master alone, can give an efficient and successful ministry to his Church. He gives such a ministry, by calling men into the holy office, and enduing them with the Holy Ghost and with faith and power.

Here we rest the subject with the consciences and hearts of our brethren, as we endeavor to lay it near our own. It would have been easy to illustrate our remarks, by examples taken from every portion of the history of the Church, but those examples our readers can supply for themselves. With the experience of by-gone ages before them, we particularly beg the attention of our younger brethren in the ministry, to this subject. Well do we know how hard it is for a young and hopeful spirit, confident in its own powers, and eager for their trial, to let go its own strength and lay hold on God's.

Well do we know that insidious self-dependence, that lurks amid a thousand fears and misgivings, and is crucified and slain only by the torture and agony of a bitter experience, and a thousand failures and defeats. Various indications give us reason to fear, there is a growing tendency to seek the power of human learning and talent, rather than the power of the Holy Ghost, and the gifts of sanctifying grace ; to substitute love of orthodoxy, and zeal for our own church, in the place of love for Christ, and zeal for the salvation of men. Woe be to you, brethren, if you yield to these temptations : if you do not see and understand that the one first and all-important thing, is, to have your own souls enriched with a special and extraordinary unction of the

Holy Spirit! If we cannot persuade, we will prophesy. The time will come, when you will understand it; when you will mourn in bitterness, that you did not understand it now; when you will look back over years wasted and mispent in an unprofitable ministry, and weep, in conscious guilt, before the cheerless and barren waste. When you shall find that God has cast contempt on all your genius, and learning, and eloquence, and despised your vain gifts, while he has honored and blessed the humble piety and unpretending devotion of some weak and unlearned brother. Then you shall bend, with smitten and breaking heart, over the wreck and ruin of your unsanctified talents, and cry with anguish to God, to strip you of all, if he will but fill you with the grace and power of the Holy Ghost.

ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *The substance of an argument against the indiscriminate incorporation of Churches and Religious Societies. . Delivered before the Committee of Courts of Justice of the House of Delegates of Virginia, on the evening of the 8th of January, and on subsequent evenings, A. D. 1846, in reply to James Lyons, and Wm. H. McFarland, Esqs. By WM. S. PLUMER. Baltimore, 1847. 8vo., pp. 82.*

The argument whose title is above given, was drawn forth by a proposition which emanated from the Episcopal Convention of the Diocese of Virginia, that the Legislature of that State should pass an act, authorising once for all, all religious, benevolent, and literary societies and institutions, to hold and transmit property, given or bequeathed to them. Such an act would be a general law for the indiscriminate incorporation of all such societies, and especially of the various churches of each denomination of Christians.

It would enure, according to the terms of the proposed law, to one denomination of Christians no more than to another, excepting as one might be more diligent than another in securing for itself more ample endowments, or as it might, by the centralization of its government, have greater means than another of wielding an extensive monied influence, and concentrating it upon the object it desired to accomplish.

Against this project of a law of wholesale incorporation, Dr. Plumer remarks, 1st. That if the privileges must enure alike to all, then all will have to be treated in all respects alike, good and bad, Protestant and Papist, Jew and Gentile, Infidel and Atheist;—there must be no preference shown.

2. That toleration of any sect or opinion, under our government is absolutely impossible. The largest and most unqualified liberty of opinion is our birthright. Toleration where it exists, places itself between God and man, and in reality, while it tolerates man to pay his worship, presumptuously and blasphemously sets itself up to tolerate the Almighty to receive it.

3. That the terms "a Christian Commonwealth," "a Christian State," can properly mean only that the majority of our people profess, or are favorable to the Christian religion. He rejects these terms if they create the belief that Christians are to be entitled to any privileges except in common with Jews, Deists, and Atheists.

4. He reverts to the history of Virginia, as furnishing melancholy examples of the intolerance of sects when established by the strong arm of law. The Church of England, under the Colonial Government of Virginia, was a persecuting church, while its clergy, to a lamentable extent, were addicted to the race-field, the card-table, the ball-room and the theatre.

5. He shows by the notorious facts of history to what a vast extent the wealth of a nation may be absorbed by an ecclesiastical hierarchy. Under Constantine, in fifty years, the church held in many of the provinces one tenth part of the entire property. In France, before the Revolution, the greater part of the soil was subject to the tithes of the clergy. The nobles and clergy possessed two-thirds of the whole estates of the kingdom. In

Scotland, before the Reformation, he might have added, the clergy held one half of the entire wealth of the kingdom. In Mexico the income of the church is seven and a half millions, answering to a property of one hundred and seventy-nine millions of dollars.

6. He shows that the petitioners pray for an act of indiscriminate incorporation, and refers to the attributes of corporations, those artificial beings, created by law, possessing immortality, and individuality, yet not the subjects of moral obligation, nor susceptible of personal suffering,—nor capable of being guilty of crime, or of incurring its penalties.

7. He shows that neither the Methodists, Presbyterians, nor Baptists desire any general law for the indiscriminate incorporation of institutions claiming to be Literary, Benevolent, or Religious,—and he even affirms that the Episcopalians, with the exception of their official members, are opposed to the whole scheme.

Into the particular arguments which follow, our limits do not permit us to enter. The reasoning of Dr. Plumer is forcible, and his defence of himself against the personal attacks of his opponents pointed, yet good-humored and sufficiently amusing.

We are not sure that we agree with him in all that he says concerning the impropriety of the terms "Christian Commonwealth," "Christian State," as applicable to the governments of these United States. It was indeed the theory of Mr. Jefferson "that our civil rights have no dependence upon our religious opinions, any more than on our opinions in physic and geometry." Yet when communities themselves Christians, nominally, or really, and holding their Christian privileges and institutions, as dearer to them than all things else, frame to themselves governments for their own protection, they cannot be supposed to have formed governments which do not protect them in the free enjoyment of that religion they profess. In several of the States, the Christian religion was once established by law, and in nearly all of the original thirteen, the Protestant religion was especially protected and enjoined. Our governments are not Atheistical; and even under the government of the United States, in which there was an effort to generalise as much as possible, the legislation on the

whole has been for the protection and promotion of the Christian Religion. In the extreme jealousy prevailing in this country against all ecclesiastical establishments, and in the great care had in guarding the rights of conscience, all traces of preference of one religious belief above another have been gradually more and more obliterated from our State Constitutions; yet the particular legislation of our country has every where protected the Christian Religion. In the decisions which have been had in this State, where the adherents of Judaism have been tried for violating the Christian Sabbath by keeping open their places of business on that day, the decisions have thus far uniformly been against them, and in favor of the observance of the Lord's day. The Scriptures treat disobedience to the civil magistrate, when the rights of conscience are not invaded, not merely as a thing not expedient, but as a sin against God, because "the powers that be are ordained of God, and the magistrate beareth not the sword in vain, but is a terror to evil doers and a praise to them that do well." And we very much doubt whether a professed Atheist could be admitted as a witness in our Courts of Justice, or be duly qualified, *by oath*, to hold public office. However the aim to secure religious liberty and the rights of conscience may denude our State Constitutions of religious terms and attributes, the whole current of our legislation, and the administration of our government, as truly marks us as a Christian people, as the governments of Pagan antiquity, exhibited them as the patrons of Paganism.

The laws of Virginia, under the present Constitution, seem to be exceedingly chary of granting to the churches and congregations the right of holding property. Property in houses of worship, and in land not to exceed two acres in towns, and thirty acres in the country, may be held by trustees, for the benefit of churches and congregations, and with these privileges, it seems from the speech before us, the majority of the denominations are satisfied. Two acres seem to us a scanty pattern for church-yard, parsonage, and lot for session house, in the majority of our southern towns, and these restrictions are evidences doubtless of

an extreme jealousy of church funds, occasioned by the exactions of the church formerly established among them.

In our opinion it would be an evil to endow the several churches to that degree that the ministry should be rendered independent of the liberality of their hearers. It would render the ties between pastor and people less strong, and cause that state of indifference which is observed to prevail where choice privileges are made free and without cost. Yet there are institutions which are of that nature that they require a permanent endowment for their success. Such, to a great extent, we believe our Colleges and Seminaries to be. And their incorporation may be so managed as still to leave them under the control of the church which endows them, immediately and quickly answerable to this church, acting through its appropriate ecclesiastical organization.

Dr. Plumer was right in standing forth on an arena not often occupied by ministers of the gospel, in contending against a civil enactment so little fraught with good to the church. The Presbytery of Hanover, in Virginia, was the first ecclesiastical body which recognized the Declaration of Independence, and in the same memorial addressed to the General Assembly of Virginia, in which they acknowledge this, they ask perfect freedom in religious worship, and affirm that the concerns of religion are beyond the limits of civil control; and their remonstrances, coupled with those of other denominations, doubtless led to the act of 1780, for which Mr. Jefferson, as its advocate and framer, has arrogated to himself so much praise. We find a similar course taken by the Rev. William Tennent, Pastor of the Independent Church in Charleston, in his speech delivered in the House of Assembly, Charleston, South Carolina, January 11, 1777, against the establishment of religion by law, and in favor of the rights of all men to free and equal religious liberty.

Dr. Plumer dedicates his "argument" to the people of Virginia, as an evidence of his admiration of the general wisdom of "the Mother of States and Statesmen," on the subject of civil and religious freedom.

2. *Apostolic Confirmation: or reasons for discarding Episcopal confirmation with the laying on of hands; with an Appendix setting forth John Calvin's real views of this ceremony.* By Rev. JAMES M. ALLEN. Richmond, Virginia, 1848.

This pamphlet of 76 pages contains the substance of two sermons which were called forth by the extravagant pretensions of Prelatists in the Author's immediate vicinity. They were first delivered to his charge to protect them from being alarmed or agitated by the unchurching dogmas so openly promulgated, and were published for the same reasons that they were delivered.

The Author first enters upon the examination of the only three passages, Acts 14: 22, 15: 32 and 41, where the word confirmation occurs. His philological argument, drawn from the import of the term employed in each of these places, ἐπιστηγίζω, seems to us complete; showing that it never can bear the signification which is imperiously required by the Episcopal doctrine of confirmation. His next object is to establish the three following historical facts: 1. That in one of these instances at least, the confirmation was performed by men who were neither Apostles, nor the successors of the Apostles. 2. That the persons confirmed were not only those just initiated into the Church, but *are the brethren* of the churches, and even *the teachers themselves*. 3. That the confirmation in question was effected, not by "laying on of hands," but by the decrees and exhortations of the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem. Then follows a careful analysis of the nine passages in Scripture which speak of "the imposition of hands." The result is shown to be as follows: in four of these passages, the imposition is connected with ordination, and the setting apart to some public service; in two others, it is connected with the miraculous gift of healing; in still two other instances, it is connected with the conferring of miraculous powers by the Holy Ghost; the last passage, which occurs in Heb. 6: 2, he shows cannot refer to the rite of confirmation, whatever else it may include.

The Appendix is an able defence of John Calvin, who, strange to say, by means of garbled extracts from his writings and by much special pleading, has been adduced as a witness to the Apostolic origin of this ceremony. The Author conclusively shows, by ample citation from his Institutes, that his comments upon Hebrew 6: 2, have been grievously perverted. He further shows the allegation to be false that Calvin in after life changed the views expressed on this subject in his Institutes; that in truth he re-wrote his Institutes, as we now have them, fully ten years after his commentary on Hebrews, which is alleged to contain his more mature views; and finally by large quotations from acknowledged Episcopal authorities, that the views held by them of confirmation are flatly contradictory to the whole tenor of Calvin's teaching, who allowed only two such institutions in the Christian Church,—Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

On the whole, we have been much pleased with this pamphlet as a specimen of polemical ability. It shows that Presbyterians are ready now, as of old, if the decree be for controversy, to carry on the war upon the offensive as well as defensive. We should be glad to believe that these inflictions would serve to abate the arrogance of those who, by their very claim of exclusive churchship, make themselves preëminently *a sect*: cutting themselves off from communion with those whom the Lord has furnished with gifts and grace to be his church and bride.

-
3. *The Czar, His Court and People: including a tour in Norway and Sweden.* By JOHN S. MAXWELL. 12 mo. pp. 368. Baker & Scribner: New York, 1848.

This pleasant book of travels opens with a brief but most entertaining account of the simple habits and hardy independence of the Norwegians. Then follows a more brief but more dismal description of Sweden. We afterwards follow the route

of our traveller through Finland into Russia, to which latter country, as its title indicates, the book is chiefly dedicated. A lively impression is given of the appearance of the country, of the habits of the people, of the classification of society, and the like. A certain political interest too attaches to the book from the views given of the resources of this great Empire—of the jealousy existing between the old nobility of the country and the haughty Autocrat Nicholas—of the various efforts made by the latter to carry forward the work of civilizing his semi-barbarous subjects, and at the same time to consolidate the despotism he wields—and of the system of vigilant espionage, by means of which this resolute and wilful monarch keeps his eye at once upon every part of his wide spread dominion. There are dashes also of history in the work, in which we are made acquainted with the early divisions of the Slavonic tribes, and the various transformations which war and conquest have effected both in people and country.

Mr. Maxwell considers the jealousy to be wholly gratuitous which is felt by the Constitutional Sovereigns of Europe towards the great military preparations and displays of Nicholas. He regards them as directed to the concentration of his own power and to the arrest of liberal principles among his own subjects, rather than to his further aggrandizement by foreign conquest.

There is less said about the Greek Church, its worship and its influence, than fully meets our curiosity. Yet from the descriptions which *are* given, we infer the Greek Church to be but little behind the Latin, in all the attributes of a corrupt religion, ignorance, superstition, sin and idolatry.

The brief notice of Poland, and the touching mention made of the grave of Kosciusco, will to the American reader almost convert the latter portion of his travel into a Pilgrimage. Alas, poor Poland! Though selfish Europe saw thee rifled and partitioned, America has a tear for thy bitter fate!

We commend our readers to Mr. Maxwell's companionship, over a long, unusual, but deeply interesting line of travel. They will part with him, at Vienna, as we did, with regret.

4. *Life, Letters and Remains of Rev. Robert Pollok.* By JAMES SCOTT, D. D., *Pastor of the First Reformed Dutch Church, Newark, N. J.* 12 mo. pp. 364. Robert Carter: New York, 1848.

Beyond the meagre sketches of his life prefixed to some Editions of the "Course of Time," the public has not heretofore been enlightened in the early history of Pollok. Dr. Scott has undertaken to satisfy the inquiries of those who feel a like admiration with his for the great Christian Poet of this century. He carries the reader with a good degree of enthusiasm through the incidents of his early life, and endeavors to trace out the various influences, such as scenery, historical associations, converse with living men, which have lent their moulding influence to his character and genius. Pollok's literary career is minutely displayed: and we are pleased to follow him as a diligent and aspiring student through the extensive curriculum pursued both at the University and in the Divinity Hall. His smaller pieces of composition, which are given, afford us additional opportunity to judge of the extent and versatility of his powers. But the letters of Pollok, which are profusely scattered through the biography, especially delighted us. It is in this species of composition we most discover the heart and temper of an author, and we most easily feel a living sympathy with him as we follow him in his letters, winding through all the relations of life. There seems too to be a singular affinity between the easy vivacity of letter-writing, and the highly wrought imagination requisite in the Poet. Our most gifted Poets have also given us the most elegant specimens of epistolary literature. It pleases us to find in this particular that Pollok is no exception to the rule which we are half disposed to deduce from the Poetry and correspondence of a Burns, a Cowper and a Byron.

Upon this Biography of Dr. Scott, as a literary production, we must bestow a measured praise. The author first conceived the idea of composing it, upon delivering an address before a

Lyceum upon the life and writings of Pollok. We judge this address to be in reality the basis of the book, as from beginning to end it wears the appearance of an expanded oration. The style is not to our taste, even for a speech—it is inflated, and ambitious in the extreme, profuse in its figures, and the frequent recurrence of the same pet phrases and metaphors stales them upon the ear. The author is also quite too indiscriminate in the praise he awards to the Poet. He wastes his superlatives upon the weakest effusions of his muse, and finds his vocabulary impoverished when he comes to the great Poem which is his monument. He has evidently written the book to canonize his bard, and pays what even the admirers of Pollok will regard as idolatrous homage. Still the work is the medium through which we receive the letters and remains of this gifted son of song: and though we much prefer the glass plain, we will not reject it because it is stained.

5. "*The Mysteries of Godliness.*" By SAMUEL L. SOUTHARD, A. M., *Rector of Calvary Church, New York.* 8 vo., pp. 138. Appleton & Co., 1848.

If any one, in taking up this little book should chance to think of the really able work of Bradbury bearing the same title, we advise him at once to lay it down: the resemblance lies only in the title. Mr. Southard was wholly unknown to us until this thin Octavo strayed from its customary haunts into our possession. The pompous but obsequious dedication to the Right Reverend Bishop, who is particularly careful to have the cross on the outside of him, was ominous—nor are the sentences wanting which shall fulfil the evil augury. Mr. Southard talks abundantly, as one should who receives a ministry committed to him by Dr. Doane, of "sacramental energy," "the efficacious sacraments," of "the holy flood which washes away the soul's defilement, of

"the 'quick forge and working-house' of the great sacrament," and the like. We have indeed read only half the book: we attempted more and thought to accomplish it by the aid of good large type and beautiful white paper; but we gave out from want of breath. Mr. Southard's ambition unquestionably is to achieve the nonsensical; and especially, as he is an artist, to whip a figure into ribands. The whole book is but the expansion of a single metaphor; well enough if confined to one page, but fairly used up before the second of the six sermons is reached. If any of our readers should have the misfortune, with ourselves, to be attracted by the above good title, we anxiously advise him not to attempt the book which is fastened to it. Or if he does, our best advice is that he be provided with "seven league boots." He will need them: for the author will not suffer him to walk upon any thing but the tops of mountains. Nay he will escape well, if he is not whirled away inter astra, and forced to do his skipping from star to star. But his sad end will be to die ignominiously, choked with bombast.

-
6. *Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, drawn from the writings of St. Augustine, with observations, by* RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, M. A., *Author of Notes on the Parables.* London: John W. Parker, pp. 159, 16 mo.

This little volume is an attempt by a safe and able hand, to draw from the circle of St. Augustine's writings whatever of most importance has been contributed by him for the elucidation of the Sermon on the Mount. The theology of the Christian East the writer tells us "was a metaphysic of the divine Being." "In Augustine, the theology of the West, and of the modern world,—the theology which relates not merely to God, but to the God of men,—first came out into its full importance." He moulded the doctrine of the middle ages, so far as it ran in the

channel of truth. And he was eminently "the Doctor" of the Reformation. Professor Trench takes delight in sounding his praises. The "homiletic treasures" his sermons and discourses contain are "sufficient to explain the proverb of the Spaniards. No hay Sermon sin Augustino." This unpretending little volume shows in its own quiet way, the learning, piety, and heart of its truly able author, a contrast quite, to the writer we have just noticed, the worthy successor to those noble men who, in the English Church, have contended for truth and Godliness.

7. *Differences between Old and New School Presbyterianism.* By REV. LEWIS CHEESEMAN, *Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, in connection with the General Assembly, Rochester, N. Y., with an Introductory Chapter, by JOHN C. LORD, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Buffalo, N. Y. Rochester.* 1848. 12 mo. pp. 224.

Our limits prevent us from giving more than a brief notice of this book, though it deserves from our hand a more protracted review. It is devoted, as its title indicates, to the exhibition of those differences between the Old and New School, which have rent asunder the Presbyterian Church in these United States, and separated into two denominations, those who retain the same Confession of Faith, and profess to submit to the same principles of Ecclesiastical polity. The author, we understand, is one who first drank of "the new wine" of the doctrines he now condemns, but having tasted of the "old wine," he no longer desireth the new, for, "he saith the old is better." The doctrines of the New School, in all their divergencies from the Old, approximate, and in many of their advocates run wholly into the Pelagian, Semi-Pelagian and Arminian heresies, with which the theological giants of former days have contended. Starting forth from a few metaphysical principles, which they carry

through their entire reasoning, neglecting the testimony of the past, and deluded with the idea that the human reason is continually working improvements in theology, our brethren are diverging now on this side and now on that, from the humbling truths of the Gospel. The real evil of these opinions is not seen when they are first proposed. It requires years for them to reach their full development. But they end at length at a remote distance from the doctrines preached by Paul, which have been so mighty in past ages in pulling down the strong-holds of superstition and unbelief. Mr. Cheeseman has handled his subject with ability. His warm-hearted interest for the truth, his love for the pure Gospel, shows itself on every page. His language is forcible, and often eloquent, and if his figurative expressions are sometimes open to criticism, they set forth his meaning with great vividness. Though he does not disguise the truth in any respect, but represents these differences as broad and palpable, he would doubtless admit that he has drawn his representations sometimes from the extreme wing of the New School force; that there are many among them, approaching more nearly to ourselves, and some, doubtless, yet to be found in their ranks, to whose orthodoxy he would not except. These discussions, now that the old heats have in a measure subsided, are timely, and we hope will issue in good. If we could find our New School brethren candidly studying those old, and by them neglected divines, Turretine, Stapfer, Pictet, Van Mastricht, Calvin, Owen, or some more modern ones whom we could mention, and trusting less in the superficial metaphysics of the modern school, we would have greater hopes than we now entertain, of a speedy reunion between them and us. An outward, hollow amalgamation, when there is no unity of faith nor oneness of heart, would be futile indeed. We cannot say much for the correctness of the typography of Mr. Cheeseman's book. Errors will sometimes occur, with the utmost care on the part of the conductors of the press; but we have not for some years read a book so replete with these minor blemishes as this.

8. *Union to Christ and to his Church ; or, the Duty of all to Believe in Christ, to confess Christ, and to become Communing Members of the Church of Christ.* By the REV. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Charleston, South Carolina. Edinburg. 1846.

An affectionate, spiritual and earnest plea, on the part of the author, with those not in the Church, to embrace Christ, and confess him before men. It was written during the progress of that work of grace which prevailed in the Second Church in Charleston, during the winter and spring of 1846. In its directness, simplicity, and use of that "Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," it reminds us more of the writings of the Baxters, Alleins, and Bostons of a former day, than any thing we have seen from the author's pen. Yet it is less elaborate, and in some points more open to criticism, than some other of the author's productions.

-
- 9.- *The Agency devolving on White Men in Missions to Western Africa.* By REV. JOHN LEIGHTON WILSON, Missionary at Gaboon, in Western Africa. Boston. 1848.

This little pamphlet is an interesting discourse of our Missionary brother, designed to shew the practicableness of carrying on Missionary operations in Africa, by the agency of *white men*. The objections against it are the insalubrity of the climate, and the savage disposition of the natives. The last of these objections, the writer says, "so dishonors the promise of the Saviour to be with his disciples to the end of the world, and is, withal, so completely refuted by the history of Missions in almost every portion of the habitable world, that it might safely be thrust aside as unworthy of consideration." The majority of the missions in Africa, he says, "are located not only beyond the jurisdiction of

all civilized governments, but many of them in situations where no civilized government on earth could render them aid, however urgent might be their distress. And yet what one of those stations have been cut off by native violence?" "The unhealthiness of the climate has been exaggerated." The public, both in England and America, have received their impressions of the insalubrity of the country from the climate of Sierra Leone, and Cape Mesurado, two of the most unhealthy locations on the entire coast. The earlier missionaries were without missionary experience, pressed down with cares, anxieties and responsibilities; often without medical aid, or under the care of physicians inexperienced in the diseases of the country. It is not denied that the climate is unhealthy. It is the protection which God has vouchsafed to the most defenceless race of men, against the cupidity of the civilized world. Yet white men do live and labor there in the pursuit of gain. Not less than 3000, the writer thinks, permanently reside on that coast, and if we add the floating population engaged in commerce not less than 8 or 10,000. The success of African missions, too, has been unusual. Ten or twelve dialects have been reduced to writing, and made the vehicle of communicating the Gospel. Seven thousand children have been gathered into Christian schools, and six thousand souls have been added to the fold of Christ. Colored men of adequate qualification to conduct this work, cannot be found, for many years to come, in sufficient numbers. Upon white missionaries, in the present stage of African missions, the Church must chiefly rely.

10. *Addresses at the Inauguration of* REV. R. C. GRIER, *President of Erskine College, Due West Corner, Abbeville District, S. C. Published by order of the Board of Trustees. Charleston. 1848.*

The first of the addresses is by Rev. W. R. Hemphill, in illustration of the apothem of Lord Bacon, "Knowledge is power;"

and the second is the Inaugural Address of the President, "On the Development of the Moral Powers." Both are appropriate to the occasion, and creditable to their authors. Erskine College is under the care of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, and has about 100 Students in its several departments. Although an infant institution, it has already been useful, as a place where the rising ministry for that church have been trained, and where a solid and religious education has been imparted to a number of young men employed now in the various walks of life.

-
11. *The First Annual Report of the Southern Baptist Publication Society; with the Proceedings of the Meeting held at Griffin, Georgia, 1848. Charleston. Published by the Society.*

The Advantages of Sabbath School Instruction. By REV. C. D. MALLARY. Charleston. Southern Baptist Publication Society. 1848.

The above pamphlets, issued by the Southern Baptist Publication Society, have been sent to our address, and we record their publication with pleasure, as a token of respect to the Society, and as a historic note of passing events. The absorbing question of Slavery has rent in twain two of the largest denominations of professing Christians in these United States—the Methodist and Baptist Churches; and they have been driven into those separate organizations which they have regarded necessary for the advancement of the interest of their churches, and of the kingdom of Christ, as proclaimed by them. We regard it as an evidence of the sobriety and intelligence of our own denomination, that there has been no occasion of division on the same basis among ourselves. The number of rabid abolitionists in the Presbyterian Church in the Northern States, is extremely small. So far as we

know, throughout our borders, our pulpits are open to Southern men; and their ministrations are as acceptable in the non-slaveholding States, as those of our Northern brethren. The new terms of communion made in other churches, which exclude the slave-holder from the communion table and the pulpit, are not made in ours. We have not yet found that new gospel which Christ and his Apostles knew nothing of, which shuts the gates of the visible kingdom of God, against the successors of Abraham of the Old Dispensation, and Cornelius of the New, who represents himself as saying "to his *own servant*, Do this, and he doeth it." We are thankful that it is so. The day may yet come, and may not be far distant, when our entire country shall be rent in twain, as the confederacy of the Jewish tribes was rent into the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of Judah. Those days, we confess, we desire not to see, when Judah shall vex Ephraim and Ephraim Judah, and when, weakened by civil feuds, we shall fall before some new Babylon, which shall, at some future day, insult over the ruined heritage of our fathers. But if it must come, we are confident that the Southern portion of our Presbyterian Church, has the ability and the energy to do her part for this land in which her Head has placed her; that she will not be behind in zeal and effort, while she remains firm, as she has ever been, in those old and glorious truths for which our fathers braved persecution, and spared not their own blood.

The discourse of Mr. Mallary, on Sabbath School Instruction, is written with that force of style for which the author has long been known among his own brethren, and breathes, at the same time, what is beyond all literary merit, a warm and pious spirit.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

DECEMBER, 1848.

ARTICLE I.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE DEVELOPEMENT OF THE PRES- BYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.,

DURING THE TEN YEARS WHICH HAVE ELAPSED SINCE ITS DISRUPTION IN 1838: SUG-
GESTED BY THE PUBLISHED MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1848

It is now ten years since the great disruption of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. That event was attended with circumstances every way remarkable; and it had been preceded by a deep and wide convulsion of the whole denomination in America. The thing itself, the circumstances which attended the final catastrophe, and the causes which had been long working to produce it, as well as those which more immediately brought it about, were, each and all, of such a nature, that reflecting men could never have doubted that results of the most important kind, for good or evil, to all the parties, must necessarily follow. To as many of the more immediate actors in those affairs, which were consummated in the disruption of 1838, as have been spared to witness the fruits of the ten succeeding years, it must be a subject full of solemn and affecting interest to ponder the results of the work to which they put their hands. One of their number — one who bore his full share of odium, and felt, at least, his full share of interest in all that was done — may be allowed to direct public attention to the general subject, and to offer some considerations upon a few topics suggested by a perusal of the Min-

utes of the General Assembly of 1848, which seem to be indicative of the general progress of the Church, especially in its interior life, since its great deliverance ten years ago.

In regard to the New School party and the separate denomination they have constituted since 1838, it is not necessary to say much in such a connexion as this. As long as it will be the duty of the Presbyterian Church to vindicate and to uphold her grand reform, so long will it be a part of that duty to exhibit, in true and impartial colours, the character of the men, the actions, and the doctrines which brought her to the verge of ruin. The more completely she fulfils her duties, and the more perfectly she developes her inward life, the more will she be separate from such actions and such doctrines; and the more impossible will it be to implicate her again in any alliance with them, or any endorsement of them. Every step in that direction is a condemnation of all that God blessed to our deliverance, and a reproach of all whom God used to reform us. It is a blessed and a significant fact, that all the movements in that direction, whether open or insidious, have signally failed; amongst the chief of which may be signalized the attempt to seduce the General Assembly of 1846 into a sacramental retraction of some of the noblest testimonies the Church ever bore. The New School Presbyterian body is like our own body, steadily working out its own inward life in its new condition. It deeply imports us to observe the process, and the fruits that will be brought forth. We are far from having seen the end—let us calmly await it. And then God will show us plainly what further we ought to do, if any thing shall then remain for us to do.

Our duty is widely different in regard to our own Church. Its acts are the indications of its life. The more those acts are performed as matters of course, the more clearly do they indicate the nature and the degree of the vital energy, which is steadily accomplishing its end, in the outward developement of her inward being. The Church is so large and so widely dispersed, that it is chiefly, if not wholly, in such manifestations, that we can find the sure proofs of her general condition, the certain indications of the point she has reached and the direction in which she tends. In every point of view, therefore, all who love her are required

to watch these symptoms with profound attention, to rejoice in proportion as they are sound and healthful, and to bestir themselves at the very first indication of disease.

The first thing which is suggested as worthy of special remark, on opening these Minutes, is the place at which the Assembly held its sessions. Maryland, one of the earliest, if not the very earliest State, in which Presbyterianism was planted, at last, and after more than a century and a half had elapsed since she received and protected Francis McKemmie, sees a Presbyterian General Assembly meet on her soil ! Baltimore, the third city in the Union, and from its foundation containing in its bosom a powerful Presbyterian influence, after beholding more than fifty General Assemblies in succession, (with one single exception,) meet almost in sight of the smoke of the city, from 1789 to 1839, is at last honoured in 1848, with being the seat of the sixtieth annual sessions of the great council of the Church ! Surely it was time. How many evils resulted to us from the single fact that it had, for so long a period, been the habit of the Assembly to meet annually at the same place, and at the particular place it had selected, it is impossible ever to determine. It became the settled habit, then a kind of settled law of the Church, that the General Assembly must convene, year after year, in the city of Philadelphia ; until, at last, it was openly proclaimed and generally believed, that to meet any where else was to brave certain fearful but undefineable dangers, which it was folly to think of encountering ; and that to meet out of Pennsylvania was to incur almost certain ruin, by the forfeiture of the charter which had been granted by the Legislature of that State. During the whole existence of the Assembly anterior to the disruption, it had never met but three times out of Philadelphia ; of these three times, only once, and that at a very early period, out of Pennsylvania, (at Winchester, Va.,) and twice (in 1835 and 1836,) at Pittsburgh. Mean time, the sentiment of Philadelphia and its vicinage became, in a manner, the sentiment of the Church itself. A few Pastors and still fewer Laymen became the general depositories of all actual control in the public affairs of the Church ; its various Boards were accumulated there ; its funds were all managed there ; its general policy was all shaped and then executed there,

and the local influence was gradually swallowing up the general control. Ruinous and derogatory as such a state of things, must always and necessarily be, there was nothing whatever to mitigate the inherent evils of this condition, in the special circumstances of this particular locality. Its Pastors were no more than a fair average sample of the Pastors of the Church, and some of them, in the end, proved to be amongst the greatest troublers and corrupters of the Church. Its population in general, even its Presbyterian population, took so little interest in the meetings of the Assembly, that all its numerous congregations could hardly furnish a single gathering of Christian people on a week-night, to hear the most admired preachers in the body; and a very large proportion of the members were, for years in succession, distributed in boarding houses instead of being received as honoured guests into private families. There were not wanting men who saw and deplored, and set vigorously about amending, a state of things so unhappy. Their efforts took the Assembly to Pittsburg in 1835 and 1836, and have since, after taking it to Cincinnati, Louisville, Richmond and Baltimore, succeeded in finally dissipating the spell, and making it, as we trust, the settled policy of the Church, that its General Assembly shall never again be a fixture attached to any particular place, gentlemen or congregations. The same new influence located the Board of Foreign Missions in the city of New York — an act whose wisdom, we presume, no mortal now questions: a plain corollary from which is, that of the four corporations belonging to the Church, still located in Philadelphia — two or three should be removed elsewhere. The essence of these statements and reflections is extremely simple. The Church ought to rule itself; no local influence ought to be allowed to become permanent or excessive in the councils of the Church; the Assembly ought to embody and to utter the true and settled judgments and sentiments of the whole Church, and not those of any dominant interest in it; and it ought, as far as possible, to know by personal inspection, all the grand sections of the Church and the Republic, and stimulate, by its occasional presence, all the great centres of power and influence. Here is a great change effected in the outward action of the Church; the manifestation of a great change in the inward senti-

ment of the Church; the indication of a great change in the point of direction to which the developement of the Church is tending: A freer, a larger, a more national action; a more perfect deliverance from local, personal, and class influences; a broader area, and a freer movement; no more metropolitan cities, no more metropolitan pastors, no more metropolitan corporations, parties or influences; loftier instincts, higher aspirations, a wider horizon, a nobler destiny. Such, unless we deceive ourselves, are the sober reflections which a calm survey of the past, and especially of the last ten years, suggests in connection with one, and perhaps some may say, one of the smallest matters involved in the convulsions preceding 1838, and terminating in the disruption of that memorable year.

Passing on to the actual constitution of the body—its roll of organic and corresponding members—the actual relations it sustains to other branches of the visible Church—and the questions which have sprung up out of these relations—we find, in each of these topics, abundant grounds for serious meditation. That the attendance of members at the Assembly should have been very full, during the stormy years, from 1831 to 1838, is not to be wondered at. That this full attendance should be perpetuated since the latter year, increasing in proportion, rather than diminishing, from year to year, as a settled habitude of the Church, is a striking and characteristic fact. Of all the churches in the world, there is not one, in regard to which these frequent and general meetings can be more important, than to ours. Covering an area already so vast, and still extending—enjoying so few opportunities of personal intercourse and personal knowledge of each other, as our Ministers and Elders, thus situated, must do—surrounded by so many and such powerful influences, tending to disturb the perfect homogeneity of the Church, and to distract its great aims—these annual meetings of the General Assembly are amongst the most precious and powerful safeguards of our Church; and a full and general attendance on them is one of the clearest proofs that the Church feels that she is *one church*; that she has one common mission set before her; and that her united power for good is but the sum of the combined efficiency of all the parts. By a sort of faithful instinct, the Church seems more and more set against all the schemes

that can be devised to weaken the power, curtail the influence, or remove from immediate contact with the body of the Church itself, this great annual court. The history of the Church itself, exhibiting the mode in which it has grown to be what it is, and the process by which the original Church in America has expanded and been divided and divided again, and the theory of its simple and divine organization, both alike attest that this vast Church of our day, which assembles from year to year, by its chosen Ministers and Elders, is not only as really one Church as the Church which M'Kemmie first planted was one Church, but that, in fact, it is the very same Church. How much error, folly, and disorder, have sprung from a contrary theory and belief? It is God, by His holy Word, and God in His adorable Providence, vesting His Church with power, and fitting her for her mission amongst men; or it is, on the other hand, carnal wisdom, guided by circumstances, and delegating and distributing ecclesiastical power at its own choice, that determines the true character of our Church in this aspect of the subject. Though some painful and strange decisions of the General Assembly, within the last ten years, seem to go very far in the wrong direction, touching its own nature, powers, and rights—tending, indeed, to strip it, if they were adhered to, of most that makes it a real power in and over our Church, and to rob it of much that should make it an object of such deep and settled interest to that Church; yet, the general tendency is in the other direction, and the ample list of Ministers and Elders, the full representation from so large a portion of our Presbyteries, and the whole aspect set forth, (so far as a printed record can do it,) of the power, and life, and movement, of the body, attest the sense in which these members are sent, and in which they take their places, in the great and divinely ordained council of the Church. It is not a handful of men, met on an errand of human contrivance, and bonded by ties of human formation, and devoted to objects of human selection, and acting with powers carrying only a human obligation; but it is a great multitude of God's servants, chosen to rule in His Church, assembled by His authority, resolute to do His bidding, and uttering their acts in His name. The disruption of 1838 stands precisely between these two extreme conditions. Before that event, we were

rapidly approaching the former condition ; since that event, the general indications are, that we are marching towards the latter. The Church is safe only so long as this progress is maintained. The true life, which alone can sustain that progress, is still exposed to falsehood in high places, which would poison it, and to errors which would stint its developement ; so that every indication of its vigorous action is to be hailed with joy. What, for example, would our condition become, if it were settled that Ruling Elders need not be present in our Church Courts, or, that though they need be present, by positive law, they are merely a human addition to God's ordered Church ? What would be our estate, if it were received truth that Papal Priests are as really and regularly Christian Pastors as ourselves, and might, without any further ordination, sit down with us, as such, in the tribunals of God's Church ; or that, on the other hand, ordination, and that only, is all in all, and, therefore, the whole Assembly might consist of men, not one of whom performed a spiritual function ? Thanks be to God, none of these delusions have had power to arrest the healthful developement of the Church ; and it is worthy to be noted, that this very Assembly of 1848, as the one for 1846 had more signally done, rebuked the silly vanity of calling our Ministers Bishops. What has the Presbyterian Church to gain by all this rabble of the middle ages — this inundation of gowns, and gloves, and lawn, and read essays, and gothic walls, and stained glass, and organs ? A church of men, a church of power, a church full of God's presence, is a church worth loving — worth striving for. A church of music, and architecture, and titles, and dress, and forms, is beneath the consideration, we will not say of a Christian, but even of a Philosopher. This general topic must not be passed over without calling attention to the rapid and remarkable growth of our Church within the period specially contemplated in these remarks. In all that constitutes the efficiency of a church, even in a worldly point of view, the Presbyterian Church in America is this day a more powerful and effective organization than she was before the disruption in 1838. Her growth in members, ministers, and churches, has been steady and immense. Her institutions are consolidated, and more effective by far ; her power is put forth in a greater degree, and is far more fruitful. What

did we lose by that memorable schism? What have we gained since it took place? How does the character of what we have acquired compare with that of what we lost? What is the actual condition of the whole mass, viewed at the two extremities of these ten years—our whole Church to-day, compared with our whole Church before the Schism? It is in no spirit of boasting—it is in a spirit of profound humility and gratitude to God, whose hand was over us for good, alike in what we lost and in what we have gained—that we challenge every considerate man in our communion to answer these questions to his own heart. We solemnly declare, that if there ever was a case in which the manifest blessing of God upon a course of human conduct can be said to have set the seal of divine approbation upon any earthly transactions, it is our opinion that the Presbyterian Church in the United States has that attestation. Let her cherish it as an “immediate jewel of her soul.”

Our congregational friends at the North, it seems, do not live up to their privileges. Of the six Associations, Conso-ciations, Conventions, Conferences, &c., with which our Assembly is in correspondence, only one (the General Conference of Maine) sent any Delegates to the last Assembly. In our remarks, suggested by the consideration of the organization of that Assembly, we cannot omit some allusion to its Corresponding Members, which, if full, would amount to some sixteen persons. The position which the Presbyterian Church ought to occupy towards all the sister churches of the world, and especially those of our own country, cannot, assuredly, be a matter of discussion in her own bosom. Every thing points her out as one of the leading churches of the world—and on this continent, certainly, there is none in advance of her. It is, therefore, preëminently her duty, not only to do all in her power to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, but also to avail herself of her high position to induce others to do likewise. In this respect, there has been no dereliction of duty on her part. She has held out the hand of concord as steadily and as promiscuously as the most ardent friend of Christian union could ask. What has she gained by it? Perhaps, the satisfaction of having done her duty. If anything more, we should be glad to have it pointed out. Most especially

in all her relations with the Congregational Churches of America, for above forty years past, she has been exposed to dangers, which have proved themselves to be most serious, and has received benefits which have been of the most dubious kind. What influence our entanglements with Congregationalism had upon our condition, from the commencement of this century up to our great Semi-Pelagian Schism, and what obstacles the entire Congregational force, in and out of our Church, presented, in the first place, to the predominance of the Old School party, and afterwards, to the purgation of the Church by it, are matters in regard to which the opinions of men are settled, and which do not require particular notice here. At the division of the Presbyterian Church, the overwhelming proportion of the Congregational element, which had been gradually infused into it during fifty years, was either cast out of it in 1837, or seceded from it in 1838. After that, the Congregational bodies at the North, we believe without exception, sympathized with the New School party, and to a great extent, they made no secret of their decided preferences. When, in 1839, the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania confounded the small Erastian party that remained in our body, waiting for an opposite decision to leave it with the more eclat, and brought the Congregationalists of the North to a clearer view of what was to be the result of their open preference of the Semi-Pelagian Assembly, a new aspect was put on the whole affair, and both bodies of Presbyterians were recognized as equally entitled to be called the Presbyterian Church. As years have rolled on, things have gradually settled on this basis, and the Presbyterian Church, passing over many serious grounds of complaint, and many still more serious grounds of suspicion that she was improperly countenancing errors it was her duty to testify against, found herself restored to the ancient status with these various bodies going under five or six different names, but all of them Congregational in government, and few or none of them sound in doctrine, according to our notions of soundness. Meantime, Presbyterianism has almost died out of New-England, where it once had considerable strength, the process of its decay going on, step by step, with the progressive departure of the New-England Churches from the faith of their fathers—a sig-

nificant fact, worthy to be held in lasting remembrance. As long as there was any prospect of bringing the whole Presbyterian Church into such a condition as was satisfactory to New-England Congregationalists, no public effort was made to plant their system, openly and by name, either in the region occupied by Presbyterianism, or within the new States growing up on its borders. Indeed, the very opposite course was sedulously pursued, and the impression sought to be made was, that the two forms of doctrine and order were sufficiently alike to satisfy every enlightened conscience and every pious heart, and that, at the best, forms of church order were matters of small moment. There are, perhaps, tens of thousands of persons now living, who have been members, and many of them ministers, successively, of both denominations—many of them changing back and forward, repeatedly, upon this precise view of the case. After the events of 1838, and the finale of the matter in 1839, it became gradually more and more evident, that the Presbyterian Church was thoroughly in earnest in its spirit of reform; that no hope remained, by any new process, of congregationalizing it, either wholly or in part; and, therefore, that the entrance of Ministers and members from other denominations into it, was to be taken, in all time to come, as a real and fair transaction, meaning what it had before only professed to mean. Thereupon, another new aspect was once more put upon the whole subject; Congregationalists fell suddenly in love with their form of church order, which, indeed, was newly discovered to be not only exclusively divine, but alone compatible with high efforts, exalted piety, or perfect developement. Periodicals were established expressly to advocate its new pretensions, institutions were endowed to spread it through the land, and a settled plan of proselyting and planting churches was widely set in operation and vigorously pushed, wherever an opening could be found—which was none the less acceptable if it promised to divide a Presbyterian congregation—to destroy one—or to supplant one. Simultaneously with this new movement, a settled plan of discrediting the Presbyterian Church was set on foot, and for a number of years past, we believe it has never failed to occur, that every year the character of the Church has undergone discussion of a derogatory kind on some subject or other—generally

the subject of slavery — in one or more of the Congregational bodies to which delegates are sent by the General Assembly; a late and very flagrant case of this description having been made a subject of discussion in the newspapers since the adjournment of the last Assembly. The sum of the whole matter, so far as fifty years of experience can reveal its true nature, is simply this: that the Presbyterian Church must, one how or other, submit to be Congregationalized, or she must buckle on her armour and take the field openly against this imperfect and insufficient system which is called Congregationalism; or she must, under the forms of a hollow alliance, patiently and ignominiously see her character traduced, her proper field of labor invaded, and her churches, in many places, distracted by those whose power to harm her results mainly from her own endorsement of them. The first alternative, the Church has plainly shown, she will not submit to; the second one, she has, with a noble forbearance, always manifested the greatest reluctance to embrace; the third one is now in a process of experiment upon her, and it remains to be seen how long she will endure it. Two things seem to us worthy to be suggested: the first is, that the time has surely come, to consider whether New-England has no claim upon our Church for the true faith and order of the Gospel; whether we can show any sufficient warrant to excuse us from planting Presbyterianism there, any more than in any other land, where it is so sadly needed; and whether, in this, as in all other cases, the true remedy to prevent trouble to ourselves by the errors of other people is not to enlighten them in the knowledge of that truth which is the immediate remedy for their own mistakes. The other suggestion is this: In point of fact, the general meetings of Congregationalists, to which the Assembly sends delegates, neither are, nor do they profess to be, in any proper sense, powers ecclesiastical, or governments at all; and, except for the force of a foregone conclusion, and the power of long received impressions, it would be extremely difficult to show why a government ecclesiastical, professing to act by divine warrant, should treat on equal terms with a gathering of gentlemen, met confessedly without power, to advise about things ecclesiastical, any more than if they meet about other matters as nearly touching the progress of religion or

morality. In the nature of the case, there is little more reason why a Presbyterian Court should send delegates to, and receive delegates from, one of these bodies, than why it should do the like with a Bible Society, or any other benevolent association. Upon the whole, it seems to us manifest enough that the progress of the last ten years has widely changed the position of the Presbyterian Church in regard to Congregationalism. Congregationalism seems to have perceived this fact sooner than Presbyterianism did, and to have acted on it characteristically. There were not wanting those, in our Church, who, from the moment of the disruption, perceived that, if we were true to ourselves, this change must occur inevitably, from the past and established character of American Congregationalism; and who urged upon successive Assemblies the propriety of considering both the suggestions made above. The time had not then come — perhaps it has not yet come; possibly some unexpected change in the spirit and conduct of the other party may defer it for the present, or continually. Still, it is obvious that the position and spirit of the Presbyterian Church are not what they were before the disruption. Her inward life has developed itself on this important subject, as decidedly as on any other; and whatever course of conduct she may, on reflection, consider it her duty to adopt, there can be no doubt, it will be essentially modified, in accordance with the whole tenor of her vital developement since 1838. Before passing from this topic, we must express our regret, that only two, out of the numerous separate bodies of orthodox Presbyterians in the United States, are as yet in such relations with the General Assembly as to send delegates to it, and receive them from it. The German Reformed Church and the Dutch Reformed Church are the two referred to. All the rest of the orthodox Presbyterian bodies in America hold aloof from us. It is their fault, not ours. The sentiment has rapidly gained ground in the Presbyterian Church, that the bonds of union between all the orthodox Presbyterians in this country ought to be greatly strengthened; and the proceedings taken by the Assembly a few years ago, in connexion with the Bicentenary of the Westminster Assembly, were all pregnant with it. This is, beyond doubt, the true point at which to commence the great work of Christian union. Let no

Church insert prominently, in its creed, or insist in practice, upon any thing but what it judges to be essential truth — essential in itself, or essential in its connections ; but then, let every Church faithfully express and adhere to what it professes. This is the first point, and altogether fundamental in any concord amongst honest men. The second step is to be taken by the closer union of Churches essentially agreed — as, for example, by the great family of orthodox Presbyterians ; and until this step is taken, all progress beyond it, and in disregard of it, must necessarily be substantially impossible — for if those who do agree cannot agree, how can they agree who do not agree ? Agree they may, in non-essentials, or agree they may, to suppress the truth ; but neither of these is Christian union. The third step would be, to bring as near together as possible the several great classes of churches thus previously in concord, and would require to be adjusted on grounds different, in many respects, from the second step, but all of which presuppose that it had been taken. The failure which we have recently witnessed, of the grand experiment which exploded at London, is but a new proof of the fundamental truth of these views ; and, in one aspect, the general results of our whole relations with Congregationalism are another. The Presbyterian Church, since 1838, and more especially since the Bi-centenary of the Westminster Assembly brought the whole subject strongly under her consideration, has manifested an increasing earnestness in the right direction, upon this most interesting subject ; and this fact exhibits a striking symptom of the nature and tendency of the inward power that is at work in her bosom — a power which it is our express object to discover and to illustrate.

There are also foreign Churches in correspondence with the General Assembly. A French and an Irish Minister were present in her sessions — as was, not many years ago, an Asiatic Bishop — and were both heard on the state and claims of their respective Churches. These are noble exhibitions — precious tokens of a better day to come. The Presbyterian Church of Ireland and the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland are now in correspondence with us. A few years ago the United Secession Church of Scotland stood in the same relations to us — relations which seem to have been silently given up as unprofitable, to say the least.

Nor is it long since the Congregational Union of England and Wales sent commissioners to us, and we to them twice, across the ocean. It is significant that we have never done this since the disruption. It seems to have been considered ridiculous, as it indeed is, for a Church Court to send persons four thousand miles, across the seas, to represent it in a voluntary association of gentlemen, whose objects and efforts were nearly as much political as they were religious, and whose entire annual sessions did not occupy twenty four hours ; and no effort seems to have been made to renew the intercourse, even by letter, for some years past. With the Churches of the continent of Europe, no direct intercourse has ever been established. No one who has not spent some time in Europe can have any idea, how great and how general is the ignorance which prevails in regard to America and every thing in it, even amongst educated people ; nor, as to Great Britain, how great is the prejudice against this country. The intercourse between the United Secession Synod of Scotland, and the Congregational Union of England and Wales, and the Presbyterian Church of America, resulted, as we have intimated, in nothing permanently useful—and was soon abolished. That now existing with the Presbyterian Church of Ireland has been fruitful chiefly of irritating complaints against us ; and that with the Free Church of Scotland—undertaken on her part with the direct design, frankly avowed, of immediate and substantial advantage to herself—has been quickly transformed into an opportunity for annual lectures to us. It is a grand mistake to suppose, that any of the Churches of Europe are in a condition to become teachers of the Churches of this country ; and it is equally erroneous to imagine, that any of the Churches of Great Britain have the least idea that this is the true state of the case. Our country and our Church have a great destiny to work out—a grand mission to perform, no mean part of which is the influence to be exerted back upon Europe herself. The grand problems God has solved by us, in matters ecclesiastical, are more important to mankind, and are more pertinent to the state out of which Europe is struggling to emerge, than the analogous problems in matters temporal, whose solution on this continent will be one main cause of the political regeneration of mankind. In this respect the

Presbyterian Church in America occupies a position, rendered more effective and imposing by the consideration, that in Scotland, Ireland, Holland, France, Switzerland, and a large part of Germany, Presbyterianism is the prevailing, and to an immense extent, the almost exclusive form of Protestantism. It is a great error to judge the Presbyterianism of Ireland by Cook — that of France by the Monods, or that of Switzerland by D'Aubigné. There is not a Synod in our Church whose condition is not blessed, when spiritually compared with the best one in Europe — *possibly*, excepting Scotland. Difficulties exist amongst us — desolations surround us — vacant congregations — ministers inadequately supported — a state of piety far too low — of alms-giving, far, very far, beneath the proper standard — of effort and sacrifice, wholly inadequate. But taken, for all in all, it is the best that exists. They who have seen nearly all, may confidently assert it. Recent events abroad give this whole subject an inconceivable importance, and render it doubly necessary that the Presbyterian Church in this country should comprehend her real position, as regards foreign Presbyterian Churches, and be prepared to fulfil her great duty to them. If she could but make widely known amongst them, what she is, what she has done, and by what means God has brought her to her present estate, she would perform for them a service, which could not be estimated, and clear up before their vision, the darkness in which all of them walked so long, and amidst which most of them are still groping about. The Presbyterian Church of Ireland is still pensioned by the State; the Free Church of Scotland still embraces the union of Church and State as a settled article of faith; the Reformed Church of France is probably more than half Semi-Arian; that of Holland is still an intolerant Church; and throughout Switzerland and Germany, it is not saying too much to assert that the mass of the ministers are not sound in the faith, and that the mass of private professors give no sufficient evidence of true piety. A great reformation has been progressing, and in most countries of Europe, has produced immense fruits amongst the Reformed, which is but another name, for Presbyterian Churches. But a work still more immense remains to be accomplished. And the object of these statements is simply to make obvious our strong impression, that

the position of the Presbyterian Church in regard to all these foreign Churches—towards some more manifestly, towards others less so, but still towards all—is that of an example propounded for imitation—that of a fortunate sister ready and capable to teach great lessons, which God has taught her a century before them. Well and wisely, then, has the Assembly declined, from year to year, calmly and gently, yet firmly declined, to be schooled about questions of which they know little and we know every thing. Her duty calls her a step beyond. Let her clearly and loudly enunciate, for their guidance, in this, their dawn of deliverance, the grand truths—secrets yet to them—on which so much of her own strength depends. Let her proclaim the freedom of the Church, not half way, as in Scotland and Ireland, but wholly and clearly, as here. Let her lift up her voice for sound doctrine and scriptural order, the great primitive foundations of a true and stable Church. Let her plead for the exercise of that indispensable discipline, which will secure godliness in the members of the Church, and save it from the curse which, throughout Europe, cleaves to it, of being, to so deplorable an extent, an ungodly assemblage of unconverted men. Let her utter her loud testimony—a testimony accumulated through a century and a half—that such a Church, truly free, sound in faith and scriptural in order, filled with Godly men, may be implicitly relied on, to build up, to maintain and to extend, the kingdom of the Lord, not only without the aid, but under the frown of the powers of this world. And let her complete her sublime testimony with the solemn truth, that any Church essentially destitute of these conditions, supposing it to be in her power to secure them, neither deserves, nor will ever permanently enjoy, the blessings of God; while any Church having and faithfully keeping them, will never be forsaken of Him. What mission would be more glorious than one bearing along with her sympathy and prayers, a testimony like this, from the Presbyterian Church of America to her sister Churches in foreign lands, in this day of their extraordinary visitation, and of the fearful shaking of all things around them!

Our readers may be apt to conclude that it is time for us to advance into the body of the Assembly, upon the threshold of which they have been so long detained. Let

us, therefore enter the venerable body. The proceedings of all our Church Courts, it has always seemed to us, ought to be more fully recorded than they are. The interests of truth, the claims of history, the just responsibilities of persons and parties, would all be better consulted, as we suppose, if our Minutes were made to assume somewhat more the form of a full and regular journal of proceedings. It is often of as much importance to know what a body refuses to do, as to know what it does—or, more properly speaking, that which passes in the negative, is as really an action, as that which passes in the affirmative—and is, often, as important to be remembered; and it is far from being useless or uninteresting, to tell us, and to tell posterity, who suggested, and who matured, who spoiled and who defeated, measures that coming generations may judge of very differently from ourselves. To illustrate our idea about omissions and suppression, we will cite a remarkable instance which is exhibited in the Minutes before us, and for which the whole Assembly seems to be responsible. In the obituary notice of Dr. Ashbel Green, prepared by a Committee of the Assembly, and recorded in its Minutes, (pp. 22–24), not the slightest allusion is made to his illustrious part in the reform of the Church; nor to the fact that any such event had ever taken place: although that venerable man devoted a number of the best years of his life, mainly, to the service of the Church, in its critical history from 1830 to 1840, and performed, perhaps, the most important and the most fruitful duties of his whole life, in the eminent position he occupied, towards the Church, during those eventful years. At the period that he aided in forming the present constitution of the Church, he was a very young man—and by no means one of the most conspicuous of the actors on that occasion; his connection with the College of New Jersey, though useful and honourable, was not remarkable for any particular or lasting results; and his pastoral work was not specially distinguished from that of many of his cotemporaries. But his undoubted position as one of the chief leaders in the reform of the Presbyterian Church; his courage, his faith, his ability, in the convulsions which preceded and attended it; his vast influence, and the wisdom, firmness and moderation, with which he used it during

those eventful years, and throughout that fearful crisis: these are the very things that made him justly honoured,—and pointed him out, most signally, as a benefactor of mankind, and of the Church of God. And yet while the less important are clearly stated, the more important things are not even alluded to, in the somewhat protracted record of his death! This is very strange: and but for our personal knowledge of the Committee, that prepared the record,—and for so many other proofs of the character of the Assembly that adopted it, without objection — we should be obliged to say, was very ominous. As it is, it must, we suppose, be ranked with that general character of all our ecclesiastical Minutes, to which we have before alluded, which every careful — certainly every curious reader of them, must have noticed with regret, and for which our readers must make allowance, in perusing these pages.

During the controversies which preceded 1838, it came to be openly discussed, as a question of fact, what really were the standards of the Presbyterian Church—a discussion which was carried even into the Assembly itself: and it was received and practised, by a large portion of the New School party, as an indisputable rule of moral duty, that whatever those standards might be, and however clear their sense might appear to be,—they were obligatory on the conscience, only *for substance*, and that only in the signification given to them by the person who might receive them. Even these wide limits were found too narrow; and some of the earliest exercises of power, on the part of the New School body, were directed to fundamental changes, in the Presbyterian system. On the other hand, it is altogether characteristic to observe, how the Old School body has manifested, since the disruption, a growing attachment to the standards of the Church, a reluctance, more and more settled, to make any considerable changes in them, and a general and fixed purpose, to build itself upon the foundation and in the spirit of its ancient formularies. The indications of this general tendency were very striking in this Assembly of 1848, and we may class them among the safest and soundest symptoms a Church can exhibit. Truth is simple and uniform; above all truth, that which is divinely revealed is the most invariable; and that concerning which the divine revelation is ended, must be the most unchangeable. Dogmatic

theology would appear, therefore, to be the department of truth in regard to which, the minds of Christian men, from generation to generation, ought to remain the most uniformly settled—and the least liable to change or distraction. In like manner, questions of Church order,—supposing God to have revealed a form of Government for His church—which Presbyterians have constantly asserted, must be considered capable of final and definitive settlement, upon an unalterable authority. Positive and fundamental truth, thus reached, cannot be affected by any subsequent developments, short of a divine revelation; and all those new views which may be obtained by a closer consideration of the subject, or a more careful comparison of established truths, must generally be confined to the clearer elucidation of what is already known, either in itself, or in its relations—the weakness of the human faculties is so deplorable, and the vastness of the subject, both in itself, and its influence, is such, that it is a mark of wisdom and not of ignorance, to rely with diffidence on our individual conclusions, when they conflict with the general testimony of God's people, and the constant consent of successive ages, in which the Divine Spirit has never wholly forsaken the Church of Christ. That inward life of the Church, therefore, which prompts it to avoid all needless innovation, to shun all vain experiments, to settle itself into a permanent and fixed order, both of faith and action,—and to revert to ancient landmarks, and old paths, rather than to cast about for changes and inventions—is, to all appearances, the healthful life we should expect to find begotten and developed under the power of that truth, which is itself immutable; and it is, at all events, a life, a power, an inward movement, most distinguishable in itself, and most worthy to be understood, and observed. So also, the honest and faithful adherence to that which is professed,—the upright reception into one's own bosom, of the truth he delivers to others—with all its consequences,—the simple and sincere submission of our own conduct to our own principles—the settled and tenacious pursuit of our own established views; here, indeed, is another manifest and distinct form of life, which, to say the least, is firm and powerful, and which, as we judge, is both wise and pure.

Whether we turn our thoughts to the Doctrine, the Or-

der, the Discipline, or, if we may venture to add a fourth category, the Practice of the Church, during the last ten years, we shall find abundant facts to illustrate these suggestions. Scarcely a meeting of the Assembly has convened during that whole period, that questions deeply affecting one or the other, and frequently all, of these grand divisions, have not come prominently before the body, in a way to test the actual sentiment of the Church, and to exhibit the tendency of her developement. To assert that there has been an absolute constancy and uniformity of decision and action, in the right direction, would be great extravagance; nay, even to deny that there have been occasional and very serious departures from what seemed to us wise and right, would be uncandid. But if it be considered that the Church had been, for many years previous to 1838, in a condition most unsatisfactory to her most faithful children, and that she had been rapidly departing farther and farther from the safe and true course; if it be remembered that she was arrested in her downward career, and brought back to her ancient moorings, by means of very severe and unusual remedies—the ultimate effects of which might possibly be different from what was hoped; if it be borne in mind, that after 1838, she was launched upon a new course, and that after a great declension and a great convulsion—and that what we are now seeking is evidence of the manner in which she has borne herself in her new career—we may confidently assert, that the current of proof is most satisfactory and conclusive, and the mass of her decisions and actions clearly indicative, that the impulse which is bearing her onward is right and powerful. Let a few examples suffice: In regard to *Doctrine*: how pertinacious have been the efforts with which she has been tormented, in every form, to change her faith on the subject of incestuous marriages? And yet, the more the subject has been discussed, the more apparent is the settled faith of the Church in the statements embodied in her standards; and, though she has been entrapped into some hurtful and inconsistent decisions, still her purpose to stand by her faith and to require her members, and especially her office bearers, to do the same, has not wavered, and, we trust and believe, never will. In regard to *Discipline*: how steadily and earnestly has she been tempted, on every hand, and from

every quarter, on the difficult and dangerous question of slavery? And yet, unseduced and unterrified, she has adhered, through good report and ill report, to her ancient testimonies. Not presuming to defend every form of expression she may have uttered, in regard to this vast and intricate question, we must, in all candour, allow that there has been, throughout her long and repeated testimonies, a consistency and a fixedness extremely remarkable amidst the convulsions and changes of the last hundred years; and the steadiness and intelligence with which she has, during the last ten years, and upon repeated consideration of the subject, amidst the storm of passion beating upon her from every extreme of opinion, and from both sides of the Atlantic, still vindicated her settled discipline, and proceeded in the more ample execution of her fixed opinions, is a phenomenon worthy to be studied—a proof of heroic devotion to her convictions, and a symptom of the nature and force of her inward life, amongst the most striking in all her history. If it consisted with the particular design of these observations, there is much that ought to be said upon this aspect of the history and developement of the Church; as it does not, it may suffice to remark, that, in our opinion, the testimony of the Church, taken as a whole, and subject to the exception we have already expressed, is not only wise, moderate, and scriptural, but that it presents, perhaps, the only ground upon which the religious denominations of the country, if not the country itself, can be saved from division and disunion. Surely, it is no small praise, that this Church has occupied, and has steadily maintained, a position so important. Again, as to *Church Government*: every one must be familiar with the discussions and agitations which have occurred since the disruption, in regard to the nature and source of all Church power—the relations of the Ministers of the Gospel to the Church and its Courts—the position, rights and powers of Ruling Elders—the nature and constitution of Church Courts—and similar questions. These have been matters of high dispute in the Church of God, from a very early period of her history; they will continue to be fundamental points of division amongst Christian sects as long as the Despotism of Popery, the high Aristocracy of Episcopacy, the Republicanism of Presbyterianism, and the Anarchy of Congregational-

ism, are maintained in the world. The followers of each class of these theories have always been subject to subdivisions amongst themselves. The Congregationalism of America is very different from that of Europe ; Prelacy has its High and its Low Church ; and even Popery is not all Ultra-montane. The Presbyterian body, perhaps, has always had in its bosom subdivisions of an analogous kind ; and the same laxness which permitted Congregationalism to infuse its elements so extensively throughout her system, extended to all her opinions, especially in regard to the Government of the Church. It is very manifest, that serious differences of opinion, on all the questions stated above, do now exist in the Church ; and that principles, some of which are thoroughly Prelatical, and others as thoroughly Congregational, are not only extensively held, but have received countenance from various Church Courts, if not from the Assembly itself — some of whose very worst acts have related to this general subject. Various propositions have been made, in relation to those Ministers who, having no cure of souls, still continue to exercise church power ; and various questions have arisen, in regard to the nature of the Ruling Elder's office. It is not very clear what interpretation should be given to the general action of the Church, taken as a whole, on all these subjects ; nor is it, by any means, certain, what is the actual state of her opinions, in regard to them. For our own part, our belief is, that the testimony of Scripture, the sense of our ecclesiastical standards, and the very nature of the case, must control the decisions of every really sound Presbyterian Church in the direction of that strict and ancient order from which we had greatly departed ; and many indications exist to prove that the sentiment of our Church is setting in that direction. To a certain extent, there is, perhaps, a sectional division, on several of the disputed points ; the South and West, inclining in what we consider the right direction, while the Eastern section of the Church, upon these, as upon various other matters, seems the slowest to shake off the spell of the past generation. The subject is one of far more importance than many have supposed, and will, according to the manner in which its various parts are disposed of, exert an important influence over the future character of the Church. In regard to the matter — which

several late Assemblies have had under consideration, and which has been several times, in several different forms, submitted to the Presbyteries—touching the Demission of the ministerial office, we judge it to be wholly impossible to determine, by the votes given, what was the state of opinion which produced them—seeing the most various, and, indeed, opposite principles, might have conspired to secure the result, as yet reached. The very agitation of the subject under consideration, is a proof that the Church sees something worthy of her serious examination; and the indeterminate nature of her acts, in regard to it, is proof that her general sentiment is scarcely, as yet, thoroughly fixed. May God give her grace to remember that she has no more power to make a government than a creed; her sole mission, in both cases, being to ascertain and to declare the mind of God. And, finally, touching her *Action*, a few words: And here are two distinct questions—one regarding the *nature*, the other respecting the *power*, of the action itself. In regard to the former question, it is well known that many of the soundest members of the Church are of opinion, that the general practice of the Church shared the fate of her doctrine, her discipline, and her order, and was, to a great extent, adulterated during the long and close embrace of Congregationalism. The mode of conducting revivals of religion—even of admitting members into the church—the very manner of conducting public worship, both for substance and for form—the introduction of little creeds and covenants for separate congregations—the manner of training ministers, collecting funds, and conducting even our largest operations—voluntary Societies—Boards—Agencies—great gatherings to manufacture fictitious excitement—turning our Church Courts into exhortatory instead of business meetings; endlessly, and every where, did the leaven work, and, perhaps, to a considerable degree, works still. Many things have been corrected—many are in the process of correction. During the last Assembly, the movement, though slight in some cases, and perhaps not fortunate in some others, was yet clear, that it is the mind of the Church to assert her just and rightful control over Boards, Seminaries, Agents, and every thing else; and to vindicate, more and more, the great principles of subordination and accountability, throughout all her

borders and all her institutions. The thing for the Church to do, it seems to us, is to perform herself, and by her own divinely appointed means, the whole work committed to her by her Saviour. Until she sees this great and precious truth in all its fulness, it is the next best thing that can happen, that she should hold firmly and steadily in her hands an effectual control over all the appliances and means she has seen fit to create, to aid her in her work; and seeing that things are as they are, this is, perhaps, the natural way for her to pass from her former to her true position. It is a stage in her true progress; and the proof that she has entered upon that stage, is, in the same degree, an indication that she is developing herself aright. As it regards the *power* with which the Church has acted since 1838—compared with her previous movement—and the manifestations of her rapidly increasing efforts, in every good and every great enterprise—the indications are such as ought to fill our hearts with joy. How many churches have been built—how many souls converted—what a vast increase in numbers—what a prodigious extension of her borders—what immense sums collected to endow schools, colleges, and seminaries—to print books—to educate ministers—to spread the Gospel through the earth! In 1838, the Church was mainly dependent on a close corporation, located in Boston, for her facilities in the great work of Foreign Missions, and her Assembly was without any direct agency at all in this glorious work. In 1848, her most extensive operation is her Foreign Missionary work; she has a Synod erected in India, and a member on her floor represents a Presbytery on the Ganges! Ah! these are proofs, never to be mistaken, that God is with her—that a true life is within her—and that she is accomplishing a glorious developement.

The practical application of truth to life is one of the severest tests by which to determine the real condition and tendency of a Church. To perceive truth with clearness, and to hold it with some steadiness, do not necessarily imply that vigor and fidelity which are necessary, in its strict practical enforcement. Along with these latter qualities, a calm, patient and just consideration of the rights and responsibilities of individuals, who may be personally implicated, and a corresponding regard to what is demanded by

the purity of religion and the glory of God, are indispensably necessary in the righteous decision of every case in which the Church interprets and applies the mind of God. It is not wonderful, therefore, that this most difficult part of the administration of the affairs of the Church, is generally the most neglected part; and it is hardly saying too much to assert, that its wise, honest and enlightened execution is one of the surest indications of a highly prosperous condition of the Church. The thing we here intend is Discipline, in its large sense—that watchful care of the flock of Christ, and that firm, but affectionate enforcement of the laws of His Kingdom, which pervades and regulates the outward life of every member, every officer, every congregation, every court, in it. Herein lies the practical and daily proof, that the Church is not a voluntary association, but that it is a real power, ordained of God; and herein is the incessant appeal to Christ, as the only Head of that Kingdom which He purchased with His blood, and to His laws, as the only, but still the constant rule of conduct for all who are members of it. Before 1838, there was scarcely such a thing—at least, for many years—as a sound and Christian Discipline, in this sense, in the Presbyterian Church. How much false doctrine—how much disorderly conduct—how much evil, the Church would endure, no one could determine; but the notion that she could not safely endure any, was so far from being the common sentiment, that the uttering of it was seldom, if ever, heard. Such cases as came before the Church Courts generally, and more especially before the Assembly, were decided far more by their party aspect, than their own merits—when really decided at all; and were, most frequently, evaded, compromised, or suppressed—unless when the guilty were openly acquitted, or the wrong publicly made to triumph. The calm, impartial, honest trial of cases, in the Assembly, upon their merits, was, most certainly, not the ordinary rule, for ten years preceding the disruption of the Church. Whoever, with recollections upon his mind, will read the published Minutes of the Assembly of 1848, will be struck with astonishment, and, we think, admiration, at the extraordinary change manifested in the conduct of that Court, on this whole subject, in all its bearings. It is not so much to the conclusions which the Assembly arrived at, in the

various difficult matters of Discipline brought before it, to which we now allude, as it is to the manner in which they were all taken up, investigated, and decided. In this aspect of the matter, there is scarcely any thing, in all the manifested life of the Church, during ten years, that is more striking or hopeful. Perfect justice to individuals, without respect of persons, and without fear, favor, or affection—perfect fidelity to truth, without regard to time, place, or circumstance—these are the ancient, distinctive traits of true Presbyterian Discipline. And, surely, every indication of their existence and living power, ought to be hailed with joy—above all, by those who have witnessed the ruin brought on the Church by their extinction, and who have watched the multiplied blessings which have attended their renewed life. No one, who has not participated in such duties, can be fully aware of the difficulty and self-denial involved in an attempt, on the part of nearly two hundred conscientious men, to spend parts of four or five days, in the midst of other business, in unravelling and deciding a complicated case of Discipline. No thoughtful man can fail to see the dangers, both to persons on trial, and to truth itself, incident to examinations and decisions which are final, under such circumstances. It is in this view, especially, that the question concerning *Commissions*, of all Church Courts, and particularly of those that are high and numerous, are so important, and are attracting so much attention. It can scarcely be doubted, that, if it be lawful and proper to establish them, they would be of immense advantage, in many respects; and as, from the nature of the case, their determinations would always be liable to the revision of the particular Court that constituted them, it is not easy to see how they could be used to the injury, either of the truth, or of persons on trial. That they are lawful, seems to us evident. No one doubts that it is lawful to appoint *Committees*, that are far more permanent than it was ever contemplated to make *Commissions*. There is really no difference between the two, except this, that the former are appointed to examine and report—the latter, to examine and decide; and the Church Court appointing them, has the same power to reverse, if it pleases, the decision of its Commission, as to confirm the report of its Committee. The General Assembly has been in the con-

stant habit of appointing permanent Committees, and that of persons not members of the body ; and all the Boards of the Church are really nothing but permanent Commissions, for Executive, instead of Judicial, business—or else they are utterly indefensible in their conception and their action. But, the very doubt of the lawfulness of Commissions arises from a misconception of the nature and origin of church power. The General Assembly does not derive its power from the Presbyteries, nor is it limited to the exercise of powers named in the Constitution of the Church. It derives its powers, and its very right to exist and act, from God himself, and may, *the Bible alone considered*, do every act which any lawfully constituted Church court may do. *The Constitution of the Church considered*, the Assembly is specially bound, by a human Covenant, to do the things therein required of it, and to abstain from doing, any thing therein prohibited to it—as for example, not to constitute with less than fourteen Commissioners ; but in no wise, is it bound by that Constitution, to abstain from doing any thing, not therein forbidden to it—which might otherwise lawfully be done. The notion that it can do nothing, but what that Constitution allows and provides, is utterly repugnant to the original Constitution of the body, to the history of our own, and other Presbyterian Churches, to the nature of the case, and to the Divine oracles. For our part, we would travel a day's journey, to see the General Assembly ordain one Foreign Missionary. The true analogy of our Constitution, is to those of the States, not to that of the Federal Union ; and instead of saying our Church courts can do nothing, but as they are allowed and directed by the Constitution of the Church,—which is the case of the Federal Government,—it is far truer to say, they can do any thing not forbidden in the Constitution, which is the case of the State Governments. The reason is obvious. The Bible, and not the Constitution, is the real source of power ; the Constitution being only a Covenant in which we have agreed, to a certain, and very limited extent, what is the sense of the Bible ; but not *all* its sense, on the subject of Order and Discipline. Our belief is very strong, that the best thing the Assembly could do, in the present matter, would be annually to appoint, before it adjourns, a Commission of its own members, who, with such other

members of the body, as chose to attend, should sit after the Assembly adjourned, and hear and determine, all cases of Appeal and Complaint; and that, the next succeeding Assembly should confirm, by its vote, the decisions of the Commission; unless, in very difficult or important cases, in which, upon a short and clear brief of the facts in proof, and the principles involved, the Assembly should review the decision of the Commission, and determine the case afresh. Such is the practice of the Church of Scotland. Such, or some thing similar, must, we suppose, ultimately become the practice of our Assembly—or very important, and we fear, very hurtful changes, may be resorted to, either in the Constitution and powers, of the Assembly itself—as for instance, to deprive it of its universal appellate jurisdiction; or in the mode of trying causes before it, to such an extent, as to amount to a ruinous delay of justice, or even to its denial. It will be impossible, materially to change the present relations of the Assembly to the Church, without running the risk of introducing principles, which are totally at war with Presbyterianism, or others, which may, at last, by their unforeseen effects, subvert the whole fabric. To resort to Synodical, instead of Presbyterial representation, in order to get a small Assembly, for the dispatch of business, which some have insisted on; is to remove the Assembly, too far from the people, and the Churches,—to reduce the importance, and change essentially and injuriously, the position of the Presbyteries, and to alter, in many important particulars, the character and relations of the Synods themselves; the result of all which changes, in the course of years, is far beyond the wisdom of man to foresee. On the other hand, to strip the Assembly of its full and universal jurisdiction, as the Assembly, in which the Church itself, is met, which others have advocated, is simply, and at a blow, to revolutionize the Church itself, and to convert it from one Church, into as many Churches as there may be Synods. As a prudential matter, therefore, the friends of our present Church order, may find in the establishment of such Commissions, as we have indicated, one of the most permanent safeguards, of very important and fundamental principles.

Many other topics suggest themselves, some perhaps, more interesting than several of those to which we have

alluded, by which to illustrate, in connection with the Minutes, which we have made the basis of these observations, the progress of the inward life of the Church, during the last ten years. We have already, perhaps, occupied too much space in the developement of our conception. The subject, however, is worthy of deep consideration, and large and frequent exposition; and we are not aware of its having been attempted in this light before. The life of man—his real, inward life—is developing itself, day by day; and will, probably, continue to do so eternally. Every corporation, state assembly, and body, constituted of men, must necessarily be subject to the same grand law, during their whole existence; and amongst the rest, the visible Church. In it, as in man himself—the indications of its condition and tendency, may neither be so positive nor so numerous, as to satisfy a casual observer. It is not, on that account, less important to study them. The virus of disease often fatally poisons the human system, before even the victim himself, is aware of any danger; and the moral condition of a Church, may be well nigh desperate, before malignant symptoms are palpable, even to good men, in and around her. When a few ministers and elders, in the Assembly of 1831, made a determined stand, against what seemed to them, manifest and crying heresies, corruptions and disorders, they were treated with open derision; and when the Act and Testimony was issued in 1834, its authors and immediate promoters, were denounced as traducers of good men, and disturbers of God's Church. Yet, in 1837, nearly one half of the Church, was found to be in a condition of flagrant departure from her doctrine and order—and in 1838, were no longer in her communion. A few more years of indifference would have placed the New School party, in the absolute control of the Church, and her destinies; and the orthodox would have had only the alternative, of making a feeble secession, or of being tolerated amidst the corruptions of the Church of their fathers. Nor was it mainly, if at all, the great and trusted men of that day, or of this day, that gave notice of the impending danger; nor the metropolitan churches and institutions of either day, that lifted up the voice of warning. Nor have those who saw the danger, and gave the warning, and stood in the breach, when few stood by them, escaped the

common fate, meted out, in this world, to such as are faithful in times of darkness. Many of them are gone to unhonoured graves ; many live on, in unnoticed obscurity ;—few, very few, have either sought or received the just consideration of the Church, which God made them the means of saving. It is enough, that God put on them so great an honour. It is enough, that their labour was full of precious fruit. It is enough, that succeeding years have demonstrated the wisdom of their counsels, the righteousness of their acts. The proofs we have been now exhibiting of the state and prospects of the Church they loved so tenderly—establish the very things, for which they laboured and prayed ; and if they tend to awaken in the Church, a deeper gratitude for God's past mercies, a more earnest watchfulness over her own life, and higher efforts to accomplish her destiny, they will have the effect they would have desired. The Semi-Pelagian controversy in the Presbyterian Church, is the most fearful crisis through which that Church has passed, since it was planted in America. The catastrophe in which it terminated in 1838, including the events of 1837 and 1839, is the most important era in her history. The influences springing from that controversy and that catastrophe, will not pass away with the generation which witnessed those great events. The time has come for those influences, so far as our Church is concerned, to begin to make themselves distinctly visible. Great lessons are to be learned by their faithful contemplation. Great duties are to be performed, by their wise and powerful developement. It is under the impression of these important truths, that we have endeavoured, with candour and simplicity, to trace a few great outlines of a subject, which on many accounts, is obnoxious to the present generation ; which the Church itself has not, perhaps, fully appreciated, but which those who follow us, will, probably, regard with profound interest.

ARTICLE II.

THE DEACONSHIP : *A Treatise on the Office of Deacon, with Suggestions for its Revival in the Church of Scotland.* By the REV. JOHN G. LORIMER, of Glasgow. Edinburgh : 1842.

The above work is by the author of a valuable treatise on the Eldership, and is very timely and important. It is an index to the sentiment now prevailing, that the revival of the office of Deacon is of vital importance to the increase and prosperity of the Presbyterian Church, in all its branches. We have concluded, therefore, to bring this matter before our readers in such a plain and practical method as may conduce to this end.

On the question of the Divine institution, authority and perpetuity of the office of Deacon, there is no difference of opinion among Christian Churches of every age and denomination. So far as there is any faith in an organized visible Church, and in Divinely appointed officers in that Church, there is but one sentiment among Oriental, Papal and Protestant Churches, on these points. The office of Deacon, in some form, has been maintained, as of Divine authority, in every Christian Church, from the beginning of the Christian era until the present time. This uniformity of opinion and practice arises from the clear and explicit manner in which the Scriptures speak concerning Deacons. The original appointment of Deacons is given at length in the 6th chapter of the book of Acts. In the enumeration of the officers of the Church, by the Apostle Paul, in Romans, ch. 12, he mentions this office where he says, (v. 7,) as it is in the original, "let those who hold the office of Deacon (*διακονιαν*) give themselves to the Deaconship, or to the duties of the Deaconship." In his first epistle to the Corinthians also, (ch. 12 : 28,) the Apostle says : "God hath set some in the Church ;" and, in enumerating the officers thus set in the Church by God, he mentions "helpers"—by which, as has been generally understood, he means Deacons. The epistle to the Philippian Church—and through it, be it remembered, to all Christian Churches,

is addressed to "the Bishops," or Ministers, "and Deacons;" thus teaching that every Church must have these officers. (1.) The Apostle Peter also is believed to refer to them, (1 Pet. 4: 11,) in the words, "if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth." And still further; in the directions given to all Churches, to the end of time, in the epistle to Timothy, the qualifications of Ministers, or Bishops, and of Deacons, are given at length. 1 Tim. 3: 1-15. In this epistle we learn also that female, as well as male Deacons, were appointed under Divine authority, whose character and qualifications, and, therefore, their perpetuity, are clearly laid down. And we agree most cordially with those Churches of the Reformation, and with many of the most learned Divines, (2) in believing that the Church at large loses very much, in not appointing suitable females to attend, under official sanction and authority, to all those various interests of female members of the Church, which they, and they alone, can properly superintend and promote. And we cannot but express the hope, therefore, that our Churches in this country, will see the advantage of following the example of the Reformed Churches in France and elsewhere, who are now availing themselves of the services of females, in the accomplishment of many labours of love which are now neglected or very partially performed.—(3.) Of how much service would many of our devoted female disciples be, were they consecrated by an open and formal request of the Church, to the furtherance of "every good word and work," which might be found compatible with their sex and their opportunity.

While, however, as has been stated, no difference has ever arisen as to the *Divine origin and perpetuity* of the office of Deacon, there have been, and there now exist, differences as it regards the functions or duties of Deacons. In the Romish, Oriental, Prelatical, and some other Churches,

(1.) Some also suppose, as the original word would admit, that Epaphras and Tychicus were Deacons. See Col. 4: 12, and Col. 1: 7, and 4: 7; and Dr. Winter's Sermon on the Office of Deacon. Lond. 1822. p. 4, 5.

(2.) See the authorities from Scripture, the Fathers, and the Reformers, given at length in Voetius Polit. Eccl., tom. 3: § 508, &c. See also the North British Review for Nov., 1847, p. 160, and the whole article.

(3.) See an article containing an account of all the existing institutions of Deaconesses in France, Germany, and England, and of a projected one in this country, in the Edinburgh Review for April, 1848.

Deacons are considered a lower class of their various ministerial orders. But for this theory there is manifestly and avowedly no warrant whatever in the Scriptures. This, indeed, is admitted, and can be proved, by the primitive Fathers, by the leading authorities in the Romish Church, and by the most able and capable writers of the Episcopal Church, as, for instance, Lightfoot, Riddle, Bishop Croft, Hadrian, Sarava, Archbishop Wake, Archbishop Whately, Dr. Hinds of Oxford, Mr. Palmer, Archbishop Potter, and Mr. Bingham. (4.)

There is, however, an opposite extreme of opinion and practice on this subject, by which this office is merged into that of the Ruling Elder, so as to admit of only one class of officers besides the Minister. This is now the case in Congregational Churches in which these officers are called Deacons, (5) and in many Presbyterian Churches where they are called Ruling Elders. This practice, however, as

(4.) See these quoted in the work, by Dr. Smyth, on Presbytery and not Prelacy, the Scriptural and Primitive Polity of the Churches. B. 1, ch. 12.

(5.) This will be evident from the following quotations from a recent paper on the subject of Deacons adopted by the Manchester and Salford Deacon's Association, in England, and published in the London Christian Witness for July, 1848, p. 231 :

"It is presumed that the Deacons of our Churches do, in the main, perform these or corresponding duties, and many others supplementary to them, which differing circumstances render necessary, and some of which, in the lapse of time, have become established usages; such as those connected with —

1. The general interests of the Churches to which they respectively belong, their places of worship, and the times and arrangements of Divine service.

2. The right management of all the religious and benevolent institutions connected with the several Churches, for which the Deacons are chiefly responsible.

3. The examination and encouragement of young converts previous to admission.

4. The distribution of the bread and wine at the Lord's Supper.

5. The visitation of backsliders with a view to their restoration.

6. The keeping and rendering an account, when necessary, of the money committed to their charge. To which may be added, as the duties of Deacons —

7. To note the attendance of the members at public and social worship, and at the table of the Lord:

8. To visit at regular intervals the seatholders in their places of worship at their own dwellings, for religious purposes; with some others which might be mentioned."

There is here an evident amalgamation of the duties of the Eldership and Deaconship in one.

it is in open contrariety to Scripture; so is it also an innovation upon the long continued and established order of both these Churches. The Waldenses, Wickliffe, Tyndal, the Lutheran Church, the Genevan Church, the Swiss Churches, the French Protestant Church, the Belgic and Dutch Churches, the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, Ireland, and England at every period, the Puritans and Nonconformists, the Independent or Congregational Churches in England and in this country, until within a comparatively recent date—all these concurred in recognizing the distinction between the office of Deacon and the office of Ruling Elder; in laying down both offices in their form of government, as of Divine institution, and in employing both in the actual management of their Churches. (6.)

Why then, it may be asked, have these offices been to so great an extent merged into one to the confusion of their respective functions, and to the great neglect of many duties designed to be accomplished by both. This confusion I attribute mainly to the want of a definite and clear discrimination between the sphere of duty and the ecclesiastical relations of these two classes of officers. And it is to their ambiguity and indefiniteness of opinion the practical difficulties experienced by many Churches, who are now re-establishing the office of Deacon, are to be traced.

Let us then endeavor to define the relative position of Deacons in relation to the Pastor, Minister, or Bishop, and to the Ruling Elders.

THE PASTOR OR MINISTER,* has, in Scripture, obtained different names expressive of his various duties. As he has the oversight of the flock of Christ, he is termed "Bishop." As he feeds them with spiritual food, he is called "Pastor." As he serves Christ in his Church, he is styled "Minister." As it is his duty to be grave and prudent, and an example to the flock, and to govern well in the house and kingdom of Christ, he is termed "Presbyter or Elder." As he is the messenger of God, he is denominated "the Angel of the Church." As he is sent to declare the will of God to sinners, and to beseech them to be reconciled to God, through

(6.) See quoted in Lorimer on the Office of Deacons, ch. iv. and ch. v. Edinb., 1842.

* See Smyth's Ecclesiastical Catechism.

Christ, he is named "Ambassador." And, as he dispenses the manifold grace of God, and the ordinances instituted by Christ, he is termed "Steward of the mysteries of God."

It is made the duty of the Pastor, according to the Scriptures, to preach the Gospel, and to explain and enforce the Scriptures; to conduct the different parts of public worship; to dispense the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper; to administer Church discipline; to oversee the religious state of persons and families; and thus to rule in the Church according to the laws of Christ.

The essential character of the Pastor, is, therefore, that of public authoritative teaching, together with the general superintendence and watch of all the interests of the Church, and hence it is obvious that, in order to be qualified to discharge these various and constant duties, he must be wholly and permanently devoted to the studies and to the practice of his profession. And it is equally plain, that in the manner of his introduction, and his responsibilities while in the office of the Ministry, he *ought* to be, as he is, subject to a body not directly and immediately under the control of the people, since otherwise the whole truth, and order, and interests represented by him, would be subjected to mere popular opinion. As a Minister, he stands *primarily* related to the Church at large and to the Presbytery of which he is a member. A man, therefore, may be a Minister and yet not a Pastor, and can become the Pastor of a particular Church and discharge acceptably his duties to that Church, only by the free and prevailing good-will, affection, and respect of the great body of the members of that Church.

Were there, however, only Ministers in the Church, or were only Ministers allowed to sit, deliberate, and vote in all the conventions, conferences, councils, associations, or, as we call them, judicatories of the Church, then that Church in its government, would be a hierarchy, and would be *essentially*, whatever it might be *practically*, a ministerial or spiritual despotism. (7.) Christ, however, has constituted His Church a Commonwealth or Republic, in which "all are brethren," and over which none are to have irre-

(7.) "It is," says Chevalier Bunsen, "on this union of the laity the popular strength of the Church rests. If the Church of the Pays De Vaud had been a Church organized as a whole, and not as a mere Clergy-Church,

sponsible dominion. Power, therefore, is given by Christ to His people, in accordance with the constitution, charter, and rules prescribed in His word, to govern His Church, appoint its officers, direct its order, enforce its discipline, and secure its efficiency. The essential feature of a republic is representation—that is, in a republic as distinguished from a monarchy, power is exercised by the people. But in distinction from a pure democracy the people exercise this power, not directly and in mass, but through their chosen representatives, to whom it is delegated in trust, and by whom it is directly and immediately enforced. In a republic, therefore, the people make use of their power directly and in person, only in their elections and at no other time.

Now, as it regards the whole doctrine, order, government and discipline of the church, which is a spiritual republic, these representatives of the members of the church, who are chosen by them, and who are empowered to represent them, are **RULING ELDERS**. These “representatives of the people,” so named in our standards, are called *Elders*, not on account of their age, since Ministers are also called Elders, who ought certainly in every point of view to be of an age more mature and established than Ruling Elders, and yet are ordained at a very early age. The name Elder is, in both cases, one of dignity and not of age; and these officers are called **RULING ELDERS**, because they are appointed to assist the Bishop, who is the Teaching Elder, in the government of the church, from which therefore they are distinguished by being called *Ruling Elders*. This name was derived from the order of the Jewish synagogue, in which, besides a Bishop, who was also called Presbyter or Elder, there was a bench of Elders, who were associated with the Bishop in authority, and to whom were committed the general powers of government and discipline. The importance of this office of Ruling Elder is founded in nature, reason and necessity. The power of the church was vested by Christ in the whole body of its members; but as these cannot all meet together to transact business,

and governed by a general mixed Synod instead of the classes of the Clergy, she would have been able to resist with a very different result the brutal force of godless radicalism.”

or all act as officers, there must be Ruling Elders or Delegates appointed by them for these purposes.

The general duties of Ruling Elders are these—To act with the Bishop or Pastor, as “helps and governments,” in the exercise of ecclesiastical authority; to watch over the flock, assist in the admission or exclusion of members, warn and censure the unruly, visit and comfort the afflicted, instruct the young, and exhort and pray, as opportunity may be given. Ruling Elders possess authority, equally with the Bishops or Pastors, as rulers, though not as teachers: for as the Bishop is ordained not only to rule, but also to teach, Elders are equally bound, with the other members of the church, to obey him in the Lord, and to receive his instructions, so far as they are agreeable to the word of God. The qualifications for the office of Ruling Elder are sincere piety, sound principles, prudence, zeal, and unblemished reputation. Ruling Elders therefore represent the people in all the general interests of the church; and as they are many in every single congregation, while the Pastor is but one and acts only as Chairman or President, it is evident that every Presbyterian congregation is, to the greatest possible extent and in the strictest possible manner, a republic, analagous to our civil municipal constitutions; and as the number of Ruling Elders *must* always equal and *may* almost always outnumber that of Ministers in every other judicatory of the church, as they *necessarily* do in the Church Session, and as in all these judicatories they sit on a perfect equality with the ministers, the whole government of the Presbyterian Church is manifestly and entirely republican. (8.)

DEACONS stand related to the Pastor and Ruling Elders, as the magistrates or other local civil officers of the city do

(8) “We may notice here,” says the N. British Review, “by the way, the somewhat cavalier manner in which Bunsen,” in his *Church of the Future*, there reviewed, “occasionally treats systems with whose practical working he is evidently but little acquainted. Thus, throughout, he speaks of Presbyterianism as a government of self-election in the hands of a self-renewing corporation, without once noticing the leading feature of that polity as it exists, not fettered as perhaps it is in Switzerland, but free and unembarrassed, as in America and elsewhere,—we mean the principle which secures a thorough popular representation in the ruling body, as well as a large measure of liberty in each particular congregation, through the power of choice vested in the body of the Christian people.”

to the Mayor and Council. The Pastor and Elders constitute the Church Council, are made responsible for the general government and direction of its spiritual concerns, and represent therefore these interests as well as those of the church at large, in all its various judicatories. Deacons, on the other hand, are local officers, charged with local interests, and called upon to discharge local duties. Their field is bounded by a particular church, and by particular interests in that church. They are *ecclesiastical* officers, in distinction from such as are merely appointed by the congregation (9) for purposes limited to the legal, fiscal, or territorial arrangements of the church. Deacons are of *divine* institution, under divine sanction and blessing, and are intended to promote directly the welfare of the body of Christ. In these respects they resemble the Elders, and are, therefore, nominated, chosen and ordained like them. But, in distinction from the Elders, Deacons are *executive* and not legislative officers, designed for practical efficiency and not for deliberative counsel. They carry out and accomplish what is thus determined by the session. To the session belongs whatever pertains to the ministry of the word, and to the doctrine, order, discipline and government of the church; and under their direction, superintendence and controul, Deacons coöperate in the promotion of "every good word and work." To the Deacons pertains the actual management and practical discharge of every duty not included under the head of doctrine, order, or discipline, which the prosperity of the church and of every member of the church demands, and which are not provided for by some other arrangement of the church. As, however, no buildings were possessed by Christians in Apostolic times, it is not *necessary* to suppose that the erection, the repairs, the chartering, the holding and the directing of these and other church property, should be given exclusively to the Deacons, as most assuredly they cannot, in consistency with their functions, be given to Ruling Elders or to the session as such; and since Deacons can only act under the direction and in coöperation with the Elders, it would seem that every church is left to manage the business

(9.) On the different modes of electing Deacons, see Voetius, tom iii. p. 507.

of erecting, repairing, paying for and holding in legal trusteeship, the property of the church, by officers of its own independent appointment. In this way, the possibility of an ecclesiastical hierarchy and of a close spiritual corporation is prevented, while the opportunity of awakening deep personal interest in the affairs of the church is more widely extended. (10.)

On the other hand, since the whole theory of the church, as understood by Presbyterians, supposes that no body or association of ecclesiastical or spiritual officers can exist

(10.) The vital principle of Presbyterian Church government is the subordination of every court of the church to one above it, up to the Supreme Court or General Assembly, so that there is and can be no irresponsible authority. As, therefore, the Session is the only authorised court in a particular church, for government, Deacons must be in subordination to and under the controul and direction of the Session, just as the Session is to the Presbytery, and so on. No important business ought to be undertaken by the Deacons without the concurrence of the Session, with whom they ought to consult, and to whom, at a regular quarterly or special meeting, they ought to submit their records, their Treasurer's account, and their plans or suggestions. In this way their proceedings are brought under review and come up before the higher courts, to whom the Deacons can refer any doubtful case, by the usual modes of *reference*, *appeal*, or *complaint*.

By not keeping this principle in view, as appears from the following extract from *The Banner* of Canada, the Free Church of Scotland have already encountered much practical difficulty:

"He then alluded to the extraordinary demands of Deacon's Courts," that is, a court independent of the Session, and also of any temporal officers, such as Trustees or Committees appointed by the congregation, "*which was an excrescence on the constitution of the church, never heard of, till after the disruption*, and which was continually, through misunderstanding as to what was its province, involving them in discussion."—*Proceedings of Free Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, from the Scottish Guardian, 19th Oct.*

"The words within inverted commas, fell from a member of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, and the speaker was no other than the Rev. Andrew King. Less than three years appear to have made a great change on the views of our reverend friend, on that subject. The Deacon's Court is declared to be an excrescence on the constitution of the church, unknown till after the disruption: the very thing we told Mr. King when he was here, and published in the *Banner*, and which he was so grievously offended at that he sent a bull from Montreal, as he was about to embark, abusing us for our presumption. It might have been scarcely worth while to notice this subject, and, as far as Mr. King is concerned, we would not have done so, if we had not regarded the Deacon's Court as a dangerous invasion on the rights of the Presbyterian people in every church really desirous to be "free." It is because, under the shelter of that court, the whole temporalities of the church are thrown into the spiritual courts, which conveys a Popish and Prelatical and Methodistical power to these courts, which will injure their spirituality and may ultimately bring ruin on the church."

within it, independent of the review and controul of the several judicatories of the church, it is evident that as the sessional records and proceedings are all submitted to the review and controul of the Presbytery, and those of the Presbytery to the Synod, and those of the Synod to the General Assembly, so ought the Records and the whole business of the Deacons to come under the review and controul of the session; and so ought the direction of the property of the church, when placed in other hands than those of the Deacons, to be so ordered as not in any way to interfere with *that controul* given to the church of all such buildings and property, for the sole and exclusive use of a Presbyterian Church, when its standards were adopted as its form of government. In the organization of the church, and in the ordination of its Pastor, such a consecration of the buildings and property, for such purposes, is formally made to the Presbytery, as the proper representative of the church, and therefore to the session also, who are the proper representatives of the Presbytery: and while, therefore, the management of these buildings and property may, as we have said, be properly and wisely entrusted to Trustees or to the pew-holders generally, their use and controul—for the *spiritual purposes of the church*—cannot with any possible consistency be in any degree alienated from the direction and controul of the only divinely instituted judicatories of the church.

But to return. To the Deacons belong all the duties coming under the general term “serving tables”—“daily ministration”—“the Apostle’s fellowship,” that is, systematic contributions for charitable and religious purposes (*κοινωνία*) (11)—ministering and “helping”—in short, to all duties relating to the temporal, rather than to the spiritual concerns of the church. The old distinction, current from the time of the Reformation, refers the term “tables” to three separate departments—THE TABLE OF THE LORD, THE TABLE OF THE PASTOR, AND THE TABLE OF THE POOR.

The word *table* is very commonly used to signify that for which a table is employed, and to include therefore the

(11.) See this subject discussed, in an Essay on “Collections for Charitable and Religious purposes, a means of grace and a part of the divinely instituted worship of God,” by Dr. Smyth, of Charleston.

whole mode of living, or whatever kind of business is transacted upon a table. To serve a table, therefore, often, in classic writers, has reference to a money table, and signifies to take care of money affairs, and to have charge of making collections and distributing alms; (12) and hence, according to the general concurrence of all the reformed churches, it is a part of the Deacon's office to take charge of THE LORD'S TABLE. This implies that they are to take care that suitable preparation should be made for the celebration of the holy ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as often as the church, through its session, appoints the administration of these ordinances. (13.) To "the Lord's table" belongs also whatever is necessary to the proper celebration of divine worship, and of all the services for the social and public duties of religion. These constitute the spiritual provisions of Christ's house, provided for and offered to His guests through the instrumentality of His appointed servants. Whatever, therefore, respects the place in which these services are held, all matters of arrangement and decorum connected with them, and the appropriation of seats to those who unite in them, devolves properly on the Deacons. To them also are properly committed the care of the sacred vessels of the Lord's house, the baptismal and communion apparatus,—the supply of the bread, the wine, the water, and the napkin,—the arrangements for their use, and whatever personal attention is required in order to secure the proper and timely introduction of the parties to whom these ordinances are to be administered.

To "THE TABLE OF THE LORD" belongs also the accommodation of those who might be induced, or have a present wish, to attend upon the services of the sanctuary.

Strangers often feel embarrassed in finding their way into a Church, and are very much influenced in their choice of a Church by the kind manner in which they are introduced, and in which they are assisted in accomodating themselves with a seat suitable and agreeable to them.

The Lord has also made special provision in His Church for "the poor," to whom, in a most emphatic manner, "the

(12.) See abundant proof in Robinson's Greek Lexicon of the N. T., improved by Negrís & Duncan, under the word *τραπέζα*.

(13.) See 1 Cor. 10: 16, 21.

Gospel is to be preached." And while it is *necessary*, in order to meet the expenses of the Church, to have a system of pew-rents, yet FULL AND AMPLE provision should be made for the accommodation of those who, from a variety of causes, may be unable to meet the expense of a rented pew. To this matter the attention of Deacons should be particularly directed. Some persons again are anxious to pay what they can afford to the support of the Church, but are not able to pay the full amount of the ordinary pew rent. Now such parties ought to be in every possible way encouraged, and it would be a most grateful service for the Deacons to make an arrangement with other individuals, so as, *among them*, to assume the rent of a whole pew, and thus at once to please and accommodate all concerned. Sometimes again, persons in moderate circumstances have such a difficulty in hearing as makes it necessary that they should sit as near the pulpit as possible, and are, nevertheless, unable to pay the rent assessed upon a pew in that position. Here then is another case, in which the Church, through her Deacons, should manifest "the tenderness of Christ," in adapting the arrangements of His "TABLE" to the circumstances of His people—"the strong bearing the infirmities of the weak, and "every man pleasing his neighbor to his edification" and comfort.

And where persons are *really* unable, while in spirit willing, to contribute to the expenditures of the Church, in this case Deacons and others should manifest the greatest solicitude to make them feel at home in the Church, to provide for them suitable and convenient seats, and thus to prove that in Christ's Church there is equal regard for the poor and the humble as for the rich and elevated, and that as "Christ is the head" of all, so are all "members one of another."

To the Deacons belong also, it has been said, THE TABLE OF THE PASTOR, Bishop, or Minister. It is the law of Christ's kingdom, that "he who is taught in the Word should communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things," "the Lord having ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." As Ministers give to their work their whole time, energy and devotion—as that work requires for its accomplishment books and other

apparatus to an indefinite extent, and as it occasions an outlay of actual expenditure in a variety of ways—it is at once evident that this law of ministerial support is reasonable, necessary, and designed to secure in the most effectual manner invaluable benefits to the parties concerned. These benefits are found not merely in the equivalent which is enjoyed in pastoral oversight and instruction, but also in the working of that universal law by which we value and give attention to any object in proportion as we make efforts and sacrifices to secure it.

It is, therefore, undoubtedly for the interest of members of the Church, as it is their imperative duty, to “communicate to Him that teacheth in all good things.” And it is a very important part of the Deacon’s office, where the duty is not otherwise efficiently provided for, to facilitate, systematize, and certainly secure, a full provision for “the table of the Minister.” It is in the power of prudent, active and liberal-minded officers, whether Deacons or otherwise, to render the performance of this duty a cheerful and affectionate tribute of respect and esteem on the part of the people, and an encouragement to confidence, perseverance and fidelity on the part of the pastor. In Churches wholly unendowed, as ours generally are, the dependence of Ministers upon the exertions and considerate sympathy of such officers, is necessarily great, and by well-timed applications, and a wise and impartial division of labor, such officers may place their Minister in a state of respectable freedom from worldly embarrassment; supply him with all needful apparatus, so that out of a full and well-garnished storehouse he may “bring forth things new and old,” “a portion always in season” for the edification and comfort of his people; and, at the same time, put it in his power to shew forth his hospitality. And, as there is a deep-seated law of our nature, which awakens lively and peculiar emotions of grateful regard, when benefits are conferred, which are purely voluntary, and not included in any stipulated agreement, the way is further open for greatly enlarging the kindly sympathies of pastor and people, by such acts of unsolicited and unlooked-for liberality.

But the Deacons are appointed to take charge, also, of THE TABLE OF THE POOR. “The poor shall never die out of the land”—“Ye have the poor,” says Christ, “always

with you, but me ye have not always." "Whatsoever, therefore, ye do for them, ye do it unto me." Such is the purpose and providence of God, and such the tenor of that rule of judgment by which our future award and proportion of happiness shall be determined. The poor to whom the benevolent efforts of the Church are to be directed, are, *primarily*, the members of particular Churches; the aged, infirm, diseased, and in any way impoverished, members of "the household of faith," for whom, if the Church does not provide with liberality, "she has denied the faith," and is worse than those societies which, without exercising *as such* any faith in the Church, or in Christ, its institutor, shew forth their charity in providing, more or less plentifully, for all who have claims upon their bounty. But the Church at Jerusalem never thought of limiting their bounty to *resident members* of their Church, but embraced all of every country and language who came within the reach of their charitable efforts; and nothing is more evident in the Apostolic narrative than the "readiness" with which the Apostolic Churches were willing, "to the full extent of their power"—aye, and "beyond their power," to aid the necessities of Christian brethren and sisters elsewhere, as well as within their own sphere.

The poor, therefore, to whom the Deacons are to "give heed," are Christ's poor—*primarily*, those of their own immediate Church, and, *secondarily*, all other "poor saints," wherever they are found, and so far as there is ability and opportunity "to communicate with them in their necessities."

But it is not for these poor Christians merely, that Christ claims attention and regard. The poor generally, whether believers or not, are the objects of Christ's special compassion. Among these He chose to become incarnate, for "He had not where to lay his head." From these He chose His disciples; to these He manifested most of His mighty works, and for them He performed most of His miraculous cures. To every one of them, in the person of the wounded traveller, He points us as a neighbor to whose wants we are bound to attend, and in the good Samaritan, in contrast with the Priests and Levites, Christ depicts the character and conduct of His *true* and approved disciples. Christians are, in an eminent sense, the guardians of the poor, and

whatever will promote their comfort and well-being, ought to be devised, advocated, and supported by them. Every Church, therefore, is, and ought to be, an association for the temporal, the moral, and the spiritual improvement of the poor. This should be one leading and prominent object, for which there should be united, systematic, and vigorous effort.

For this purpose are Deacons instituted by Christ, and clothed with authority, and invoked by a solemn sense of duty, to "devise liberally" and wisely for "this heritage of the Lord." The office of Deacon is undervalued by many, only because this great function of the Church is little known and little felt. The Church is suffering greatly because she has so long, and to so great an extent, "passed by on the other side," and left the poor to perish in neglect, or to be taken up by other associations formed "to supply her lack of service." The injury done to the cause of Christ, by this neglect, is, beyond calculation, great.

There ought to be in every Church, therefore, a large bench of Deacons, including men of prudence, piety, wisdom, and great liberality—say eighteen or twenty. Among these, "the region round about" the Church should be divided into small sections, so that "two by two" they might visit and become personally acquainted with all the poor in their respective districts. By visiting these poor families, their character, condition and wants would be known, and by availing themselves of the resources within their reach, their immediate wants could be relieved, the education of their children provided for, habits of industry and economy be promoted, by introducing them to the Savings Bank, and encouraging them to live within their means, and a spirit of love, reverence, and attachment, be cherished among the poor, towards their wealthier neighbours.

Depend upon it, the severance of the poor from the bounty and oversight of the Church, is a fatal policy, both for the Church and the community. This policy is fatal to *the Church*, because the poor have been the friends and supporters of the Church, when higher parties have been hostile; because "to the poor the Gospel is preached;" because "the poor God has chosen to be rich in faith and heirs of the promises;" because, therefore, the blessing of God is made to depend upon the attention of the Church

to the poor; and because, if the poor are alienated from the Church, they will be found — as in England, in Ireland, in France, and wherever they are supported by poor laws, or not provided for at all — the greatest enemies of truth and righteousness, and the greatest hindrances to all moral and social improvement. Let the poor, however, — as to some extent is the case in many parts of Scotland — be provided for by the church, and they will be found the greatest friends, supporters, and patrons of the church — be elevated and ennobled in their own character, and become industrious, moral, and peaceable in their whole deportment.

Their policy, therefore, of leaving the poor to legal assistance, will be found equally fatal to the *community at large*. It introduces the poor-law system with all its gigantic evils. It severs the provisions for the poor from all moral and religious influences. It destroys self-respect, degrades moral character, multiplies a thousand-fold the evil it attempts to meet, fosters pride and dissatisfaction, and by sanctioning the idea of a *legal right* to such provision, paves the way for the spirit of agrarianism, and of hatred and dislike to all the distinctions of society. (14.)

(14.) On this subject see a very able work, Bosarquet on the Poor. Mr. Lorimer, of Glasgow, in his work on Deacons, has the following remarks, which are of great weight. "The world holds that it deals in substantial kindness, while the Christian contents himself with faith, as distinguished from morality. To meet this common charge, it is most desirable, for the honour of Christianity and the Christian Church, that they be seen in their true character as the patrons of the poor, especially the pious poor: and how can this be better done than when it appears that a court of officers, to watch over the interests of the poor, in the spirit of Christianity, is an essential part of the constitution of the Christian Church? So long as the Church cannot point to these officers in living operation under her authority, she wants the full answer which she may and ought to have it in her power to return to the charges and insinuations, whether of worldliness, or superstition, or infidelity. It is not enough to say that Christians are charitable — far more charitable than others — unless it can be shown that the poor are so important in their eyes, and dear to their hearts, that they have a regular official provision in the very structure of the Christian Church for attending to their wants, and that men are failing in Christian duty where this, in one form or another, is wanting. Let, however, the Christian Church be fully equipped with a large staff of laborious tender-hearted Deacons, watching over the poor from week to week and year to year, ministering to their wants out of the donations of the Church, and treating them with the kindness of brethren and sisters; and what is there in any occasional charitable bequest, any regular and extraordinary deed of benevolence, on the part of the men of the world, which could bear any comparison with such friendship? Tried by this test, Christianity would not only

From what has been said, and from the other passages of Scripture in which the office of Deacon is described, it is evident that while this office is local, and while, for the sake of order and unity, it must be under the direction of the session and auxiliary to it, it is one in itself most important and honourable, and in its influence most beneficial to the church and to the community. It is equally evident that the field of duty opened to the Christian efforts of Deacons is of incalculable value. Indeed, there is no other limit to it than the benevolent desires and active zeal of those who fill the office. In many ways, not now pointed out, Deacons might, in a silent and indirect manner, contribute to the personal, social and business prosperity of those who are connected with the church; recommend them to those who might need their services or their goods; put those who wish employment in the way of finding it; introduce those who are strangers, to the acquaintance of each other; procure subscribers for those periodicals of our church, whose circulation is deemed advisable; promote the establishment of parochial schools, under the watch and care of the church: and in numerous ways, incapable of distinct mention, build up, strengthen and beautify Zion. (15.)

be acquitted of indifference—its genuine liberality would be established and rendered conspicuous. We can conceive few things more dishonorable to Protestant Christianity, or more fitted to impair its progress, than to be able to say, with apparent truth, that it is careless of the interests of the poor—more careless than the men who make less pretension. And, on the other hand, we can conceive few things more fitted to propitiate the good will of the world, which, at all events, admires benevolence, than to be able, in a way which does not admit of cavil, to show that the same religious system which alone can provide for the welfare of eternity, is the most active and unwearied guardian of the poor man's interest in time. This is an argument which must always be powerful, but particularly in such a day as the present, when it is to be feared irreligion and infidelity prevail to a considerable extent among the humbler classes of society—classes which were once happily strangers to the poison, and which are naturally led, from their very circumstances, to make comparisons of men and systems in connection with their care for the poor, and to consider this as almost the exclusive standard of character."

(15.) In depicting his Church of the Future, Chevalier Bunsen says—"We found the most startling and important signs of this in the help afforded to the church in her care of the poor, the sick and the prisoners. We were here met by a zealous company of men and women, who had founded institutions of helpful love, for the reformation of those who have gone astray, for the maintenance of homeless and orphan children, for the comfort of the sick and the prisoner; we were met by operatives full of

But in no other way can Deacons do more service than by carrying out a plan of systematic contribution, by which every member of the church and congregation shall have the opportunity of giving what they *should* give to the several objects of Christian benevolence, to which the attention of the church is directed. In this way, every one may know, with certainty, when and how they shall be called upon—may be enabled to “set apart” their “gifts” and have them ready—may become habituated to give, from principle and “from a willing mind,” and therefore prayerfully and cheerfully.

Such is, undoubtedly, the divinely appointed order for

faith, and by a holy band of deaconesses, performing the works of the merciful sisters of the clergy-church, without vows, in the full freedom of the gospel, and in the might of free, because thankful, love. Now every one who considers the way in which the diaconate first decayed and died, and how it is especially wanting in the clergy-church, because it requires for its free development the full communion of the laity, and the full acknowledgment of the universal priesthood, will readily comprehend the historical significance of the fact, that amongst the vigorous offshoots of the church-life of the present day, the diaconate is the most distinctly and gloriously prominent. *This is the ministry of love, and in an especial manner the ministry of the Church of the Future.* We may here behold coming to the birth the new elements of that Church of the Future, whose birth-throes we all feel, of that free congregation of faithful men, to which the groaning of the creature, and the ever more fearful revelations of the misery of mankind are pointing. Here is that ministry which is open to all; here is that approval of our faith to which every one is called; here is that exercise of the priesthood for which every constitution of the church gives liberty. Here is that centre from which the constitution of this Church of the Future must proceed, if it is to be partaker of an inward and spiritual life.”—*Bunsen*, pp. 202–205.

“All hail,” says the N. British Reviewer, “to such a Church of the Future! The world yearns for it; creation groans for it. Society is sick at heart; sick of sore maladies which politics can scarcely cure; sick of many empirics and few physicians. And Christ’s church alone has the *panacea*—the universal cure. Deacons and Deaconesses, Brothers and Sisters of Charity,—with Christ’s love in their hearts and no Pope’s yoke on their necks—Priests and Priestesses, self-devoted to the High Priest’s own work of going about to do good—such is the ministry, the age, and the church, and the world, all demand. Otherwise, churches are self-consuming; light and life go out in a cold vacuum. Pastors, Elders, Deacons, Schoolmasters, People, eat in on themselves and on one another. Forms of polity and worship stand; rights of rule and rights of choice are balanced; but love dies; and with love all peace and joy. An earnest, outgoing ministry, in all who are the Lord’s—in Dorcas as in Paul—is the grand want of the times. What church will realize this? That is the church of the Future! Bunsen, Arnold, Vinet, Chalmers, all are one here. For, at the last, intellect, humanity, piety, are always one.”

raising charitable and religious contributions, and one special and primary object for which the church is instituted, and for which every Christian is "called and chosen of God." Such contribution is a part of Christian discipleship, a test and evidence of our sincere love and devotion to the Saviour. It is a prominent part of Apostolic institution, precept and practice. It is an integral part of the worship we may acceptably render to God, and to withhold which is to "rob" and dishonor "God" and to put Him to an open shame before the world. A systematic plan by which all the members of the church may be reached, and by which such collections might be made to contribute to the spiritual benefit of all concerned, was framed by the Apostles, and is given for our instruction and example; and as, therefore, the church is returning to the scriptural order of Deacons, let the Deacons direct their special attention to the restoration of the scriptural plan and method of raising collections, for all those purposes to which the church is devoted.

From what has been said, it will be further seen that, while Deacons are only officers in a particular church, their office is essentially connected with every interest of Christ and His cause. Their qualifications, therefore, cannot be too spiritual or too high; nor should any provisions by which the purity, the efficiency, and the spirituality of the Eldership are guarded, be omitted in the case of Deacons. Our standards, therefore, make the mode of nomination, election and ordination, the same, both for Deacons and Elders; and while they allow their election to be made by the members of the church, limit their nomination to the session.

In conclusion, we would say, that the church cannot too deeply feel the obligation under which she is laid to those who undertake and endeavour faithfully to discharge the duties of these several offices, nor too "highly esteem them in love for their work's sake." And as the efficiency of a session, and of deacons when appointed, depends upon the perfect harmony and unison of views and feelings which prevail among these officers, so that they may ALL be "co-workers" and "fellow laborers," it follows, that for this reason, even if there was no other, the nomination of any

additional members, to either office, is wisely given, by our standards, and the practice of our best regulated churches, to the session; and that, in their election, great regard should be paid by the members of the church to the conviction and wishes of the session, as manifested in their nominations. Could parties, uncongenial or antagonistic, be introduced into either body, the consequence would be inevitably injurious to every interest of the church, and be a certain means of preventing it from enjoying the gratuitous services of its most valuable members. (16.)

(16.) "Where the Pastor and the Deacons act independently of each other," says Dr. Winter,* "they are generally mutual hindrances; but where they strive together, they are mutual helps."

"Christian brethren," said my friend Dr. Newman, who preached on this subject more than fifteen years ago, at the Monthly Meeting of the Baptist Ministers and Churches, in this city and its vicinity, "Christian brethren! give to the Minister I love, for a Deacon, a man in whose house he may sit down at ease, when he is weary and loaded with care; into whose bosom he may freely pour his sorrows, and by whose lips he may be soothed, when he is vexed and perplexed; by whose illuminated mind he may be guided in a difficulty, and by whose liberality and cordial co-operation he may be animated, and assisted in every generous undertaking."†

* Mr. Jay's friend, in his Sermon on the Office of Deacons. See also an elaborate discourse on this subject, by the Rev. Mr. Wilson, of the Reformed or Secession Church in this country, not at this moment at my hand.

† See "The Work and Reward of Faithful Deacons:" a sermon, addressed to the Baptist Monthly Association, August 21, 1806. By William Newman, D. D. Second Edition, 1820.

NOTE.

The following paper was adopted by the Session of the Second Presbyterian Church in Charleston, in view of the appointment of Deacons:

The Bible and our standards have made the office of Deacon, in distinction from that of the Pastor and the Ruling Elder, plain, obvious and imperative. And the General Assembly, together with our Presbytery, have called upon every church where the office has fallen into disuse, to have it restored. The Ministry and the Eldership have relation to the doctrine, discipline and government of the church; and the Deaconship to the general interests of the poor, to collections made for pious purposes, and, generally, to all matters relating to the interests of the church, in which the session may desire their coöperation.

It is thus manifest that the duties assigned to Deacons, need not interfere either with those of the session, on the one hand, or of such officers, on the other hand, as are appointed by the congregation, for the exclusive management of its fiscal affairs, its buildings, and its burial ground.

Resolved, therefore, that this session do now proceed to nominate as many Deacons as may be at present expedient, to be recommended to the church for their election.

Resolved, that, in doing this, the following rules be adopted, for the better understanding of the mutual duties of Deacons and Elders :

1st. The session, consisting of the Pastor and Ruling Elders, constitute the supreme and only authorized body in the church, for directing (in accordance with its spiritual rules) every thing pertaining to the spiritual order, government and discipline of the same.

2nd. The Deacons, therefore, are appointed to act only in accordance with the views of the session, and within that field to which session may direct their labors ; and all nominations for that office shall be made by the session.

3rd. It shall be the duty of the Deacons to appoint a Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer, and to keep minutes of all their proceedings, which shall be submitted to the session for review and approval once a quarter.

4th. Within the field assigned to them, it shall be the duty of the Deacons to devise and employ every proper means for furthering the objects entrusted to their care.

5th. Once a quarter, or oftener, if necessary, the Deacons shall meet with the session, when they shall make their report and receive directions and advice, and when appropriations to the regular beneficiaries of the church shall be made.

6th. In regard to the specific duties of the Deacons. *Resolved*, that to them be committed, under the aforesaid direction and superintendence of the session—

I. The poor, and every thing pertaining to their temporal comfort and advantage.

II. The collections for all religious purposes; to be made in the congregation as appointed by the session, and the means of rendering them more general, more equal, more liberal, and therefore more systematic.

III. The arrangements for the accommodation of strangers and others, at all the meetings of the church.

IV. It shall be the duty of the Deacons also to use every proper and practicable means for inducing strangers to attend the church,—for aiding and assisting young men and others in procuring situations or employment,—for promoting, as far as practicable, the temporal welfare, business and prospects, of members of the church ; and in every other way for furthering its interests.

V. It shall be further the duty and business of the Deacons, to assist in promoting the circulation of such periodicals as, in the judgment of the session, it is desirable to circulate in the congregation.

Finally, as it regards the election and ordination of Deacons. *Resolved*, that they be conducted in the same manner as those of Ruling Elders, according to Rules 1 and 2 of this church.

ARTICLE III.

OBSERVATIONS ON 1 JOHN 5: 7, 8.

BY THE REV. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M.

Dallas County, Alabama.

In discussing the genuine or spurious character of these verses, it is not our design to review the whole field of controversy, for no portion of the Sacred Writings has given rise to more theological disputation. Advocates and opponents have appeared in the Church in every age and country; but the great controversy has been chiefly confined to the *Unitarians* and the *Orthodox*, the one asserting that they are an interpolation, and the other as strongly maintaining that they are a part of the Sacred Record.

In the *textus receptus* the verses stand thus, ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ Λόγος, Καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσιν, Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, τὸ πνεῦμα, Καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, Καὶ τὸ αἷμα· Καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν. In the Clementine edition of the Vulgate they are found in this form, Quoniam tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in coelo, Pater, Verbum, et spiritus sanctus; et hi tres unum sunt. Et tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terra; Spiritus, et aqua et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt.

In the Complutensian Polyglott, which contains the first *printed* edition of the Greek Testament, it appears in Greek and Latin as follows: ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν, &c. Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in coelo, pater, verbum, et spiritus sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt, &c. No manuscript authority has been discovered for the peculiar reading of the passage as it appears in this edition, and hence it has been thought that the editors translated it from the MSS. of the Vulgate version. Another reason for this conjecture, is, that when Stunica, one of the editors, was challenged by Erasmus to produce his Greek authority for it, he appealed to no Greek MSS., but referred to the authority of the Latin.

In order to come to some definite conclusion on this subject, we will briefly consider *first*, the *evidence against it*.

It is found in no Greek MS. written before the 15th century. Of the 187 Greek MSS. Dr. Clarke makes only 112, that have been discovered, *four* only contain these verses in full, while the rest contain not one word of them as they appear in our received text.

The four which have the verses are, first the *Codex Montfortii*. This MS. is in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, to which it was presented by Archbishop Usher. It formerly belonged to Dr. Monfort, a divine of the 17th century. The second is the *Codex Ravianus*, so called because it was brought from the East by Professor Rave, of Upsal. The third is the *Codex Ottobonianus*, discovered by Scholz, and the fourth is the *Codex Guelpherbytanus*. The *Codex Ravianus* is now admitted to be a forgery, copied from the Greek of the *Complutensian* edition, and the third edition of Stephens. The *Codex Ottobonianus*, is proved to be a MS. of the 15th century. Scholz thinks that it has been altered in many places to make it agree with the Vulgate. The *Codex Guelpherbytanus* is a MS. of the 17th century, for it has the Latin of Beza evidently written by the same hand.

The *Codex Montfortii* then may be said to be the only *genuine* MS. which contains this text. Yet Wetstein has proved it to be written in a Latin style. This was also advanced against it by Professor Porson, and Bishop Burgess tried to defend it, but he has signally failed to make good his statement. Michaelis, Griesbach, Porson, Marsh and Scholz, refer it to the 15th or 16th century. This passage is wanting in all the ancient versions. It is not found in the two Syriac, the Arabic, the Coptic, Sahidic, Ethiopian, Armenian, and Slavonian. The best editions of the Greek Testament omit it. It is not found in Erasmus' first and second editions. In his *third* edition he inserted it according to a promise he had made to Stunica.

From Erasmus' editions it found its way into those of Stephens. It is wanting in the editions of Aldus, Gerbelius, Cephalaëus, and of Colinaeus. Most also of the *modern* editions have omitted it. In Knapp's it is enclosed in brackets. It is worthy of notice that Luther never admitted

it into any of the editions of his translation. It was, however, added after his death. In consequence of this, Professor Michaelis remarks, that "it is uncandid in the extreme for one Protestant to condemn another for rejecting this passage, since it was rejected by the author of our reformation."

In the old English Bibles of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth, it was printed in *small* letters, or included in brackets; but after the year 1566, it began to appear in the form in which it is found at present.

Griesbach, who has critically examined all the evidences on both sides of the question, and who was as competent for the task as any man that has ever lived, has given up the text as utterly defenceless. "For if" says he, "a few dubious, suspicious and modern evidences, with such weak arguments as are usually adduced, are sufficient to demonstrate the authenticity of a *reading*, then there remains no longer any criterion by which the *spurious* may be distinguished from the *genuine*, and, consequently, the whole text of the New Testament is unascertained and dubious."

Rosenmüller says, "Verba haec non esse genuina plerumque criticorum hodie est sententia."

Sir William Jones says, that it is wanting in the copy of the Scriptures which he found among the Christians of India.

Sir Isaac Newton says, that the connection is best preserved by expunging it.

It is also wanting in one of the oldest Irish MSS. extant, the *Codex Armachanus*, described by Sir William Betham, in his "Antiquarian Researches;" which Codex, he maintains, was written by Aidus, Bishop of Sletty, who died 660.

Lücke, one of the ablest modern writers on John, maintains that the internal evidence alone would be sufficient to reject the passage, as John never uses *ο πατήρ* and *ο λογος*, as correlatives, but ordinarily associates *ο υιος* with *ο πατήρ*; and always refers the *λογος*, in Christ, to *ο θεός* and not to *ο πατήρ*. He agrees with those critics who look upon the passage as an *allegorical* gloss, which found its way into the Latin text, where it has, ever since the fourth century, firmly maintained its place as a welcome and protective passage. Here, Lücke fully coincides with the late learned Bishop Middleton, in his work on the Greek article. Lücke's

conclusion is very strong, and worthy of consideration. "Either these words are genuine, and the epistle, in this case, a production of the third or fourth century, or the epistle is a genuine work of the Evangelist John, and then these words are spurious."

Dr. Buchanan, in his *Christian Researches in Asia*, p. 118, says that it is not found in a Peschito or Syriac MS., which belonged to the Syrian Church in India above a thousand years. This MS. is now in the public library at Cambridge, England. Nor is it in any of the ancient Syriac MSS. brought from the East by the late Mr. Rich, which are preserved in the British Museum.

It is a remarkable fact, that the ancient Greek fathers never quoted the passage, even where we would naturally expect them to do so. Neither is it cited by any of the ancient Latin fathers, where the subject on which they were writing appeared to require it. There is not a single Italian father in favor of the verse: even when defending the doctrine of the Trinity, they never quote it. This, in our opinion, proves that they were either unacquainted with it, or that they considered it as spurious. And even if they had quoted, in express terms, all the disputed words, this would prove no more than that they were in their MSS. of the vulgate; and it is well known that the authority of the Latin versions is inferior to that of the Greek ones, and no scholar of any reputation would consider them of equal authority.

We do not consider it necessary to produce any further testimony on this side of the question.

We now come, in the second place, to consider the evidence that has been advanced *in favor* of the disputed clause.

It is found in the old Latin version, current in Africa before the vulgate was made. It is also found in the majority of the MSS. of the vulgate. It is retained in the *Ordo Romanus* of the Latin Church, which recites it in the offices for Trinity Sunday and for the octave of Easter.

But a chief argument in favor of it, is derived from the confession of faith drawn up by Eugenius, Bishop of Carthage, at the end of the fifth century, and presented, by nearly 400 bishops, to Hunneric, King of the Vandals, an

Arian and a bitter enemy to those who professed the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. In this confession is the following passage: "That we may show it to be clearer than the light, that the deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is one, it is proved by the testimony of John the Evangelist, for he says, 'There are three which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, *and these three are one.*'"

Tertullian and Cyprian, both of the third century, have been produced as witnesses in favour of this verse. Concerning Tertullian, Bishop Kaye, in his *Eccles. History*, observes, "In my opinion, the passage in Tertullian, far from containing an allusion to 1 John, 5: 7, furnishes most decisive proof that he knew nothing of the verse."

Cyprian uses this language in his treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*: *Dicit Dominus, ego et Pater unum sumus, et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sanctu scriptum est, el tres unum sunt.* This might seem to settle the point, but when examined minutely, it does not prove what was intended.

Another argument brought forward in favor of the passage, that it is found in the Confession of Faith, and also in the Liturgy of the Greek Church. It has been maintained by Dr. Hales, that this Church would never have adopted the clause on the sole authority of the Latin, because of the lasting schism that existed between them. Hence, he considers the Greek to be a distinct and an independent witness for the authenticity of the verse.

The Bishop of St. David's says, after a learned and critical examination of the passage, "Upon the whole view of the important and interesting subject of these pages, the evidences internal and external, direct and indirect, of the controverted verse, are so many, so various, and so powerful, as to leave in my own mind no room to doubt that we have, in the testimony of the three Heavenly Witnesses, the authentic words of St. John."

Mr. Nolan, of England, after stating the internal and external evidences of the verse, adds, "I trust nothing further can be wanting to convince any ingenuous mind that 1 John, 5: 7, really proceeded from St. John the Evangelist."

It was ably defended by Bengel, in his *Gnomon*, who conceived that the passage contained a Divine, internal evidence of its genuineness.

Dr. Wiseman renewed the controversy, in favor of the clause, in 1834. His letters appeared in the *Catholic Magazine*. The Doctor's arguments are founded on citations in African writers. He supposes that there were two ancient recensions of the Vulgate, the *African* and *Italian*. From this latter, as well as from the Greek MSS., he thinks that the clause had been lost at an early period. But, as he deals in *suppositions*, we will not notice any further what he has written.

The latest vindication which we have seen of the passage, is that of Gaussen of Geneva, in his *Theopneusty*. But his reasonings are without any foundation, and, therefore, prove nothing.

Jones, in his "Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity," says, "I firmly believe it to be genuine;" and he that wishes to see the text further vindicated, may consult Pool's Synopsis and Dr. Hammond, and also Dr. Delany, in his volume of Sermons, page 69, &c.

From this brief review of both sides of the question, we are forced to the conclusion, that the disputed clause must be abandoned as spurious. The stress which some writers lay upon the *internal* evidence, in our humble opinion, proves nothing. "Internal evidence," Bishop Marsh says, "may show that a passage is *spurious*, though external evidence is in its favor. *But no internal evidence can prove a passage to be genuine, when external evidence is decidedly against it.* A spurious passage may be fitted to the context, as well as a genuine passage. No arguments, therefore, from internal evidence, however ingenious they may appear, can outweigh the mass of external evidence which applies to the case in question."

Many are unwilling to admit the spuriousness of the passage, because they consider it would diminish the evidence in favor of the doctrine of the Trinity. But this is a mistake—for the proof of the Saviour's Godhead can be obtained from other portions of Scripture which are not questioned. We are, therefore, not shut up to this passage. We can part with it, and yet our cause suffer no injury.

On the subject of the Trinity, we would refer the reader to a small work by Horne, entitled "The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, briefly Stated and Defended." (London: 1826.) In the appendix he has produced very strong testi-

mony for the truth of the doctrine, by the actual profession of faith in Jesus Christ, together with other proofs, derived from ecclesiastical history and the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries of the Christian era.

There is nothing in the whole controversy calculated to shake the believer's faith in the doctrine that Christ Jesus is God equal with the Father. To quote the language of Griesbach, "there are so many arguments for the true Deity of Christ, that I see not how it can be called in question," &c. Nov. Tes., tom. 2, Praef. pp. 8, 9. Halae: 1775.

ARTICLE IV.

DISSERTATION ON ROMANS, 8: 19-22.

These verses have been regarded by commentators as among the most difficult of all the Apostle's writings. The sense of the whole passage depends on the interpretation of the word *κτίσις*, rendered, in our common version, creature and creation. In each of the first three verses under consideration, the word is translated creature; but in the last it is found with an adjunct, and rendered the whole creation. Why our translators varied the rendering in the last from the others, except to avoid repetition, does not appear. Perhaps their intention may be seen in the examination of the passage.

Of the various meanings assigned to the word *κτίσις*, only two appear to us worthy of our consideration. The first of these is, that the Apostle has reference to the whole family of mankind, including Christians, Jews and Gentiles. This view is supported by Whitby, Ammon, Macknight, Stuart, and others.

The other view of the passage extends the meaning of the word to the whole irrational and inanimate world. This is the interpretation adopted by the ancient commentators generally, and by many of the most able of modern times. Chrysostom, Jerome, Theophylact, Luther, Doddridge,

Flatt, Tholuck, Hodge, Chalmers, Haldane, and others, appear as the advocates of this interpretation.

Before making a statement of our own view of the passage, we deem it most profitable to notice some of the difficulties that attend both schemes of interpretation. In our humble opinion, no one line of exegesis will run through the whole passage without meeting with almost insuperable objections. The great point to be gained, then, is to strike out a course, though it seem a devious one, that will be found in strict accordance with Scripture truth and the undisputed testimony of history.

The advocates of the first mode of interpretation must suppose the whole human race, Christians and unbelievers, including Deists and Atheists, to be anxiously awaiting "the manifestation of the sons of God." And the difficulty that at once presents itself, is gotten over by understanding the anxious expectation of the unbelieving world to be the desire of an immortal existence. But there is a manifest difference between a longing after immortality, without regard to the moral condition of the soul, and an anxious desire for the appearance of the Lord of Glory, to render to every man according to his work. And this difficulty, together with the fact that all the human race will not be introduced into the "liberty of the children of God," has proved sufficient to drive the other class of critics to the other extreme, and led them to exclude from the interpretation of *κτίσις* the whole rational and accountable creation.

But is not the other view of the passage pressed with difficulties? To speak of the inanimate world as sighing, groaning, and travailing in pain, is to use a figure unsurpassed in boldness in the legends of Eastern allegory. And can we suppose the Apostle, in the midst of an abstruse doctrinal discussion, where he would exercise the utmost caution against being misunderstood, to indulge in one of the boldest flights of poetry and personification? And, although this exegesis of the passage is attended with fewer difficulties than the other, its advocates have duly appreciated them, and acknowledged their importance to be too great to be lightly passed over. And we cannot conceive how the Apostle could so quickly lose sight of the train of thought which he was just before pursuing. The children of God, with their "sufferings of this present time,"

and "the glory that *should* be revealed in *them*," cannot be supposed to vanish so quickly from his mind, even from the highest transports of poetic rapture.

It is acknowledged a sound and safe rule of interpretation to enter into the thoughts and feelings of the writer, and follow his reasoning on to his conclusion. And we shall ever be liable to do injustice to the precepts of revelation, if we subject them to any arbitrary process of verbal criticism which the passage may be made to bear, in order to support a favorite theory. While it is right to allow due deference to the opinions of those wise and holy men who have gone before us, it behooves us to take the Scriptures for our guide, and, with the aid of the inward teachings of the Holy Spirit, to indite our own opinions.

From the time the Apostle had written the 12th verse of the 5th chapter of this epistle, he has had in his mind the fall of man, and its dread consequences to the world. He has discoursed of that sin which "brought death into the world and all our woe;" the struggles of the regenerate soul with the remains of innate corruption, and the ultimate triumph of the children of God over all their temptations and sufferings. The leading idea in his mind is most certainly the race of man, his brethren according to the flesh. His mind turns back to the fatal hour when that nature was dashed from its high estate of holiness; when man was cursed for his breach of God's covenant with him; when the woman was sentenced to pain and servitude; when the serpent was cursed above all cattle, and the ground made barren and waste for the sake of man. And we cannot avoid the conviction, that Paul, when he penned this passage, had before his mind all classes of beings that suffered on account of the fall—the race of man, believing and unbelieving, the brute creation, and the inanimate world. Facts undisputed bear us out in this interpretation. We might, indeed, have limited the meaning of *κτίσις*, in this place, to the children of God, as they were the subject of the Apostle's discourse; this would seem consistent with the dignity and unity of it. But we are assured of a more extensive application of the word by the language of the 23d verse, where he says, "And not only they"—that is, the rest of creation—"but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit." It is true, in fact,

that the children of God do groan and suffer, and long to be delivered from the bondage of sin and the evils of this world : " For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven." It is true, also, that unbelievers travail in pain, and long to be delivered from the sufferings of this life. They do not, indeed, indulge the same hope with the children of God—for this is absolutely impossible. " The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." They have neither the faith to enable them to realize darkly the happiness of God's people in a glorified state, nor the love that would impel them to seek its enjoyments. Nothing is so dreadful to unbelieving souls as the full conviction of the coming of the Lord to judgment. But sophistry will always find a refuge. Our's is a world of hope. The Apostle says " we are saved by hope." And take away this source of enjoyment from the most wicked, and the soul is left in the horrors of despair. The carnal man longs for something more than mere continued existence. He is dissatisfied with his present state, and he anxiously awaits a better. He desires and expects a heaven beyond the grave, though it be a sensual one of his own mind's creating; or though he hope, in some miraculous way, to undergo a change in his own heart, that will prepare him for the heaven of the Christian.

Besides, the same word may designate two distinct classes of persons in the same sentence. Rom. 5 : 18—" As by one offence judgment came upon all men unto condemnation ; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men, unto justification of life." So in the 19th verse, in both of which, according to the Calvinistic interpretation of them, the *all men* of the one, and the *many* of the other, relate to two distinct classes of persons. So *κτίσις* in this passage may embrace different races and objects, and different classes of the same race. The one part of the human family, may be actually expecting, or earnestly waiting for, " the manifestation of the sons of God." Another class, living in a false religion, with darkened understandings and depraved hearts, may be looking forward to a happiness, which they will never realize. They are waiting for " the manifestation of the sons of God," in a different way from the others. This latitude of

interpretation must be allowed, or we cannot see how the passage is to be explained, without manifest violence to the meaning of the sacred writer.

Moreover, the term creature, or the whole creation, may be limited in its meaning, to a part of the human race, without doing violence to well established rules of interpretation. To ascribe to a whole class what is true only of a part, is in strict accordance with the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures. "And so all Israel shall be saved." Not every individual who came out of Abraham's loins, but enough to constitute a nation. So not every individual of our race will "be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God;" but a sufficient number to be called "the whole creation." "The free gift came upon all men unto justification of life:" not upon every member of the human family, or universal salvation is true. Many other texts could be adduced to establish the same principle. And even admitting that the unbelieving world cannot be regarded, as in any sense, waiting "for the manifestation of the sons of God," the multitudes which no man can number of the righteous, are sufficient to justify the application of the term — the whole creation, to them. It was the opinion of that great and good man, President Davies, that the whole number of souls lost, will be found in the day of judgment, to bear no greater proportion to the number saved, than the criminals executed according to the laws of the land, bear to the rest of the people. And if we assume the salvation of all who die in infancy, nearly half the human race, and compute the millions that will be converted, and saved during the long period of millennial glory, when few, if any, will be lost, the opinion will not seem extravagant. Then the wicked will be only as the drop in the bucket, or the dust in the balance, and their comparatively small number, are not of sufficient importance to deter us from applying the term creation to the rest of the world. But, though this is a legitimate mode of interpretation, we cannot agree to reject from the meaning of *κτίσις*, altogether, any part of the human race. To include only believers, raises a difficulty in the 23rd verse, where the Apostle evidently makes a distinction. All mankind must in some sense be included. All may in strict accordance with Scripture, be said to be

hoping for deliverance from the evils of this world. And it is not essential, as before remarked, that their views should be correct, or their hopes such as could be realized. The Jews and Gentiles too, as we shall see hereafter, expected, and anxiously waited for the advent of the Messiah, and yet how erroneous their notions of his character, and how fallacious their hopes! The prophet calls him, "the desire of all nations." So we find it common in Scripture language, to ascribe desire and expectation to creatures in reference to things which tend to their advantage; though they explicitly know nothing of them.—(Whitby.)

An analysis of the passage presents the following difficulties: If we limit the meaning of *κτίσις* to the family of believers, we are met with a contradiction in the 23rd verse, where a distinction is made from some other class. If we extend it to the whole race of man, in each repetition of the word, all mankind cannot be said to be literally "delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." To exclude the whole human race is a *suppressio veri*, and losing sight of the object most prominent in the Apostle's mind. To limit the term to the inanimate world, forces upon us a figure of the boldest kind, in the midst of a strictly doctrinal discussion; which though admissible, is much more consistent with the unity of the discourse, when we include man, and regard the lower orders of the animal creation as sympathizing with him. The only apparent mode of removing these difficulties is to allow a latitude of interpretation, that will vary the meaning of the term creation, so as to exclude the whole reprobate part of mankind, where any thing is ascribed to the term, which cannot be predicated of them in accordance with the general tenor of the Scriptures.

The whole terrestrial creation, both animate and inanimate, are suffering from the effects of sin. All have been made subject to vanity, that is, frailty, misery, and corruption, by the Almighty, in retribution for the sin of man. But though subjected to these evils, there is hope of deliverance. This deliverance is promised them by Him whose word cannot fail. They will be delivered at some time, and in a way incomprehensible to us, "from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." The whole world are now anxiously looking for-

ward to this event. The words of the 22nd verse, are descriptive of the agonizing throes of a world in misery, struggling for deliverance.

In the consideration of this passage of Sacred Writ, we must not lose sight of the relation, in which the creation stood to him, who was the guilty cause of its suffering. The evils were inflicted immediately by the retributive hand of God; but man by his violation of the Covenant provoked the judgment. Adam, when created, was constituted lord of this lower world. He was made a little lower in the scale of being than the angels, and crowned with glory and honor. All the rest of the terrestrial creation were made for his use, and put in subjection under his feet. A new race of immortal beings had been created, of a holy nature, designed to live for God, and the glory of his name. All inferior orders of creatures, both animate and inanimate, were made subservient to his comfort. Man was monarch of the world, and the federal head and representative of all his own race. He was the head of the terrestrial creation; and when he fell, all the rest fell with him. From the highest to the lowest of this new made world, all sunk in dignity, and station, and comfort, perhaps in the same ratio with man. Man was the sovereign on whom all the others depended; and when he revolted from his allegiance to God, they were doomed to experience the bitter consequences, as the head of a nation may involve all his people in the calamities of war, by a single act of his own. And as all things fell with him in his transgression, all things are suffering with him, and struggling for deliverance; and with an exception too small to negative the general facts, all will be delivered with him. This view of the passage is both consistent with the teachings of the Scriptures, and softens the boldness of the figure which we are compelled to use, when we extend the meaning of the term creation over the inanimate world. We can, with much less seeming extravagance, attribute to inanimate things the feelings and actions of man, when we view them in this indissoluble connexion with him.

Having adopted this view of the text, as liable to the fewest objections, and best corroborated by Scripture and experience, let us now turn our attention more particularly to the sufferings of the world under the reign of sin, and the redemption that shall follow.

Of the whole effect of the fall of man on the realm of nature, we shall never in this life be fully sensible. We know not how much richer would have been the tints that beautify the landscape,—how much more exuberant and delicious the fruits of the earth,—how much sweeter notes of music would have greeted our ears,—and how much more fragrant odours would have regaled our senses,—if the crown of innocence had never fallen from the head of Adam. Nor can we fully appreciate the physical effects of the fall on the race of man. Of man's moral degradation we can form some estimate. We have had one instance, though only one, of perfect holiness on earth since the fall. In the person of our blessed Lord, who was very man, we behold human nature in all the beauty of moral perfection. And we may contrast the heavenly temper and demeanor of the meek and lowly Redeemer, with the spirit and conduct of the wicked world around him; and we may imagine the happy state of things that would have existed, had all the race been like him. The blessedness and peace of heaven would have been seen on earth. But, O! how marred and how dejected was even this impersonation of virtue in human flesh! How far below the perfect symmetry, the noble bearing, and the majestic appearance of man in his original state of innocence! The Redeemer of mankind, though a pattern of perfect holiness, was, nevertheless, "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." We may not suppose him to have been like man in his primeval state. Though holy, he was made like sinful flesh, fashioned like unto man in his fallen state. His human nature was burdened and weighed down with the sins of the world. He was subjected to pains and trials, from which man, in his innocence, was entirely exempt. So we have no model of man's primitive excellence. But if his physical constitution has been impaired in the same ratio with his moral faculties, how miserably degraded, how wretchedly deformed, and how different from that man who came fresh from the hand of his Creator, made in the divine image, and pronounced by God himself to be very good! We behold now only the wreck of that building which was created for a temple of the Holy Ghost. Its beauty is faded, its strength is impaired, its symmetry is gone, its glory is tarnished, and the whole

system is fallen from the high estate in which it was created. It has lost the perpetual glow of health given to it at first, and, while holy, still retained. Pains and sorrows have laid hold upon it,

"And fierce diseases wait around,
To hurry mortals home."

Men now grow up, not to bloom for immortality here, but to fall prematurely by the sword of the fell destroyer. Beauty ripens but for the tomb. Strength is the prey of fearful maladies in this life, and food for worms to riot upon and devour in the grave. The earthly tabernacle, instead of being the richly adorned casket, in which the precious jewel of the soul is treasured up, is rather like the prison house, or manacles that fetter and lacerate it with painful wounds. We are a dying race. Sickness and death are our certain inheritance. With Job, we may all say, "If I wait, the grave is mine house: I have made my bed in the darkness. I have said to corruption, Thou art my father: to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister."

And if we turn our eyes from the outer to the inner man, we shall find it no less dashed and broken. The only remnant that we shall find of that mysterious fabric, the soul, is the stamp of immortality, indelibly impressed on it by the hand of Omnipotence. The wreck of its former self is every where visible. The desolating effects of sin may be traced in every faculty. The powers of the soul are impaired, like those of the body. From a height almost angelic, it has made a fearful descent, too often approximating to the level of the brute. Aspiring to the wisdom of God, man became a fool. His highest attainments in knowledge are foolishness in the sight of God; and his mind is debased, and not disposed to seek objects of high and noble enjoyment. The carnal propensities predominate over both the moral and intellectual faculties; and the mass of mankind prefer those grosser delights which are enjoyed by the brute creation. The mind being weakened, its most vigorous efforts are feeble and slow; and its progress in the acquisition of knowledge is interrupted by those wayward and turbulent passions, that rankle in it and cloud its perceptions. Anguish and mental distress distract it; and disappointments wound and deject it.

Moreover, on the soul's every lineament, we find the marks of moral deformity. Its original holiness is gone; the image of its Maker entirely defaced. Contentment and cheerful obedience have given place to restlessness, murmuring, and rebellion. Sweet peace is gone, and a war of passions now agitates it continually. It is no longer man's meat and drink to do the will of his heavenly Father. He is prone to evil, as the spark is to fly upwards. He is a child of the devil, and his works he will do. He drinks iniquity like water, and draws sin as it were with a cart rope. Man is but a pilgrim and sojourner here, and must soon pass away and be forgotten. But, while in this world, he must endure a great fight of affliction. His own passions are his fiercest tormentors. Like the furies of Orestes, they pursue him whithersoever he flies; they are a part of his nature; and he can no more escape from them than he can fly from himself. They are ingredients which, when blown into a flame, will kindle hell in the eternal world. And all these evils have come upon our race, in lieu of that heavenly peace that once dwelt in paradise. It may then be said, with propriety, that the whole race of man groaneth and travaileth in pain together; and his only relief is in the redemption that is by Christ Jesus. It is at the cross that forgiveness is found and peace is given. It is in this way that the Spirit is given, to cleanse the soul from all impurities, and to restore to it the glorious image of him who created it. Then the weary soul can say, with the Apostle, that "this light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

Again: That the lower orders of the animal creation were visited by the effects of the fall, we suppose will not be doubted. The one beast which was employed as the agent in seducing man to sin, we know was cursed by the Lord. He was cursed above or more than all cattle. One part of this curse consisted in his degradation from an erect to a prostrate form; for had no change been brought upon him, the curse would prove to be words without meaning. It is with good reason believed that the serpent was originally a much more noble creature than he is at present; that he moved upright, supported by wings, and that he

touched the earth only by a few gyrations of the tail. This opinion is rendered probable by the mention of the "fiery flying serpent," in the Holy Scriptures, and the accounts given by profane writers. There are still in existence varieties of this creature, that approach nearer to the primitive form than those with which we are best acquainted. Bochart and President S. S. Smith suppose the "fiery flying serpent," mentioned by the Prophet Isaiah, to have been the same species that attacked the children of Israel in the desert, and that it still exists in the heart of Arabia. But how much more noble was this creature, before the curse of the Lord fell upon him! Then his flaming colors and splendid form, resembling the seraphim or angels, evidently rendered him an inviting object in paradise, and well fitted to impose on the credulity of her who "was first in the transgression." And we are assured, both from the declaration that he "was more subtle than any beast of the field," and from the fact that the devil selected him as the agent most likely to succeed in his hellish designs, that the serpent was among the noblest of the brute creation. But now, how fallen and degraded, feared, hated, and loathed, as the common enemy of the whole animal world! And while his degradation rendered him a monument of God's displeasure towards sin, it is no less a proof of the truth of Scripture history. But the serpent was not rational and accountable, and no personal guilt could attach to him; and we conceive him to have suffered this marked degradation, solely on account of man's yielding to his seductive agency. But while the serpent was thus cursed, and changed, and degraded, the rest of the brute creation are by no means exempted. The extent of their degradation is both unknown and unimportant. They were all dependent on man, as their sovereign and lord, and all felt the shock given to the wide creation. They have been subjected to all the evils which their natures are capable of suffering. Like men, the different tribes make war, and bite and devour one another. The carnivorous feed upon others that fall into their power. Hunger and rage exist on the one part; while fear and extreme caution are produced on the other. The very demands of nature have made some the terror of other tribes. The suffering and death of the one is essen-

tial to the life of the other. They are subject to disease and bodily suffering. Fierce tumults and contending passions rage within them, and little of their lives is free from pain. They are endowed with natural affection, and experience joy and sorrow. Their pains produce the same restlessness that is seen among men. They are sensible of the difference between pleasure and pain; and they long for relief from the one, and for the enjoyment of the other.

This is not the proper place to discuss the question of the future existence of the brute creation, even if we were disposed to enter into the argument. It is perhaps enough to say, with the wise preacher, that the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth. And since the Scriptures, from which we have all our knowledge of the life to come, have given us no light on the affirmative side of the question; and since the great object for which they were created—the use of man in this world—will have been accomplished, we feel constrained, though we might wish otherwise, to consign them to that oblivion of silence which revelation maintains in regard to them. It is true that they exhibit many of the phenomena of mind; they have memory and reflection; but this truth is as far from teaching their future existence, as it is from proving the immortality of the soul of man. But although we may not hope for them a glorious immortality, we may ascribe to them an earnest desire and expectation of a deliverance from the evils which they suffer.

We are brought now to a consideration of the inanimate world. The Apostle, rejoicing over the future prospects of the children of God, and believing himself to be one of that happy number, contrasts the joys of that period with the sufferings of the present. "For I reckon," says he, "that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." And from the sufferings and anticipated redemption of himself and his brethren, who had received the first fruits of the Spirit, he, in the benevolence of his soul, cast his eye out on the vast creation by which he was surrounded, and looked forward to the day of its redemption from the bondage of sin and corruption. He looked back to the melancholy hour, when "by one man sin entered into the world,

and death by sin :” and he mourned the blight that had spread over the face of nature. And here the words of inspiration come directly to our aid. Whatever difficulties may attend our interpretation of the text, it is manifest that the whole terrestrial creation, from the highest to the lowest orders, has suffered a terrible disaster on account of sin. When man rebelled, he not only brought the vengeance of God down upon himself, but a withering curse upon the whole world. Is the question asked—Why is our eye doomed to rest on yonder barren heath? and why is not its place supplied by the verdant plain, the green forest, or the waving field of grain? we find the response in the words of the Almighty, cursing the ground for the sin of man. As man was made at first for peace and happiness, so the earth was fashioned for fertility and usefulness. But now we find its surface marred by vast arid and burning tracts, and rising into precipitous heights, totally unsuitable for the abode of man. Those portions of its surface, too, which are covered with a fertile soil, bloom not spontaneously with rich and useful herbage, nor pour forth their abundant fruits, for the sustenance of man. With pain and toil, he draws his scanty supply from the earth; ever verifying the words of the curse, that he should eat bread by the sweat of his brow. The gentle zephyrs rise into the desolating tornado, and with ruthless violence carry destruction in their train. The swelling floods burst forth from their embankments, cover the fruitful field with their sounding waters, and bear away the most precious products of his hands. The atmosphere, instead of regaling our senses with perpetual odours and healthful breezes, is charged with malignant damps and pestilential effluvia, the emissaries of disease and death. Barren wastes mar the beauty of the landscape; the gnarled oak stands amid the green foliage of the forest, scathed and blighted by the lightnings of heaven: rugged cliffs and impenetrable morasses have taken the place of the green and flowery paradise that came from the creating hand of God. Every thing on the face of our planet seems disjointed and broken, and perverted from its original design. In departing from its God, the world seems to have bid adieu to every thing good. Satan and sin wield their iron sceptre over it. The earth is wholly con-

taminated with wickedness. "It seems," says one, "like a stray member of a serene and blissful family, and has turned into a wayward, comfortless, ill-conditioned thing." And perhaps it is only kept, by the common laws of nature, within its own orbit, for the sake of other obedient worlds that have not been cursed by the sins of their inhabitants. For could we suppose its sister planets, too, to have departed from God, it would seem proper and necessary for the hand of Omnipotence to give them up to destruction. The nicely balanced powers which now keep them in their respective spheres, would be destroyed; world would dash on world, and, running wildly through space, all would hasten to utter ruin. But as, for the sake of the elect among men, the earth is kept in being, so, perhaps, for the sake of other obedient worlds, while the face of our planet is disordered and marred, the law of gravity is not broken; and, like a truant reckless child, it is kept under control by the instrumentality of other members of the same family.

But their travailing in pain implies that all things are struggling for deliverance. The sufferings of the world are not the agonies of death, but of birth. "Thus, we are assured," says Scott, "that the whole creation groans in every part, as with one sympathizing expression of anguish, (like a woman in the pains of travail, not as one in the agonies of death,) expecting and impatiently longing for a glorious event of all these distractions." All things may be said to be looking forward to a happy period, when the golden age of light and peace will return, and when a reconciled God shall look in favor upon the world, and again pronounce it very good. The creature was subjected to vanity; but it was subjected in hope. Hope seems to be the only good left. And we readily see how this accords with the classic idea of the condition of the world. According to the myths of the Heathen, when all manner of evils flew out of Pandora's box, hope was left at the bottom. Though all things suffer and groan, they nevertheless *hope* to be delivered. They desire and expect a brighter day to dawn upon our world, when nature, disordered and sickly, will be restored to primitive health and vigor. Ever since man fell, there has existed throughout the world a hope of regaining that which was lost. Both those who had the light of revelation, and those who sat in the dark-

ness of Paganism, pictured to their minds a future millennium of glory and peace. The philosopher and the poet, on whom no ray of heavenly light ever dawned, discoursed and sung of a golden age that had existed, and spoke confidently of its return. In the volumes of uninspired writings we have been sometimes startled at their near approach to Divine truth. In examining the connexion between sacred and profane history, we find much to assure us of the truth of the former, though the facts which were originally drawn from the Holy Scriptures, and handed down by tradition, have been obscured by the fabulous additions of Heathen writers. Throughout the writings of Pagan authors, we find evident traces of the creation of man; his golden age of innocence; his fall, and his expected restoration at some future time. The period to which expectation was directed, was the advent of the Messiah. For a long time previous to this event, a belief prevailed throughout the world, both Jewish and Gentile, that the Prince of Peace was about to descend from Heaven, to take the government of the world into his hand, and restore all things to their primitive order and purity. The Sybilline oracles teemed with predictions concerning the happy event. One of these, recorded by Suetonius, was, that nature was about to produce a King who should govern the whole Roman Empire. In the opinion of the great Latin Poet, Apollo was to be their incarnate God. "The last time is arrived, sung by the Cumean Sibyl, and the mighty order of ages commences again. Now, justice returns to the earth, and the innocence and happiness that reigned in the beginning of time. A new progeny descends from Heaven. The iron age of vice shall cease, and the golden reign of peace and virtue shall overspread the world. Now let thy Apollo reign. The time is just at hand. Enter on thy great honors, dear offspring of Heaven." The people of the East looked for this distinguished personage from the West; the West expected him from the East. The Magi of the East, who had been awaiting the glorious event, immediately recognized his star, and came into the land of Judea, to worship him who was "born King of the Jews." In the sacred books of the Chinese, it has been discovered that they looked for this expected Saviour, and styled him "The beautiful man of the West." And about

sixty years after the birth of Christ, one of their Emperors sent an embassy westward to inquire if the Holy One had yet appeared. These proceeded as far west as India, and there finding a new idol worship established, and presuming this to be the God whom they sought, carried back the idol with them, without farther search. Thus we see that the Gentiles, who knew not the true God, were full of expectation, earnestly desiring to be delivered from the bondage of sin and misery under which they groaned.

But, it is from the clearer light of revelation that we arrive at a full assurance of the truth. The harp of the sweet singer of Israel, the strain of the Prophet, and the prediction of the Apostle, have given us light which could come from no other source, and in which there is no deception. The advent of the Prince of Peace in the flesh, both as to time and place, was most explicitly declared. But how widely mistaken were the world, both Jewish and Gentile, in their conceptions of this remarkable event! How erroneous their views, both of the character of Christ and of the state of the world that should follow his coming! The iron age still continued, and the power of sin and misery reigned as before. It was only the obedience of this glorious personage to law and death that rendered it possible for the world to be redeemed. In the first Adam it fell; in the second, it is restored. But in the birth, life, and death of the Expiator of the "sin of the world," only the battle was fought and the victory gained, that should effect the actual redemption of the world at a future time. It is true, that then the serpent's head was crushed, as was promised just after the fall; but the final triumph will not be till the end of the world.

Another period to which our minds are directed by the prophecies of the Scriptures, is the day of millennial glory, or the reign of Christ upon earth. What is to be the date of this grand epoch in the history of the world, is unknown to us; but the truth of the event itself cannot be denied. The glory and peace of that period are depicted in strains of inspired poetry, and in the predictions of the New Testament writers. This happy state of the world was expected to follow immediately the coming of Christ, and the thousand years of the Apocalyptic vision were supposed to embrace the first thousand years of the Christian dispensation, at the close of which the world was to come to an end.

But the glowing descriptions of that time, given by the inspired writers, have never yet approximated to a fulfilment. Dominion is yet in the hands of the devil, as it was when he tempted the Saviour with "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory thereof." Nation yet rises up against nation, and men still delight in the smoke and carnage of the battle-field, and garments rolled in blood. But under the mild reign of the Prince of Peace the moral state of the world will be wholly reversed. "Nation shall not lift up the sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Ambition, rage, envy, and malice, will give place to the Christian graces, love, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Holiness to the Lord shall be on the bells of the horses, denoting, in Scripture language, its general prevalence in all the concerns of life. Instead of wars and tumults that shake terribly the nations, the arts of peace and industry shall every where be cultivated. Righteousness will abound as iniquity now does; and its legitimate fruits will be enjoyed. The constitution of man, no longer impaired by disease brought on by sinful practices, will be more healthful and better adapted to discharge its duties to God and man. Industry will be crowned by prosperity and success, and honest labor will not be without its reward. To a very great extent the curse will be restrained or removed from the earth. And if the predictions that "the child shall die an hundred years old," and "as the days of a tree are the days of my people," have reference to this period, the age of man will be much longer than it is at present. And the different tribes of animals, losing their natural hostility to each other, shall be delivered from the bondage of fear by which they are now held, and dwell together in peace, similar to that once enjoyed in Paradise.

But a perfect and full deliverance will not be effected until all the effects of sin shall be removed. Whether the earth shall be destroyed, or only purified by fire, is a question that has perplexed the critics as much as the interpretation of the text, because of its intimate connexion with it. That it is perfectly consistent with the perfections of the Almighty to annihilate any portion of his works, after it has subserved his righteous purposes, none can deny. It is as much His prerogative to destroy as to create. And as there was a period when the earth began to exist, there may be one when it will cease to be. And if we adopt the

opinion of astronomers, that the asteroids of our solar system are the fragments of a large planet rent to pieces by some mighty convulsion, analogy would teach us that the earth may be either wholly destroyed, or changed in any manner at the pleasure of the Almighty, without detriment to the other planets. It is evident from Peter, that it will undergo the ordeal of fire as it was once deluged by water. But how far a consumption of the material of which the earth is composed will take place, we do not aspire to know. The change of the heavens and the earth, spoken of by the Psalmist and quoted in the first chapter of Hebrews, does not afford any specific testimony of the renewal of the earth for the future residence of the Saints; but only of their frail and perishable nature, when contrasted with the perfections of Deity. The nature of the change is not described. And the new heavens and the new earth mentioned by Peter, are evidently the same with those of John in the Apocalypse, and are intended to express the blessed abode of the righteous in heaven. That they differ in their meaning from the like expressions in Is. 65 and 66, seems clear, as these passages describe a happy state of the Church before the end of the world. All the evidence of the Scriptures seems to us opposed to the opinion, that the earth will be the abode of man in his glorified state. There is a place where heaven is now, with God, the Angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, and we have no evidence that the locality will ever be changed for that of earth. Our Saviour ascended in a bright cloud into heaven; and Paul was caught up to the third heaven, where he heard things not lawful for man to utter. And Christians are represented as being caught up to meet the Lord in the air, in the resurrection, and as being forever with the Lord, 1 Thess. 4: 17. And our Savior prays, John 17, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." And Paul speaks of "having a desire to depart and to be with Christ." But where is the human body of Christ in its glorified state? Most certainly in heaven, whither he ascended from the Mount of Olives, and whence he will descend in flaming fire to judge the world.

Concerning the renovation of the earth, the Scriptures give us no specific information. The promise that it "shall

be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God," assures us only of the extermination of sin and misery upon it, and the removal of the curse. But this will not occur until the race of man shall have left it. And as the suffering of the inanimate world can only be considered as a figurative sympathizing with man, its deliverance may be only from moral evil. We have no idea that it will ever be restored to its paradisaical state, although the world of mankind may have expected it. For we have seen that both Jews and Gentiles were mistaken, looking for a restoration to the primitive state, instead of a less perfect one of a happy state of the Church under the Christian dispensation. For if the earth be restored to its original condition, to continue thus without change, we must admit the restoration and immortality of all things which then existed, the brute creation not excepted. We have no objection to the theory of an entire renovation, or new creation of the earth. He who created it at first may, for aught we know, render it unutterably more splendid and glorious than it was in the day of man's innocence. And indeed the past history of our planet would seem to indicate this by analogy. If we admit, with Chalmers and a large portion of the Christian world, that the earth has already undergone several renovations, in each rising to a higher degree of excellence, why may not the divine power that created and renewed it in ages past, subject it to a purifying process, and make it fit for the residence of a more noble race of beings than has ever yet existed on it? But we must suppose the Apostle to have reference only to the redemption of the earth in connexion with the believing part of the human race, from all the effects of sin, whatever we may assume upon other authority, to be its ultimate destiny. And we must stop our inquiries with the Scripture account.

But the final triumph of the Saints will not come till the resurrection. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." And believers wait "for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." They will come forth from the grave in triumph, and be crowned in glory by the Saviour's own hand. The Son shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and God shall be all in all.

ARTICLE V.

HISTORY OF THE GIRONDISTS, OR PERSONAL MEMOIRS OF THE PATRIOTS OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, *from unpublished sources, by ALPHONSE DE LAMARTINE, author of "Travels in the Holy Land, etc."* In three volumes, translated by H. T. Ryde; New York, Harper & Brothers, 1847.

There has certainly been much disappointment in the public mind, both here and in Europe, as to the power which Lamartine would wield, to good purposes, in controlling the course of the French Revolution. The expectations which had been raised would hardly have existed had the History of the Girondists been much read prior to that event. Very few of us who look calmly on from a distance, and see the perils which environ society and threaten the very foundations of morals and religion, would expect decision, firmness, or consistency in the apologist of Robespierre, the eulogist of the Gironde, and the admirer of the Jacobins. The character of his moral influence might well be gathered in the single sentence which pronounces, that,

"Heaven had destined Voltaire, not to destroy, but to illuminate, and wherever he trod light followed him, for reason (which is light) had destined him to be, first her poet, then her apostle, and lastly her idol." 1 v., p. 151.

Or more distinctly, as he proceeds from the theorist to his practical follower, and thus lauds the last cowardly weakness of humanity in the suicide of M. Roland.

"If his death be the greatest act he ever committed, the individual who has hitherto appeared as an ordinary character, becomes a hero by that death; and M. Roland could scarcely be said to have lived in vain, either for glory or liberty, since his career was terminated in a manner worthy of antiquity."

His common sense, (that article so very necessary to guide the rushing stream in which he had cast himself,) will hardly be appreciated, except perhaps by a brother poet, who may be able to attach an idea to his epithet for Char-

lotte Corday ; for ourselves, we confess "THE ANGEL OF ASSASSINATION" is one of those sublime fancies which we would no more attempt to comprehend than we would "The Devil of Holiness," or any other paradoxical absurdity which French mistyness or transcendental folly could coin.

In fact, throughout the whole of his spirited narrative of the eventful scenes, between the death of Mirabeau and that of Robespierre, (for this is the space his three volumes occupy,) there runs that vague, misty, untangible, and *undefined* conception of principle, so peculiarly French, and which hinders them from approaching the practical, useful, and possible — a mass of floating and unfixed words, surrounding, but not developing, unsubstantial and unreal ideas, which never advance to the solution of any of the difficulties which invest the actual experiments of life and the necessities of social existence. The calm wisdom which looks to the possibilities of life—to the circumstances beyond control—to the evils, manifestly without a remedy—to the good that can be done, not to that which is only desirable, and goes on to meet with suitable means the actual wants of the crisis, leaving Utopia to the visionary and enthusiast ; this is wanting in most Frenchmen, and its absence in M. Lamartine is most evidently developed in the pages before us. Like most of his countrymen, reason to him, if not a God, is at least identical with revelation. Man under its sway is inspired ; and self-government becomes as easy and unerring as divinity could make it. An idea, a thought, a theoretical principle, takes with him the form of personality and the power of a force — becomes an agent — bears on its broad shoulders the responsibility of action, and absolves the men who guide it, and who, to common minds, represent its existence, from all the consequences of urging in its name measures the most diabolical : thus—

"All was blind except the REVOLUTION itself. The virtue of the Revolution was in the *idea* which forced these men on to accomplish it, and not in those who actually accomplished it ; all its instruments were vitiated, corrupt, or personal ; but *the idea* was pure, incorruptible, *divine*. The vices, passions, selfishness of men, were inevitably doomed to produce, in the coming crisis, those shocks, those violences, those perversities, and

those crimes, which are to human passions what consequences are to principles." 1 v., pp. 46-47.

We confess, to our unpoetical mind, the Revolution is inseparable from the men who conduct it; and that we are as much bound to restrain our *principles* as our *passions*, if both lead to crime. We will quote on, that our readers may judge if we misrepresent the tone of our author.

"If each of the parties or men, mixed up from the first day with these great events, had taken their virtue instead of their impulses as the rule of their actions, all these disasters which eventually crushed them, would have been saved to them and to their country. If the King had been firm and sagacious, if the Clergy had been free from a longing for things temporal, and if the aristocracy had been good; if the people had been moderate, if Mirabeau had been honest, if La Fayette had been decided, if Robespierre had been human, the REVOLUTION would have progressed, majestic and calm as a heavenly thought, through France, and thence through Europe; it would have been installed like a philosophy in facts, in laws, and in creeds. But it was otherwise decreed." 1 v., p. 47.

This is a long and round about way of saying, "if man was not a fallen and depraved being, any government would have been easy and conduced to his happiness." Even a "despotism," based on this "if," would afford all that we need, and be devoid of danger; and, better still, such an "if" might realize the dream of the only right down honest party in France, (by the way, they have an organ) who protest against all government, and go for the universal Irish right of every man doing as he pleases. We like the straight forward, unmitigated rascality of these men, far better than the smooth trickery of the canting philosophers, who pull down with a sophistry and undermine with a fraud; who borrow religion itself to mask crime, and justify the bloodiest deeds by reasoning, which strikes away the foundations of faith and levels the landmarks of virtue. The sickly cant of French political philosophy is to us even more dreadful than the contemplation of its bloody history; for it speaks of a dark future, yet unread. While we see the roots red with their sanguinary life, we feel that the natural fruits, once borne before, may

again spring forth into that hideous despotism of irresponsible slaughter, more dreadful than the most grinding tyranny that absolutism ever invented. The awful prostitution of the name of Christianity, by the more sentimental and poetical of this tribe of revolutionary speculators, is not the least painful feature presented to us. It forbids hope for a people who desecrate the most holy things, and use the everlasting truths (which alone could give them stability and happiness), to decorate and sanctify movements and impulses which led directly to the most appalling exhibition of relentless depravity which the world has witnessed. M. Lamartine's "*Travels in the Holy Land*" gave us a clear idea of what kind of Christianity he possessed; but the book before us, in its every page, presents lamentable evidence of an utter ignorance of its primary truths, and shows that he ranks it very little higher than the revolutions of Mahomet, Constantine, and Charlemagne,—and akin, though somewhat inferior, to the grand revolution of the infallible French nation, "*the Apostle of liberty*," as he calls her. With more propriety, he might have named her *Priest*; for Druid bards and "*bloody Rome*" never excelled her hecatombs of living victims.

Before we dismiss the book, to pass to more general subjects, we must give our readers some further extracts. Without much selection, we might afford ample proof of the radical tone of the whole man, both in politics and religion. His every page is stamped with the restless yearnings and uncertain aspirations of the natural heart, where the intellect has been highly cultivated, and seeks to substitute its own regeneration for that of the soul. His whole book blends and confuses religion and morality, virtue, vice and crime, right and wrong, until we lose all power of discerning whether he most reprobates or most admires the darkest deeds and the vilest men. But we will go on with our samples of his poetry.

"All that could then be seen of the French revolution, announced all that was great in this world, the advent of a new idea in human kind, the democratic idea, and afterwards the democratic government.

"*This idea was an emanation from Christianity.* Christianity finding men in serfage and degraded all over the earth, had

arisen, on the fall of the Roman empire, like a mighty vengeance, though under the aspect of a resignation. It had proclaimed the three words, which 2000 years afterwards were reëchoed by French philosophy—liberty, equality, fraternity—amongst mankind. But it had for a time hidden this idea in the recesses of the Christian heart. As yet too weak to attack civil laws, it had said to the powers—‘I leave you still, for a short time, possession of the political world, confining myself to the moral world. Continue, if you can, to enchain, class, keep in bondage, degrade the people. I am engaged in the emancipation of souls. I shall occupy 2000 years, perchance, in renewing men’s *minds*, before I become apparent in human institutions. But the day will come when my doctrines will escape from the temple, and will enter into the councils of the people. On that day the social world will be renewed.’

“This day had now arrived ; it had been prepared by an age of philosophy, sceptical in appearance, but in reality replete with belief. The scepticism of the eighteenth century only affected exterior forms, and the *supernatural dogmata* of Christianity, whilst it adopted with enthusiasm, morality and the *social sense*. *What Christianity called revelation, philosophy called reason.* The words were different, the meaning identical.” 1 v. pp. 17, 18.

This is a very long extract ; but we think our readers will not object to so full an exhibition of the cant, absurdity, and unmeaning verbiage of this school of modern rationalists. Where, in the teachings of the Gospel, “the democratic idea” is found, we are not told. In what was it “a mighty vengeance,” or where its “aspect of resignation,” we must find out ourselves, after first discovering the meaning of these lucid phases : “Liberty, equality, and fraternity,” we presume, are declared in the Epistle to Philemon ; the “social sense” is what we used to call gregariousness ; “the supernatural dogmata of Christianity,” is salvation by Christ, we presume ; and “the morality,” which philosophy adopted with such enthusiasm, we must look for in the *life* and works of J. J. Rousseau, and the history of his disciples, Robespierre, Danton, and other heroes of the reign of terror. That all this is the veriest cant, in the full acceptance of the term, as understood by Carlisle, is proved by the frequent contradictions and inconsistencies we meet with. In the extract above, Christianity is said to have been “too weak to attack civil laws,” and this, for 2000 years ; yet,

when it becomes convenient to show why the revolution attacked Christianity, he charges, that "Monarchical Europe, was the handiwork of catholicism. Politics were fashioned after the image of the church." 1 v. p. 20. In truth, as history teaches us, Christianity very soon corrupted herself, not only by a union with governments, but by a slavish imitation, continued to this very day, even among some of the reformed churches, in diocesan episcopacy and other forms of organization, not warranted by Scripture, and sustained only by arguments of expediency and the authority of a vague and uncertain tradition. That this union was for their mutual support is unquestionable; but the power of the Popes and the sway of the hierarchy, from the days of Constantine to the time of Luther, and their active interference with civil government, are facts which M. Lamartine should have considered, before he declared Christianity was 2000 years in existence ere it became apparent in human institutions; or, choosing to outface history, he might have had the consistency not to charge the existing "human institutions of Europe" on its influence. Verily cant, which says one thing and means another, or means just nothing at all, will frequently re-cant. Such folly, such inconsistency, and such ideas of religion, morality and government, come but too naturally from one, who says, Tom Paine's "Good Sense, Rights of Man, and Age of Reason, are three pages of the *New Evangelist*, in which he has brought back political institutions and *religious creeds* to their primitive justice and lucidity." 2 v. p. 296.

We will conclude our extracts with a Chapter of Axioms. It is too rich to omit.

VII.

"Human thought, like God, makes the world in its own image.

"Thought was revived by a philosophical age.

"It had to transform the social world.

"The French Revolution was *therefore*, in its essence, a sublime and impassioned spirituality. It had a divine and universal ideal. This is the reason why its passion spread beyond the frontiers of France. *Those who limit, mutilate it.* It was the accession of three moral sovereignties:—

"The sovereignty of right over force;

"The sovereignty of intelligence over prejudices;

"The sovereignty of people over governments ;

"Revolution in rights ; equality.

"Revolution in ideas ; reasoning substituted for authority.

"Revolution in facts ; the reign of the people.

"A gospel of social rights.

"A gospel of duties, a charter of humanity.

"France declared itself the Apostle of this creed."—1 vol. pp. 19, 20.

The reader will observe the oracular way in which these short sentences are uttered, and that they are evidently put forth as the result of profound reflection, and intended to contain some very profound ideas. It is true, there *are* some big words, and the sentences *are* short. But big words and short sentences, though common to oracles ever since Delphos flourished, do not always contain wisdom. But as this short chapter evidently contains M. Lamartine's political creed, and his political creed I take to be the sum of his religious creed, it becomes us to examine and see really what the oracle does say. It is true, it begins rather unfavourably ; for it utters a new *fact*, without proof, to wit, that the *world* was made in the image of God. We know *man* was. Passing this by, and striking out the words "like God," we get an assertion, which may be true if it means that human thought influences human will, and thus directs the characters of men and the affairs of the world. But this idea is neither original nor very profound ; and as human thought and will, tainted by human depravity, is not exactly the image we like to see the world in, we hope some better axiom will be found to start from. We imagine thought always existed, and had a large share in all we did. The philosophical age was perhaps revived by it, or rather produced ; it has always been changing the social world, in some degree ; but how the French revolution was, *therefore*, a sublime and impassioned spirituality, is more than we can see. It may be our blindness, but we cannot perceive what the *therefore* has to do with the preceding sentences. Thought may have had that job to do, and been revived, and so forth, and yet the French revolution be, what we, and we suspect a long posterity will always think it, a most vicious, bloody, and debased *carnality*. It *had* a universal idea ; that is, the French people, with a desire for

conquest and love of war, and that bigotry which has been their chief national characteristic, did pant after universal empire and universal plunder,—as well as the universal acceptance of their creed at the point of the bayonet,—as is the common custom of bigots, whether they call themselves Mahomedans, Romanists, or Atheists. The sentence we have italicised, contains a hint for the rest of Europe at the present day. The spirit of the first revolution is the principle of the *hero* of the last. "*Those who limit, mutilate it.*" We have searched in vain for a solution of the next aphorism—"The sovereignty of right over force." Was it in the transfer of the King from Versailles? the overthrow of the Swiss guard, and the capture of the palace? the bloody days of September? the reign of terror? the consulate? the empire? To our simple capacity, if there is one lesson which every successive step in the French movement teaches, it is the *sovereignty of force*,—brute force. If the poor old king had had a General Taylor, or a Captain Bragg, for instructors, and believed in time in "a little more grape," he would have only ascertained the same truth the revolution has developed, and with much less misery and awe. All history speaks the same. The only changes are the transfer of force. The only effect of light, is the knowledge of its position. Thought, principle, object, may direct this force; but they are valueless without it. In France, the silly king, influenced by some silly notions of reform, let the Bourgeoisie know and feel their own strength. They in turn, with still greater stupidity, suffered the Jacquerie to learn theirs. The first class were then incapable of self-government; the second always will be. The fruit was, a transfer of the sovereignty of force to the least competent hands: they used it with a vengeance, until the other classes, in terror, transferred the sovereignty of force to a single man, who used it more discreetly. Any despotism is better than that of the "Many headed monster thing."

However, whatever this sovereignty, whether of force or of right, M. Lamartine says it was that of intelligence over prejudices. If so, high as some moderns rank intelligence, we confess to a slight prejudice in favor of prejudices. We are prejudiced against having our heads cut off, and think

it would at all events stop our intelligence. We are prejudiced against ignorant people governing the wise and the learned. We doubt much if the triumph of prejudice was ever greater than in the reign of terror: intelligence is certainly very little apparent, until they had the good sense to get them an intelligent Emperor, who had some prejudices in favour of order and good government. If, by "the sovereignty of people over governments," M. Lamartine means "the sacred right of insurrection," we beg to be delivered from this fruit of the democratic idea. We believe in that sovereignty which enables the people to form, and, with proper restrictions and those pretty numerous, to alter and amend governments; but if one or the other is to be a simple, absolute, unrestricted despot, then we prefer the government, any kind of one, to the people, alias, the mob. And this last we take to be M. Lamartine's "democratic idea" of a "democratic government." We did not at first comprehend "the revolution in rights,—equality;" but, upon reading the 2nd vol. pp. 492, 493, we think we find a solution. He says—

"Truth is evidently the Christian and philosophical community of property on the earth, and deceptions are the violences and systems by which we have vainly hoped to establish and organize this truth. The social leveling, the law of justice, appears to be as equally and logically the plan of nature in political order, as the leveling of the globe in material order. The mountains, in the opinion of many geologists, will one day glide into the valleys, and the valleys will become plains, owing to the effect of the wind, waters, and other causes. This change, if effected in a moment, would crush all the living creatures on the face of the earth; if effected by slow and imperceptible degrees, it would reestablish the equality of the level and of fertility without crushing a single insect."

And this material illustration, based on an absurd supposition of some geologists, is apparently quite satisfactory to the mind of this French poet and philosopher, as a reason for leveling *down* the human race to one uniform platform; and a low one indeed it would be. We will consent to this, whenever the world becomes a smooth round ball, without hill or hollow; we are then content that the Communists shall spread us over the surface in even layers. In the mean

time, it would be as well if M. Lamartine and his brother speculators would leave both to the "slow and imperceptible process of nature." Had Louis XVI. done so, the elder Bourbons might still, in conjunction with common sense, have swayed France, from whose borders we fear they are now for ever banished. We do not care much about the Bourbons, but we really are sorry that common sense and the hope of a rational liberty seem to be further from France than ever, simply on account of that impatience that will not wait the developements of progressive civilization,—a process which must be conducted by wealth and intelligence, and invariably retrogrades when subjected to the sway of the "democratic idea."

However, we are wandering from M. Lamartine's oracles. "The revolution in ideas" was, "that reasoning was substituted for authority." So says M. Lamartine. Stubborn history says the guillotine was substituted for both. "The revolution of facts,—reign of the people." This is the first truth we encounter; but, fortunately, it was a short, though terrible reign. We trust its lessons will never be forgotten. It is the first, we hope it will be the last, exhibition of the "democratic idea" in actual life,—in a "democratic government."

Lastly, says the oracle, this bloody episode in the world's history is "a gospel of social rights"—"of duties"—"a charter of humanity." All we know of its brief and bloody triumph is, that every social right was violated; hardly a social duty performed; humanity seemed to forsake the earth, and fiends of hell to have possessed the bodies of those, so called *men*, who reigned and rioted in the horrible carnage. "France was the Apostle of this creed," and, as we said before, its immolating Priest. If she again feels impelled to this holy mission, we trust that the embattled host of the oppressed world will not come together in vain. Twice have they marched to Paris. If a third time this restless people force them there, and they leave one stone upon another, the blood of millions will rest on the heads of those who weakly suffer this cradle of murder and crime to continue in a situation again to deluge Europe in gore. And let the nations see to it in time. The historian of the first,—the hero of the last,—the late head of the Provisional

Government says, "Those who limit (the revolution), mutilate it."

We have given our readers enough to enable them to form some idea of the tone and spirit of the book before us. A perusal will show them, these are no isolated blots; that the same principles and views, the same modes of thought, and the same errors pervade the whole work. Its literary execution is unexceptionable;—the narrative spirited and interesting;—the events and characters, grouped, and arranged, so as to present the most connected and satisfactory story of the eventful period he chronicles we have ever read. He has lost no ground as a literary man,—as a mere writer,—even as a poet. Yet we cannot conscientiously recommend any one to accomplish the heavy task we have achieved. It is long since we have read a detailed and consecutive account of this dark age of modern history;—we have ever shrunk from the re-perusal of its black and loathsome horrors;—and now, that for the purpose of this Review, we have again read its bloody page, we confess that we rise from it with all the freshness of the deep disgust, with which it impressed our young heart, as we turned with despair, from the contemplation of unrestrained depravity, left to the natural workings of its own corruption;—a period, undignified by one noble action, unadorned by one lovely sentiment, unredeemed by one noble man;—when even the lowest of all the virtues, brute courage, was debased by its union with ridiculous frivolity;—and the magnificence of the ferocity of the tiger, was made disgusting by the antics of the monkey. We leave the book and its subject gladly, to turn to the present, and to seek in the past only what may direct us for the future. We live indeed, "in perilous times," and it will be no unprofitable task, if we can find amid the principles of the past, the chaos of to-day, or the hopes of the future, any stable ground on which to rest our wearied thoughts. We are afar off, and hear the howlings of the storm, though on us it bursts not yet. But the rough tossings of the raging sea of Continental Europe, even now, move the waters in monitory swells beneath our feet; and the loud peons of our press, and unnecessary gratulations of our Government; show that a false philosophy, a morbid philanthropy, and

most short-sighted statesmanship, if things of European growth, are easily transplanted, and find but too congenial soil in a country fast verging to Democracy. The history of the last seventy years has been a series of startling changes, and at the same time, of precocious and hot house growth, in art, science and politics;—Europe, for the most part, has been a battle field; revolution has followed revolution so fast, that steam presses can hardly chronicle the shifting lines of states. The geography of our boyhood is obsolete, and our maps the monuments of the past. Art and science, hand in hand, have rendered space a mere mathematical term—production superabundant, and laughed at impossibilities as a bygone idea. Civilization has nearly reached the refinements of Imperial Rome; there are but a few of its discoveries that have not been recovered. We look complacently on all this, and compare with it, the semi-barbarism of even a century past, feeling the immeasurable superiority of the present. But is this so? What is the advantage we possess over the past? To the rich, have been added comforts, and appliances unknown to our fathers; but are the mass better fed?—better clothed?—happier?—more contented?—even freer? We speak not now of our own country; with a wide field,—a sparse population,—room enough for all,—a dense forest—rich prairies; and all the adventurous charm of frontier life to carry off the excitement and fever of society. We are in the midst of an experiment, with every advantage for trying it,—every drawback yet remote, and the struggles, difficulties, and sufferings of Europe to warn and guide. But the old country now enacts the panorama of our future, unless in time we find the soundings of her chart, and avoid the rocks and banks which have made her the helpless wreck that floats in our sight,—the license of despair prevailing over all the habits of discipline, and her safety and succor dependent on the ignorant rabble from before the mast, who stalk the quarter deck, with the drunken audacity of unaccustomed and unfitting authority. Are we shaping our course through the same channels? following in her wake, to meet her doom? These are questions worth asking. The answers are worthy of consideration. To do so advisedly,—the past and present state of Europe, its morals, its

policy, and particularly its philosophy, must be examined with a less superficial glance, than is generally devoted to subjects of such moment. That there has been a loose, careless, and unconsidered mode of using terms, and assuming axioms, is at the bottom of most of the fallacies, which have plunged the old world and its suffering inhabitants in a state, compared with which, the age of Louis XV was one of peace, happiness, and prosperity. A great many, indeed most of those who have philosophized on these subjects, have not gone beneath the surface; — many good men and true have hastily admitted premises, from whose inevitable conclusions they have shrunk, when it was too late to arrest the consequences to which they led. For some two or three hundred years, we have had speculation on speculation about political ethics, the relations of man with man, and society with Government; towards the middle of the last century, these speculations took life and form, in the active impulse given to all inquiry by the sudden birth of a new Empire, announcing, as if for the first time, man's capacity for self-government. This movement, the slow growth of progressive improvement, fostered under circumstances the most propitious — surrounded with vast oceans, to isolate from all mankind and their conflicting interests, and checked, and trammelled in its practical operation by a machinery too minute to be appreciated by the world, yet regulating and modifying the license of democracy, became at once the star of hope to which all eyes were turned. A multitude of writers arose, both in the New and Old World, and a thousand wild, and visionary theories on every question connected with society — social rights, individual rights, and government — were put forth. Among ourselves, we had many profound and able men, who with time for reflection and the opportunities for mature consideration, would never have put forth, even theoretically, the untenable dicta, that often went out in a period, when danger, difficulty, and excitement left no room for the accurate weighing of words, and the precise meaning of terms. — That they were so used is clear, from the fact that they were never acted on. A Government was formed, which while it recognized slavery in the face of the declaration of equality, gave to the slaveholding States a representation,

partially based on slaves numerically, while the vote was only lodged with the whites—hedged round the Federal Government, with the checks of a Senate of equal numbers from each State, and six years in office, the Presidential Veto, and an independent Judiciary; while in many of the State governments, principles still more conservative were retained. All this was simple and easy, among a people educated to liberty, intelligent, free, independent in pecuniary circumstances, with plenty of land, no debt of any consequence, and very slight social inequalities, either of position or wealth, to engender that vindictive war of interests, which burst over Europe the moment the first signal was given to the mass of discontent and anarchy that lay slumbering under the hand of authority, ready to break its bonds at the first touch of that Ithuriel spear, which showed its physical strength, so far tamed and curbed by the hand of intelligence. France, at this juncture, had fallen into the hands of a King, trained to some weak and visionary notions of the duties of his station;—a belief that his work was to reform the abuses of long years—not merely by applying the powers vested in him by descent, but by bringing the new powers philosophy had discovered, and granting to an uneducated ignorant *Bourgeoisie* rights and privileges, which no doubt would have been theirs in the progress of time; but this premature movement on the King's part, gave the reins too early to charioteers entirely incompetent to hold them. The sluice opened, the whole flood rushed in. The well meaning, weak King—the Constitution hardly dry—the royal family—the Royalists—the Republicans—the Jacobins—Liberty—all were swept away in its rushing red torrents. Amid the wreck and ruin of this moral waste, rose up a soldier, and with strong arm, stayed the plague for a brief while. He fell. The Old Bourbons replaced a little while, fell again; the New Bourbons shared their fate. The Provisional Government had its brief day. Again the fierce democracy began its bloody course, and another soldier became the Ruler of France. Must these things ever be so? Is this course the inevitable result of the principles and doctrines of modern political philosophy? We fear so, and the future looms before us, in a dark red haze the eye cannot penetrate, which yet appals the heart by its hidden gloom.

The words most commonly found in the mouth of philosophy, are "the natural rights of man," and "the unalienable rights of man." Many very pretty theories are built from certain positions, classed under one or the other of these two heads. Good men admit the foundation, deny the theory, but are carried away in its vortex. We have searched in vain for any authority for man's *natural* rights. If he had any, they existed before the fall. That is, Adam and Eve may have had some rights which God gave them, and which modern philosophy, in its pretended reverence for the name of God, prefers to call natural rights. We can imagine, they had the right to eat of the fruit of the trees of the Garden; they were restricted even in this, by the prohibition of one. As far as we can know without positive assertion, their liberty of action was confined to the Garden. These were not "unalienable rights" however; for they forfeited *them*, and life, with the first act of disobedience. Had they, after this, any *rights*? We cannot imagine them; they were condemned beings, they could have no rights, but by Christ's gift as King. These are the only rights man can have, as an independent, or isolated being; if we choose to consider him in this impossible position, in which so many theorists have placed him. If he had no rights he could suffer no wrongs. Rights and wrongs are therefore necessarily the creatures of society; such as man would establish himself, in his gregarious state. They are, in this state, both artificial and voluntary. But God created, and designed him for this state; all his laws are framed for this purpose; it is only in them, we can look for obligatory or enforced rights—to respect which, others were bound only by the same law. In a series of years, God, from time to time, has given laws, defining or indicating the rights he has given his elect. The only right we can recognize, given to man as such, independent of his relation to God by adoption, is the right to his life, or rather the prohibition to all other creatures to take it. Even this reservation is not as one of man's rights, but one of God's; for if it were man's, he could part with it, and suicide would be his right. This is made as criminal as to take the life of another, which shows that the protection extended to life, is only the preservation of existence, until the appointed time for the probation to close. Though man has no

rights, as thus considered, undoubtedly he has the *power* by mutual and common consent, to establish in society such arbitrary rules of Right and Wrong as his necessity enforces. That even among the Heathen nations, some traces of correct views of the relations of man with man are found, is to be traced, partly to the tradition of these principles — partly to “that law unto themselves,” of which St. Paul speaks, and which is a direct emanation from God; but mostly as we think, because the selfish wants of man, in many instances, compel to the recognition of that law of forbearance, which pervades revelation. We cannot therefore recognize any foundation for natural rights, any more than for natural religion; two verbal sophistries, the fruitful source of many errors, and closely linked in the systems of those philosophers who have done their part to unsettle the foundations of society and morals, and to create that restless spirit which renders all things in the present, as uncertain and precarious as the bark drifting without rudder or pilot on the broad bosom of the ocean. They take for granted man’s natural right to govern himself, and from this foundation eliminate “the democratic idea, and the democratic government;” they have begged the question, and the superincumbent edifice of fallacies becomes an easy structure. Now this right we deny. Man in every relation is under God’s government, and to God’s law alone must we look for his rights, his duties, and his privileges. If they are not all there plainly written, they must be plainly inferred from its spirit, and must never contravene its teachings. In that law, notwithstanding the assertion of M. Lamartine, we find neither “the democratic idea,” nor “Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity,” as he and the French Socialists understand the terms. Every other species of Government we find at least tolerated, from the Republicanism of the Jewish Eldership, to the absolutism of Imperial Rome. It is true that Israel was under the immediate, and direct government of God himself, and from time to time he gave them rulers who like Moses, Joshua and many of the Judges, exercised an authority almost despotic. But under them, and after their day, a system of human means was constituted, which afforded them the nearest approach to self-government unregenerate man is likely to achieve. Among all the fanaticisms of to-day, the Fifth Monarchy

men are alone wanting, unless their principles live with Joe Smith and his Mormons. And though no one now expects the immediate and direct presence and government of God in a visible Shechinah, yet surely we may find in his Word sufficient indications of such a human organization as is possible for man in his present state. The history of His own people, chosen, beloved, and favored, may well afford us the means of judging how far that wonderful utopia of the Communists is attainable or lawful. In the early records of social life, we find the Patriarchal system generally prevalent, and all-sufficient for the then wants of man. This, in the progress of time, necessarily gave way to other forms; the kingly was most generally adopted, growing, probably, by the union of several families, and the selection of one Patriarch as the head, or leader of all.

But we find the Jewish people, under the immediate direction of God, following Moses to the wilderness, and guided by him alone, though more as a prophet than a king, until, by his father-in-law's advice, he organized a regular government, choosing "able men out of all Israel" to be rulers of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens.* The chief men of families seem also to have had a part in the government, and to have been consulted in the affairs of the people. They went, seventy of them, with Moses and Aaron, to Mount Sinai.† In Numbers 11, we are told, the Lord commanded seventy men who were of "the elders of the people, and *officers* over them," to be brought before him for special consecration. So, in the thirteenth chapter, "the rulers," "and heads of the children of Israel," are spoken of. That these elders and chief men possessed power and rule, is apparent from the fact that they rejected Samuel's sons as Judges, and demanded a King.‡ The people confirmed the selection of Saul.¶ The men of Judah anointed David;§ and the Elders of Israel confirmed the act.** David, after Absalom's rebellion, sent to "the Elders of Judah" to come and bring him back, as deeming his restoration imperfect without their assent.†† In the whole history, we are instructed in the double lesson, that a large and liberal freedom was permitted to the Jews, even

* Ex. 18: 25. † Ex. 24: 9. ‡ 1 Sam. 8: 3. ¶ 1 Sam. 10: 24.

§ 2 Sam. 2: 4. ** 2 Sam. 5: 3. †† 2 Sam. 19: 11.

under the theocracy; and, on the other hand, that the government even of a king is not repugnant to any of God's laws, or opposed to correct views of human liberty. We find it anticipated and provided for in Deut. 17: 14, et seq. We find the man after God's own heart—the selected as the human progenitor of the Saviour—a prophet and inspired writer, exercising this office, not only unrebuked, but by God's own choice. Surely this sad turmoil in Europe is utterly without foundation, and the principles of its leaders based on views opposed alike to the reiterated precepts of the Gospel and the uncontradicted facts of history. From the first to the last of the inspired penmen, we find gradations in society recognized and approved, and the relative duties of these grades enforced and required. Obedience to the higher powers—to kings and to magistrates—is ordered again and again.* So are the relative duties of masters and slaves freely spoken of and authoritatively enjoined.† Where is the democratic idea? Where is the boasted equality? or any such licentious liberty as is claimed by the wild enthusiasts of Europe? Even the *fraternity* of the Gospel, one of its living principles, and its dearest social blessing, is spiritual and heavenly, and never calls for the neglect of those broad distinctions which the inequalities of intellect and wealth have always and will always create, unless man's whole nature becomes so totally changed that laws and governments will alike become unnecessary. Until then, we are satisfied with the guarded and conservative republicanism, which the wisdom of our fathers gave us in that magnificent instrument which has never been surpassed by mere human wisdom. Yet, wise and profound as are the provisions and checks of the Constitution, we, for one, do not believe it would have resisted the shock of democracy twenty years, if it had not the aid of that institution which accident, or, rather, a beneficent Providence had given the South. Slavery is the great conservative balance wheel, which so far gives stability and permanence to the Union, and secures us the only possible liberty which can endure the rude pressure of a fierce democracy, growing every day bolder in its assaults, and tending every

* Rom. 13: 1, 2, 3, 4; 1 Peter, 2: 14, 15, 16.

† 1 Cor. 7; Eph. 6; Col. 3, 4; 1 Tim. 6; 2 Tim. 3; Philemon.

where else in the world to that agrarianism, which must be the sure precursor of barbarism, but not of liberty; for even the mob, in its freest hours—even the Parisian populace, in its hour of triumph and its reign of terror, has its masters and its rulers. It is not a question of whether there should be rulers or not, but *who* shall be rulers: the wise, the intelligent, the cultivated and refined—or the base demagogues who sway the crowd—the Heberts, the Sauterres, and the Sobriers? Is it for this that these philosophers have written, and talked, and roused the populace to arms and barricades? No sooner have the deluded sans-culottes driven the timid King from his throne, than the men of the tribune take up the fallen reins, and find they have loosed a foe more terrible than any single despot who ever swayed a nation's destiny. In vain they strive to buy them to order and submission; in vain they open nominal workshops, and feed the army now threatening to be masters: the storm comes, (some shrewdly suspect, encouraged by the desperate government itself,) and another fierce and bloody contest, in the very heart of Paris, speaks its warning lesson, and leaves the people in two vast parties, more irreconcilably opposed than ever.

Can it ever be otherwise? Where are the ties to connect capital and labor? Will not time only render their interest more directly conflicting? There was a period when this was otherwise. In the relation of lord and serf, there was the kindly influence of mutual support—of service on the one hand, and protection on the other. There was, in a great degree, a community of interest—they prospered or decayed together; there was loyalty and love—and the affections were not entirely the product of money. There was, too, the practical administration of equitable justice, even in the smallest concerns of the poor. In every country in which civilization has made any progress, the necessity of a system of equity jurisprudence is felt and recognized. The hard, unbending generalities of law, in their literal application, become tyranny. As far as property is involved, they have been relieved by a system called equity, professing to be governed, it is true, by fixed rules and certain precedents which grow up gradually in its progress. At last, however, it resolves itself into a regulated absolutism in the Chancellors. This is tolerated because of its necessity and its

sound practical working ; it is, however, too expensive for the poor, and has never been applied in any free country to criminal offences. Yet, among the needy and the suffering, continually exposed to the temptations of poverty, and steeped in the crimes of ignorance, it seems to us this very system, or something similar, is most desirable. It was supplied in Feudalism. The Baron was the seat and source of justice, and had both the power and the right to soften the asperities of rigid law, and to take into consideration all the circumstances and attendant incidents which either lessen the guilt of motives, or increase the enormity of crime. Thus, real justice was meted out. In our own system, the same result is attained ; and the master can afford his slave, in all his wants, as well as all his crimes, a fairer justice than the police courts of Europe ever mete out to the poor peasant, who is often driven to vice by the law, and legislated into crime.

Europe, however, has parted with her old bulwark—most probably never to regain it. The capitalist is too sordid to desire it—the social slave too ignorant and too puffed up with his fancied rights to consent. There is, apparently, for France at least, but one alternative : foreign bayonets, or barbarism. It may seem strange to talk, in this century, of the polished French and barbarism in the same breath. But, with all our self-sufficiency, can we boast of a higher civilization than Greece and Imperial Rome ? If a black night followed their high refinements and cultivated intelligence, through the inroads of northern hordes, why may not France, under the sway of Red Republicans, more ruthless than Goths, and more barbarous than Vandals, drive from her, capital, intellect, and virtue, and sink her into the same unmitigated night. They who would desecrate the Tuilleries, with its old recollections of the glory and greatness of the nation, into a hospital for the rabble soldiery of the faubourgs, would look on every vestige of civilization as its foe and rebuker. It is easy to level down—it is hard to level up.

The abolition of feudalism was not the consequence of the growth of liberty, or the progress of opinion, as the philosophers (who love to think their words power) boast, so much as the gradual increase of personal property, the influx of bullion, and the consequent rapid growth of com-

merce, manufactories, arts and sciences. The agricultural nations were the last to surrender a system, which, if it gathered a nominal wealth and real power in the hands of the few, extended protection, bread, and a reasonable liberty to the many. But when the hopes of wealth, the excitements of commerce, and the chances of trade, opened the door to all, new interests and new principles arose. The capitalist willingly freed his serf, when he could get more out of him as a freeman. He loosed the bands of loyalty, but he bound him fast with the chain of necessity. He made him a freed man, more surely to control him as a serf. He only added the mockery of political liberty, as if to sneer at his social slavery. These facts are apparent to even such visionaries as our author, but the causes which produced them are hidden. M. Lamartine says—

“The excesses which the revolutionists of Nice committed against their personal enemies, under the shelter of the bayonets and banner of France, caused a revolt among the *Mountaineers*, *always more attached to old customs, and more faithful to old governments, than the people of the plains, on the banks of the rivers, or on the sea coast.*” 2 v. p. 401.

He, fond of geological illustrations by way of argument, as well as poetical in his ideas, accounts for this fact by the influence of scenery.

“The sea seems to inspire the nations who dwell near it with the feeling and desire for liberty. The ocean, whose sight sets thought free, seems also to give freedom to people.” 2 vol. p. 439.

Profound statesman! accurate thinker! consistent writer! Not long ago, we were told that a “philosophical age revived thought;” now “the ocean sets it free,” and ends with giving freedom to the people. Verily a watery idea, worthy of the condensation of the vapory dreams of this bubble philosopher. The ocean and the rivers are the highways of commerce; the plains, the nurseries of trade and the seat of wealth. Thus the corruptions of Mammon are first felt by those who dwell within such influences; and the result is, as we have said, in the nominal freedom of the lower class, because they are thus more available to capital, and at a cheaper rate. Eventually capital marches

to the mountains, and drives out the last vestiges of real freedom, their old inhabitants most commonly preferring a voluntary exile to the so-called improvements of wealth and civilization. Thus Swiss mercenaries are found in every service, and the gallant clans of Scotland have been scattered over the new world. But if a selfish civilization and sordid calculations have added largely to the progress of a nominal freedom, the excitement of the political brain fever, under which the world has been laboring for a century, has rapidly hastened the growth of art and science, and all the physical improvements, which hurry on with a speed defying calculation or conjecture. A hot-house and unhealthy precocity pervades every thing, and forces into morbid activity all the resources of society. Books are thrown out without reflection,—thought uttered without consideration,—speculation advanced without data,—assertions made without proof. The mind is growing shallower and more superficial in its attainments, as if knowledge, in its spread, had lessened its depth. Commerce has been forced into a fever, which, coming in paroxysms, is followed by regular sincopes, whose intervals are less and less frequent. Machinery has progressed from step to step, increasing, it may be, the number of employees (as is urged), but so swelling production, that the price of labour cannot support life. Wealth is driven into narrower channels, and heaps itself into enormous but unhealthy and bloated banks, that only conceal for a time the quicksands that are ready to engulf all the civilized world. Thus have wealth and democracy acted and re-acted on each other; beginning as sworn friends, they now stand forever opposed in deadly hostility. One or the other must rule; and for this rule they have fought through half a century, and again stand armed and ready to renew the deadly conflict. How it will result, human foresight cannot say. We can only hope for the triumph of intelligence, and at least a semblance of morality, which, let demagogues preach as they may, invariably accompany wealth, rather than the mere brute force of ignorance and numbers. We would not be understood as ascribing to wealth the production of either intelligence or virtue. We only maintain that, as a class, it is the necessary consequent of wealth to gather

these to its party. By wealth we mean the aggregate of property ; that which in all wise Republics well ever have a representation, as well as population. This triumph will never be attained by what M. Lamartine calls the "sovereignty of intelligence over prejudices," in any other way than by such wise combinations of "intelligence" as will ensure it the "sovereignty of force." Then, doubtless, the progress of real civilization will induce the establishment of such freedom as is compatible with the advance of the Jacquiére, in knowledge and social virtue : and when the triumph of Christianity is perfect, will the success of civilization be complete. They must go hand in hand. Hitherto the vain attempt has been urged of pushing on the latter, beyond the former. In fact, among the larger number of the philosophers, the regeneration of the mind has been substituted for the regeneration of the soul, and the refinements of intellect considered sufficient, without the sanctification of the spirit. Thus the leaven of a vital Christianity, with the preventive restraints of its contact, so far from being an indispensable principle in the progress of civilization, was entirely rejected by the earlier school, and is only tolerated by the modern, as a salvo to prejudice. That philosophy, which in M. Lamartine's opinion was "in reality replete with belief," had in fact struck at the vitality of religion, and cast away the only hope of progress or improvement. In France, in all Catholic Europe, it found no principle to cope with it. One falsehood could not deny another. "The man of sin" could not rebuke the sinner ; and the worn out forms and empty shell of a miserable compound of simulated Christianity, and sensual idolatry, presented but a feeble obstacle to the high sounding pretensions of human perfectibility and social regeneration, which this self-sufficient philosophy promulgated. The old creed had swept away the substance, the new one blotted out the forms of Christianity. The Romish priests went to martyrdom for their forms. So did the Druid bards. So did a good many of the French atheists. We must "judge the spirits ;" the effects are often simulated. But real, vital godliness was dead in France before her revolution ; and without its checks, its morals, and its purity, civilization and its progress is replete with dangers. Unsanctified

knowledge is but a sharpening of the weapons of Satan. Vice and luxury are the inevitable companions of refinement; the extremes of poverty and ignorance, its unhappy necessity. Unchecked by the presence and the contact of Christianity, these are dangers it cannot resist; and hence the world's history has been but progressive improvement to a certain height, only to fall into deeper abysses. Romanism, but a semblance of Christianity and its real foe, has never and can never avert these inevitable tendencies. Look abroad on the great civilized world, and in proportion as Romanism pervades the spirit of a nation, in that same ratio has she sunk in the scale of political existence and moral excellence. On the other hand, as Christianity is a living principle among a people, so do they stand forth in intelligence, freedom, worth and power. Government and its forms make no apparent difference. Sunk alike is monarchical Spain, her republican daughters, and imperial Austria; while the old seat of the Apostate himself, classic Italy, is fallen almost beneath the contempt of the nations. On the other hand, the United States and England, where a purer faith prevails, stand first in the race of empire, and immeasurably the first in order, morality and good government. Sweden, with legalism and rationalism, both largely hiding her Christianity, follows; and Germany, with her thousand *isms*, and her religion well nigh extinct, trembles on the brink, and has not any certain indications for her future.

We, the spectators of these interesting scenes over which we have been looking, may learn some salutary lessons, of which we stand in need. As South Carolinians and slaveholders, we may well foster with care, and guard with jealousy, as well the checks of our State government, as that great institution, which yet preserves all that is to be valued in the old European system, before commerce and wealth had debased and desecrated the relations of the two great classes into which mankind will ever divide. We have a peasantry without political rights; our social slaves are not our equals, and we have none of the evils of this absurd anomaly. Let us be careful of this great blessing; defend it even with our lives; for the worst evils of a servile war can be no worse than the horrors of a French

revolution. Let us beware of this false philosophy, with its democratic idea, and its Irish sympathy, and French admiration. Take care that we do not sow tares in our own wheat, and learn, too late, that a sickly and morbid interest in visionary and wicked schemes abroad, brings its own punishment, by rousing at home the like spirit of discontent. We trust our Irish sympathisers are sufficiently satisfied with the magnanimous war of that great nation, successfully put down by a few constables, a parish priest, and an old woman; and will leave to the rewards of his own glory the hero of retreats, Field Marshal Smith O'Brien, or at the utmost weave a cabbage garland for his brow, whose verdant hue will be at once an emblem of his party and his plans. We know these things are only for political effect; baits to catch fresh Irish gudgeons at the hustings. But fishers sometimes catch Tartars. Of all things, do not let us catch *here* the spirit of discontented Europe, which throws on government all the ills that uncontrollable Providence appoints; or set an evil example to the nations, by fostering in their borders a treason we would crush in our own. If they tamper with our slaves, we are deeply indignant. Have we any right to tamper with the social slave of Europe, because they have derided him with the absurdity of political freedom? Let them manage their business; we mind our own. The next time the French have a revolution, we should wait, and it would be dignified if our government would do so likewise, at least until we see the result. We ought to know, before we applaud, whether it is the *Jacquerie* who have cut the throats of the *Bourgeoise*, or vice versa, though with the vote-hunters we suppose this would be immaterial.

A greater lesson yet, we learn from the state of the nations,—that is, to cling to our Protestantism. Beware of the progress of Rome; resist her every step; watch her every movement. She is galvanized into a temporary resurrection; her struggles will be fierce; her end will be in convulsions. God's providence and his promises are the sure trust of the Christian; but he has also provided means, and appointed their use. Let us apply them boldly, zealously, above all, prayerfully; and, fiery though the trial be, we may yet bear its heat, and conquer in His great

name. Never should we forget, in the contemplation of second causes, the one great first cause, who has decreed from eternity the ways of men ; so that though they appear "to work out their own devices," they are nevertheless controlled and overruled in all things to the single purpose of the triumph of his Son, and the establishment of His kingdom. "In vain do the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things." All their philosophy (falsely so called) shall be brought to nought, and the simple way of salvation be made apparent, as the real source of happiness here and immortality hereafter. Nevertheless, all the world's history is written for our instruction, and it becomes us to read its lessons and take its warnings. This is one of its most unreal and selfish periods,—when words of cant are on almost all lips, and the science of humbug and delusion spreads over the rotten surface of society a crust of fallacies, which hides its corruptions and fosters its fraud. We cannot close this article better, than by a choice specimen from the pages of our author. Speaking of the first revolution, he says—

"This deadly struggle for the cause of human reason, is a thousand times more glorious than the victories of the armies which succeeded it. It acquired for the world inalienable truths, instead of acquiring for a nation the precarious increase of provinces. It enlarged the dominion of the mind, instead of expanding the limits of a people. Martyrdom is its glory ; its ambition, virtue. We are proud to be of a race of men to whom Providence has permitted the conception of such ideas, and to be the child of an age which has impressed its impulses on such advances of the human mind. We glorify France in its intelligence, its character, its soul, its blood ! The heads of these men fall, one by one ; some justly, others unjustly. But they fall in consummation of the work. We accuse or absolve, weep or curse them. Individuals are innocent or guilty, loved or hateful, victims or executioners. The working out is vast, and the idea soars above the instruments, like the ever pure cause over the horrors of the battle field. After five years, the revolution is nothing but a cemetery. * * * * *

"A nation should unquestionably bewail its dead, and not console itself for one head unjustly and hatefully sacrificed ; but it should not regret its blood, when it has flowed to bring forth everlasting truths. God hath placed this price on the germi-

nating and bursting forth of his designs on man. *Ideas vegetate from blood.* Revelations descend from scaffolds. All religions derive their divinity from martyrdom." 3 v. p. 537.

The blasphemy, which parodies the Eternal Sacrifice to justify the unhallowed crime of the revolution, comes but too naturally from one who, worshiping reason as divine, and thought as the maker of the world, sees in blood but the fertilizer of his God.

ARTICLE VI.

ON THE MANNA OF THE ISRAELITES.

Two derivations are given of the name of this substance, furnished in so wonderful and miraculous a manner to the people of God, in the deserts of Arabia. One of these forms it from the interrogative in Hebrew, *mân*, ("what is it?") denoting their surprise at the sight of what, till then was unknown to them. Deut. 8: 3. The other assigns its meaning from the root *mânan*, to divide out, to allot, and hence, its signification would be a portion, or gift. Josephus adheres to the former; he says, "Now the Hebrews call this food 'manna,' for the particle *mân*, in our language is the asking of a question, what is this?*" Gesenius, and many others incline to the latter. As might be expected, this article is often spoken of in the Bible; and is not only called by its common name, but by several others. Thus in Ex. 16: 4; Neh. 9: 15; John 6: 31, 32, it is called "bread *from* Heaven;" in Psalms 78: 24, "corn of Heaven;" verse 25, "Angels' food," or the bread of princes, nobles. In Psalms 105: 40, (Wisdom 16: 20,) "bread of Heaven." Paul, in 1st Cor. 10: 3, alluding to the same thing, says, "they did all eat the same spiritual meat; but whether he means spiritual as denoting its source,

*Ant. Bk. 3, Ch. 1, Sec. 6.

divine, spiritually produced ; or as in its nature, pure, refined ; as when he calls the future resurrection body spiritual ; 1 Cor. 15 : 44 : or whether he so calls it as intended to convey instruction to the mind, may be a matter of doubt. From what Moses says, Deut. 8 : 3, "And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know : *that he might make thee to know* that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord, doth man live ;" this quoted by Christ, Mat. 4 : 4, together with the use made by him of the miraculous supply of manna to their ancestors, when speaking to the Jews, John 6 : 31, 32, would lead us to suppose that the last may have been the idea of Paul, when he calls that food "spiritual meat;" though not to the exclusion of the other senses. We will now proceed to make some examinations concerning this manna ; and,

1. As to the size and shape of the particles. Ex. 16 : 14, in the English translation we read, "there lay a small round thing, as small as hoar frost on the ground ;" when the dew was gone up in the morning. Literally "fine flakes, or scales, fine as hoar frost." And there is nothing in the original that necessarily implies that the particles were *round*. In Psalm 78 : 24, it is called "corn of Heaven," which indicates that it was in grains like wheat. And if the name be derived from the root that signifies to divide out, it may point to this idea, manna, q. d. *granulated*. In two places, viz : Ex. 16 : 21, and Num. 11 : 7, it is expressly compared to coriander seed ; and this must refer, not to its color or taste, for they are otherwise described, but to its shape and size. Josephus says the same thing ; "in *bigness* equal to coriander seed."* And the fruit of the coriander, as found in the shops, is globular, about the eighth of an inch in diameter, obscurely ribbed, of a greyish or brownish-yellow color ; and separable into two portions, (half-fruits) of which it consists.† Some of these seeds now before us, that grew in this country, are about equal in size to grains of wheat.

2. As to its color : it is uncertain whether we can take

* Ant. Bk. 3, Ch. 1, Sec. 6.

† United States Dispensatory, Wood & Bache, p. 275.

Ex. 16: 14, where it is compared to hoar-frost, to refer to its size and shape only, or also to its color. If to the latter, of course it was white, and may be compared to the flakes of snow that fell in very cold weather, roundish or pear-shaped, and very compact. Josephus says the Israelites "thought that it snowed, and that it was what usually fell at that time of the year."* In Num. 11: 7, it is said, "The color thereof is as the color of Bdelium," or the *eye* of it is as the *eye* of Bdelium. Whether the interpretation given in the June Number of the Review,† making this substance to be quicksilver, be correct or not: if it be that, or pearls, or some kind of gum; this comparison will make the Manna to be of a white color. In Ex. 16: 31, it is expressly said to be white. Whiston, the translator of Josephus, quotes the saying of Artapanus, a heathen writer, who compared it to "meal like oat meal in color, like to snow rained down by God."**

3. As to its taste and other qualities: Ex. 16: 31, "And the taste of it was like wafers made with honey," or "flat cakes in honey," that is, eaten with it. Num. 11: 8, "And the taste of it was as the taste of fresh oil." Or as in the Lexicon of Gesenius, "a sweet cake made with oil." It fell in the night with the dew; and as the nights in that country are cold, even in the warm season, it was then hard, and so continued till the sun waxed hot, when it melted: Ex. 16: 21. It is not certain, however, that it melted naturally in this way, but it may have been caused to be so, in order to compel the Israelites to gather it early in the day, and for other purposes. Num. 11: 8—They ran about hither and thither, and collected it, and ground it in mills, or beat it in a mortar, and baked it in pans and made cakes of it. We infer from this that though perhaps it might be eaten raw, or uncooked, yet it required to be heated like grain; and seethed or baked before it was adapted to become human food. And it is important to notice here, that from the connection, it would appear that it would ferment with yeast. It fell in equal quantities by measure to every individual, an omer, or about five pints

* See Josephus as before. ** Ibidem.

† Southern Pres. Rev., June 1848. p. 95, &c.

per day : or at least they gathered it in that proportion. Ex. 16 : 16. "And he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack ;" verse 18, and 2, Cor. 8 : 15. The same labor must be performed every morning : if any one attempted to lay up in one day provision for two or more days, "it bred worms and stank," except on the morning before the Sabbath, when they gathered a supply for two days which kept good.*

And in passing we may make here two remarks :

1. How great must have been the labor to collect from the surface of the ground their supply of Manna, when composed of so small particles ; of which about five pints must be gathered for every member of a family : and that too, while the coolness of the morning continued. They must labor for their daily bread, while yet it was given them by miracle from Heaven. John 6 : 27. It was doubtless necessary that they should have some employment, as they were not always in motion on their march ; nor occupied with their flocks and herds, of which they had some, (Exodus 10 : 26 ; 12 : 38,) brought from Egypt.

2. How immense the quantity that fell first and last, by the space of forty years. Ex. 16 : 35. It is commonly supposed from (Num. 11 : 21,) that if there were six hundred thousand footmen, (Ex. 12 : 38) that the whole mass of the people could not fall short of three millions, in the camp. If we reduce this sum by one third, and allow two millions, and estimate the omer at 51 pints, we shall have the quantity gathered per day, 20,238 hogsheads ; in a year, 7,386,870 ; and in forty years, 295,474,800 hogsheads ! Surely God did open the window of Heaven, and rain down Manna upon them ; as well as bring water out of the flinty rock for their thirst, and send them quails to the full.

As might be expected however, they soon became tired of what was so sweet. They began to murmur ; (Num. 21 : 5,) "Our soul loatheth this light bread : " (11 : 6.) "Our soul is dried away ; there is nothing at all before our eyes besides 'this Manna.'"

The enquiry now arises, what was this Manna ? It was

*The author of "The Wisdom of Solomon," (16. 20-21,) gives a truly apochryphal quality to the Manna. It suited itself to every man's taste, appetite, &c.

evidently not a natural production of that, or of any other country. It fell at all seasons of the year, and at all places alike. It fell in just the quantity needed, and in double quantity once in a week. And even if it could be supposed a natural product of Arabia, or some other country, the quantity given, and the time and mode of supply, would render it miraculous. But if it were produced in that region, through which they were passing, Moses who spent forty years there, would have been acquainted with it; and that is not so remote from Egypt, but that they or their ancestors might have had some knowledge of it. But, (Deut. 8: 3-16) forbids the supposition that they had ever before seen such a substance. Further; if natural and often met with, why was Moses directed, (Ex. 16: 33,) to take a pot, (Heb. 9: 4,) and put an omer full of Manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be *kept for their generations*?

It is true that we read of a substance, which Josephus says in his day, "in all that place came down in rain."* And at this day, we find in the shop of the apothecary, an article used for medicinal purposes, called Manna. It exudes from the bark or leaves of certain trees in the East, mostly a species of ash; but sometimes the oak, and also the tamarisk. It is a kind of gum, or inspissated juice; though there are several kinds of it, differing in their qualities. It does not flow from the trees in all seasons of the year, but mostly in the months of July and August. Nor does it resemble the Manna of the Bible, either in external appearance, or in its qualities. The purest and best kind is called flake manna; and is known also as manna canulata. "It is in irregular and unequal pieces, often several inches long; somewhat similar in appearance to stalactites, rough, light, porous, brittle, of a whitish or yellowish white color. When broken, these pieces exhibit a chrysaline, or granular structure."† It has purgative, more than nutritive qualities, and is used in medicine as a gentle laxative. It has a sweet, but not very agreeable taste. In most kinds of it, the sweetness is not owing to the presence of sugar, but to a peculiar saccharine principle called mannite, *which, unlike sugar, will not ferment with water and*

* See Josephus as before.

† U. S. Dispensatory, Wood & Bache, pp. 447, 448.

*yeast.** We see here no resemblance to the Manna of the Bible; and especially do we see, that since the modern Manna has a distinct principle, which will not ferment, as that of the Israelites appear to have done, it can have no affinity with that.

That, however, found at present in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai, differs in some respects from the preceding. Dr. E. Robinson, who visited that country in 1838, says: "It is found in the form of shining drops, on the twigs and branches (not upon the leaves) of the *turfa, tamarix gallica mannifera* of Ehrenberg, from which it exudes in consequence of the puncture of an insect of the *coccus* kind, *coccus manniparus* of the same naturalist. What falls upon the sand is said not to be gathered. It has the appearance of a gum, is of a sweetish taste, and melts when exposed to the sun or fire." He was told by the Superior of the Convent on Mount Sinai, that it was not produced every year—sometimes only after five or six years—and that the quantity in general had greatly diminished. "Indeed, so scarce had it become of late years, as to bear a price of twenty or twenty-five piastres the pound."† The author states, also, in a note at the close of the first volume of his *Researches*, that "a chemical analysis by Prof. Mitscherlich, of Berlin, showed that the manna of the tamarisk of Sinai contains no mannin susceptible of chrystalization, but is merely an inspissated sugar."‡

Burckhardt, in his *Travels in Syria*, says of the same kind of manna, that it is collected before sunrise, when it is coagulated; but it dissolves as soon as the sun shines upon it. He could not learn that the Arabs ever made it into cakes or loaves; that it is found only in years when copious rains have fallen; sometimes it is not produced at all. He saw none of it among the Arabs, but obtained a small piece of the last year's produce at the Convent on Mount Sinai, where, having been kept in the cool shade, it had become quite solid, and formed a small cake; it became soft when kept some time in the hand; if placed in the sun for five minutes, it dissolved. When the Arabs gather it, it never acquires that state of hardness that will

* Turner's Chemistry, p. 516.

† Rob. Researches, vol. 1, p. 170.

‡ Ibidem, p. 550.

allow of being pounded. Its taste is agreeable, somewhat aromatic, and as sweet as honey.*

We do not recognize in this the manna of the Bible. What, then, was it? It was sent in a miraculous manner, as the best article of food that God could provide for his people, and probably we shall never discover, in this world, precisely what it was. The subject is not, however, so sacred that it is profane to conjecture; and it must be supposed to be from the vegetable, rather than from the animal or mineral kingdoms. On examination, it will be found that if it was not pure sugar, it contained a large proportion of the saccharine principle.

It was very sweet, but it was not honey which seems to have been the chief sweetener known to the ancients; and stands, in comparison, at the head of all. Psalm 119: 103; Proverbs 24: 13, 14; Ezekiel 3: 3. There are circumstances that serve to show that though the manna was not, perhaps, entirely composed of sugar, it contained a large share of it. The fact has already been mentioned, that the peculiar principle of proper manna, at this day, to which it owes its sweetness, is not sugar, but *mannite*, which will not ferment. Nor do its other qualities agree with the manna of the Israelites. And we doubt not that every one is convinced that our present article that bears the name is not what we are seeking after.

In favor of our position that that manna was principally sugar, we will mention:

1. The way the Israelites were affected by the use of it. As was natural, they ate it principally for their food, and in large quantities—for five pints per day is an abundant supply for an individual; though we do not suppose that every one was compelled to consume that quantity. Sugar is very nutritious, but, not having any nitrogen in its composition, when used alone, it is not capable of sustaining life for any great length of time; the person *dies as if from starvation*. Though it contains carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, nitrogen, which it does not supply, is one of the great constituents of animal matter. And there is an important distinction between those alimentary substances that contain nitrogen, and those of which it constitutes lit-

* Robinson's Calmet, Art. Manna.

tle or no part. Among the latter, sugar holds a conspicuous place. Various experiments have been instituted to determine how long different animals would live confined to a diet of pure sugar and water.

"The experiments were performed on dogs. During the first seven or eight days, the animals were brisk and active, and took their food and drink as usual; but in the course of the second week they began to get thin, although their appetite continued good, and they took daily between six and eight ounces of sugar. The emaciation increased during the third week, and they became feeble, and lost their activity and appetite. * * * * The animals still continued to eat three or four ounces of sugar daily; but, nevertheless, became at length so feeble as to be incapable of motion, and died on a day varying from the 31st to the 34th."

These experiments were performed by M. Magendie. He also found the result similar with other articles of food that contained a large proportion of nutriment, *but no nitrogen*. And we are told that another physician, "Dr. Stark, died in consequence of experiments, which he instituted on himself, to determine the effects of a long continued sugar diet."*

Now let us see in what connection it was that the Israelites murmured so much. Exodus 16: 1, 13—the manna began to fall on the sixteenth day of the second month after they came out of Egypt. And it is worthy of notice there, that the original purpose on the part of God seems to have been to alternate the quails with the manna—sending the quails every evening and the manna every morning. (Ex. 16: 8, 12, 13.) This would have been precisely what was needed to supply the proper quantity of nitrogen in which the sugar was deficient. But it would seem that this plan was not carried out; the manna only was continued after perhaps the first evening. The quails were intermitted till after the twentieth day of the second month in the next year, and after they had left Mount Sinai. (Compare Num. 10: 11, and 11: 45, &c.) In the meanwhile, they may have had some animal food, since they had flocks and herds with them to be offered in sacrifice; but probably they were allowed to kill very few of them for their own

* Miller's Elements of Physiology, pp. 331, 332.

use. They had been living mostly, if not entirely, then, on manna, for at least a year, when they break out in their complaints recorded in Num. 11: 1-6. And what is the burden of their complaint on that occasion? Just what might have been expected of those who had been confined to a sugar diet: they called to mind the great variety of food which they had in Egypt; "the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic."* But the article that rises first in their minds, and of which they regret the loss most, *is the fish*. "We remember THE FISH which we did eat in Egypt FREELY"—gratuitously, in abundance. And this fact agrees with what other writers state, as may be seen by reference to the book mentioned at the foot of the page, where we are told, among other things, that Herodotus says, "a part of the inhabitants of the Delta, shepherds, * * * lived entirely on fish." The Israelites, having been deprived of their accustomed diet, together with all other animal food, for the most part, now about a year, in their craving appetite for it, "*fell a lusting*," "*and also wept again*," "and said, Who shall give us *flesh* to eat?" and verse 18, "Ye have wept in the ears of the Lord, saying, Who shall give us flesh to eat? for it was well with us in Egypt." This was perfectly natural, if they had been confined to a diet of saccharine matter, which could not supply one of the essential wants of the system—nitrogen. They needed flesh meat. They *had nutriment enough, but not of the right kind*.

We see also that they became thin and emaciated, precisely as is the case in the experiments given in works on Physiology. "But now our soul is dried away; there is nothing at all besides this manna before our eyes." The word *soul* here evidently means, not the soul in our present sense of the word, but the animal frame and the vital strength. They became weak and lean in flesh, "dried away," and withered. As a natural consequence, when the quails were sent, (Num. 11: 31-35,) they ate them in excess, and injured themselves. And we are told that even the proper degree of flesh will not restore one who has been deprived of it too long; he will die, notwithstanding. The

* The subject of the articles of food in Egypt, here given, is discussed in Dr. E. W. Hengstenberg's "Egypt and the Books of Moses," pp. 220-226.

idea of the judgment of God upon them, for their rebellious spirit, of course is not excluded in the case of the Israelites.

2. We see that this manna was principally sugar, from the fact that Moses was directed to put up a pot full, "to be kept for their generations." It would keep good, then, indefinitely long: nor are we to suppose a constant miracle in the case. Heb. 9: 4. Paul says this was a golden pot, and put inside of the ark of the covenant. Now what other article is there at all approaching to what we must suppose the manna to be, that will keep good "for generations," except sugar? This will not only keep itself, but, like salt, it "is a powerful antiseptic, and is beginning to be used for preserving meat and fish; for which purpose it possesses the advantage of acting in a much less quantity than is requisite of common salt, and of not altering the taste, nor impairing the nutritious qualities of the aliment."*

3. If we are right in supposing that they fermented it when cooked, it *will in some degree confirm our theory that the manna was sugar.*

4. Pure sugar is perfectly white, and consists of small crystalline grains; these however, though easily affected by heat, do not readily melt in the sun. Nor do we suppose that this was the case naturally with the manna. These grains are not round either, but in the form of four or six-sided prisms, leveled at the extremities. But we are not compelled to understand Ex. 16: 14, as saying that the particles of manna were round, though so translated in the English Bible; but comminuted, and fine as hoar frost. Though, whatever might have been the natural shape of the particles cooling at rest, they might acquire a roundness by falling from a great height.

If it be objected here to our view that the consequences of the use of manna are to be attributed to the saccharine principle contained in it; that the same ought to have appeared before, and to have been found afterwards, in the journeys of the Israelites, till they came to Canaan: We reply, that what would have been the natural consequence may have been prevented by divine intervention; that it was not pure sugar; and that they did use some animal

* U. S. Dis. Wood and Bache, p. 619.

food, furnished by their flocks and herds; and that a part of the time they may have found game to hunt, and that perhaps the quails were sent on more occasions than we read of.

But whether our theory, as to the nature of the manna, be established or not, there is one other interesting inquiry that arises here, viz., whether there is any connection between this "bread from heaven" and the water out of the rock, that followed the Israelites,—which rock was Christ, (1 Cor. 10 : 4),—all supplied in this wondrous manner to the church of God in the wilderness; and that "hidden manna" (Rev. 2 : 17), and "the water of life" (Rev. 22 : 1), which are promised to the saints in light, after the resurrection of the body. Or are we to understand all that is said on that subject, in a figurative and spiritual manner? Do natural things, in all these cases, stand as the representatives of purely spiritual things? Do we not admit that the saints will possess *material* though refined and pure bodies? And must they not exist in some *place*, and have a home, though not confined perhaps to one particular spot? And will they not be made supremely happy? But the pleasures of food and drink, derived to the soul through the sensations of such bodies as they will have, when clothed with immortality, may be so much added to that happiness that in the nature of the case the soul by itself is capable of receiving; it is so much over and above mere spiritual and mental enjoyment. And God delights in conferring happiness on his obedient creatures, in every way and in a degree suited to their capacity. We see him, in this world, giving sensitive life and enjoyment in a manner and degree vastly diversified, to creatures capable of no other. And not only the surface of the earth, and the existing races of animals every where, but solid masses of rock, and vast ranges of mountains, composed of the remains of once living beings, furnished evidence how diffusive the divine benevolence has been in past times as well as the present. Here are "the monuments of the felicity of past ages." Adam was perfectly holy, but his happiness was enhanced by bodily sensations. We are not Gnostics or Manicheans; we do not believe matter to be essentially evil; when God, at first surveying his work, pronounced it all "very good."

Nor need we be scandalized at certain consequences that will of necessity be suggested, when the idea of eating and drinking material alimentary substances in heaven, even "the bread of heaven" and "angel's food," is presented to the mind. For why not suppose some process analogous to the action of the organs of respiration at present? and the taking up of nutriment into the stomach, and passing off the refuse matter by the pores of the skin, in insensible perspiration? That body will be indeed strong, glorious and immortal, with its every sense an inlet of joy; and no waste or wear to replace. Vital in every point; all eye, all ear, all smell, all taste, with new senses added, inconceivable by us at present. At every point of contact with the material world deriving pleasure, and pleasure only in a constant stream. There is no danger there of "dying of a rose in aromatic pain." This body is completely the servant, and not as the present, the master of the indwelling mind. Now we see two kinds of happiness proffered to us in the future world. We read of "seeing God," of "beholding the face of God," and of holding communion with Him, as well as of associating with the various grades of moral and intellectual life above. We read also of joys of a different class; and it is a good rule not to interpret language, and especially that of the Bible, figuratively, unless there is necessity for it. And let us look at some of those passages that speak on this subject. Luke 22: 29, 30. "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; *that ye may eat and drink at my table,*" is the language of the King in Zion to his disciples. And in Rev. 2: 17, the same person promises, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of *the hidden manna.*" Rev. 19: 9. "Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb." Matthew 26: 29. "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, *until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.*" Rev. 2: 7. "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." And this is the tree (Rev. 22: 2, 14,) that stood by the river of life, and yielded her fruit every month. Zophar, in Job 20: 17, says of the wicked man, that he shall not even be permitted to "see the rivers, the

floods, the brooks of honey and butter," kept in store for the righteous. See also, Ps. 26: 9. Now, if we reject the idea that these *particular articles* are found in the future world, are we to exclude the idea of *all material food there*? We think not. And cannot angels and glorified saints eat and drink? Did not Christ do this after his resurrection? Luke 24: 42, 43. "And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honey comb; and he took it and did eat before them." And Peter says (Acts 10: 41,) that they "*did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.*" The angels that appeared to Abraham (Gen. 18: 8; 19: 1,) eat before him. Though, however it may be with them, we know that the risen bodies of the saints need no nutrition. 1 Cor. 15: 40-54. And we also know, that with our present bodies there is pleasure connected with the gratification of the appetites, besides the utility of taking food into the stomach to supply the wastes of the body. And why not suppose that, in the new body, formed after the model of Christ's, while the vitality and necessity now found in food is removed, there shall remain the pleasure of indulging the appetites, with their objects there furnished, and adapted to them with infinite skill? And that gratification too, enhanced a thousand fold, both from the more exquisite sensibility of the body, and from the most delicious viands furnished it to feed upon. Is it not one of the objects of the Saviour, in redeeming, raising and constructing, the bodies of the saints, to enhance thereby the bliss of heaven? The spiritual and more refined joys of the soul, by the sensations of a pure body? The Saviour will honor, will bless, will gratify, his redeemed ones, in all the ways that Almighty power, guided by infinite goodness, and moved by boundless love, can devise. *He makes heaven.* We are apt to overlook the fact, that the heaven set before the Christian is not simply the natural result of a holy life, and obedience in a perfect being. It is not that happiness simply that belongs to those who have always stood upright. They are happy in their own way, in their own kind and degree of enjoyment. But there are joys peculiar to the saints, in which angels do not share. The heaven of those *made righteous* in the righteousness of Christ, is made by him specially for them. It is paradise. A positive, peculiar

kind of happiness is there provided for them ; not in the way of nature, but of grace ; and superior to all that angels ever saw or enjoyed. John 14 : 2, 3. Mat. 20 : 23 ; 25 : 34. And a part of this will undoubtedly consist in feasting on the "bread of heaven," the fruits of paradise. And we can as readily conceive of the mind making that body subservient to itself in this respect, as in locomotion, or in any other way. Now Christ "is he that was in the church in the wilderness." Acts 7 : 38. *He* fed her with that peculiar kind of food, which was the best that heaven could furnish. *He* commanded the clouds from above, and opened the doors of heaven, and rained down manna upon her. *He* gave her of the corn of heaven ; and *men* did eat angel's food. *He* clave the rocks in the wilderness and gave her drink, as out of the great depths. *He* brought to her taste, not only the fruits of the land flowing with milk and honey, literal Canaan, but also the true bread from God. True, that may be regarded as a type of his body and blood, given to the New Testament church, to sustain *her* while passing through *her* period of persecution in the wilderness. But it is also a foretaste of that good, furnished by the same hand, to those who have crossed Jordan, and have entered into rest in the Canaan above. And if the word of God, that testifies to us now of the love of Jesus, and conveys that love to our hearts, is sweeter than honey and the honey comb to him that has tasted it, what then will the heavenly manna be, when the pure soul and the incorruptible body are united ? When they shall feed, without satiety, upon the best that God can give, and drink of the pure river of his pleasures ? When they shall be satisfied who awake with the likeness of their Lord ; and see him, not as now, through a glass darkly, or in the shadowy vision of faith, but as he is, clothed in ineffable brightness and crowned with the praises of the redeemed, as well as wearing the honors of all the hosts of heaven ?

ARTICLE VII.

THE CERTAINTY OF THE WORLD'S CONVERSION.

BY REV. J. L. WILSON,
Missionary at the Gaboon, W. Africa.

"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." This stern declaration wrung from the disciples of Christ the earnest inquiry, "Who then can be saved?" To this the Saviour replies, "With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible."

In this reply, there is no abatement of the real difficulties of being saved. The impressions of the disciples, on this particular point, were correct, and no effort is made to change or remove them. The kingdom of heaven, if taken at all, must be taken by violence, and none but the violent shall ever enter. It has a straight gate and a narrow way; and it is only those who enter the one and walk in the other that shall ever attain to everlasting life. The immutable terms of discipleship are, that we must take up our crosses and follow Christ, through evil as well as good report. Those who shine in the upper courts with most lustre, are those who have come out of great tribulation and made their garments white in the blood of the Lamb.

The impressions of the disciples, therefore, are rather confirmed than removed. According to their previous views, and those of the young man with whom the Saviour had just been conversing, it was not possible to be saved. Both were indulging fundamental errors on the most important of all subjects, and it was essential to their salvation that those errors should be corrected.

But whilst the foundation upon which they were standing is thus torn away, they are not given over to despair. A surer and better way is pointed out. That which they could never attain by their own exertions or morality, can easily be effected by the grace of God. In other words, what is impossible with men is possible with God. What we can never effect by our own unaided efforts, may easily be achieved by throwing ourselves upon the almighty power of Jehovah.

This doctrine accords with the experience of Christians in all ages of the world. There is no lesson more thoroughly taught in the school of Christ than this. Christians who have had even but little experience, are fully aware that they can make no advances in holiness, except so far as they are aided from on high. A clear view of the number and power of their spiritual enemies, if not attended by equally clear views of the all sufficiency of divine grace, never fails to awaken apprehensions about their final salvation; whilst a lively appreciation of the promises and assurances of the Bible, and right apprehensions of the power of God, as seldom fail to inspire them with courage and resolution.

Nor is this principle of dependence upon God, more important or indispensable in our personal conflicts with sin, than it is in every enterprise in which we engage for the benefit of others. "Without me," says the Saviour, "ye can do nothing." But then again it is said with equal emphasis, "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me."

Guided by this principle of dependence, there is no enterprise, however great or difficult, provided it is in accordance with the Divine will, upon which we may not enter with confident assurance of success. It matters not what human probabilities may be arrayed against it,—it matters not what disproportion there may be between the means and the end to be effected,—it matters equally little whether we are able or not to trace all the intermediate steps by which it is to be brought about,—nor are we to be discouraged or intimidated because unforeseen difficulties rise and threaten to frustrate our work. It is enough for us to know that we are engaged in a cause that has been authorised by God, and that we pursue it in a manner that he approves. Having settled these fundamental principles, we may press forward in any good work, with confidence that our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord.

These general remarks have been made for the purpose of introducing our general subject, *the certainty of the world's conversion*.

There are multitudes in the Christian church, at the present moment, who are pressed with difficulties in relation

to this matter, not unlike those which the disciples once felt in relation to the salvation of their own soul. And who is there among us, Christian hearers, who does not in some measure, at least, participate in feeling these difficulties.

No doubts are entertained in relation to what the Bible teaches on this subject. The mass of Christians believe, or profess to believe, that "all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of God." But the *overwhelming magnitude* of the work fills the mind with doubts and skepticism, and leads many to abandon the missionary cause, as a visionary and hopeless work.

Nor can it be denied that there are difficulties of the most formidable character in the way of evangelizing the world. When we remember the despotic power which the Greek and Roman churches wield over the great mass of European mind, even though those systems themselves are occasionally shaken to their very foundations; the fierce and intolerant spirit of Mahomedanism, in Western Asia and Eastern Africa; the iron grasp of Bramanism, in Central and Southern Asia. When we have remembered the millions of India, China, Africa, and the isles of the seas, immured in the deepest debasement; the prostrated condition of their moral and intellectual faculties; their steadfast adherence to the superstitious customs of their forefathers; their open and undisguised repugnance to the spirit and requirements of the gospel, wherever it has been preached among them; the insalubrious regions in which the great mass of these people live, and the difficulty of reaching them through the agency of white men, from whom alone they can reasonably expect to receive the gospel; the number of missionaries who have already fallen on these fields, or been compelled to retire, from impaired health or broken constitutions; the great number of languages that must be acquired and reduced to writing, before the minds of these multitudes can be reached and influenced; the supposed inadequate resources of the church, to furnish the men and the funds necessary to carry the gospel to every part of the world; the small and as yet but partial impression that has been made upon the heathen world by missionary labour; the great difficulty of procuring labourers, qualified in all respects for the arduous and varied duties

of missionary enterprise, we almost cease to wonder that the minds of the feeble have been seized with doubts and skepticism. Whoever looks at these difficulties, apart from the power of Almighty God, can scarcely fail to have their confidence shaken.

Pressed with the intrinsic difficulties of the work, and at the same time overlooking the power and agency of God, by which alone they can be surmounted, men have devised a variety of theories to exonerate themselves from their obligations to send the gospel to the heathen, and at the same time maintain an air of honesty and consistency. We will bestow a passing notice upon two of these theories.

One of these has its origin in the overweening regard which is felt for the superior excellence of the white race, and especially for the Anglo-Saxon branch, which it is supposed will supplant every other race, and ultimately become the sole occupants of our globe. And the inference which naturally flows from this high estimate of ourselves, is that those races which are to be supplanted are scarcely worth cultivating.

But it may be asked, in this connexion, what is it that has imparted so much energy and superiority to the Anglo-Saxon race? Has it not been the power and influence of Christianity? And why may we not expect equally as much, when her influence is exerted upon other races? She found our forefathers immured in the deepest debasement of heathenism. Her power was put forth, and they have been exalted to the first place among the families of the earth. Christianity has lost none of her native energy. What she has done in past ages, she can do now. What she has done for our race, she can do for every other on the face of the earth.

Besides it will be a perilous crisis in our own history, when we virtually adopt that theory which aims to root out other races, to make room for the expansion of our own. Christianity was not bestowed upon our world for the purpose of exalting one portion of the human family at the expense of the other. No people, however great or prosperous, can continue so long, who practically disregard those great laws of Christian charity which were intended to bind the whole human family in one common brother-

hood: and a career of reckless disregard for the rights and interests of others, can scarcely fail to result in the overthrow of our own.

The other theory, to which allusion has been made, couples itself with a favorite theological opinion; and if it is not itself the origin of that opinion, it at least derives its main strength from it. We allude to the views of those who believe that the second advent and personal reign of Christ on earth is nigh at hand. According to this theory, the conversion of the world, if it takes place at all, must be done by miracle, and that in a comparatively brief period. But as there is no indication of this, for the present at least, the difficulty is surmounted by supposing that the gospel is to be preached to the distant nations, as a *witness*; by which it is supposed a few will be gathered out and saved, whilst the great mass of the heathen are to be converted by miracle, or to be cut off and consigned to everlasting ruin. Hence, it is not uncommon for such to number themselves among the friends of missions; and they make haste to preach the gospel abroad, not so much, however, with ardent desires and persevering efforts to benefit and save the heathen, as to prepare the way for the fulfilment of their own expectations in the personal reign of Christ on earth.

We leave this theory with the single remark, that is not only unauthorized by the word of God, but is directly at variance with the ascending command of our blessed Saviour, "go ye into all the world and *preach* the Gospel to every creature."

There is no real occasion to resort to any of these subterfuges. A lively faith sees no insuperable obstacles in the way of the conversion of the whole world. If it depended wholly or mainly upon the unaided efforts of men, it would be a hopeless undertaking. But when we take into the account the omnipotent energies of Divine grace, the question assumes a new and entirely different aspect. Here is an element of power adequate in all respects to the magnitude of the work.

With, men the conversion of the world would be an impossibility, but with God all things, even the conversion and salvation of the whole world, are possible. Heathen na-

tions must forever remain what they are, or sink down even into deeper pollution, without an influence from on high; but let this be shed down upon them in God's own good time, and the world will speedily be filled with the light and glory of the Gospel.

In pursuing this subject further, we will endeavour to show — 1st. That there is nothing *unreasonable* or *improbable* in the expectation that the world will be converted to God. 2d. The *means* or *instrumentality* by which it is to be effected: and 3d. What we, as individuals, may do to hasten its accomplishment.

In showing the *reasonableness* and *probability* of the conversion of the whole world, we will draw our arguments from three sources. 1st. The word of God. 2d. The analogies of nature and Providence: and 3d. The history of modern missions.

And in relation to the *first*, viz: the testimony of the word of God, we shall do little else than adduce a few passages of scripture, and allow them to speak for themselves. If the conversion of the world is not the subject of prophecy, both of the Old and New Testament, it will be difficult to say what is. What other interpretation can be given to such passages as the following? "As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." "As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." "All the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." "For the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." "Ask of me and I will give the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." "He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth." "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him, and all nations shall serve him." "And there were great voices in Heaven, saying the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever."

Our next argument is drawn from *the analogies of nature and Providence*.

The difficulty which skeptical minds feel in relation to the conversion of the world, arises from the great disparity

between the magnitude of the work, and the apparently insufficient means by which it is to be effected. And yet this very fact, instead of militating against our general position, when rightly viewed, furnishes a strong presumptive argument in its favour. This principle of contrast, is not only strikingly exemplified in ordinary operations of the laws of nature, but equally so in that superintending providence, which God is constantly exercising over the moral world.

What a disparity, for example, between a grain of mustard seed, that smallest of all seeds, and that luxuriant stock, which shooteth out great branches, so that the fowls of the air lodge under its shadow! Between the huge oak of the forest with its outstretched giant arms, and the little acorn which once embraced its embryo existence! Or those terrific flames that are sweeping away the noblest city in the world, and the little spark from which they took their origin! These are all striking missionary emblems, and show what immense results may flow from apparently inadequate causes.

We have still more striking illustrations of this principle, in the moral government of the world. Scarcely any great event has been brought to pass in the moral world, except by means that were apparently inadequate to the result; and in most cases, not only contrary to all human calculation, but in many instances, despite of the most vigorous efforts on the part of men to defeat them. The history of Joseph is an illustration in point. Who, following the footsteps of that disconsolate youth, as he journeyed over the sand plains and rugged rocks of Arabia, or when he was an obscure prisoner in an Egyptian dungeon, could have foreseen that he was destined to stand at the head of the most powerful kingdom in the world, and was to be the dispenser of bread and life, not only to a whole nation, but even to those unnatural brothers, who had sold him into bondage? Who could have predicted that Gideon, with his three hundred chosen men, could have routed the hosts of Midian, or that Jonathan and his armour bearer, as they silently clambered up the steep sides of the mountain, would put to flight the whole camp of the Philistines.

These were results that were greatly disproportioned to the means by which they were brought about.

The murderous Jews, as they stood around the cross of Christ, and witnessed his tragical death, flattered themselves that they had frustrated all his designs of mercy, when in reality they had only contributed to their fulfilment; and the results of that solemn scene, are such as no human sagacity could have predicted. Nor was the first establishment of Christianity in the various parts of the world less wonderful.

What human calculation could have foreseen that a few illiterate fishermen were to be made the instruments of revolutionizing the most powerful kingdoms in the world, and establish a religion that would survive the wreck of empires, and work its way in the world with increasing power and influence to the end of time?

How remarkable is the history of the great reformation of the fifteenth century? How obscure and how apparently insignificant its origin! Against what fearful odds had the cause of truth to struggle! How often was it, to human appearances, on the verge of ruin, but as the result proved, when most endangered in appearance, most secure in reality. None but those who could overlook the narrow and changing scenes of this world, and behold coming events by the eye of faith, could have foreseen the glorious end to which these struggles were tending.

If it were necessary to multiply proofs in illustration of this principle, what an emphatic comment we derive from the recent affairs of Europe. How sudden, how unexpected, how contrary to all human calculation, have been the changes that have taken place in the political affairs of that continent! And who does not see the providence of God in all this? Who can confidently predict what will be the end of the varied struggle there? What have the nations, even the most powerful, of Europe, proven themselves in the hands of God, but as "a drop of the bucket," and "as the small dust of the balance." Is He not overturning and overturning these, to prepare the way for him whose right it is to reign? And why may we not expect changes in the heathen world, in God's own good time, as sudden, as unexpected and as powerful as those that are transpiring in Europe at the present moment?

But we call your attention, in the third place, to the his-

tory of modern missions, for evidence that the conversion of the world is no visionary expectation.

It cannot be denied that a feeling of impatience is beginning to manifest itself in many parts of the Christian Church, at what is regarded as the slow progress of the missionary work.

Many do not pretend to conceal their convictions that the success of missionary labour, so far as the conversion of souls is concerned, has not been proportioned to the outlay of means and labour, and draw the somewhat natural inference, that the heathen world, at this rate, will scarcely ever be evangelized.

In relation to such, there should be no hesitation in saying, that they have either entered upon a work, the cost of which has not been counted, or they are sadly ignorant of the actual results that have been achieved by missionary labour.

There is no want of statistical information to show, that the Gospel has not only been as readily received in heathen as in Christian lands, but in proportion to the outlay of means, in many missions at least, it has been vastly more successful. Take, for example, the missions to the Sandwich and Society Islands, to Sierra Leone and the Cape of Good Hope, to certain parts of central and northern India, and compare the number of converts in these, with those of the most favoured parts of our own Zion, and the preponderance of success, in proportion to the efforts that have been made, will be decidedly in favour of the former.

And the contrast will appear still greater, if we take into consideration, the great difference in the moral and social condition of the two. As yet the missionary work is in its incipient stages. When your missionaries first went among the heathen tribes, to whom they have since preached the everlasting Gospel, they found them not only absolutely ignorant of Christianity as such, but wedded to systems of idolatry, whose entire spirit was in open hostility to it.

On the side of these systems of idolatry, were enlisted the influence of habit, the force of public opinion, the power of superstition, the example of their fore-fathers, and more than all, perhaps, the open license which these systems gave to all sorts of vice and immorality.

On the side of Christianity there was not, humanly speaking, a single advantage. Against it were arrayed, the charge of novelty, its uncompromising denunciation of their vices, its open and undisguised hostility to all forms of false religion, and the fact likewise that it held forth no proffers of temporal good, with which heathen minds are always more readily influenced, than by any prospects of remote advantage, however great or inviting.

It should be remarked, further, that much of the time of your missionaries, heretofore, has unavoidably been spent in doing what may be regarded as *preparatory work* ; such for example, as studying out and reducing to system the languages of heathen tribes ; in translating the word of God into those languages, and in training up a native ministry who can be relied upon hereafter to preach the Gospel more extensively and effectively, than the missionaries themselves.

But, notwithstanding all these drafts upon the time and strength of your missionaries, and all these odds and disadvantages against which Christianity has had to contend, the Gospel has been faithfully preached, and thousands of souls have been converted to the Lord Jesus. And there is another very encouraging thought in connexion with this subject : The work of conversion, as a general thing, is progressing somewhat in proportion to the length of time that has been spent in cultivating these different fields of labor. It is a well known fact that in the older missions established by the American Churches, the number of conversions during the last ten years have greatly exceeded those of the previous twenty. And when we remember the constantly increasing forces at work in the heathen world—the multiplied translations of the Bible—the influence of Christian education upon the heathen youths around our stations—the awakened consciences of the multitudes who have already heard the Gospel—the influence of a native ministry—the impression that is constantly being made upon the heathen mind by the public administration of the ordinances of the Church—the gradual yielding of the power of superstition—we are amply authorized to believe that the work of conversion will be greatly accelerated in all future times. Indeed, we have, in the past history of missions, as limited as has been our experience, such success as to leave no room to doubt either the possibility or

probability of the world's conversion. A much stronger impression has already been made upon the heathen world than could reasonably have been expected ; and God is beginning, even at this early period of the missionary enterprise, to bring about such results as no human sagacity could have foreseen, which no ordinary faith could have realized, and such as to leave no reasonable ground to doubt the ultimate evangelization of the whole world.

The progress of the various schemes of benevolence in the Christian world, has been such as to show us that there are ample resources in the church, to carry out this great work, and this in a comparatively short time. Take a single fact in illustration of this point :

In 1804, it is said, there were about 4,000,000 of Bibles in circulation in the world. At the present time, after the lapse of 44 years, it is supposed that there are about 30,000,000 in circulation, or more than seven times as many as there were in 1804. If our progress in translating, printing, and circulating the Scriptures, the next 44 years, be at the same ratio of progress, we shall have in circulation more than 200,000,000, which will be equal to a Bible for every family in the world.

Now, if the progress of improvement in other departments of benevolence be equal to this, and there is no good reason to question it ; if, for example, the missionary corps be augmented at the same rate ; our stations, our schools, our churches, our pupils, be increased at the same ratio, what is there unreasonable or visionary in the expectation that the Gospel may be preached in the hearing of every human being on the face of the earth, even before the expiration of the present century ?

But these varied instrumentalities, no matter how well they may be multiplied, can never, of themselves, effect any material change in the actual condition of the world. The Bible may be translated into every dialect in the world ; the missionary corps may be augmented a hundred fold ; schools may be established, and churches reared in every village and neighborhood in the habitable world ; and, after all, no material improvement be made in the moral or religious condition of the Pagan world.

By what *means*, then, may we expect the heathen world to be renovated ?

It will not be accomplished by any *miraculous interposition*, unless we regard the ordinary operations of the Spirit in the conversion of souls as such.

It will not be attained by a *ministry of angels*. God has committed the work to human hands; and it is by their agency alone, feeble and imperfect as it is, that he will accomplish his purposes of mercy to our fallen race.

It will not be brought about by leaving the heathen to themselves. Of the downward tendency of heathenism, the past history of the world affords ample evidence. The heathen nations of the earth have sunk down too deep in the mire of sin and pollution, ever to rise even to outward prosperity in the world, by their own unaided efforts; much more impotent must they be to rise to spiritual purity. The Apostle saw the difficulty of this, when he said of the Gentiles, "how shall they call upon him in whom they have not believed, and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?"

Subordinate instrumentalities, of a varied character, will no doubt be extensively employed in bringing about this great work. The discoveries in science—the improvements in the study of political economy and civil government—the advancement in moral and intellectual philosophy—the rapidly extending influence of commerce—the increased facilities of travel and transportation, by which the remote parts of the earth are brought in close contact—as well as other improvements and discoveries yet to be made, will all, under the controlling Providence of God, be made subservient to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom and the salvation of the world.

In relation to the discoveries of modern science, the political economist sees in them the seeds of national wealth; the politician sees in them the elements of national power; the merchant expects them to extend his business and increase his wealth; the agriculturist expects them to fertilize his lands and fill his barns with their richest products; the man of science looks upon them with conscious pride, and regards them only as tokens of greater and more wonderful discoveries yet to be made; but the *Christian* regards them as so many agencies called into being by the Providence of God, to hasten the conversion and salvation of the world.

But the great and efficient means by which this event will be brought about, will be the mighty outpouring of the Spirit upon the Church, and, in connexion with this, upon the whole world.

The fact of the world's conversion is not itself more clearly a subject of prophecy, than it is that it will be accomplished by the outpouring of the Spirit. This promise was fulfilled in part on the day of pentecost; and so it has been in every instance since, where there has been any ingathering of souls into the fold of Christ. This is all that is necessary now to secure the speedy regeneration of the heathen world.

We have already in the Christian Church the men and the money, and every thing else that is necessary to carry the Gospel to the remotest end of the earth, and it only remains that the Spirit be poured out upon us to stimulate our zeal, and prompt us to the needed effort. The primitive church, with scarcely the hundredth part of our resources, published the Gospel in almost every part of the then inhabited world.

What might we not do if we had their spirit? Their's was the true spirit of missions, and this is what we want—a spirit of love, of self-denial, and of unreserved consecration to the service of Christ; and this spirit is not less necessary to the missionaries you send abroad, than it is to the churches here. We all need to rise to a higher sense of responsibility. Your missionaries must be men of courage, of faith, of self-denial, and of perseverance, even unto death, if need be; whilst Christians here must take a more comprehensive view of duty than to suppose that their obligations to the heathen are summed up in contributing a portion of their substance to the cause of missions, and in uniting in an occasional prayer for the conversion of the world.

We must rise to those high and clear views of duty, that shall make us regard our property, our talents, our time, and every thing else we have, committed to the great work of regenerating and saving a lost world. And why should we not? It was for this that the Saviour laid down his life. For the same end, the Spirit was promised. For this purpose the church was organized. The providence of God has brought the most distant, and formerly the most

inaccessible parts of the earth, within our reach. The heathen, every where, are waiting to receive the gospel; and is there any enterprise, in the whole range of human affairs, of more real grandeur, or which promises more glorious results, than this?

But let us inquire, in the last place, more specifically, *what we may do for the advancement of this work.*

The fact that we have organized missionary societies and boards, is evidence that we are alive, to some extent at least, to the responsibilities of this momentous duty. On this point we can only bid our brethren God speed, and leave it, as our parting injunction, that they do so much now that they leave no room for unavailing regrets when they come to stand with the assembled universe, before the judgment seat of Jesus Christ. Think of the value of souls, as they will appear in the light of that great day. Think of your money, in connexion with these priceless souls, and act now as you will then wish you had.

But our prayers and our hearty sympathies, in the missionary work, are as much needed as our contributions. It must be in answer to prayer, that the spirit will be poured out upon the heathen world; and so deep are our convictions of the indispensable importance of earnest prayer for the success of the gospel, that we seriously doubt whether contributions, however generous or prompt, would do any good without it; and we speak from experience when we say that, if brethren would cheer the hearts and strengthen the hands of their missionaries, as they toil in foreign lands, let them see that they feel a lively, sympathetic interest in the work in which they are engaged.

But there is a third duty which we would not fail to mention, especially as it is less frequently urged than those to which allusion has just been made.

We take it for granted that some of those we are now addressing are mothers; and the duty which we wish to enjoin, is, that you train up your children with reference to the missionary work. We would not have you take them out of the hands of God, and shape their future course according to your convictions of their duty. This is the prerogative of Jehovah, which even a parent may not usurp. All that we propose is, that you endeavour to interest your children in this great cause; let them understand that a

command has been laid upon the church, to preach the gospel to every creature on the face of the earth; inspire them with enlarged views of duty; so that when they come to decide the question, to what great object they will devote their lives, they may decide it intelligently and with hearts overflowing with love and compassion for a perishing world.

We have spoken of the certainty that the world will be converted; we have spoken of the decided impression that has already been made upon the heathen world; but we would not remove the impression generally entertained, that the work yet to be done is one of immense and almost overwhelming magnitude. We do not speak of our success as proof that any considerable progress has already been made towards the accomplishment of this great work, but as evidence of what *may be* done when the energies of the church are properly enlisted. Our efforts must be increased a hundred fold, before we can expect any grand or glorious results. But where shall we find the men to carry forward this enterprise, if the rising generation does not possess more of the missionary spirit than we do?

We do not suppose that parents can reconcile themselves to the idea of giving up their children to the missionary work, without a struggle. It would be but natural for them to wish to see them settled around them, occupying stations of usefulness and distinction in their native land, and enjoying comforts which the industry of parents has heaped up for them. But of how little importance will it appear to you and to them on a bed of death, whether they have lived here or in a foreign land, provided they have been walking in the path of duty! How indescribably insignificant and contemptible must appear all the comforts and luxuries that you may lavish upon them now, provided they shall not have devoted all their energies to that one great object of advancing the Redeemer's kingdom on earth.

Let us all engage in this work more heartily than we have ever done. It is not a hopeless cause in which we have enlisted. We shall not contend, as those who beat the air. It is as sure of success, as it is that Jehovah is enthroned in glory; and it is one upon which we shall look back with joy and gratitude, when all the honours, and the wealth, and the pleasures of this world, shall be forgotten!

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Apostolic Confirmation ; or Reasons for Discarding Episcopal Confirmation, with the laying on of hands. With an Appendix, setting forth John Calvin's real views of this Ceremony. By REV. JAMES M. ALLEN. Richmond, Va. 1848.*

This pamphlet of seventy-six pages contains the substance of two sermons, first delivered to the Author's own charge, and afterwards published because of the excitement and complainings they occasioned in the Prelatical camp. Mr. Allen devotes himself to a thorough examination of all the passages, where the phrases "laying on of hands" and "Confirmation" are found. Before he is done, the "baseless fabric" of this Episcopal ceremony melts away like the mirage before the approaching traveller.

The Appendix is a full and complete defence of John Calvin, who, strange to say, by means of garbled extracts and by much special pleading, is forced by a Prelatical pressgang into the defence of Confirmation as an Apostolical Institute. In the issue, however, Calvin is seen, like the elephant in battle, trampling to death those who unhappily forced him into the unnatural alliance.

We have been much pleased in the perusal of this pamphlet. It shows that Presbyterians, true to their well-earned character, are ready now, as of old, if the decree be for controversy, to carry the battle over into the opposite camp. We should be glad to believe that these inflictions would serve to abate the arrogance of those who, by their claims of exclusive churchship, make themselves preëminently *a sect*: cutting themselves off from communion with those whom the Lord has furnished with gifts and grace to be his church and bride.

2. *Oration, delivered before the Charleston Library Society, at its first centennial Anniversary, June 13th, 1848, by JAMES L. PETIGRU, L. L. D., a Member of the Society. Charleston. J. B. Nixon, Printer, 1848.*

We have read, over and over again, some parts of this plain and unpretending production, with ever fresh delight. It presents its distinguished author in a character very fascinating to us. The profound lawyer, the sagacious counsellor, the eloquent advocate, are laid aside; and without any parade of learning, or any attempt to overwhelm his audience with a sense of his acknowledged and preëminent abilities, Mr. Petigru presents them with an address, as appropriate and instructive as it is modest and simple. We presume that many readers will think it common place, till they try in vain to imitate it. Such a man as Mr. Petigru can afford to publish an oration like this; and its manly simplicity should be a model for speakers of less established reputation.

The Charleston Library Society, which "sixty years ago had on its shelves only three or four hundred books, but now owns a collection of twenty-five thousand volumes," was formed (as we learn from this address) one hundred years since, by some "plain citizens of a small town, and has, for its object, the collection of books, and the encouragement of a taste for reading. No shout of victory hails the progress of these quiet benefactors of Provincial Society. No trophies attest the success of their labors, or the gratitude of their country. They gained no glory by the destruction of mankind, and their arms were directed against no enemy but Ignorance. On the 13th June, 1748, Alexander McCauley, Patrick McKie, William Logan, James Grindlay, Morton Branford, Joseph Wragg, Jr., Samuel Wragg, Jr., Robert Brisbane, Paul Douxsaint, Alexander Baron, John Sinclair, John Cooper, Peter Timothy, William Burrows, Charles Stevenson, John Neufville, Jr., Thomas Sacheverel, Samuel Brailsford, and Thomas Middleton, subscribed the roll, as the

original members of the Society; and now, at the distance of a century, we give thanks for the good which they have done, and offer our congratulations on the benign favour of Providence, which has given their work stability, and allowed us to partake of the fruit of their labors.

“ It is but just that we should remember them whose generous care was extended to posterity. They planted the tree which invites our noon-day steps from the cares of business, to its cool, refreshing shade. Gratitude demands the tribute at our hands; nor let self-conceit or vanity contemn, too easily, the value of such praise as belongs to the Founders of our Society. To such men, the world is indebted for much of its knowledge, and nearly all the material elements of comfort and happiness. It is not to extraordinary services, or to great occasions, that the sum of human happiness belongs. Although we are dazzled by the style and equipage of the rich, the mass of national wealth is really in the hands of those who have but little. The treasury of the State would be but poorly supplied by the contributions of the opulent, if no assessments were laid on men of moderate means. And, however brilliant the path of ambition may be, with whatever honors the brow of genius may be crowned, society, after all, is mainly indebted for refinement in manners, and improvement in circumstances, to the modest and unpretending merit of those whose virtues are confined to the sphere of private life. Great abilities, even when best directed, avail but little, unless seconded by the general sense of the community. The honor of state, and the fame of learning, are bestowed on few; but the success of those who attain such envied distinction, in doing good to mankind, by correcting prejudice, or elevating the standard of public morals, depends on the coöperation of obscure and faithful agents. No age has been without its heroes; those who would have saved their country, if it had been possible, or rescued their fellow-men from guilt or ruin, if they had been permitted.

“ Si Pergamma dextra,

“ Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.

“ But when the public mind is engrossed by sluggish indifference, or selfish cupidity, vain is the warning voice, and impotent the valiant arm.

“ As in the order of nature, whatever bears the name of fruit, grows and is developed from the ground; so in the order of society, whatever is perfected in the form of a state, or community, grows and is developed out of the family. The virtues of the family lay the foundation for all the energies of the state; and according to the discipline and training of the family, such is the condition of the Body Politic. All real improvement, therefore, must commence in private life, and those who cultivate the moral sentiments of individuals, and within the sphere of their influence, promote humanity and the love of order and industry, are benefactors of their country, as well as of the particular society to which their labors are confined. Their merit is greater than their reward. They are more deserving in the eyes of God than of man; and among men are honored most by those, whose judgment is the most enlightened. It is not therefore without cause, that we commemorate the names of those who have laid the foundation of a public Library. Of all the instruments of man's invention, for the improvement of his strength, and the developement of his skill, books are the greatest. They are not merely an auxiliary of civilization, but civilization lives in them. They are the inheritance of the Earth. All that is contained on the surface of the globe, all the structures that have been raised into the air, and all the wealth that has been dug out of the ground, are to the world, collectively, of far less value, than the books which have been written. Without letters, there would be an impassable gulf between the past and the present; and each generation, uninformed by experience, would be born into a world unknown; like aliens, wandering in a land where a permanent settlement is denied, and the acquisitions made by the dead, are resumed by a higher power. But books preserve the succession. By books, the present age enjoys the intercourse of the past, and will live in the learning of the future. Those who established this Library, therefore, promoted the inte-

rests of the community in the highest and noblest sense; and the honor due to their memory, is a tribute paid to virtue."

The Author recognizes some "familiar names" on the list of the Society's founders, which he hopes will be "perused with honest pride, by their descendants, at the end of another century. But many of them are no longer found on the census of our City. Their absence reminds us of the changes which an hundred years have wrought, and it is not uninstrusive to consider the difference between the condition of things at the present day, and at the commencement of the century which has elapsed since this Society came into existence. Like the traveller, who climbs some hill, to gain the view of a distant scene, let us, from the stand point of 1748, survey the prospect which the face of Society in Europe and America, then presented."

From the Historical sketch thus proposed, we select a few paragraphs:

On the eastern side of North America, thirteen colonies owned the British sway; and James Glen exercised executive authority in the name of George II, in South Carolina. His civil jurisdiction was, in fact, confined to a narrow strip of territory on the seaboard, reaching from the Waccamaw to the Savannah. Beyond Nelson's ferry lay the primeval forest, stretching across the continent to the Pacific Ocean. Charles Town was a rival of New York in population and commercial importance; but Queen street was the northern boundary, and the city scarcely extended beyond King street on the West.

The colonies exhibited great diversities in their forms, but the essential characteristics were nearly the same in all. Their life was obscure, they were occupied in laying the foundations of society, in overcoming the obstructions of the swamp and forest, in pursuing wherever the hope of gain might lead their traffic upon the sea, and in subduing the wilderness to the dominion of the plough. Great was the contrast between them and the Spanish colonies. Here, rustic, or at least, industrious life, frugality, and severity of manners. There, precocious establishments, spoil, and pride of domination. The wonders of Mexico and Peru

dazzled the imagination, but the homely farms, and every day appearance of the small towns in North America, had no charms for the lovers of romance. For their Literature they looked exclusively to the emanations of European genius. Jonathan Edwards was known only by his devotion to the duties of a pastor, in the village of Northampton, and it was not until he published his *Origin of Evil*, in 1754, that he was discovered to be a profound metaphysician. Nor had the genius of Franklin yet emerged from obscurity. It was four years later, in 1752, that by his discoveries in electricity, he advanced the boundaries of knowledge, and gained the first rank among the philosophers of the age.

“That age was not conspicuous for its literature. Men spoke of the time which the old still remembered, as the Augustan Age of Louis the XIV. Yet Voltaire sustained the reputation of his country by the universality, if not the depth of his genius. And in this very year, Montesquieu presented to the world his unrivalled work on the *Spirit of the Laws*. In England no great poet had appeared since the accession of the House of Hanover. The tuneful voice of Pope was hushed, and he had left no successor. Johnson was working his toilsome way to the first place amongst the writers of his country, against all the discouragements to which men of genius were exposed, till literature was made popular, and the people took them under their patronage. His *London* had already been published; and though depressed by neglect, he had given evidence of the ability that afterwards raised him to the highest rank, as a critic of singular acumen, a profound teacher of moral wisdom, and the first of lexicographers.

None of the great English Historians had yet appeared; and it was still literally true, that the best history of England was written by a Frenchman. It was from Rapin that the English youth continued to draw their information of the annals of their country, until the advent, at a later period, of Hume and Robertson. But in eloquence, the age was illustrated by the genius of Chatham, who was now in the prime of life, and culminating to the meridian of his fame. Yet, how strange does it appear that

in a nation, studious of the models of antiquity, and cherishing an admiration for eloquence and oratory, there should be no speech of Bolingbroke on record; and that the oratory of Chatham, which swayed the destinies of England, during a brilliant period; is known only by tradition, sustained by meagre and unsatisfactory specimens! Nay, more, that in 1748, it was deemed a high breach of privilege to publish a speech made in parliament. This absurd interdict of the publishing of public speeches, was in those days practically enforced; and the orders of the two Houses were evaded by publications, which were ushered into the world as Debates in the Parliament of Lilliput. It was not until 1774, that this mummary was laid aside. But the rule has never been in form repealed, though the utmost latitude of publishing now prevails; being one of the victories gained by the reason of the age, over inveterate error and a blind attachment to exploded usage. Perhaps in another age, inconsistencies as gross, may be detected in our way of thinking, and some things now tolerated by the public, may appear equally irrational a century hence, in the eyes of Posterity."

We must use the liberty which belongs to us, as censors of the press, in offering a single observation relative to some of the accompaniments of this Oration. We are told in the account of the day's doings, that the Society proceeded to the Lutheran Church, where, after the singing of an Ode, composed by a young Lady of Charleston, and a prayer by Dr. Bachman, the Orator delivered his address, after which a Hymn was sung, to the tune of Old Hundred. Thus the Oration was both preceded and followed, by *religious services*. But what was the Ode, sung on that occasion, in a Christian Church, by "the Clergy of all denominations," and the other guests, as well as the members of the Society?

It was a very beautiful poetic effusion, full of exquisite classical allusions, but there was in it, nothing at all suitable to the place, nor to the assembly, nor to the object of a *Christian* religious service. It began with—

"Hail to old Faust and his true German brothers,
Framers of type, near four hundred years past."

And it continued and finished, by representing literature, as "a Goddess," an "Enchantress Divine," for whom the Society had prepared "a shrine," and to whose "altar wide" it was desirous to allure hosts of new "worshippers." We object altogether, to this mixture of things, sacred and profane.

3. REVEALED RELIGION. *A Duddleian Lecture, delivered in the Chapel of the University at Cambridge, Wednesday, May 10th, 1848, by Rev. SAMUEL GILMAN, D. D., of Charleston, S. C.*

Would that some among us would, by donation or bequest, endow one or more Lectures, similar to that of Mr. Dudley, who left, nearly one hundred years ago, a fund sufficient to procure, and in some degree, remunerate a Lecture, alternately on Natural Religion, Revealed Religion, the Corruptions of the Church of Rome, and the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination. What a glorious harvest has sprung from the Boyle, the Bampton, the Bridgewater, the Hulsean, and the Congregational Lectures in England; and what a stimulus, encouragement and zeal would be imparted by such a Lecture, if amply endowed, to our whole Southern Religious community. And if private munificence cannot be enlisted, why could not a combined effort at once secure a sum of \$5,000, which would publish, at least, a triennial course of well prepared Lectures, say eight, as in England, and the proceeds of whose sale might be given, as a compensation for time, toil, materials and necessary books, to their respective authors. Will it be done?

The Lecture of the amiable and accomplished author, we have read with very sincere and great pleasure; there is little in it from which we dissent, and much in it we most heartily approve. True, it leaves out much we would have introduced, and implies what we think defective, in the statement of the truth; but coming from a Unitarian Minister, we cordially re-

joice in the evidence it gives of a high spiritual, conservative and manly spirit.

The object of the Lecture is, to illustrate and defend the fact of a positive, special, supernatural Revelation, against the current theories of Rationalism, Swedenborgianism, Mormonism, Mesmerism, Communism, and other *isms*. The argument is plain, perspicuous, and conclusive, and we felt in the perusal, that while it fortified impregnably, the position of the Lecturer, it gave equal support to the Evangelical doctrine of the reality and necessity of the Holy Spirit's operations to the conversion and sanctification of the soul.

We present the following extract from the close of the argument: (p. 22, 23.)

“Nor, without a death-struggle, could I be disposed to part with a belief in this great reality, notwithstanding the attempt to assure me that there are equivalent resources in the unaided moral and religious elements of my nature. Say what you please of the grand deductions of reason, concerning the existence and attributes of the Deity, and his relations to the human soul,—and you *can* say much, very much, to kindle an adoring admiration,—yet, without some belief in His occasional, special, personal interposition, he will virtually remain at an awful, infinite distance from man. From eternity to eternity he will seem to maintain a gloomy, inviolable silence. His inexorable law sweeps by, and buries and annihilates us beneath its absorbing generality. To say that God speaks to us from nature, is but metaphor and poetry. In vain will you point to the beauties and glories of the universe, and its marks of evident design.—Unless self-deceived, you cannot say that you are satisfied with them. Man, from his inmost being, craves some specialty, some perceptible demonstration of God's interest in him. Without it, he is still alone, alone! He calls aloud in anguish on the mute heavens, on the unconscious flowers, on the sullen ocean, to speak but one word, to breathe but one whisper, to exhibit one faint smile or token, in order to assure him that the God whom he adores and admires is also the loving Father whom

he may love. And when this deep want of his being, which is as much entitled and as likely as any other want, to be answered by the good Creator, is supplied—when the voice of the Past, enshrined among the noblest inheritances, and most authentic monuments of our race, proclaims to his mind the inestimable fact—then that Hand, which before, in dim vision, he saw coldly wielding the unalterable forces of nature, seems to draw near, and to press, with a paternal, gentle tenderness, on his very head.—Before, religion was but a mass of bewildering, impalpable abstractions; now, it is a concrete—a thing—a subject of time and space, like man, its living throne. The lights that gleam out from the concave sphere of existence around him, are now brought down to a burning focus on his heart. Creation appears in new and brighter aspects, happier attitudes, more visible smiles—a spark has lighted up the heavens—prayer now finds a spot to kneel upon, and an opening in the motionless curtain around, through which, in well-founded hope, it can direct its eye. How could it find them before? Give me all the uncertainties, difficulties, and perplexities of the Bible, with its celestial truths shining through on my searching reason and faith, rather than leave me alone with universalities and generalizations, presenting a wall before my eyes, as wide as the world, and as high as the firmament. The idea, that the soul of man is naturally sufficient for its own religious necessities, is contradicted by the facts of universal consciousness. Question the most profoundly religious natures, both of the past and the present, they will tell you, that just in proportion to the prevalence of that sentiment within them do they look out of themselves, and expect and long for some assurance from a higher source than what is denominated nature.”

5. *The ANALYTICAL HEBREW and CHALDEE LEXICON: Consisting of an Alphabetical Arrangement of every Word and Inflection contained in the Old Testament Scriptures, precisely as they occur in the Sacred Text, with a grammatical Analysis of each Word, and Lexicographical Illustration of the Meanings. A complete Series of Hebrew and Chaldee Paradigms, with grammatical Remarks and Explanations. 4to. S. Bagster & Sons: London.*

“The revival of a taste for Hebrew Literature, among our countrymen, is a gratifying symptom of the age in which we live. No branch of education can be regarded as more important in its bearing upon biblical studies. The time has gone by when a mere smattering of the Hebrew tongue is deemed sufficient for those who aspire to the sacred office. The attention of all our college professors, is now drawn with greater intensity to this branch of study, than at any former period; and as the love of Hebrew Literature has increased, it is matter of sincere congratulation that the means and instruments for its successful prosecution, have multiplied in an almost equal degree. Not a year passes without some valuable addition to the existing apparatus, for mastering the peculiarities of the Hebrew language.

“It is to be lamented, that the time generally allotted to the acquirement of this language, is far too brief for its complete mastery. The result is, that young men leave our colleges just at that precise juncture, when they are beginning to feel at home in this department of their curriculum. In such a state of things, which is well known to exist, in reference to a large class who have had no early training in Hebrew, how important is the multiplication of works, affording the best aid to the youthful pastor in carrying forward his Hebrew studies to a successful issue.

“With these views, we cannot but rejoice in the appearance of Bagster’s “Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon,” which

embraces so fully the etymology and signification of all Hebrew words."

This Lexicon comprises the following important features:—

"I. A complete alphabetical arrangement of every word, and every combination of each with prefixes, suffixes, etc., found in the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures.

"II. A grammatical analysis of every word; in which the construction of the word is explained, and the causes of any irregularity pointed out.

"III. Lexicographical illustration of the meanings of every Hebrew and Chaldee Root, embodying the results of the latest investigations.

"IV. Under each Root is given a Conspectus of all the words thence derived, with explanatory lexicography.

"V. The indication of all those words and forms of words, which have but a single occurrence in the Scriptures, with citation of the passage.

"VI. Tables of the Pronouns, the Verbs, and declensions of Nouns, forming a complete series of Paradigms.

"VII. Copious grammatical remarks upon these Tables, with an enumeration accompanied by explanatory notes, of every single exceptional case: the Scriptural occurrence of every one of which is indicated.

"VIII. Various minor helps, such as the indication of the tone syllable of all doubtful forms, and the Kamets Chatuph in all cases, etc., etc., which, although apparently trifling in character, will be duly estimated by the student in using the book.

"This account of the work will explain to most readers, its general character:—it might be described as being to the Hebrew Bible, what Dawson's Lexicon is to the Greek New Testament, only on a plan materially improved, and as to execution, a much more critical and scholar-like work. Many who, although possessed of but little leisure for the purposes of study, have been desirous of acquiring a competent knowledge of the New Testament in the original language, have been enabled to

do this by means of Dawson's Lexicon; and without it, they would have been obliged to give up the attempt as hopeless. This might be enough to show that there were reasons for preparing a work like the present for the Hebrew learner, even if no improvements had been introduced, and no original character given to the work.

Attempts have been made from time to time, to aid the Hebrew learner by arrangements of all the words in Alphabetical order, with all their *circumstances*, i. e. prefixes, suffixes, etc. The most important of these is the Lexicon in two vols. folio, which bears the name of CARDINAL PASSIONEI. This work, which was executed by two persons at his expense, was published at Avignon in 1765. The authors used a copy of Montanus's Hebrew Bible, which may still be seen in the library of the *Museum Calvet* at Avignon; they appear to have taken out, one by one, the words throughout the Bible, *underlining* each as they extracted it, and when the same word occurred again, they appear to have drawn a line through it. Such is the plan on which they worked, as far as may be gathered from a careful examination of the volume they used. In the work the words are accompanied by a Latin translation, and the roots are referred to in an opposite column; but there are no grammatical details, as to *what* the several words are (as parts of verbs, etc.), and the whole work, although exhibiting no small industry, is not of a really critical character.

"The "Hebrew, Latin and English Dictionary," published by Mr. Frey in 1816, (of which there has been more recently a condensed edition,) is an attempt of a somewhat similar kind, but which possesses no particular importance to the Hebrew student.

"Thus the present work as to several of its distinctive and more important features, occupies *a ground wholly new*.

"Although it is evident that such a work as this has been undertaken, with the particular object of aiding *beginners*, yet it must not be supposed that they are the only class who can use it with profit. It is often convenient in a language like Hebrew,

to be able to refer *at once* to a word ; and there may be some peculiarity in its *form*, which hinders its being referred to immediately ; this work will meet all such difficulty, for the word will be found in its alphabetical place, and it is also accompanied with full *grammatical* explanation. This grammatical explanation, it is believed, will be found to promote the progress of a learner materially, for it will go a long way towards guiding him to a knowledge of *forms* and *inflections*.

“ The lexicographical part of the work, although not entering into points of abstruse criticism, will be found to embody the results at which the most distinguished modern scholars have arrived.

“ These points will indicate the utility of the present work ; without aiming to supercede critical Lexicons, as commonly constructed, it takes a different place, furnishing the student with assistance which he might previously have sought in vain.

“ The tables and paradigms, and the references to these, given throughout the work, speak for themselves as to utility and value.”

Too much praise cannot be given to Mr. Bagster, who has devoted his life to the patronage and publication of editions of the Old and New Testaments, in their original, and in all modern languages ; and to works immediately bearing on their illustration.

In this work he is still going forward. Although his various editions of the Bible, from the smallest pocket size, to the quarto and folio size, amount to hundreds, and are unequalled for accuracy, convenience and beauty, they are now in universal circulation, and found in the pulpit, the parlour, the study, the library, and the pocket.

A very extensive work by him is now in progress, and of great interest. It is styled—

“ A New Translation, with Notes, Critical and Explanatory, by the Rev. D. A. DE SOLA, Minister to the Congregation of Spanish and Portuguese Jews ; S. L. LINDENTHAL, Reader and Secretary to the New Synagogue ; and the Rev. MORRIS J.

RAPHALL, M. A., D. Ph. Lecturer at the Synagogue, and Head Master of the Hebrew National School at Birmingham. Vol. I. The Book of Genesis, octavo, price 21s.

"This edition has been undertaken for the use of Jews, and by those who are Teachers and Ministers in the Synagogues. It may therefore be taken as fairly expressive of the opinions, which are held by those who profess this religion in this country. The Jew whose acquaintance with Hebrew is not extensive, must of course value a translation into the vernacular tongue; indeed this work may be regarded as fairly indicative of what the Jewish teachers now consider to be desirable instruction for their co-religionists.

"To the Christian reader, the *Translation* has considerable interest; the critical reader may gain materials which he may use to profit; the non-critical reader may feel no small satisfaction in finding the *general accordance* of the renderings of this work, with the translation which he has been accustomed to use; he may thus see how little real variation there is, whether it be Jews or Christians who give a translation from the Hebrew.

"The *notes* are of course intended for Jews; but it is interesting to see the frequent use made of the critical inquiries of modern scholars, and the citations from Christian writers. The use made of the LXX. Version, and of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and also of more modern versions, is at least remarkable; and so is it to see in Jewish pages the names of Rashi and Aben Ezra in juxtaposition with those of Sir Isaac Newton, Dr. Adam Clarke, Gesenius, and Rosenmüller. The Christian reader may learn from these notes, the manner in which Jewish writers treat questions of Scripture criticism, and also the degree of weight they give to the sentiments of those not Jews;—he may also, even though unable to consult the Rabbinic commentaries for himself, find here ample specimens of them translated into English."

We perceive also, that Dr. Davidson is engaged by Mr. Bagster in preparing an Introduction to the New Testament.

5. ELEMENTS OF PLANE AND SPHERICAL TRIGONOMETRY. *Prepared for the Sophomore Classes of the South Carolina College. By MAT. J. WILLIAMS, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanical Philosophy, Astronomy, and Civil Engineering, in the South Carolina College, Columbia, S. C. Printed at the South Carolinian Office, 1848. pp. 87.*

This little book is published by Allen, McCarter & Co., of this place, and by McCarter & Allen, of Charleston. If we knew nothing more of it than the fact that it was written by Professor Williams, we should know enough to satisfy our minds that it must be eminently adapted to afford the elementary instruction which it professes to impart, in the department of science to which it is devoted. Its author is a man too deeply imbued with the spirit of Christianity to be capable of writing from motives of ostentation; and too thoroughly versed in the whole circle of Mathematical science to be capable of a mistake, as to the kind of work which the exigencies of his pupils demanded. To know him, is to know that he could not have undertaken such a labor without the prospect of benefit to others; and to know the book, is to know that the benefit has actually been conferred, and that an important desideratum has been supplied, in the means of elementary instruction, on the subjects of which it treats. Professor Williams "proposes merely to present an old subject in a new dress. He has endeavored, by simple illustrations and the fulness of his explanations, to remove some of the difficulties, which his experience as a teacher for many years has pointed out." We need not say that he has more than accomplished his aim; and we sincerely hope that this little work is only an earnest of larger contributions which he may yet make to a department of learning in which he is known to excel, and in which he has been remarkably successful as a teacher.

6. **POPERY**—*the Punishment of Unbelief: A Sermon, before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church at Baltimore, May 25, 1848.* By ALEXANDER T. MCGILL, D. D., *Professor in the Western Theological Seminary; pp. 44.*

Dr. McGill has, in this Sermon, endeavored to establish the position that "Popery is an organized form of God's judicial wrath against the unbelief of men." He does not deny that there may be some of God's children in outward connexion with the form of Apostacy any more than that many of his enemies are professedly members of Orthodox Churches—but that the Church of Rome, in her corporate capacity, is so used by the Divine Wisdom. He supports his position by, 1st. The *names* given to this heresy; 2dly. *The cause of its coming*; 3dly. *The manner of coming*; 4thly. *The manner of continuance*; 5thly. *The place of its continuance*; 6thly. The character of the *individuals* who are proselyted to Rome; 7thly. *The congeniality* of the system with the character of reprobate men; 8thly. The manner of its *overthrow*—and lastly, by the *antithesis of consolation* promised to believers in their escape and preservation from this system. We are not prepared fully to concur in all of Dr. McGill's views, though cordially agreeing with his general design. Especially do we think his sixth head worthy of consideration, thought, and practical enlargement. In this day of intellectual light and much head knowledge of religious subjects, it is to be feared that many who resist the power of the Gospel are given over to that judicial blindness which ends in some form of delusion which perpetuates the hardness and insensibility of the heart. Rome is busy with her claims, and presents the most imposing attractions of all other forms. Discussions, such as Dr. McGill has entered on, are therefore well timed and may prove profitable.

7. THE WOMEN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. By ELIZABETH F. ELLET, *Author of "The Characters of Schiller,"— "Country Rambles," etc.*—2 vols. 8vo.

The obligations we owe "our Fathers," have been the theme of so many books, that an attempt even to catalogue them would be a task. But "the Women" of that period which we delight to eulogise, though their merits and services have been generally acknowledged, have had but few biographers; nor do we remember any previous attempt to give form and permanency to the record of their deeds. The materials are now necessarily scanty, and the recollections of many a scene of deep interest are fast passing into the tomb, with the few remnants of the actors. Mrs. Ellet is entitled to the thanks of *her* sex as well as *ours*, for rescuing from oblivion some of the lessons which the example of our heroic mothers have taught; and not the less, that she has dwelt more on the household and feminine virtues of her characters, than on the more masculine deeds which the times justified. We are among those who believe that a nation owes its greatness chiefly to the influence of its women; but that influence ceases to be happy when it attempts to change its sphere. We rejoice to see these opinions fully sustained in the noble specimens of female character, to whom Mrs. Ellett has raised the monument of patriotic affection. She has done full justice to the very meagre records that are left, and given us a pleasant and not uninteresting book.

8. A SERMON, on *Christian Psalmody*, by REV. EDWIN CATER, A. M. *Preached at Lebanon Church, Fairfield District, S. C. September 5, 1847. Columbia: I. C. Morgan, 1848.*

Though we notice some blemishes in style, and in one or two places some defect in the argument, we can but commend this

discourse as an ingenious and able defence of the practice of our Church, in reference to Psalmody. The incidental approbation of instrumental music in public worship, while it accords with the views of many in our Church, will not be acceded to by others. It is a point, which the space allotted to these brief notices, does not allow us to handle. Yet the opposition to this species of Church music, we are loth to regard as a mere prejudice. It has prevailed, more or less, in all ages of the Church. Clemens, Alexandrinus, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and many besides, are found in the ranks of its opposers, all of whom denied that it was used in the early Christian Church, as it evidently was not in the Synagogues of the Jews, from which the usages of the Christian Church were in some measure derived. When this opposition is founded on principle, we are bound to respect it, and if constrained to differ, to deal tenderly with it.

9. HISTORY OF THE JESUITS : *from the foundation of their Society to its suppression by Pope Clement XIV; their Missions throughout the World; their Educational system and literature; with their revival and present state.* By ANDREW STEINMETZ, Author of "*The Novitiate*," "*The Jesuit in the Family*." 2 vols. 8 vo. Philadelphia : Lea & Blanchard, 1848.

In these closely printed volumes, the author professes to give a candid and complete history of the Society of the Jesuits. And although there is something we do not like in his style, a pertness, and an occasional descent to colloquial idioms, unworthy of a dignified author, his volumes are replete with interesting facts, and afford a somewhat complete history of that wonderful Society, blasphemously calling itself the Society of Jesus, whose members have brought upon themselves in all lands, the execration of the world. Driven out of one country after another

of Catholic Europe, they are finding a home in Protestant England and America. Still our author thinks, that in England the increase of the Catholic Church, has been relatively small. In the days of Elizabeth, the number of Romish priests in that country was 400. Since then the population has been quadrupled, and yet there are but 806 Catholic priests in that country, while the clergymen of the established Church amount to 12,000, besides a countless host of dissenting ministers. The subject these volumes open before us is extensive, and we may revert to it on a future occasion.

-
10. THE FAMILY COMPANION; or *Prayers for every Morning and Evening of the week, and for various Special occasions; together with brief remarks on sundry passages of Scripture, with short prayers appropriate to each.* By BENJAMIN M. PALMER, D. D., formerly Pastor of the Independent, or Congregational Church, Charleston, S. C.; to which have been appended, by request, a few Sermons from the pen of the lamented Author. Charleston, 1848.

This unpretending volume is a memorial of one extensively known in this portion of the Church as a beloved and useful Minister of Christ. For more than forty years his voice has been heard among us, as a preacher of righteousness, and a son of consolation. And though, on the great question on which our Church divided in 1837, he differed from us, now that he has exchanged the turmoil of earth for the rest of Heaven, we remember, and desire to remember, only his many virtues. The volume before us was found among the papers of Dr. Palmer, and was written some years before his death, as it would seem, for the purpose of being useful, in a spiritual way, to those who might be induced to peruse the volume, or to use it as a guide and incentive to devotion. The aim of the author, therefore, precluded all display, either of the higher beauties of style or of intellectual power. To those who knew him, these Prayers, so appropriate, flowing and scriptural, will present him

to their minds anew, as he appeared in those approaches to a throne of Grace, in which he was so eminently gifted. The affections of the heart will flow forth afresh towards their venerable teacher, who, being dead, yet speaketh. And it is doubtful if a work of different aims, and different complexion, would so much have interested his immediate friends, and former flock, as this, which brings him so much before them, in the character of the faithful monitor and experienced Christian, in which character he so eminently excelled.

11. THE VALIANT MAN. *A Discourse on the Death of the Hon. Samuel Wilkeson, of Buffalo.* By JOHN C. LORD, D. D., Pastor of the First Old School Presbyterian Church of the City of Buffalo.

After an appropriate introduction on the nature of Christian valor, that Divine grace in the Church, of which that valor, the *virtus* of the ancients, so much lauded by them, was an image and shadow, the author proceeds to describe the character, and relate the leading incidents in the life of his departed friend. It was our fortune to listen, as a wearied and unknown traveller, more than a twelve month since, to a discourse delivered by the same brother, in the same Church, at the funeral of Mrs. Wilkeson, the gifted and pious consort of him whose absence from earth he now deplores. In this discourse, as in that, the affectionate, considerate, and able Pastor is seen, who holds up the virtues of departed worth for the imitation of survivors, and makes audible these voices of Providence to the duller ears of his fellow men. Judge Wilkeson must have been a remarkable man, for courage, energy, and indomitable perseverance, all consecrated, in the closing years of his life, to the service of Christ. He died far from home, at Kingston, Roane Co., Tennessee. The Physician who was called in to see him, says "he was conscious of his approaching dissolution, and met it with the most perfect calmness and submission. On asking for water, he found he could not swallow it, and turning over, said, 'he would drink of the springs of living waters.'"

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

MARCH, 1849.

ARTICLE I.

PAUL'S PREACHING AT ATHENS.

The first public conflict, as Milman properly remarks,* betwixt Christianity and Paganism, took place at Athens. The champion on the one side was Paul, the distinguished Apostle of the Gentiles, who had himself been a relentless persecutor of the Gospel, and who had been graciously honoured with supernatural evidence of its truth. He was prepared to speak what he knew, and to testify what he had seen. On the other side were certain philosophers of the Epicureans and the Stoicks, impelled partly by curiosity and partly by vanity of contest, to encounter one whom their philosophic pride prompted them to stigmatize as a babbler; and their settled indifference to truth, to receive as a setter forth of strange Gods.

The loss of Athenian independence had removed the checks, which, in ancient times, political considerations had arbitrarily imposed upon freedom of debate and liberty of discussion in regard to the popular religion, and though this renowned city was still the head-quarters of the reigning superstitions of the world, no philosopher was likely, for the sake of his opinions, however apparently licentious or heretical, to be exposed to the fate of Socrates, Stilpo or Diagoras. In the Schools of Athens, no subjects were too sacred for discussion—too profound for inquiry—or too sublime and mysterious to awe the efforts of vain curiosity. The stubborn doctrines of the Stoicks—the polite, accommodating principles of the Epicureans—

* History of Christianity, Book II., Chap. III., p, 178. Amer. Ed.
VOL. II.—No. 4

the sentimental refinements of Plato, and the practical methods of the illustrious Stagyrte—the claims of the popular worship—the superstitions of the mass, and the hidden mysteries disclosed to a chosen few, were matters of free, open, unrebuked debate. In such a city, the long chosen abode of philosophy, science and the arts—the literary metropolis of the world, rendered holy to a freeman by the mute memorials of Independence eloquent in ruins—in such a city, and among such a people, the Apostle of the Gentiles appears, the champion of the Gospel, against philosophy, science, idolatry, superstition—all the wisdom of this world, arrayed in enmity to God. To the eye of sense, the odds were fearfully against him. His name and country were identified among the Pagan nations around him, with all that was little, contracted and mean. A Jew by birth, exclusive in his religion, and a reputed bigot in his opinions, he presented, in his national associations, those features of disgust which provoked the satire of Juvenal—the contempt of Gallio, and the raillery of Martial. It is true Paul was a scholar, skilled in Grecian models,—but all his pretensions to refinement and elegance were sunk in the fact that he was a *Jew*—as the valour and courtly influence of Naaman were nothing to the damning consideration that after all he was a leper. But curiosity was too strong for either prejudice or contempt. His disputes in the synagogue with his own brethren—his instructions to those whom he found seriously intent upon the duties of religion—and his public discussions in the market place with all whom the Providence of God threw in his way, had made him the object of attention to the leading sects of Philosophy. *Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoicks encountered him.**

We may here pause to contemplate the contrast in their motives and aims, and those of the servant Jesus. He had come to Athens as a stranger. Driven from Thessalonica by a popular tumult excited by religious bigotry, he sought safety and quiet in this mart of learning, elegance and paganism—while tarrying for his brethren, his spirit was stirred in him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry. He looked not upon its statues and temples, its altars and sacrifices, with the eye of poetry or taste.

* Acts xvii, 18.

These ornaments of art—these imposing monuments of genius and skill, however they might adorn the names and perpetuate the memories of Phidias and Praxiteles, were an insult to God—and, like Elijah, the prophet of another dispensation, he was very jealous for the Lord God of Hosts. His imagination could not expatiate in rapture, upon scenes which proclaimed too plainly to the ear of faith, that the curse of the Almighty was there. What signified the beauty of the work when the end was death? While he mused and saw, the fire burned—the love of Christ, an emotion felt for the first time, perhaps, upon that classic soul—zeal for the glory of God—intense desires for the salvation of the lost—the terrific sanctions of the law—all pressed upon him, and roused his noble spirit to lift up his voice like a trumpet, to cry aloud and spare not. He was a man of God—and the word of the Lord was like fire in his bones. His position was indeed sublime—and though the object of contempt, ridicule, or idle curiosity to others, he was raised by the grandeur of his mission and a tenant in his heart, whom the world knew not yet, above all the petty desires which vanity, pride or ambition could suggest; and like his Divine Master, prayed in spirit for those who despised him. He had no doubtful disputations to propose—but a message to proclaim in the name of God. He was no dialectician from the Schools, but an ambassador of the skies—he preached not the wisdom of men, but the wisdom of God in a mystery. He spake with the confidence of one whose feet rested upon the rock of eternal truth, and with the persuasiveness of one who was not a lord of the faith, but a helper of the joy of his hearers. The zeal, devotion and deep conviction which glowed in his soul, made him earnest, but neither an enthusiast nor fanatic. His discourse is managed with consummate skill; and while the word of the Lord is plainly declared, it is studiously framed with a reference to the state, prejudices and opinions of the assembly. Paul had seen among the monuments of Athens, an altar to the unknown God. This furnishes the Apostle with a text. He begins with the statement of a general fact, true of all men, but preëminently true of the Athenians, that the interests of religion, in some form or other, must and will exact atten-

tion. Man is essentially a religious animal. His nature calls for religious worship. He must have a God to pray to, as well as a God to swear by; and while the true God is unknown, the heart will be filled with idols in His place. All idolatry consists essentially in the false worship of the true, or a superstitious worship of the unknown God.—Having paved his way to the favorable attention of his hearers, Paul proceeds to recapitulate the leading doctrines of Natural religion, to some of which, with more or less modification, the Stoics might assent, and to others the Epicureans*. The doctrine of Providence—of human responsibility—of a moral government—are not only announced, but are pressed as formal arguments against a false worship, and urged as motives for seeking to be ascertained of the truth. The obvious dictates of nature, if properly heeded, are sufficient to condemn idolatry. The fall of man—his present depravity, and the necessity of repentance are briefly and compendiously stated; and then the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel are summarily discussed under the heads of Jesus and the resurrection.

The effects of this sermon are briefly detailed by the Historian†. Some of them treated the matter with downright scorn, others were afraid that it might be true, but were not prepared to make the sacrifices which a full assent would obviously require. Still there were a few, a select and noble band, consisting alike of plebeians and philosophers, who clave to the Apostle, and believed his doctrines. It is remarkable that these effects were produced, not by Paul's dissertations upon natural religion—upon the Being and Providence of God—the accountability of man, and the strict moral government which has been established in the world. He seems to have been heard with patience as long as he insisted upon these and kindred topics. Even his denunciations of idolatry, though a direct rebuke of their practice and a tacit imputation upon their understandings or integrity, awakened no visible displeasure. But the very moment that the Apostle entered upon the territory of Grace, and proceeded to expound those mysteries of the Gospel, which eye had not seen nor ear heard, neither

* Milman's History of Christ. Book II., Chap. III., p. 179. Am. Ed.

† Acts, xvii., 32-34.

had entered into the heart of man to conceive; the effect was striking and characteristic; some mocked, others said we will hear thee again of this matter; and only here and there an auditor received the engrafted word and lived.

This sermon of Paul at Athens deserves our serious attention, as it sets forth in brief and pregnant heads, the whole contents of Revelation, and the essential doctrines, in particular, of what is properly and exclusively Christianity. Revelation and Christianity are not convertible terms. Every thing that even the Bible contains is not a part of Christianity. There have been at least three dispensations of this religion, distinguished from each other by outward form, and accidental circumstances, and each of these is described in the Bible, and the peculiarities of each throw light upon the general scheme to which they all pertain.

Every thing in Revelation is subsidiary to Christianity, but is not, necessarily, part and parcel of its being. Some things are presupposed in it, their truth is essential to its arrangements, and other things belong to the age, people, and country of its first introduction. All these subsidiary and incidental circumstances are to us the subjects of Revelation, and therefore to be received with undoubting faith; but much may be received, and the Gospel in its essence not be embraced, and many revealed facts may be unknown, and yet the salvation of the Gospel imparted. It is, therefore, a profoundly interesting question—what is Christianity? What are the essential features of that system which Jesus introduced into the world, and which, without His interposition, would not only have been unknown, but would not, and could not have been true? What are those peculiarities which, wherever they have been proclaimed, whether on the Areopagus of Athens—in the seats of modern learning—the halls of science—the church—the market place, or meeting-house, have uniformly made some mock, and staggered others, until God, by His spirit, gave them a lodgment in the heart. The solution of this question is of fundamental importance. Our lives depend upon it. True, the Gospel is a simple system, but notwithstanding its simplicity, multitudes perish with a lie in their right hands, fondly dreaming that they are in the ark, when they are only sheltered by bulrushes. Thousands mistake what Christianity

is, and die; they kindle a fire and walk in its light, and receive the punishment at God's hand, that they shall lie down in sorrow. Let us, therefore, address ourselves to this question with the solemnity and earnestness the nature of the subject demands.

The course of thought pursued by the Apostle in this celebrated sermon, the disposition and arrangement of his topics, and the obvious relations which they sustain to each other, will correct many prevalent errors, and conduct us by an easy process, to the precise views which ought to be entertained. Paul first insists upon the *necessity* of the Gospel, and then announces its doctrines in their adaptations to the wants they were designed to relieve.

I. First, then, what is the *necessity* of Christianity? What is the call for it in the circumstances of our race? And what end, consequently, was it designed to answer? The necessity of *revelation* is a point upon which Christian apologists are accustomed to insist as establishing the antecedent credibility of the fact, and though their arguments are, for the most part, conclusive, as showing the likelihood of some interposition to mitigate our ignorance, they fail to present the peculiar need of such a dispensation as that of the Gospel. It is too frequently taken for granted that "the supposition of sin does not bring in any new religion, but only makes new circumstances, and names of old things, and requires new helps and advantages to improve our powers, and to encourage our endeavors; and thus the law of grace is nothing but a restitution of the law of nature."* The ground ordinarily assumed, is the ignorance of man and the goodness of God; and this ignorance, which seems to be regarded as the principal injury of the fall, has reference to the great facts of Natural Religion, which, if known, would have sufficient efficacy to secure amendment of life and everlasting happiness. The controversy has been, in many instances, so conducted with the Deists as to convey the impression that the doctrines of nature were sufficient to constitute the complete religion of a sinner, the sole point in dispute being the competency of reason to discover

* This extraordinary statement is quoted by Halyburton from one who, he says, "wore a mitre."—Nat. Rel. Insuf. chap. 1, p. 279—Works in one volume.

these doctrines without supernatural aid.* We are represented as creatures destined for another life, and needing information in reference to its character and its connection with the present, which cannot be derived from the light of nature. In this view, Christianity is no new religion; it is only a new publication of that which subsisted from the beginning of our race. It is a *revelation*, strictly and properly so called, and nothing more; and its whole relation to us is exhausted when we receive and submit to it as a Divine teacher.† We are ignorant, for example, of a future life; or if we have, from the operations of conscience, or the spontaneous desires of the soul, vague convictions, or indistinct impressions of continued existence in another state, or among other scenes,—the evidence is too feeble and shadowy to furnish the grounds of a steady belief. Christianity accordingly relieves our blindness, and brings life and immortality to light. The apprehensions of nature, it reduces to realities; its vague impressions to the certainty of facts. So, again, without revelation we are represented as uncertain, whether our conduct here shall effect our destinies hereafter, or what is the nature of the connection which subsists between the present and the future. Christianity comes to our assistance, and teaches us that this present world is a school for eternity; and that according to our characters and conduct here, will be our destiny hereafter. This is the method in which the apologists for Christianity have too often conducted the argument with the Deists. There has been no dispute between them, as to *what* religion is sufficient to secure the happiness of a sinner. They are, for the most part, agreed in its nature

* This is the impression left by Paley—and it is clearly the doctrine of Mr. Locke. His Christianity is nothing but *Revealed Deism*.

† It is very unfortunate that the distinctions between Christianity and natural religion have been expressed by the terms, natural and revealed religion. The idea obviously suggested by this phraseology is, that their difference lies in the sources whence we derive our knowledge of them. Nothing, however, has been more clearly proved by Christian writers—among whom, we may especially refer to Halyburton, and to Norris—than that we are as much indebted to revelation for any adequate knowledge of natural religion, as for the mysteries of the Gospel. They are both *revealed*. The difference between them is radical and essential, and not accidental or contingent. They are different *religions*. One is the religion of our nature before the fall; the other the religion of grace after the fall. The one contemplates God, simply as a moral Governor—the other as a Saviour and Redeemer.

and principles; but it has been keenly debated, whether reason, since the fall, is capable of discovering this religion without supernatural assistance, or of authenticating it with sufficient evidence to make it of practical importance. We may admit that the argument is conclusive, as conducted by the friends of revelation. Natural religion is certainly not the offspring of natural light. In the present condition of our race, whatever may be the evidences which exist within us and around us of the being, perfection, and character of God—of the condition of man, and the relation he sustains to his Creator—his darkened faculties are incompetent to gather from them the conceptions which make up the fabric of natural religion; however, he may prove its truth from these sources, after the ideas have been suggested to the mind. We confidently believe that if natural religion were the *sole* religion of a sinner, revelation would still be necessary to teach us what it is—to re-publish it with light and power—to free it from corruption, superstition, and abuse, and present it in the symmetry of its parts, and the integrity of its combination. But then, this, although a *revelation*, would not be Christianity. It might remove the veil from the eye of ignorance, and unfold realities of tremendous power to alarm the guilty, and stimulate the righteous. But all its truths would be independent of the mission of the Saviour, except in so far as he was the instrument in the hands of Providence to unfold them. That this whole theory is fundamentally wrong—though sustained by the splendid names of Locke and Paley—though the favorite and cherished hypothesis, during the dynasty of the Stuarts—defended alike by mitred Prelates and humble Curates, that Christianity is something more, immeasurably more than a *revelation* of truths, which in themselves were independent of the mission of Christ, may be inferred from the order and connection in which Paul has here introduced the mysteries of the Gospel. It is not a little remarkable that every solitary element of the system which those, who take this view of the subject, make it the object of Jesus to communicate, was insisted on by the Apostle before he gets to the Gospel. The great doctrines of natural religion which constituted the faith and the worship of man before the fall, are treated as preliminary to the distinctive peculiarities of Christianity. The creed of Herbert—the most

liberal of the Deists—as good a Christian as many who have defended miracles and prophecy—so far as this creed is natural religion—is recapitulated by the Apostle as introductory to the Gospel. The unity of God—His absolute independence and universal sovereignty—the relation in which He stands to men—the necessity of religious worship, and the guilt and folly of idolatry—the perfection of His moral government, and the essential, unchangeable distinctions of right and wrong; these are all eloquently enforced, but these are not the Gospel. We do not say that they are not revealed truths—we do not say that any religion is the offspring of mere natural light; but we do say, and the method of the Apostle justifies us in saying it, that although these are truths of revelation, and truths which must be recognized, in order to understand the Gospel, yet they are not Christianity. We will go a step farther and assert, that the natural religion which Paul preached on Mars Hill, contained propositions which unassisted reason is utterly, under any circumstances, incompetent to discover; and which, yet, from the beginning, must have been parts of the primitive religion of the race. He insists upon the federal headship of Adam. This is the fundamental truth in nature's system. We are of *one* blood. There is a mysterious unity in our race, indicated by a common descent, and a common nature, in consequence of which, we sustain different relations to each other, from what we would have sustained, if we had been separate, independent, isolated beings. In our world there is not only *society*, but *kindred*—not only similarity, but identity of nature, and our religion proceeds upon a principle which recognizes this unity, and in its great charter of hope, treated with the race in one man. So, also, the doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine of natural religion. But there might have been imparted to us a knowledge of the object of worship—the great federal dispensation under which our race was created, and the consequent condemnation and ruin of mankind in the first man, who was of the earth, earthy—and yet not a single doctrine of the Gospel, as connected with the mission of Jesus, be known. Nay, all these things, whether known or not, would have been true, had Jesus never been born, or never died. Paul's Christianity therefore was something more than a re-publication of natural religion, even in its

true form and perfect proportions, as adoring the Trinity, and binding the race in a federal compact with a common head. The Apostle virtually admits, that in our present state, we cannot discover the true system under which we were born, and which attaches to our natures as moral and as human. There was a season of ignorance in which all who had no revelation were permitted to walk. But the removal of this ignorance is not all that the Gospel proposes; it is a new dispensation, out of which new duties and new relations to God spontaneously grow. God *now* commandeth all men every where to repent, because He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained—whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised him from the dead. It is plain that Paul regarded Jesus as introducing a religion whose distinctive law, so far as it respected human conduct and obedience, was the law of repentance. We shall not stop to inquire whether repentance is a duty of nature; but as here unfolded by the Apostle, it depends upon principles supernatural and divine. But the argument which we would frame from this passage, against the supposition that the prime necessity of our nature arises from our ignorance, and is therefore to be relieved simply by revelation, is drawn from the importance, which the Apostle attaches to the resurrection of Jesus, and the consequent resurrection of the dead. The religion which Paul preached at Athens, and which the necessities of all men require, is a religion in which this fact must enter. We must bear in mind that the resurrection, neither of Jesus nor His followers, is ever treated in the Christian Scripture as a *proof* of Christianity; it is always made a *part* of it—an essential, indispensable element of the scheme. It is not presented to us simply as a *miracle*, authenticating the Divine mission of Christ, though of course this must be an incidental result. But it is treated as being as really, and truly, and necessarily a component part of the Gospel, as the death or incarnation of the Saviour. Paul* sums up the whole of Christianity in Jesus and the resurrection:—For I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received; how that Christ died for our

* Acts, xvii: 18—I Cor. xv: 3.

sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures. The death, burial, resurrection of Christ—these were the facts upon which the Gospel depended, that Paul preached at Athens and Corinth. To represent the resurrection as a mere proof of Christianity, resting upon the same footing with the other miracles of the New Testament, and authenticating Christ's supernatural commission in the same way, is without sanction from the Scriptures. It is never treated simply as a credential—a motive to belief, but not the thing to be believed. On the contrary, Paul affirms, that if Jesus be not risen, our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain—the Gospel is absolutely worthless. This cannot be said of any single miracle of the Saviour, or His Apostles. They might have wrought more—they might have wrought fewer—the Gospel would have been the same. But if Jesus had not *risen*, there would have been no Gospel, and we should *have been in our sins*.

The passage in Romans, which seems to make the resurrection a proof of the sonship of Christ, has a much wider sweep than interpreters have been accustomed to give to it. The ordinary view is, that as Christ before His death had declared Himself to be the son of God, and as He was condemned by the Jewish Courts upon the ground of His supernatural pretensions to a Divine generation alone, His resurrection from the dead was the endorsement of the Father of the veracity of His own testimony. But, according to this view, any other miracle would have answered the same purpose. The darkened Heavens—the yawning earth—the cleaving rocks and the rising dead, had already proclaimed His sonship as truly as the resurrection—proclaimed it so loudly and powerfully that the centurion confessed the stupendous truth, while all the people that came together to that sight, beholding the things which were done, smote their breasts and returned.* The impressions of that scene were as awful and convincing as any mere miracles could possibly be made. Every previous miracle had as much authenticated the Divine mission of Jesus, and of course, the Divine truth of all that He had uttered, as this final one of His resurrection from the dead. And that God never

* Luke, xxiii, 47-49.

intended it as a *mere proof* is evident, from the fact that He did not shew Himself openly to all the people, but to witnesses chosen beforehand.

The whole reasoning of the Apostle goes upon the supposition that his resurrection *directly* declared his sonship; it did not simply declare that he spoke the truth when he affirmed it, but it attested the fact independently of any such connection. The Psalmist, looking to this great event, represents the Almighty as proclaiming by it, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee;*' and when He ascended into Heaven the joyful acclamation was heard, 'God is gone up with a shout. Jehovah with the sound of a trumpet.†

It is, therefore, evident that both the Old Testament and the New represent the resurrection, not only as an integral part of Christianity, but, as a pregnant proof of the eternal sonship of Christ, and consequently every scheme must be false in which this great fact is not obviously possessed of this distinction. Whatever the Gospel is, it must be something into which the resurrection essentially enters, and so enters, as to establish the sonship of Jesus; and, as neither the one nor the other can be affirmed of His office as a prophet, it is very certain that the necessity which Paul contemplated must lie much deeper than the natural ignorance of man, in regard to truths which are independent of the mission of Jesus. It is obvious that whatever the Gospel is, its truths must have been *created* by the mission of Jesus. They would not have existed at all, if he had not been born, crucified, buried and rose.

Enough has been said to show that Paul contemplated Christianity as something more than a *revelation*. This proposition may strike our readers as hardly worth the labour we have expended upon it; but those who have been brought most in contact with the educated minds of the country must be sensible that the difficulties which they experience in Christianity are largely owing to this low view.

The principles of natural religion seem so reasonable, when once they are fairly proposed, that it is hard to get quit of the conviction, that what so obviously commends itself to the understandings and consciences of men, might

* Ps. ii, 7. Acts xiii, 33.

† Ps. xlvii, 5.

have been discovered without supernatural light. The presumption against *revelation* is increased by confining its scope to a department of truths which were certainly the original furniture of reason, and which when once they are announced, reason, apart from the influence of prejudice and passion, does not hesitate to recognize. To tell us that nature and Christianity embrace exactly the same religion, that Christianity is distinguished by nothing but the source from which it springs, that its sole object is to publish with clearness and enforce with authority the doctrines of nature, is to put its necessity on a footing which, however successfully it may be maintained, will seldom produce that deep and earnest conviction of need, which hails the Gospel with joy, and detects, in its provisions, an adequate reason for the interposition of God. This low view of the subject has not only to encounter the supposed presumption against revelation in general, but an additional presumption against that species of revelation which, with an immense apparatus of means, does little more than enlarge the territory of knowledge, and dispel a few floating clouds from the atmosphere of truth. The great bell of the universe is rung to preach a sermon of which nature was previously in possession of the heads.

Lord Herbert's difficulties with Christianity arose, for the most part, from an utter misconception of its principal design. The question could never be raised concerning the sufficiency of reason if the proper end of the Gospel were kept steadily in view. Deism was comparatively unknown in England, until a style of preaching was adopted, which confounded morality with holiness, habits with the Spirit of God, and faith with a general conviction of truth, which, discarding all its distinctive doctrines, reduced Christianity to a frozen system of heathenism, and made the ministers of Jesus little better than the "miserable apes of Epictetus." When the prelate and the curate were equally anxious to have the world believe, that their Gospel had exploded the antiquated notions of spirituality and grace; that such uncouth phrases as justification, adoption, regeneration and redemption, were stripped of their repulsiveness, and adjusted, as well to the notions as the dialect of fashionable life; it is not to be wondered at, that men should stare at

the pomp of preparation with which *such* a religion had been announced to the world. The affluence of means and the poverty of result were so conspicuously in contrast that the question seems to have been naturally suggested; whether, if *this* were all, reason might not have been left to itself. We can sympathize with such difficulties; and though we are far from asserting, for we by no means believe, that unassisted reason, since the fall, would ever have discovered the whole system of natural religion; yet we are as far from asserting that Christianity is the form in which a revelation, designed chiefly to assist reason, would have been given. To this inadequate conception of its office, as a mere handmaid to nature, is owing, in some degree, the fact that the whole current of modern philosophy, under the pretext of great veneration for religion, is fatal, in its tendencies, to the claim of inspiration. The sufficiency of reason has been defended, not on historical, but psychological grounds, and the excellency of Christianity is represented as consisting in the distinctness and fulness with which it echoes the voice of nature. This is to betray the Saviour with a kiss. These insidious assaults may indeed be repelled by direct arguments, but we can only reach the source of the evil by placing the necessity of the Gospel on its true basis. The change which sin has introduced in the relations of our race to God, and the glorious provisions of the new Covenant, must be set in the light in which the Scriptures uniformly put them, if we would not judge of Divine revelation by a false standard. To show that ignorance is not the great evil which Christ came to dispel; that the scheme of redemption is a vast and mighty dispensation of grace, a stupendous work which our exigencies demanded and God was glorious in doing, is to remove one of the leading difficulties which press upon educated men, when they first turn their attention to the subject. They often hesitate because they do not understand the case.

II. Others, unable to escape from the pervading testimony of Scripture, that the mission of Jesus contemplated a work to be done, as well as truths to be revealed; that Christianity is a grand dispensation of Providence and Grace, involving a series of supernatural acts, directed to the salvation of the sinner; whose history, in their origin,

relations, and results, is the principal instruction it imparts, while they discard the low conceptions of an earthborn philosophy, which can detect in the Gospel nothing but a republication of Natural Religion, fail yet to rise to an adequate apprehension of the real nature of Christ's mediation. Whether it be owing to a fastidious modesty which perverts a just dread of presumption and a becoming sense of ignorance into a refusal to be wise up to what is written; or whether there be a lurking dislike of the principle upon which a consistent explanation can be given of the method of redemption; whatever be the cause; there are men who admit an apparent necessity of the interposition of the mediator, and yet fail to present, in their account of His work, any correspondence, discoverable by us, to the necessity they acknowledge. They very justly represent Natural Religion as unsuited to the condition of a sinner; it makes no provision for the pardon of the guilty; it knows nothing of mercy; nothing of reconciliation to the favour of God. Conducted upon the principle of distributive justice, it promises life to the obedient; denounces death to transgressors; but opens no door of hope to the wretch who has incurred its curse. It *must* render to every man according to his works,—“to them, who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile.” With these representations, not so strongly and emphatically made, we confess, as the nature of the case seems to us to warrant, of the necessity of justification to the salvation of a sinner and the hopelessness of any justification by personal obedience, it is not a little remarkable, that the persons we have in view should miss of the precise nature of redemption in its relations to man, and make it the great object of the Saviour to introduce a new principle of government, or a new method of administration, which has the effect of mitigating the severity of law, putting the guilty in a capacity of salvation, and furnishing them with facilities for turning to account the advantages of their new condition. This principle is the pardon of sin upon repent-

ance. Jesus has made it possible that God should receive penitent transgressors into favour, and has rendered penitence itself less difficult and arduous than it is found to be under the regular and ordinary course of nature. How this capacity of salvation has been introduced by him the advocates of the system do not pretend to explain: it is due, in some way mysterious to us, and unrevealed in the Scriptures, to His humiliation, sufferings and death. It is enough for us to know the fact that repentance has the efficacy ascribed to it without presuming to inquire how it came to be possessed of it.*

None can censure more severely than ourselves that arrogance of understanding which refuses to recognize any dispensation as Divine which cannot be adjusted to the measures of human probability. We are too sensible of the ignorance of man and the greatness of God to dream, for a moment, of making our finite reason the standard of the counsels of infinite wisdom; and we sympathize profoundly with the humility of mind, always characteristic of exalted attainments, that shrinks in reverence from the clouds and darkness which surround the throne of the Eternal. It is the glory of God to conceal a thing; and where He has drawn a veil over the operations of His hand it is presumption in us to pry into His secrets or speculate with confidence on the mysteries He has not thought fit to reveal. But it is neither piety nor modesty; it is unbelief, however speciously disguised, which makes darkness where God has given light; mystery, where all things are plain. To say

* "Some have endeavoured to explain the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us, beyond what the Scripture hath authorized; others, probably because they could not explain it, have been for taking it away, and confining his office as Redeemer of the world, to his instruction, example and government of the Church; whereas, the doctrine of the Gospel appears to be, not only that he taught the efficacy of repentance, but rendered it of the efficacy which it is, by what he did and suffered for us: that He obtained for us the benefit of having our repentance accepted unto eternal life; not only that he revealed to sinners, that they were in a capacity of salvation, and how they might obtain it; but, moreover, that he put them in this capacity of salvation, by what he did and suffered for them; put us into a capacity of escaping future punishments and obtaining future happiness. And it is our wisdom thankfully to accept the benefit, by performing the conditions upon which it is offered on our part, without disputing how it was procured on his."—Butler's Analogy, Pt. 2, Cap. 5, § 6.

that we are left in ignorance, as to the method by which the mediation of Christ achieves the salvation of a sinner, is to contradict all those passages of Scripture, which directly teach, as well as indirectly imply, that the wisdom of God is conspicuously displayed in the scheme of redemption, and it is made the duty of the saints to admire it. "We preach Christ crucified," says the Apostle; "unto the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God." "Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect." The lowest conception of wisdom involves the idea that the means should be adapted to the end, and it is displayed only in so far as the correspondence betwixt them is capable of being discerned. Where the adaptation of means to an end is not perceived, wisdom may indeed exist, but it is absurd to say that it can either be admired or displayed. That emotion can be elicited only by an actual contemplation of the fitness upon which the wisdom depends. It is, accordingly, impossible that believers should be expected to glorify that attribute of God, to which, as much as to His power and grace, we are indebted for the economy of redemption, if they are not permitted to see how the mediation of Christ is adapted to effect their salvation. They can no more be filled with admiration at the contemplation of a wisdom which is concealed from their understandings, than they can be filled with love at the contemplation of a beauty which is hidden from their eyes. We are very far from asserting that we, or any other finite intelligence, can comprehend the whole mystery of Godliness: there are facts in redemption, such as the incarnation, and the subsistence of two natures in one person, and there may be designs in reference to other worlds and perhaps also in relation to our own, proposed by it, in the infinite counsels of God, which shall for ever transcend the capacities of creatures. We do not pretend to know the whole case. We hardly presume that we ever shall know it. Throughout the countless cycles of eternity we expect to occupy the anxious position of the Angels who, previous to the advent, are represented as earnestly inquiring into these things. The glories of redemption are as boundless, the depths of its wisdom as

fathomless, as the infinite perfections of the Godhead. But, though there be heights, which the loftiest genius cannot climb, and depths which no finite line can sound, still we maintain that there is a wisdom which we can discover and a wisdom we are required to adore. In so far as our own personal acceptance is involved, we can see the fitness of Jesus for His work and the fitness of His work to the necessities of man. If we cannot comprehend all the fullness of meaning in which Christ crucified is the wisdom of God, we can, at least, receive that portion of light which irradiates our own *salvation*; and we dare not brand as delusion all that joy in Him which flows not simply from the faith that He is a Saviour, but from the felt conviction that He is a Saviour peculiarly adapted to our wants. We must therefore protest against any hypothesis which discards as presumptuous all efforts to explain how the sacrifice of Christ contributes to our pardon. Whatever other mysteries surround the cross, this point is not left to the hazard of conjecture or the uncertainty of speculation. It is *revealed*, or words have lost their meaning, and the Bible is a book of riddles.

But the most serious objection to the theory in question is, that it represents Christ as introducing by His work, a new principle in the moral government of God, or a new method of administration, which cannot be conceived without confusion of ideas nor expressed without a contradiction in terms. The patrons of the scheme, studious to put, in its true light, the inadequacy of natural religion, are not wanting in proofs, that whatever intimations the facts of experience may give of the possibility of mercy under the general government of God, they all point to mediation, as the channel of compassion, and furnish no ground to suppose that any arbitrary purpose on the part of our Judge, or any penitence or amendment on our part, could have arrested the execution of the curse. Between penitence and pardon, they are unable to trace any natural or necessary connection; but a mediator may cause to be instituted, and in the case of Christ, has caused to be instituted, a dispensation of leniency under which repentance may be followed by forgiveness. The defect of Natural Religion to which Christianity is a remedy is, not that nature admits of no repentance, but that repentance is incapable of

securing pardon. The design of mediation is to establish a connection between them. Not to make one or the other possible or certain, but supposing them to exist, or capable of existing; to bind them in a new relation unknown to nature.

Now we take leave to say that Christianity has instituted no connection between penitence and pardon which is not founded in the very nature of things. Their relation to each other is not contingent but necessary; not derived from the interposition of a mediator, but from their essential relations to God. There never was a case, and there never will be a case in all the history of the universe in which a penitent sinner has been damned. What is repentance, in its full developement, but a restoration to that state of integrity and holiness, of knowledge, righteousness and communion with God, from which Adam by transgression fell? and can we entertain the thought, without horror, that He whose nature is in sympathy with the righteous, should banish into outer darkness those who are devoted to His law, who love His name and rejoice in His glory? A penitent sinner is one who has been a transgressor but is now just: the laws of God are now put within his mind and written on his heart, and his moral condition is evidently one which renders the supposition of punishment incongruous and contradictory. Such a man is as unfit for the atmosphere of hell as an impenitent transgressor is unfit for the atmosphere of Heaven. There is obviously, therefore, no principle of reason or nature, as there is unquestionably none of revelation, which teaches that a man may be penitent and perish, that he may be driven into final banishment with the love of God in his heart and the praise of God upon his tongue. On the contrary, we are expressly taught, that "if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die; all his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him, in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live." This seems to be the dictate of right reason. The incongruity is so palpable and revolting of dooming to destruction, one who, at the time, is possessed of every element of character, that puts it in harmony with the

perfections of God that writers* are, by no means, wanting, who are as confident in asserting a natural, as those whom we have more immediately in view, an instituted connection betwixt penitence and pardon. The difficulty of Natural Religion is, not that it excludes the penitent from hope, but that it precludes the possibility of repentance itself. Upon the hypothesis that the thorough and radical change of heart and character, implied in the Scripture doctrine of sanctification, could take place under its administration; that a man could be delivered from his moral degradation and reinstated into that condition of righteousness to which its promises of life are directed; we see no harm in asserting that in his righteousness he hath done, he shall live. The question under the law of nature, in regard to such a case, is precisely analogous to the question under the law of grace, whether an apostate saint shall be damned. The true answer is that the case can never occur. Nature shuts us up in despair because it shuts us up in *impenitence*. The least transgression contracts guilt, guilt calls for punishment, and this punishment consists in that banishment from God which is attended, in every dependent being, with spiritual death and the unbroken dominion of sin. To be a sinner, therefore, once, is to be a sinner forever, unless some agency should be interposed to arrest the natural and ordinary course of justice and law. Hence the office of a mediator must be, not to make repentance efficacious of pardon, but to make repentance possible. It is accordingly the great blessing which is promised, as well as the paramount duty enjoined, under the dispensation of the Gospel. In other words, it is the great end of Christianity, to restore and secure to man the holiness he has lost.

The first step, it is obvious, which must be taken in this work of renovation is the removal of guilt. In the only

* Locke and Warburton may be particularly mentioned. Of course, however, what they mean by *repentance* is no real repentance at all. That is a change of heart effected by the power which originally formed it, and a man thus renewed is evidently in a state of salvation already. Holiness is salvation or there is nothing which deserves the name. But the case is very different in relation to those changes which are wrought in our characters by the law of habit under the influence of convictions and of fear. Such repentance is no preparation for heaven, and such penitents are worthy of death.

sense in which it can be conceived that repentance is likely to be acceptable to God, all its appropriate exercises are the results of His favour and of the communications of His grace. If the least degree of sin entails spiritual death—if death must continue as long as guilt abides, and repentance is a resurrection from this state; the guilt, in some way or other, must be effaced, before life can be imparted. There must be pardon, before there can be that union with God, which is the foundation of all holiness, as contradistinguished from morality. It is guilt which seals the soul in impotence, and that guilt must cease to be imputed before a renovation of the nature can be effected. To say that an unpardoned sinner can repent, is to affirm that he may be under the curse and in the favour of God at one and the same time; that he is both dead and alive—active and senseless—free and a slave, at the same moment and in the same relations. There is no method of escaping from these palpable contradictions, but by making pardon prior in the order of nature to repentance, and resolving both into a state of reconciliation, for which we are indebted to the gracious interference of a mediator. The same work, whatever it may be, which removes our guilt and propitiates the favour of the Father of our spirits, entitles us to those communications of love which render us meet to enjoy the blessedness of His smile. We must be pardoned that we may live; and we must live in order to repent; so that repentance and pardon are indeed indissolubly connected; not however as cause and effect, nor in the order in which they are too commonly presented, but as the joint results of a common grace, arranged in the relation of means to an end, pardon being in order to repentance.*

*In what we have said about the priority of pardon to repentance, we do not mean that the sense of pardon is experienced or that the thing itself formally takes place antecedently to regeneration. In the actual communication of grace, the heart must be changed before faith can exist, and faith must be exerted before justification can be had. But the *grounds* of pardon in the work and intercession of Christ are presupposed in any provisions for the renewal and the sanctification of the sinner, and the mission of the spirit through which he is made a partaker of Christ is in consequence of that mediation which could effect nothing if it did not remove guilt. We mean nothing more in what we have said than the absolution in heaven and the imputation of Christ, of which

That these were the doctrines which Paul preached on the Areopagus at Athens, cannot, of course, be directly collected from the brief record of his sermon, which has come down to us; but that he could not have taught any different theory, seems to us plain, from the nature of the arguments he employed. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent, because He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained: whereof, He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised him from the dead." The Apostle here makes it the great object of the Gospel, in contradistinction from the law of nature, to inculcate the duty of repentance. As long as men were left to the light of their own eyes, without any adequate revelations of the method of redemption, the doctrine of repentance was not promulgated, because the grace of it was not yet to be imparted. The dead were not commanded to live, because He had not arrived, whose voice could penetrate their graves, and quicken the pulse of immortality. It is only in connection with the kingdom of heaven that the Scriptures ever insist upon repentance, because it is in that kingdom alone that repentance can possibly exist. Had not Jesus appeared, no eye would ever have wept a tear—no heart ever heaved a sigh of Godly sorrow for sin. When we attend to the steps by which Paul reaches the conclusion, that God now commandeth all men every where to repent—that the generation of holiness, and the destruction of sin are the characteristic ends of the Gospel, the inference is inevitable, that his views of repentance must have been very different from that which makes it the condition of pardon. It will be recollected, that the general judgment is not presented as a *motive* to amendment, but as a proof that it is commanded. He does not say that men *ought* to repent because they will be judged, but that they are *commanded* to do it. He first collects the command from a general judgment in righteousness, and then proves, not that there will be a judgment, but that it will

Owen speaks in his *Death of Christ and Vindiciæ Evangelicæ*. See also Witsius, *Dessert Ireni* and Halyburton's *Inquiry into the nature of Regeneration, &c.* But see particularly chaps. xi. and xii. of Owen on the *Death of Christ*.

be in righteousness, because Jesus has been raised from the dead. The sum of his reasoning is briefly this: Men are required to be holy, because God will hereafter deal with them upon the principle of distributive justice; and that this is the method of His government, is put beyond doubt by the resurrection of His Son from the dead.

There are two aspects in which this inspired argument is inconsistent with the doctrines we have been combating. In the first place, if we are ignorant of the nature of the Saviour's mediation, and know not the principles on which it contributes to our pardon, it is impossible to detect any logical connection betwixt His resurrection and ascension, and the final judgment of the world in righteousness. If we know not what relations to the law He sustained in His death, we must be incompetent to perceive how His resurrection secures its supremacy. Paul does not adduce the resurrection as a proof of His divine mission, and through it, a proof of what He had asserted in regard to the proceedings of the last day, but he appeals to it as a fact, which, in itself, contained an infallible assurance from God, that the world should be judged in righteousness. It is a fact which, as soon as it is understood, proclaims this awful truth.

In the next place, if repentance is the appointed precursor of pardon, then it is either a principle of natural justice that the penitent should be pardoned, or, under the mediation of Christ, the government of God is not one of distributive justice. To assert that repentance and pardon are connected as antecedent and consequent, under the dispensation of nature, is to set aside all those arguments by which the Divines of this school, are accustomed to establish the necessity of mediation. To say, that under the mediation of Christ the government of God is not strictly and properly just, is to contradict the Apostle, who affirms a general judgment in righteousness, of which this very mediation is the clearest and most convincing proof. Hence, they must be either inconsistent with themselves, or inconsistent with the Apostle, in making it the object of Christianity to put men in a capacity of salvation, by dissolving, through the work of Christ, the natural connection between guilt and punishment, when a moral change has taken place in ourselves.

III. There is another class of Divines, possessing many points of resemblance to the one whose opinions we have just been considering. They differ, however, in the circumstance that they profess to understand the principle on which the efficacy of what they denominate atonement, depends. They are unwilling to assert the absolute necessity of the death of Christ; not from the modesty which shrinks from the presumption of pronouncing, with confidence, upon what the Almighty might or might not do, but from the principle, plainly avowed and elaborately defended, that Public Policy is the only necessity to be admitted. Those very considerations of expediency by which others have been accustomed to repel objections, and which are in felt disproportion to the importance and magnitude of the event, are received by them as a complete explanation of the case. The great problem to be solved by the death of the Redeemer was the consistency of Pardon with the honour of the Divine reputation, and the dignity of the Divine administration, and the general prosperity of the universe. It was a terrible tragedy enacted before the eyes of all creatures, to display the holiness of God and illustrate the transcendent enormity of sin. It was intended to give emphasis and depth of impression to truths which might have been obscured or undervalued, if sin had been absolutely pardoned, or pardoned upon mere repentance. The Divines of this school do not hesitate to assert that, according to their scheme, the method of salvation involves an inversion of the principles of strict retribution. "Neither Christ nor the sinner," we use the very words of Dr. Wardlaw, "neither Christ nor the sinner has his own due. The guilty, who, according to these principles, should suffer, escapes; and the innocent, who should escape, suffers. In no strict and proper sense, then, can distributive justice be *satisfied* by substitution, when its demands, instead of being adhered to and fulfilled, are, for a special purpose, and by an act of Divine sovereignty, suspended, superseded, over-ruled." These men, whatever they may affirm to the contrary, regard the distinctions betwixt right and wrong, not as final and ultimate, but as means to an end. The great purpose of God, in the government of His creatures, is the production of the largest amount of happiness, and His laws are nothing but the expedients of His prudence

and wisdom, to accomplish the ends of His benevolence: When, accordingly, the public good can be promoted without these laws, there is nothing in the nature of rectitude; the perfections of the Deity, or the relations of man to his Creator, which prevents them from being suspended, superseded, over-ruled. They are binding because they are necessary to the well-being of the universe; and, when a larger amount of happiness can be produced without them, the same reason which induced the Deity to prescribe them, induces Him to set them aside. Policy is superior to right, or rather right is nothing but policy under another name. Experience, however, and the obvious fitness of things concur to demonstrate that the principles of morality are; for the most part, the highest expediency; that truth, justice, benevolence, are the surest means of private felicity and public prosperity, and that the interests of the universe; accordingly, require that all the Divine proceedings should be distinguished by the tendency to impress an awful sense of them upon the minds of intelligent creatures. When, therefore, the Divine administration in any degree departs from them, the general result should be, a stronger commendation of them than if they had been faithfully and punctiliously observed. Whenever God, in other words, breaks His own law, the design should be, to make that law more sacredly and solemnly impressive upon the minds of His subjects. It is seen to be "more honoured in the breach than in the observance."

That we have not misrepresented the theory in question, nor the reasoning by which it is supported, however inconsistent that reasoning appears in our account of it, will be obvious to any one who will take the trouble to analyse and compare the following statements, from a work of confessed ability. "*Distributive*, or, as others designate it, *retributive* justice, according to its strict requirements, admits not of substitution. It issues a righteous law, with a righteous sanction. It passes its sentence of condemnation against the transgressor of that law. It makes no mention of any possible satisfaction but the punishment of the guilty themselves,—the endurance by them of the penal sanction in their own persons. It is only by the death of the sinner himself that the proper demand of the law can be fulfilled; that the principles of distributive justice can have their due applica-

tion; and that, under this aspect of it, consequently, Justice can be satisfied. According to the requisition of justice, in its distributive sense, every man, personally, must have *his own due*. But in substitution it is otherwise. There is an inversion of the principles of strict retribution. Neither Christ nor the sinner has his own due. The guilty, who, according to those principles, should suffer, escapes; and the innocent, who should escape, suffers. In no strict and proper sense, then, can distributive justice be *satisfied* by substitution, when its demands, instead of being adhered to and fulfilled, are, for a special purpose, and by an act of divine sovereignty, suspended, superseded, overruled.—It is well to remark, however, that, in another sense, it was satisfied; all its ends being virtually, and to the full, effected by other means. And this leads me to the true end of atonement. It is to *public justice*, as we have before defined it, that, in substitution and propitiation, the satisfaction is made. The grand design is, “to preserve unsullied the glory of the great principles of eternal rectitude: to shew the impossibility of the claims of equity, founded in these principles and essential to the government of the universe, being dispensed with; to settle in the minds of God’s intelligent creatures, as the subjects of his moral administration, the paramount obligation and immutable permanence of their claims; to give such a manifestation of the divine regard to these elements of his immaculate administration, as to preclude the possibility of any the remotest surmise that in the pardon of sin they have been at all overlooked or placed in abeyance; and thus to render it consistent with divine propriety, or, in other words, honourable to the whole character, as well as to the law and the government of Jehovah, to extend pardoning mercy to the guilty, and to reinstate them in his favour, according to the provisions of the gospel. It is thus that, in so pardoning, his regard to righteousness is as conspicuous as his delight in mercy; and, in the minds of the pardoned, the impression of the claims of the one as deep as that of their obligations to the other.—In this view of it, the scheme possesses a divine grandeur. The glory of God, and the good of his universal empire,—the two great ends of *public justice*, are with “all wisdom and prudence,” admirably combined in it. It is as essential

to the latter of these ends, as it is to the former—(they can never, indeed, be separated)—that the authority of the divine government be maintained in its awful and inviolable sacredness; that the demands of the law be upheld, without one jot or tittle of abatement; that no sin appear as venial; and that, if any sinner is pardoned, the mercy shown to the offender be shown in such a way,—on such a ground,—through such a medium,—as shall at once manifest the divine reprobation of his offences, and, at the same time, secure the restitution of the guilty perpetrator of them to the principles, affections, and practice of holy allegiance.—Such are the purposes, and such the effects, of the Christian atonement.” *

The plain meaning of all this smooth and beautiful declamation is, that God may do evil that good may come. He may do a thing which confessedly is not just. He may invert the principles of strict retribution, — suspend, supersede, overrule the operation of His own law, provided in, so doing, He makes His creatures feel the paramount obligation and immutable permanence of the claims that are set aside. Rectitude is essentially eternal and unchangeable,† but God need not observe it; if, by occasional departures from its rules, He can make the universe more scrupulous and punctilious. The death of Christ was, accordingly, a grand expedient by which the Deity, in all wisdom and prudence, has successfully contrived to impress, with commanding emphasis, the eternal principles of truth and justice upon the minds of every other intelligent being, while He Himself, in this awful dispensation, confessedly disregards them. Such is the theory as expounded by one of its ablest advocates.

Our business, at present, is not with the merits of it, but simply with the question, whether the Historian has not furnished reasons for believing that, whether true or false, this was not the scheme of atonement which Paul preached in the metropolis of Paganism. Paul's Gospel is compendiously expressed in Jesus and the *resurrection*. But so far as we can discover, the resurrection is no necessary part of the Gospel, which resolves the death of Christ into considerations of

* Wardlaw on Atonement, pp. 58—60.

† Upon this subject Dr. Wardlaw has expressed himself very strongly, both in his *Christian Ethicks* and his work on *Atonement*.

expediency, and explains its efficacy by the moral impression against sin it is suited to produce. The two great ends of Public Justice, we are told in the passage just quoted, are the glory of God and the good of His universal empire, and these ends, according to the patrons of the scheme, are adequately secured by a dispensation which shows that God *hates*, while He pardons iniquity. All that would seem to be essential, therefore, is the sufferings and death of the Redeemer. The resurrection is not an element of the work of redemption, it is simply a necessary fact, springing from the Divinity of the sufferer, and no more conducive to the expiation of our guilt than the eating and drinking which pertained to his humanity, or the alternations of activity and repose, which were inseparable from his sublunary state. As Jesus was God, it was certain that He could not be holden of the bands of death. He had power to lay down His life,—He had power to take it up again: but if we could conceive the possibility of his permanent subjection to the dominion of the grave, the impression for ought that appears, of the transcendent enormity of sin, would have been more awful than is likely to be produced by temporary suffering followed by unutterable glory. To say that such a doom would have been a revolting exhibition of cruelty is either to deny that the principle on which his sufferings were inflicted was just, and then any degree of them would have been a measure of cruelty; or to affirm that there is a point beyond which justice cannot push the punishment of sin, and then it ceases to be the mighty evil they represent it. Upon any view of the case, therefore, the resurrection is an immaterial circumstance in this scheme of redemption. Suffering,—the visible and palpable endurance of it,—this is what is required to the manifestation of the righteousness of God,—this is what is needed for the purpose of salutary impression.*

* “Meanwhile it is enough to remind you, how the idea of *manifestation* is associated with the atonement. There is not only a provision for the exercise of the Divine righteousness in man's salvation; but there is the *declaration* of that righteousness. Now, in order to this, there is required not suffering merely, but the palpable and visible endurance of it. It would not otherwise have the necessary impression and effect,
* * * And without vain and presumptuous speculations, we are,

It deserves further to be remarked that, according to this scheme, the resurrection of Christ furnishes no proof that God will judge the world in righteousness. If by righteousness we are to understand the principle of distributive justice; and such, in all similar connections, seems to be its meaning—that, according to this hypothesis, is inverted. Neither man nor the Saviour receives his due. If we are to understand the public justice to which so much importance is attached, that may be illustrated by the *death*, but we cannot perceive its relation to the *resurrection* of Christ, which becomes, upon this hypothesis, a necessary adjunct of the *person*, but no part of the *work* of the Redeemer.

There is another objection to this theory, suggested by the sermon at Athens, which, if we can make it as clear to our readers, as it is to ourselves, will, we apprehend, be conclusive against it. The whole discourse seems to have been conducted on the principle, that the Gospel is its own witness—that the facts of redemption authenticate themselves—that we can reason from its phenomena as effects to their origin in the mind of God as we ascend from nature up to nature's cause. Paul has evidently taken it for granted, for there is no allusion to any external proofs of the Divine mission of Jesus, and no intimation that he himself wrought any miracles at Athens; that as the heavens proclaim the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork; so the death and resurrection of Jesus, when properly apprehended, are their own proofs that He is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth. The work itself proves its Divinity. That work cannot be acknowledged, without prompting the confession of Peter,—thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the son of the living God. Now there is one branch of this a posteriori argument which is absolutely impossible upon the theory of Public Justice. The resurrection furnishes no direct proof of the Deity and Sonship of Christ. There is nothing in the

every one of us, sensible that the spectacle of a Saviour *thus* dignified *thus* suffering is enough for the purpose of salutary impression: impression deep, solemn, awful of the Divine righteousness,—and impression amply and delightfully encouraging, of the Divine mercy." Wardlaw on Atonement, p. 45-6, Dis. 2nd.

nature of the sufferings which He underwent, which requires that the sufferer should be a Divine Person. As to their amount, for aught that appears, they might have been endured by a creature; and as to their design we could not have pronounced beforehand that a very solemn and awful display of the holiness of God and the malignity of sin, fitted to inspire a salutary fear into the minds of the guilty, might not have been made by one who was less than Jehovah's fellow.* Hence the mere fact that he died the death which he did, and triumphed over it in his resurrection from the grave, is no necessary proof of what Paul affirms it to demonstrate with power, that He was the true and proper son of God. He died.—He rose. These are the facts. Now if there be not something in the nature of His death, which imperatively demanded that the sufferer should be Divine, there can be nothing in the nature of the resurrection to declare his Deity. If we knew beforehand that he was God, we can account for His resurrection upon that hypothesis, but there is nothing in the circumstance itself, which independently of any other proofs, demonstrates His eternal worship as well as His kindred to man. It deserves further to be remarked that, according to this hypothesis, the connection between the death of Christ and the salvation of His people is a matter* of arbitrary appointment, and the entire efficacy of His work is resolved into the dignity of His person. In the Epistle to the Corinthians the Apostle teaches us, that there is a species of death which, if *any one* endures in the name and for the sake of others, they shall be acquitted, renewed and sanctified. Because we thus judge, says he, that if one died for all, then all died. The death of the substitute is, in law and justice, the death of the principal; it delivers him from guilt. The effect depends not upon the *person* dying, but upon the nature and relations of the death itself. If any other being could have been found who was capable of dying the death which Christ died, the same glorious results would have followed. His Deity was essential,—not to

* Dr. Wardlaw admits as much in attempting to prove the necessity of Christ's death from the fact that He *did* die, which, no doubt, is very sound reasoning from cause to effect, but it cannot be reversed,—p. 14. Cf. p. 46.

establish the connection between His death and the salvation of His people,—but to create the possibility of the death itself. There was a peculiarity about it which absolutely demanded the strength of omnipotence to undergo it. None but God could have shed the blood which Jesus poured out. When it is said that the value of Christ's sufferings depends upon His person, it is not intended that a fictitious importance is to be attached to something inherently and essentially worthless, in consequence of its association with a Divine being—which is the only sense of the terms consistent with the theory of Public Justice—the meaning is, that they were fully and completely the *death* which the exigencies of the case required, and which they could not possibly have been, if the sufferer had been less than Divine. Redemption is glorious; not because God achieves it, but because none but God *could* achieve it. The death of Jesus was glorious; not because it was His death, but because it *could* be the death of no other. A creature might as well have undertaken to *create* as to *save* a world. The work itself demands the interposition of God; and any theory which fails to represent the death of Christ as an event which, in its own nature, as clearly proclaims His Divinity as His superintending care and preservation of all things, cannot be the Gospel which Paul preached at Rome, at Corinth, at Athens, and which extorted from Thomas, upon beholding the risen Saviour, the memorable confession,—My Lord, and my God.

IV. If the necessity of the Gospel is not founded in the ignorance of man, nor the want of a natural connection between penitence and pardon, nor the policy of government, the question recurs, what is the nature of it and what peculiarities must distinguish the provisions that are intended to relieve it. It is obvious that Paul, in his recapitulation of the great principles of Natural Religion, designed to produce in the minds of his hearers, a deep and pungent conviction, that sin had occasioned an emergency in the government of God, which rendered salvation, independently of Jesus and the resurrection, hopelessly impossible. These very principles created the difficulty, They represent God as a just judge and a righteous governor; dispensing rewards and punishments according to the rule of

distributive justice; dealing with every man according to his works. The first great necessity of man, therefore, as a sinner, arises from his guilt; an obligation to punishment which, according to the eternal principles of rectitude, cannot be set aside. The government of the world is not prudential, but moral; and under a strict and proper moral government the wicked cannot be received into favour; they *must* be punished. There can consequently be no hope to a sinner until the problem is solved, how God can be *just*; not simply wise, discreet or prudent, this is not the difficulty which a sense of guilt presses upon the conscience of a sinner, but how God can be *just*; can maintain the principle upon which His administration is conducted, and yet receive transgressors into favour. There appears to be an impossibility in the pardon of sin under the law of nature. This first and paramount necessity, springing from guilt under a righteous government, it is the object of Christianity to relieve. It is accordingly an amazing Dispensation of Providence and Grace which proposes to reconcile the pardon of the guilty with the strictest principles of justice; which, while it opens a door of hope to the guilty and removes the apprehensions which conscience awakens in the breast of transgressors, demonstrates, at the same time, in the clearest and brightest light, that God will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained. The more clearly the doctrines of Natural Religion are understood, the more hopeless becomes the condition of a sinner. The imperfect knowledge of them which can be gathered from the dictates of our own consciousness; the crude and mouldering remains which may yet be detected of the law originally written on the heart, are enough to arouse our fears and fill the mind with anxiety and suspense, as to the possibility of final acceptance upon any terms. As the light increases and revelation pours in upon us, its discoveries of our former state—our present ruin—of God's immutable holiness and inflexible justice, despair thickens upon us. Our hearts condemn us, and God is greater than our hearts and knoweth all things. The anxious question is wrung from us,—“Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow before the High God? Shall I come before Him with burnt offer-

ings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" Now guilt is only another name for a conviction of *ill-desert*. It is the response of the human soul to the justice of punishment, and is utterly independent, as all human experience testifies, of all calculations of expediency. The burden upon the conscience is,—not simply that we shall suffer, for suffering may be a calamity as well as a punishment—not that the interests of the universe and the safety of God's throne demand our misery; these are considerations which never enter into the bitterness of remorse—the burden which presses with intolerable weight upon the soul—is the terrible conviction, wrung from the depths of our moral nature,—that we have done wrong and *deserve* to die. It is this feeling that we *deserve* our doom, which kindles the hell within us. If we could strip ourselves of the burning consciousness of this fact, no amount of evil could ever be regarded in the light of punishment. Whatever was inflicted for the general good, we might nerve ourselves to bear, from lofty considerations of benevolence and self-sacrifice; and to whatever was inevitable, we might bow with patience, if not with resignation. But energy and resolution avail nothing against a sense of guilt; the feeling of *ill-desert* drinks up the spirits, and conscience makes cowards of us all. This, then, is the peculiarity which distinguishes guilt; it is a conviction that punishment is due—that it ought to be inflicted, and that under a righteous government, sooner or later, it *will* be inflicted; and it is precisely this sense of guilt which the truths of Natural Religion are adapted to produce within us. It is the echo of our own hearts to the fearful condemnation of a holy God.

If guilt is the response of the soul to the justice of punishment, the only way in which its sting can be extracted is by an arrangement, which shall make the punishment cease to be just, and give the sinner a right to escape from the evils which conscience forecasts. By no other conceivable method can peace and tranquillity, in conformity with the principles of eternal rectitude, be imparted to the mind.

The source of all its fear is the conviction that it *ought* to die, and unless a contrary conviction can be produced, that the same justice which doomed to death now exempts from the curse, guilt will continue to agitate the heart with dismal forebodings, which cannot be dismissed as phantoms, because they are founded in the very nature of the soul. This *obligation* to punishment—this *righteousness* of condemnation, must cease to press, or the need which guilt creates cannot be relieved. The sinner feels, in other words, that the justice which calls for his blood must be satisfied, or that blood must be yielded to its demand. It is, accordingly, the glory of the Gospel, that the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God, purges the conscience, dispels all its distracting fears, and imparts peace and serenity where despair and guilt had held their troubled reign. Availing itself of a principle, which, in every dispensation of religion, has been fundamental in the Divine dealings with our race, which belongs to natural as well as supernatural religion, and which, in some form or other, has always commended itself to the moral judgments of mankind, it reveals to us a work, in consequence of which, the pardon of sin on the part of God, becomes not merely a dictate of mercy, but a matter of right. Jesus, in the name of His people, and as their federal head and representative, has endured the curse, and the justice of God is now solemnly pledged to Him, to exempt them from personal subjection to its woes. He has died the death of the law, and upon an obvious principle of justice, from the relations in which they stand to Him, His death is their death. If one died for all, then all died. We are baptized into His death. I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.

No scheme of atonement that fails to represent Christ as submitting to the proper penalty of the law, which the sins of His people had provoked, and in such relations to them that His sufferings can be justly charged as their own,—can be regarded as adapted to the exigencies of *guilt*. It does not relieve that condition of the conscience which apprehends punishment as a matter of right. It does not meet the prime necessity of the sinner. He is still left *guilty*,*

* This is admitted by Dr. Wardlaw and the Divines of the same school.

under *obligation* to punishment, and if his iniquities are pardoned, law and justice are defrauded of their due. Hence, if the principles of Natural Religion are immutable, there can be no peace to the transgressor, until he is placed in a position, in which it is no longer *right* to remember his offences against him. When God can be just and faithful in blotting out his transgressions, then and not till then, is conscience sprinkled with clean water and purged from dead works. Christianity must take away our *guilt*, or it leaves us under the curse of nature. This, we maintain, is precisely what the Gospel achieves. The Lamb of God bore away our guilt. He became a curse for us—sin for us, though He himself knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. He was wounded for our transgressions—He was bruised for our iniquities—the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, but the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all. It is in reference to this aspect of the work of Christ as expiating guilt, that the eternal covenant which He came to ratify and seal is styled the counsel of peace; the kingdom which He came to establish consists in joy and peace, and the great blessing which He communicates to all who are sprinkled with His blood is that peace which passeth all understanding, and which abides unshaken amid the agitations and tumults, the glooms and convulsions of the world. Through Him God becomes the God of peace, the Gospel the message of peace, Preachers of righteousness the heralds of peace; and the two great results of His work, according to the rapturous song of the angels, are Glory to God in the highest and peace on earth. We see no alternative, but an open denial that the Gospel is the religion of a sinner, adapted to those moral necessities of his nature which spring from the immutable principles of natural religion, or a cordial admission of the fact that Christ, by His suffering and death, completely satisfied the justice of God in regard to the sins of His people. They, through Him, either cease to be guilty, or they must die; their consciences are either purged by His blood, or they have no peace. They are still under the law and its curse, or they are delivered from its condemnation. It is idle to speak of the ends of punishment

being answered by anything but punishment itself; of costly and imposing expedients by which a salutary impression is made on the universe, and the righteousness of God illustriously displayed and the malignity of sin unfolded; this may be true, but all this does not reach the malady within, the plague of the sinner's conscience—that is seized by the strong hand of justice, and until its iron grasp is relaxed—until right as well as policy ceases to demand his blood, he cannot be at ease. Hence it is, and must be, an indispensable element, in anything which deserves the name of atonement, that it satisfies the justice of God, or lays the foundation of a claim of right to exemption from punishment.*

But guilt is not the only need, a sense of which is awakened by those truths of nature which Paul proclaimed at Athens. To be delivered from guilt is to be put in the moral position of the innocent, without obstructions to the free communications of Divine favour and without a right to any good but the exemption from ill.† Such persons might be made alive to God, but they could have no claims to His favour and no security for whatever integrity might be graciously imparted. It is only to the *just* that the confirmed state of blessedness which the Scriptures mean by life, is infallibly promised. Obedience to the law, *righteousness*, is the indispensable condition of God's everlasting favour. If, therefore, the scheme of redemption had done

* "Even the commender and publisher of Grotius' Book of "Satisfaction," the learned Vossinu himself affirmeth, that Christ, by His death, purchased for us a double right: First, a right of escaping punishment and then a right of obtaining the reward." Owen's Death of Christ, chap. x.

† "The satisfaction of Christ tends in all that it is, to the honour and reparation of the justice of God. This, then, in its utmost extent and efficacy, cannot give ground to build such a right upon. The ultimate effect of satisfaction may be accomplished, and yet not the least right to any good thing communicated to them, for whom this satisfaction is made. The good things attending the death of Christ may be referred unto two heads; the amotion of evil and the collation of good. For the first, the amotion of evil, the taking that from us that it may not grieve us, and subducting us from the power and presence thereof, it is immediately aimed at by satisfaction. That the curse of the law be not executed, that the wrath to come be not poured out, is the utmost reach of the death of Christ, considered as satisfactory. * * * For positive good things in grace and glory by satisfaction alone, they are not at all respected."—Owen—Death of Christ, chap. xi.

nothing more than deliver us from the curse of the law, though it would have conferred an incalculable benefit upon us—an utterably great salvation—it would not have done all, that the necessities of the case required, to secure the perfection and blessedness of our nature. If it had gone so far as to remove spiritual death and reestablish the communion of the soul with God, the life which it imparted would still have been contingent. It might be forfeited by disobedience, and in the actual circumstances of our race, surrounded with temptations, encompassed with infirmities, ensnared alike by the world and the Devil; if our first father under much greater advantages failed when left to himself, it is morally certain that all of us would have come short of the glory of God. A contingent life would have been a cruel mockery of our hopes. Hence the Gospel proposes not merely to deliver us from the condemnation of sin, to put us into a state in which it is no longer right to damn us, but to introduce us into a state in which it is right to *bless* us. It proposes to give us a title to life, a title founded on the same eternal principle of rectitude which would have confirmed Adam in holiness and bliss forever, if he had fulfilled the condition of his trial. The Gospel, in other words, proposes to justify, and upon the broad principle of righteousness, to open the kingdom of Heaven to all believers. This righteousness secures our holiness—secures life—because it secures God's favour and gives a right, under the constitution of His own government, to the enjoyment of Him, as the supreme portion of the soul. They who are justified must be glorified. The very end of justification is to take away the contingency of holiness. If Adam had maintained his integrity during the term of his probation, his justification would have imparted to him no element of character which he did not previously possess; the image of God was not half drawn upon him—but it would have put him in a *state* in which he could never lose his holiness, nor be exposed to the risk of condemnation. And so the justification of a sinner introduces him into a state in which he can no more be left to the dominion of sin and the possibility of the curse than Christan close his glory, or God be unfaithful to His promises and oath. For whom He did foreknow He

also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren; moreover, whom He did predestinate them He also called, and whom He called, them He also justified, and whom He justified, them He also glorified.

Such, we apprehend, is the substance of that doctrine which Paul preached in his first open conflict with Paganism. The religion he proclaimed was preëminently that of a sinner—adapted, in all its provisions, to the spiritual necessities of a fallen being, under the righteous government of God. The altars around him were dumb, yet pregnant witnesses, that the wants, which the Gospel undertook to relieve, were not the fictions of fancy, nor the creatures of superstition, but the urgent demands of the soul. Under the imperfect light of heathenism there were still cases, in which conscience asserted its supremacy, and summoned the guilty to the tribunal of the unknown God. The uncertainty which invested the doctrine of a future life was suited to quicken the apprehensions of guilt, while the utter darkness into which the spirit seemed to retire, invited a disturbed imagination to people its shades, with ministers of vengeance and executioners of justice. Amid all the ignorance of God, and vagueness of conjecture which pertained to the condition of a thoughtful pagan, the terrible impression would cleave to him, that he was under a curse. It would haunt his dreams like the ghost of the murdered, embitter his waking hours, turn life itself into a burden, and make him long yet dread to die. He might endeavour to lay the flattering unction to his soul, that the great unknown, in whose hands he was, and to whom he was responsible, was good and kind, and would be tender to his infirmities and failures; but the scenes of wretchedness around him—the frightful ravages of disease, pestilence and death; the stern and relentless judgments which scourge entire generations and sweep away nations in their progress; the cry of weeping, lamentation and woe, which bursts from the smitten bosoms of the whole family of man; the portentous fact, written in blazing characters around him; stamped upon the cheek of the dying, the brow of the living, and even upon inanimate nature itself, that God has a controversy with men, and that, if He is good, He yet deals out to the trembling tribes of

earth, the vials of a fierce indignation — considerations like these, would thicken the blackness with which conscience had covered the future, and shroud the soul in the deepest night of despair. If the syren voice of hope should attempt to whisper, that there yet might be peace, the monitor of God within would proclaim, in tones of thunder, there is no peace to the wicked. If there should still be an effort to prop the sinking spirit upon the mercy of its author, nature would cry aloud, from her thousand chambers of suffering and anguish, woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of earth! Where could comfort be found? Where could peace be sought, except in that desperate hardihood of spirit, which would sternly banish thought, and like the beasts that perish, catch only the passing moment as it flies? And what is the religion, which such a sinner, grappling with despair — burdened with life and afraid to die — what is the religion, which the necessities of his soul demand? Is it more of light in relation to God, His law, His justice, and the stern retributions of eternity — when what he knows already, presses on his conscience like a night-mare, and peoples the land of darkness with all that is awful in mysterious power, with all that is dreadful in insulted justice? Ah, no! He needs not light, but life, not philosophy and science, not new discoveries in heaven and earth, but a Saviour, — a Saviour who can pluck him from the wrath to come, arrest the avenger of blood, seize the sword of justice, put it up into its scabbard, bid it rest and be still. The glory of Christianity is its Saviour, and His power to save is in the blood by which he extinguished the fires of the curse, and the righteousness by which He bought life for all His followers. Jesus made our curse — Jesus made our righteousness; this, this is the Gospel. All else is philosophy and vain deceit. This it is which gives Christianity its power. By this, and this alone, it subdues the ferocity of passion — disarms temptation of its violence — disrobes the world of its charms — changes the tiger into the lamb, and makes the lion eat straw like the ox. This constitutes the grand difference between the religion of Mahomet and the religion of Jesus, between the Koran and the Bible.

Upon this scheme, and this scheme alone, as it seems to us, the preaching of Paul, at Athens, can be reduced to

consistency and method. It accounts for the importance which he attached to the doctrines of nature. He would acquaint the patient with his malady before he explained the nature and application of the remedy, especially when it was likely to be sought, just in the degree in which it was felt to be needed.

In the next place, it makes the resurrection an integral part of Christianity. That resurrection was the justification of Jesus as the Head of the Church, the discharge of the prisoner upon the satisfaction of the debt, as well as the passage of our great High Priest into the Holiest of all. If Christ had remained under the power of death, the curse of the law could not have been removed from us; we should have died in our sins. He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

Upon this view, we may add further, that the resurrection of Christ becomes, what Paul affirms it to be—a signal proof of His eternal sonship; if by His eternal sonship, we understand that spirit of holiness, according to which He is truly and properly God. None but Jehovah's fellow could have received the stroke of Jehovah's justice in His bosom and survived the blow. The penalty of the law was no vulgar ill, to be appeased by a few groans and tears—by agony, sweat and blood. It was the wrath of the infinite God, which, when it falls upon a creature, crushes him under the burden of eternal death. It is a blackness of darkness through which no ray of light or hope can ever penetrate the soul of a finite being; to all such it is the blackness of darkness *forever*. But Jesus endured it—Jesus satisfied it—Jesus bowed beneath that death which the law demanded, and which sinks angels and men to everlasting ruin, and came victorious from the conflict. If He had been a creature, He would have been crushed, sunk, lost,—if He had been less than God, the bitterness of death could not have been passed; never, never could He have emerged from that thick darkness into which He entered, when He made His soul an offering for sin. The morning of the third day—and a more glorious morn never dawned upon our earth—forever settled, to all who understood the event, the Deity of Jesus; it was the crisis of all human hope. When our great substitute had given up the Ghost for us—

descended into hell—the possibility of His return to us, depended on His ability to meet the infinite wrath of the Infinite God. When the terrific cup was administered and He drank it and died, His slumbers in Joseph's tomb could never have been broken, unless He could thunder with a voice like God, and bear the burden of infinite woe. The third day which proclaimed His triumph, declared Him to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of Holiness, by His resurrection from the dead. He had died a death, which none could die, but one who was Almighty.

But Paul teaches us that the resurrection is not only a proof of the Deity of Christ, but a proof, at the same time, that God will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom He hath ordained; that His government, in other words, is conducted on the principle of distributive justice. This is an obvious inference from that representation of Christianity, which makes the sufferings of Jesus a full and perfect satisfaction of the penalty of the law, and His life of spotless obedience, the ground to all claim of everlasting bliss. No other scheme harmonizes the salvation of a sinner with the immutable principles of natural religion. This is its characteristic excellence; it rears the fabric of grace—not upon the ruins, but the fulfilment of the law. God is never seen to be more gloriously just, nor the law more awfully sacred, than when He spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all. The impression which this event makes is indeed solemn, awful, sublime. It was a wonder in heaven, a terror in hell, and is the grand instrument through which the rebellion of earth is subdued, and the stout-hearted made to melt at the remembrance of sin. Upon the cross it is written in characters of blood, that none can ever be pardoned who have not died, in their substitute, the death of the law; that none can ever be admitted into Heaven, who cannot present that obedience to which life is promised. Justice has its full demands upon the representative of the sinner, while grace abounds to the sinner himself. It may be said, however, that the admission of a substitute is itself a compromise of the strictness of justice. Without entering into the abstract question, it is sufficient for our present

purpose to observe, that God never contemplated any other justification of our race but through the obedience of a federal head. This was the fundamental principle of the covenant which contains the substance of natural religion. If Adam had stood, we should all have been justified by his obedience; as having fallen, we sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression. No promise of life has ever been made to man upon any other basis than that of imputed righteousness. It is nature's method, as well as the method of grace; and as natural law is admitted to be just, there is no concession, nor compromise of the eternal principles of right, in laying upon Christ, the iniquities of us all.

From the exposition which has been given of this noble monument of eloquence which inspiration has transmitted to us, it may be seen what constitutes the essence of the Gospel. Jesus and the resurrection. Jesus dying for our sins, and raised again for our justification. Where these elements are wanting, — whatever else may be found, — there is no Christianity. A penal death and a perfect righteousness, imputed, the one for pardon and the other for acceptance; these are the things which make the Gospel glad tidings of great joy. To deny these is to deny Christ.

We may here see also that the most successful method of preaching is that which aims at thorough and radical *convictions* of sin. The law must be applied with power to the conscience, or the preciousness of grace will be very inadequately known. The superficial piety of the present day is owing, in a large degree, to feeble impressions of the malignity of sin. That thorough breaking up of the fallow ground of the heart, that groaning under bondage, that full experiment of our weakness and nothingness which characterized the experience of the past generation, are unsuited to the haste and bustle of this stirring age. The transition from absolute indifference to cordial reliance upon Christ must be made in an instant. One gush of sorrow, one leap of joy, and the work is done. Such converts must know little of the law, little of Christ, and less of themselves. Men must be soundly instructed by Moses, if they would know the sweetness of the liberty in Christ.

ARTICLE II.

ON THE SCENE IN REVELATION, CHAPTERS IV. AND V.

This is a vision of things, and beings as actually existing, or as symbolical of real existences. The Seer tells us he saw a door opened in the sky, and heard a voice as loud as a trumpet, calling to him, and inviting him to come up there and have revealed to him future things. This was after the "things which must shortly come to pass," had been signified to him by Christ through his angel. (Ch. 1, 1.) He saw nothing however till he "was in the Spirit:" whose mysterious and powerful influences, immediately in connection with the invitation, came upon him, and elevated his spirit to view things else unseen by mortal men. He was rapt out of himself: and he tells us what he saw, in this ecstasy, through the opening heavens. And we must undoubtedly regard him, either as contemplating the scene on the same level with the principal objects in it, or from a higher point of view still: for otherwise some would obstruct the sight of others. This too agrees with what we find in other cases, where the prophet seems to himself to stand upon a "watch-tower," or upon the top of "a great and high mountain." Ch. 17: 3. 21: 10. Isa. 21: 5-8. And we want, if possible, to see what he saw: to get a conception, a mental picture of the vision, with every object just as it appeared to him; and in the same relative position. It will be our first object, then, to describe the vision as clearly as possible from the language of the sacred record. The object of the first importance, and which first attracted his attention, though most remote from him, was a Throne, set, or stationary, and not in motion, as in the visions of some of the Old Testament prophets. "And one sat on the Throne," "to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone." He gives us no shape, or outline of the person occupying this exalted seat; and in his comparison, perhaps does not convey a very clear idea of his color; but we may suppose it was mostly reddish, or of a fiery tinge.

We read next that there was a rainbow, of an emerald green color, round about the Throne: and we think there is nothing in the description that forbids us to understand this as in the position of a natural rainbow; vertical and not horizontal; and shall therefore consider it as over the Throne, not encircling it round. For in that case it must have been too small for the august scene; or must have interfered with the sight of something else. Immediately before the Throne were the seven lamps, blazing with fire, "which are (represent) the seven Spirits of God." Proceeding outward from the Throne towards the Seer, next we locate the four Beings, or Living ones, full of eyes. Beyond these, still nearer to him, and inclosing all the preceding, in the form of a semicircle in front, were the twenty-four elders, sitting upon twenty-four separate seats; "clothed in white rayment;" with golden crowns, as kings or victors.

There is also mentioned "a sea of Glass, like unto crystal before the Throne;" but we find it difficult to assign to it any place, unless we regard it as the floor, ground, or substratum of the whole vision, that seemed to rest upon the surface of a smooth, clear, pure body of water. All these things must have seemed to be borne up by something, and pure water resembles ether, as much as any substance, to which the Apostle could have compared it. In ch. 15: 2, we read of "a sea of glass mingled with fire," on which persons stand, even the multitude of the redeemed.

This interpretation too will make it correspond with the expanse, or "firmament," over the heads of the "living creature," and upon which was the "likeness of a Throne," in Ezk. 1: 22. That expanse is compared in color to "the terrible crystal;" in all these cases perhaps the clear sky, or ether may be understood. So in Ex. 24: 10. Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu and the seventy elders of Israel, "saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were, the body of Heaven in its clearness." See also "the street of the city," New Jerusalem. Rev. 21: 21, i. e., the pavement in the Public Square.

Having then an idea of the things seen in Chapter V. we may add to these what we find in Chapter VI. A book,

closely sealed, in the form of a roll, is seen in the right hand of the one who sits on the Throne; and whom the Prophet carefully avoids naming, or designating in any other way; (4: 2, 9, 10. 5: 1, 7, 13. 7: 11. 19: 4,) unless where as in 4: 8, 11, he introduces some of the heavenly hosts, addressing the Divine Majesty.*

And after a proclamation was made, and a challenge given, for the universe to furnish some one able to loose the seals of that book, or to understand it; and no one appeared; the prophet looked again, and just on the spot before the Throne, occupied in the other chapter by the seven Lamps, he sees a Lamb, with marks of slaughter, having seven horns, and seven eyes; which are those same seven Lamps. He stands with his head towards the prophet. He goes to the Throne, and takes the sealed book. After which there is seen an innumerable company of angels, forming a circle around all that has already been presented to our view. We have then an outline of the sublime and heavenly vision before our minds. But as we know there are different grades, or ranks of the heavenly host, having each its "own peculiar," though we cannot tell how they are distinguished, while differing in glory; in order to give greater distinctness to our conception of them, and not to regard them as a confused multitude in a world where order reigns, we will suppose them, not only intently gazing at what is going on before them, and deeply interested in it, but arranged in concentric circles, according to their ranks, and rising one above another as they recede from the Throne, like the seats in an amphitheatre; the highest in dignity being nearest, and the least favored most remote from the centre. And as the number seven is a perfect number, which abounds so much in this Book, in which it is applied to nearly a score of things, we may allow at least, seven grades of those Beings that we so often denominate by the common name of angels; as the prophet does in verse 11, where he calls them "many angels," "and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands."

And though we may not be able to understand enough of

* He does afterwards say "the Throne of God," in some places.

the celestial economy to assign a name to each rank in the series, according to its own distinguishing quality, or talent, yet it helps to give distinctness to our ideas of them to name them. Leaving then the term angel, as a general term to include all classes of the celestial hierarchy; and beginning with those nearest the Throne, we have 1, Seraphim—2, Cherubim—3, Thrones—4, Dominions—5, Principalities—6, Powers—7, Archangels. These then form the outer environment of the seat of justice and judgment for the universe; and of the objects more immediately before it. And how vast and sublime beyond all conception is the whole scene! How few on earth have been permitted to see such visions of God! While the heavenly hosts are always looking with intense gaze to see the unfolding of the Divine counsels here. 1 Peter, 1: 12. Eph. 3: 10.

Our next object will be to examine briefly into the meaning of these symbols, and the occasion of this "General Assembly," of the Hierarchies of Heaven, in the midst of whom the Great King appears in State.

1. The Throne is the emblem of Majesty and Dominion: the one who sits on it is God the Father. He has no shape or parts, but is clothed around with fiery splendour, and not now with the "majesty of darkness." Lightnings and thunders issue from his seat. The obscurity that veils the Throne, enhances the sublimity of this symbol. The prophet Ezekiel, 1: 26, saw in a similar vision "the likeness of a man," upon the Throne. And probably that is the only instance where God absolute, or God the Father, has been so represented, if he be the person then seen, which seems to be allowed by the best critics. In Dan. 7: 9, 13, "The Ancient of Days," is not described: Paul, 2. Cor. 12: 4, when he was "caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words," tells not what he saw. In Deut. 4: 12, 15, Moses told the Israelites; "ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire." See also Isa. 6: 1, 2.

2. But God is not altogether "a consuming fire;" He is not altogether dressed in vengeance, and prepared to execute punitive justice; above, and amidst the flames, and the flashes of lightning, as a counterpart to them, and to quell the fears of beholders, stands out the emerald bow.

This is a most interesting symbol, in this connection: "Justice and Mercy have met together." The Rainbow, Gen. 9: 12-17, was originally appointed as a sign of the Covenant between God and Noah, after the flood, that the course of nature should not thus again be interrupted. Here is the sign of the Covenant of grace: and it is a singular one in that it is all of a brilliant emerald green color, instead of being composed of the seven primary colors of the spectrum, as is the natural bow. How surpassingly beautiful, and how surprising to the world it would be, to see now on the face of an angry dark cloud, amidst the roar of thunder, and the flashes of lightning, a pure bright green rainbow!

And it is singular too that this color stands in the middle of the Spectrum, and is composed of the colors, blue and yellow, that border it, one on the one side, and the other on the other. This too is the color with which so generally, God has seen fit to clothe the vegetable world. The one on which the eye can rest longest without fatigue. This is the bow of mercy and love; here the wearied eye of the soul may repose with delight, where the milder attributes of God have tempered the more severe. When conscience alarms, and the law speaks of wrath, we can look upon the emerald bow, he hath set above his angry brow, the sure pledge that he who sits beneath it is ready to be reconciled to us.

3. The next object in the order of our location, is the seven fold Lamp: seven is the number of perfection. And this symbol, without doubt, signifies the Holy Ghost, the Third Person in the adorable Trinity. It is his office to give light and knowledge, He enlightens the understanding, and renews the heart.

4. Some would perhaps assign the next place to the sea of glass. But as we before remarked, it is difficult to see where it was, if it was something like the brazen sea, or laver in the court of the Temple, 1 Kings, 7: 23, or to interpret it as teaching anything, by its introduction in this place. If it be said to represent the blood of Christ, it might be said in reply that water, clear as crystal, would hardly be a symbol of blood: that there is no need for such a fountain in Heaven: that Christ has not yet been received

there as the Lamb slain, and it would not agree with scenic propriety to show his blood there before he himself was ushered in: and that no instance can be given in the New Testament where this word *sea* is applied to the brazen laver. On the other hand we have shown abundant reason why the "sea of glass" should be regarded as that on which the whole vision rests, and only shows itself to the eye of the seer in the open space, or area "before the Throne," and between the other objects. We may further mention however, that this agrees with certain passages in the Psalms, as 104: 3, "who layeth the beams of his chambers in (or on) the waters." Comp. 148: 4, and 29: 10. "The Lord sitteth upon the flood."

5. We find now the "fourfold visaged four" Beasts, calling our attention: every one must admit that this is a most unhappy translation, for Beings, or living ones, like the "living creature" of Ezekiel. There is an agreement between all the recorded appearances of this compounded and mysterious symbol. Each Cherub has a fourfold face; and we will place, side by side, the descriptions of them found in three places in the Word of God, viz:—

1. BY JOHN, REV. 4: 7, 8.	2. BY EZEKIEL, 1: 10.	3. BY EZEKIEL, 10: 14.
---------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

1. Like a lion.	1. Face of a lion.	1. Face of a lion.
2. Like a calf.	2. Face of a cherub.	2. Face of an ox.
3. Had a face as a man.	3. Face of a man.	3. Face of a man.
4. Like a flying eagle.	4. Face of an eagle.	4. Face of an eagle.

In Revelation each one has six wings; in Ezekiel, 1: 10, "every one had four wings; and the same in Ezekiel, 10: 21. In the Theophania, Isaiah, 6: 1-4, the seraphim had each six wings. It would draw us too far aside from our present purpose, to describe fully, or to discuss at length the meaning of this most sublime and mysterious symbol. Nor do we feel ourselves capable of doing the subject justice. They who would pursue their inquiries upon it, and seek a full and extended, as well as a minute examination, of all that pertains to it, will find all probably that can be said, or that the human mind can attain to, in relation to it, in the Commentaries; especially on Ezekiel, chapter 1, by Calvin, Vitringa, Rosenmüller, Michaelis, Professor Hitzig, or per-

haps still more satisfactory in that of the late Professor Havernick.*

We may remark however, that this is not a mere visionary Being, but a real existence: it is usually found accompanying the visible manifestations of Deity; especially when moving, and coming to judgment, or to administer justice. It also constitutes a kind of vehicle of the Divine presence. "The chariot of Paternal Deity." Psalms, 18: 10. 99: 1. 80: 1. 68: 17. 2 Kings, 6: 17. In the Tabernacle, and Temple, it was over the cherubim, on the mercy seat that God met his people. Exod. 25; 32. In the passage before us, the Throne is set, and the cherubim are worshipping before, instead of bearing it, and the wheels of beryl, Ezekiel, 1: 16. 10: 9, those rings full of eyes, and "so high that they were dreadful," are not seen; unless there be room to conjecture that John mistook one of the rings (the felloes of the wheel) of beryl, the others being concealed behind the Throne, and has called *that* an emerald rainbow. They would be very much alike every way. The complex fourfold structure of these forms is generally considered as having reference to the four quarters of the world. This may be so, but seems to us to restrict it too much to this earth. These Beings stand highest; nearer to the Throne, and more intimately connected with it, than any other creatures, among which they are certainly to be classed. Taking the idea of an eastern monarch, who keeps himself secluded in person from his subjects, and who holds intercourse with them only through his ministers of state, we may consider these beings as filling a post of that kind. God hides himself from his creatures: either he "dwells in light unapproachable," or "clouds and darkness are round about him." He buildeth his stories in the Heavens. And these are his ministers, through whom other creatures hold communion with God; except now on the Christian scheme Christ, who *stood between them and the Throne*, is our Great High Priest, and Intercessor. What constitutes the connecting bond between them, so that while *four*, in one sense, they are *one* in another, we cannot know; whether they are so made indissolubly joined, with a common life and spirit, Ezekiel, 1: 12, 20, or whether they can exist separately, is no where

* Translated in Bibliotheca Sacra, Nov. 1848, page 701.

revealed. They are often regarded as expressing symbolically some attributes of the Godhead ; as knowledge, power, life-giving, preserving, or destroying. It is perhaps not determined whether they stand in a special relation to God absolutely considered and the kingdom of nature, or to the Trinity and to the plan of redemption. In Revelations, 5: 8, 9, it is held determinative that the Beasts did not join with the elders and the church in their ascriptions of praise, that the word ζῶα is neuter, while the pronoun *εκάστος* each is masculine gender, and must be restricted to the twenty-four elders, who had the "harps and golden vials full of odors," and sung the new song. There are also moral improbabilities, not to say impossibilities, against the four Beasts' joining in that song.

6. We may say with regard to these twenty-four elders, that they represent the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Twelve Apostles, or the union of the old and new church in one body. We find in the description of the New Jerusalem, Revelation, chapter 21, that the names of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, are on the gates, but those of the Twelve Apostles of the Lamb are on the foundations. We must enter the church through one of those Tribes, but build on the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets. These elders are purified from sin ; clothed in the righteousness of Christ ; and crowned, to signify that they have gotten the victory, and will reign with their Lord.

We may remark here then,—

1. That this vision seems to show the ministers of Jehovah, and the Church above, assembled in state, and waiting for some great event.

2. That here is the symbol of God the Father ; and of God the Holy Ghost ; but nothing as yet to represent the Son. There is no mention made of him, or of redemption, in chapter 4.

3. That the only sign of mercy, the Emerald Bow, seems placed by way of anticipation ; or as an indication of that grace about to be announced, in an authoritative manner, after the commission of the sealed book is put into the hands of Christ.

4. That all the worship we see rendered in chapter 4, is to God the Father ; God the Creator, and Preserver.

He is praised as the one "who *was, is, and to come;*" "who liveth for ever and ever." For his Almighty Power; for his Holiness; see verse 11. Christ then, has not yet finished his work, and ascended on high. But these beings have assembled, and are waiting to receive him; to open the everlasting doors, and let the King of Glory come into the temple not made with hands. But before he comes and is crowned, something else must be done. In order to make his triumph more august, his exaltation more exalted; to show his superiority over all others; his capacity to rule the universe with supreme authority and dominion, a sealed Book, or Roll, is now brought to view, in the right hand of the Father, containing his eternal counsels; and while all are in this state of suspense, by the voice of a mighty angel as crier, the whole universe is challenged to produce one that can open that Book, loosen its seals, or understand its contents; for so we take the word βλέπειν, to look. But this involves more than any mere Creature in Heaven, or in the Earth, or under the Earth can do. And this failure on the part of Creation to furnish one able to open the "mystery of God," is taken in the light of an acknowledgment that whoever should do that, would have the right of sovereignty over them. They have the first offer, but fail. This opens the way for Christ to come forward. And when the Prophet was weeping much that no one was found to open the volume, not an Angel, but one of the twenty-four Elders told him to dry his tears, for the Lion of the tribe of Judah had prevailed, had gained the victory, had been found so far super-eminent above all, Phil. 2: 3-11. Eph. 1: 20-22, as to take the Book, and open it. He looked, expecting to see a Lion, but finds it a Lamb, with marks of death wounds received in the house of his friends. He occupies the place before filled by the seven Lamps. And how was he qualified to enter upon so mighty a task? For as Mediator, he receives those endowments that are necessary for the execution of his commission.

1. He has fullness of wisdom, and of life; the seven spirits of God who gave not his Spirit by measure unto him; John, 3: 34, not his own Divinity, for he was God, but the Third Person in the Trinity. He is now a quickening Spirit.

2. He has seven horns, and as a horn is the emblem of power, he has fulness of power, "all power in Heaven and in Earth," Matthew, 28: 18.

3. He had died and risen again; has laid down his life and taken it again; and "has the keys of Death and Hell;" having "destroyed him that had the power of Death," he shows that he has satisfied the law for the sins of his people, and hushed the thunders of Sinai.

4. He combines in himself at the same time, the strength and terrible fierceness of the Lion, towards his foes, and the meekness and gentleness of a Lamb towards his friends. When the Father delivers to him the Book, he confirms to the Son the right to rule and reign in the midst of his enemies. Now we see Jesus, who for the suffering of death, was made lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honor. Hebrews, 2: 9. 1: 3-13. Now the worship of the upper sanctuary is renewed; and what is the burden of their songs now? It is not as before, Eternal Existence; nor Almighty Power; nor Creation; nor the Preservation of the Creatures. But they take their harps; and vials full of incense. And the four Beasts, and the twenty-four Elders, fall before the Lamb, and the latter in the name of the whole Church, sing a song till now unheard in Heaven. The burden of it is redeeming Love. They make the worthiness of Christ to open the Book, to consist in the fact that he had been slain; and had redeemed them with his blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. And had conferred on them already royal and priestly privileges, and would confirm and enlarge them hereafter.

Then the vast multitude of angels take up the strain; the prophet does not seem to have noticed them before, and perhaps they had been absent ministering to Christ, Matthew, 26: 53. Luke, 24: 23. John, 20: 12; and followed in his train when he ascended on high; attending him on his triumphal entry into Heaven, and so they took their places there, rank above rank, just at the moment that the Lamb appeared to stand before the Throne. And now they witness his inauguration, and acknowledge him as their King. Hebrews, 1: 6. They begin the anthem, where the Church of the redeemed left it; and they ascribe to him seven distinct qualities or gifts. Admit the supposi-

tion before made that there are seven grades or ranks of them, distinguished by some peculiarity ; and we shall see the beauty and sublimity of this first act of worship rendered to the risen Saviour, by the Heavenly hosts. For in his humiliation, he had divested himself of every thing. Phil. 2: 7, 8. He laid aside his rank, dignity, reputation, rights, riches, happiness, glory, power ; 2 Corinthians, 8: 9. John, 17: 5. As Paul in his expressive language, Philip-
 pians, 2: 7, says, ἐκένωσε ἑαυτὸν ; he made himself empty ; destitute of all things. But here we see all this paid back to him, by the angels, in seven particulars ; in which all good things may be summed up. Suppose then, that the rank nearest to the Throne is heard to say with a loud voice, "worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Power," and for the moment ceases, while the next in order repeats, "worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive—riches ;" the next in the same way gives, "wisdom," and so the sound travels outward ; and "strength"—"Honor"—"Glory" and "Blessing," are heard successively, by as many separate orders. Then begins the chorus from all creatures in Heaven, Earth, and under the Earth, and in the Sea ; repeating nearly the same words, *but in the opposite order* ; saying, "Blessing, and Honor, and Glory, and Power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." The correspondence is not so complete here, between verses 12 and 13, as between 5: 12, and 7: 21, where we have the same act of worship performed. Thus in 5: 12 ; 1, Power ; 2, Riches ; 3, Wisdom ; 4, Strength ; 5, Honor ; 6, Glory ; 7, Blessing. But in 7: 21 ; 1, Blessing ; 2, Glory ; 3, Wisdom ; 4, Thanksgiving ; 5, Honor ; 6, Power ; 7, Might. There is precisely the same number of words used in each case, and those almost the same, but the order is reversed in the latter.

Now Christ had naturally the right to rule all creatures, for he made all things, Ephesians, 3: 9. Colossians, 1: 16. John, 1: 3, but having given up this right when he became incarnate, and made a sacrifice of it, leaving it in the hands of the Father ; and having accomplished the work he undertook, and proved himself "by merit, more than birth-right, Son of God," he receives it back again from the Father in the delivery of the sealed Book. But he will not only *reign of right* ; he will have the cheerful, and willing

homage of his subjects: he will reign in their hearts. They must choose, and recognise him as their Lord, as they do here, all but the wicked, who had been before subdued, and led captive; and who do not seem worthy of notice here at all. There is no exception made, no negative vote, no discordant note.

“ *The whole Creation join in one,
To praise the sacred name
Of him that sits upon the Throne,
And to adore the Lamb.*”

There is another aspect of this proceeding that we may notice. Christ as Creator, had given to every creature all he had; to some more, to some less; to some in one kind, to some in another; all came from him as the *fountain of life*, and the *treasury of gifts and endowments with life*. There was nothing that had not come out from him, of whom the whole creation is an emanation. Now they all bring back to him all that they had received, and sum up all anew in him; not now as Creator, and the God of nature merely, *but above that*, as worthy of higher honors for redeeming man. See Ephesians, 1: 10. We give to God what we have, when we confess him as the author and giver of it, and acknowledge from the heart his right to it. It is *as if* a new creation; *Novus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo*, when Christ is set as King on the holy hill of Zion. Psalms, 2: 6.

1. We may remark then, that from the foregoing, we can see what time is indicated in this vision; and that is the ascension of Christ. Acts, 1: 10. Psalms, 2: 6. Hebrews, 1: 3-6. Ephesians, 4: 8-10. It will be objected of course to this that it is inconsistent with the promise made to the prophet to show him things which must be hereafter, 4: 1. But most of the things revealed in the Book are future to the time when the vision *was seen*, whatever that may be; about which there is a great diversity of opinion, founded upon conflicting traditions. This particular transaction in the Divine Economy had not been fully declared to men before, though it had taken place; and there is no succession of time to the Divine mind. This scene exactly befits the occasion to which we have applied it; the inauguration of the Prince of Peace, with

supreme authority over all beings, and all worlds; "God over all, blessed for ever." Anointed with the plenary influences of the Spirit, and sat on the holy hill of Zion: made the first-born of God, higher than the Kings of the Earth. What other occasion can we imagine to call for so august an assemblage, and so solemn a ceremony? We see too that he proceeds with his Spiritual conquests, as foretold in the 45th Psalm, where we find the same as in chapter 6: 2, and all of which aptly applies to the outpouring of the Divine Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. Thus the time indicated in the vision seems to fix itself: and may be regarded as independent of the time when it *was seen*, or the Book was written; which latter must be of course after the Ascension of Christ; and the traditions of the early Christian Fathers, particularly Irenæus, place it at the close of the reign of Domitian, A. D. 96.* Others place it earlier, in the time of Nero, who died A. D. 68, and who persecuted the Christians, the four previous years. Internal evidence is thought to favor this latter supposition. Ch. 17: 10, seems to suppose Nero yet alive; 11: 1-2, the Temple of Jerusalem standing, i. e. before A. D. 70, ch. 6: 6, seems to allude to the persecution under Nero.† But it is not our purpose to settle the chronology of the Apocalypse. And we may simply remark further here, that the ascension of Christ, the point of time where this apostle had last seen his Saviour in person previous to the Revelation of himself in chapter 1: 12-20, forms a very appropriate era from which to *begin*, to show him things to come; and if the vision was seen between A. D. 65-68, the ascension will antedate the time of the vision at most, by about 33 years.‡

2. It appears that Christ is God: He does what no creature can do; all creation is challenged to take the sealed Book, and open the Divine counsels, but no creature dares accept the challenge. He is above all creatures; and is worshipped, jointly with the Father, *immediately after his inauguration*, by all the heavenly hosts; but never joins in that worship. Praise is given "to Him that sitteth

* Euseb. Eccl. Hist., book 3, ch. 18.

† Ordo Sæclorum, by Henry Browne, A. M., sec. 619-626.

‡ Daniel, 7: 1-3, is in part retrospective: Babylon *had* risen; and was near its end.

upon the Throne, *and* unto the Lamb." And this becomes thenceforth almost a standing phrase, 6: 16. 7: 10. 14: 4. 15: 3. 21: 22. 22: 1, 3, though it is not precisely the same in every case. As Dr. Dwight remarks, "the only part attributed to Christ is to be united with the Father *in receiving* the ascription" of praise. But no creature can be thus united.

3. The church of the redeemed hold a high rank in Heaven, if the being *placed on seats, crowned*, nearer to the Throne than any other creatures, except the Four Beasts, all of whom are standing, be any indication of rank and honor before the Great King. And this agrees with what is said in other places: of judging angels: sitting on Twelve Thrones: sitting with Christ on his Throne: seeing God: standing before him: dwelling with him: being his children and in his family. The twenty-four Elders *are made* Kings and Priests *unto our God*. They for whom God has done most, not only love him most, Luke, 7: 47, but by a natural principle, are the most beloved and favored of him. Angels are servants *to the Saints*; but *they* are *friends, children, priests and kings, to God*. *They* partake of the honors of their King, Head, and Lord.

4. Redemption is the highest theme of praise in Heaven, and should be on Earth. How different are their songs *before*, and *after* the introduction, and inauguration of the Lamb. Compare 4: 11, and 5: 9, 13. The song of redeeming Love, *begins* with the church, and ends with it, 5: 14. Their example is for our imitation: they furnish us with a song to sing: not Creation; not Judaism; not an abolished Dispensation. But the *Death*, and the *Resurrection*, and the *Glory* of Christ;

"Worthy the Lamb *that died*," they cry;

"To be exalted thus:"

"Worthy the Lamb," our lips reply,

"For he *was slain for us*."

We must not put new cloth into an old garment. If they can sing this song: these sentiments of the New Testament *in Heaven*, and if we hope to enter there and join them, in that song to all eternity, who is he that forbids the singing of them in the church on Earth? And how can we sing *there*, having never learned *here*?

5. There is perfect order, and solemnity in the worship of Heaven; just as Paul says, 1, Corinthians, 14: 33, is "*in all churches of the Saints.*" All are in their proper places; and perform their proper parts. All have their minds fixed on the Great Object of worship before them. God is a God of order; order is the first law of Heaven. And it is the end of all law to keep every creature in its proper place and rank.

6. Instrumental music in the worship of God cannot be wrong in itself. It was employed in the Old Testament church; and that by a great number of instruments, in the most prosperous period of that church, and under David, its most pious king; "the man after God's own heart." But now, when we hear some men speak on this subject, with such a "holy horror," of even a viol, or a soft-toned flute in the house of God, who could suppose for a moment, that they knew of *harps* being used in Heaven, and before God, and so far from being condemned, called Revelations, 15: 3, "harps of God?" It is believed that, Revelations, 5: 8, is *the first instance* on record, where anything like instruments are mentioned in connection with the worship of Heaven. And if it be said that they are not real, but "visionary emblems," that will not be sufficient, for what is wrong absolutely, cannot be introduced there, *even in a figure.*

7. The salvation of Christ's redeemed people was then certain. The Elders, as the representatives of the church, say "thou *hast redeemed* us by thy blood, out of *every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation.*" But at his ascension, the number of converts was small, (Acts, 1: 15, 120; 1 Corinthians, 15: 7, 500,) and those from among the Jews. The day of Pentecost even, had not come, yet here we hear of men redeemed in all the Earth, to the end of time; as if the conquests of Christ *had been then* already accomplished. It was then all *just as certain* as if already done. "God seeth the end from the beginning." "Known unto him are all his works from the foundation of the world." And the renewing of every soul is as much his work, as the calling of things that be not, so that they be. Ephesians, 2: 10.

ARTICLE III.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

1. *Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America on Parochial Schools. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1847.*
2. *Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1848.*

The documents at the head of this article we regard as of more than ordinary importance. They are certainly very extraordinary papers considered as Reports. They are truly entitled to be called "Permanent Documents," and will we hope be stereotyped and preserved as such. The subject of Parochial Schools, and of Denominational Education generally, is here fully, clearly and elaborately discussed. The assembly must have closed its eyes to the light had it not entered upon the path of plain and imperative duty. It must have deliberately repudiated—so far as this subject is concerned—the honoured name of Old School, and proclaimed itself to be indeed *New School*, at least in its educational principles. The reasoning, the evidence, and the urgency of these Reports we regard as irresistible. And we cannot do better than to make them a starting point, or groundwork for a presentation of the question of Parochial Schools.

This subject has unfortunately become strange, and as it were, novel in this country, where it is environed with peculiar prejudices and difficulties. The main question, however, is the divine authority of such a scheme of Education. Is the church really commissioned and required to take charge, under her oversight, direction and support, of such a system, just so far and so fast as she can? To this question we will endeavour to give an answer.

According to the double source ascribed to the word *parish*, it may mean nearer the church or house of God (*παρά οίκος*); — or a salary and allowance for support. (*ἀπὸ ἐξου*). A parochial school, therefore, is a school convenient to, and supported by, the church, and under its government and direction. In this country the term *parish* generally refers to the society or church, and not to any territorial limits, and includes the inhabitants of a town or district belonging to one church, though residing promiscuously among the people belonging to another church. A parochial school, therefore, means a school supported, governed and directed by the people connected with some one church or denomination, for the purpose of securing not only a good secular education, but also a sound moral and religious training.

In considering the bearing of Scripture upon the duty and expediency of having such schools, in accordance with the views of our General Assembly, we must recur to the memorable words of our Saviour, in which the duties and responsibilities of the church are defined. There are found in Matthew, 28. 19, 20, and are as follows, "Go ye therefore, and teach (or make disciples) of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always and even unto the end of the world. Amen."

These are the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, "who is the head of the body the church." "All power therefore," says Christ, (v. 18,) "is given unto me in heaven and earth." (See Psalm 2.) "And there was given unto him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him." (Daniel, 7. 14. Ephesians, 1. 10, and Romans, 12. 5.)

These words are the language of the Lord Jesus Christ, addressed to his church, that is, to all who profess to believe upon Him and to hope through him for salvation. This is that kingdom over which Christ exercises sovereign and universal dominion. Christ has an infinite right to exercise this dominion by virtue of natural godhead, covenant stipulation, and the decree of God the Father. (Psalm 2.) The dominion of Christ, in its absolute extent, embraces

heaven and earth, men and angels, saints and sinners, time and eternity, heaven and hell. It is made *visible upon earth* in the profession of His gospel, and the observance of His ordinances, by all those who acknowledge and submit to Christ's authority; and it will be made *eternally visible, in heaven and hell*, in the everlasting blessedness and the everlasting misery of His friends and enemies.

Over His church or kingdom on earth, Christ exercises supreme government and administration. He is its Lord, its founder, its liberator, its Redeemer and purchaser, its legislator, its Judge, and the centre and source of all its blessings now, henceforth and forever. And the words of this passage of Scripture constitute the commission of Christ delivered to this church or kingdom on earth; Christ being here seen in the act of intrusting a solemn charge or duty to His people, committing it to them, and sending them forth to perform it.

The church remained under its Jewish form until, by His death, Christ had "finished the work given him to do;" had "brought in everlasting righteousness;" had "become the end of the law for righteousness to every one that should believe on Him;" and had therefore rent the veil and laid the foundation — "*the rock*" — upon which he has built His church. "The church of God," — as it had hitherto been — now became the church of Christ, — "Christ having for this end both died and rose and revived, that he might be the Lord both of the dead and the living." (Romans, 14. 9. Luke, 10. 22 and 1. 32, 33. Hebrews, 1. 1, 2. Ephesians, 4. 8. Romans, 12. 5.) "Having therefore ascended on high, Christ" assumed His dominion, and issued to His church or people this commission as their warrant for exercising certain powers and performing certain duties. This church or people *now* constitutes Christ's "body," — by the agency of whose "many members," He acts in carrying out His great designs of mercy and salvation to mankind. (Ephesians, 4. 8-16.) This church is also called Christ's "Bride," by whose presence, management and industrious care, His absence is supplied; — the interests of His "family" and "household" preserved; — the gospel proclaimed, and its manifold mercies bestowed upon the needy applicants. (Revelations, 22. 17.) The

church or people of Christ are further represented as "the ground and pillar of the truth," that is, as the instrumentality by which "the truth as it is in Jesus" is both maintained and published. And they are still further described as "the angel" or messenger of Christ, "having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell upon the earth and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." (Revelations, 14. 6.)

By this commission the church or people of Christ are required, as an absolute, indispensable, imperative, and supreme business, to carry out and execute all that Christ here commits to their agency. The doing of this is THE ONE GREAT END for which the church is designed, in its present visible relation to the world at large — the unreclaimed territory of "the Prince of darkness." This "one great business here" the church or people of Christ are not merely authorised, but commanded to pursue and accomplish, under the penalty of forfeiting Christ's favour and blessing, and under the assured warrant and promise that in a faithful and fearless discharge of this "high calling," they shall be sustained by Christ's presence, for says He, "Lo I am with you always unto the end of the world."

This commission therefore makes it the great and primary duty of the church, and of every believer; 1, To make known the way of salvation unto all men. 2, To disciple all men, that is, to bring them into visible connection with Christ's church or school, so that they may become learners and disciples, in the general acceptation of that term. 3, To instruct and thoroughly indoctrinate all who have been thus disciplined. Under one or other of these departments of duty, the obligations and functions of the church and people of Christ will be found.

It is, however, only to the third and last department of duty, we wish now particularly to direct attention — the duty of the church or people of Christ in reference to the "teaching" of "all the world."

"All nations" are the field of their operations, and the end of the world the limit of their term of duty. "Every creature" of all nations — as the Evangelist Mark records it, — are included in the field, and "the uttermost parts of the earth," (Acts, 1. 8,) even in these Western continents,

in the wide extent of this dominion. "All men" every where — whether governors or statesmen, or humble men, — are "now commanded by God to repent and believe the gospel" as made known to them by the church, and to submit to its teachings, discipline and ordinances. For, the church or people of Christ are His appointed agents, by whom "every creature" — parents and children, masters and servants, — are to be brought to "the obedience of the faith" and "taught whatsoever Christ has commanded."

This duty of the church — as "the Teacher" of every creature in all nations, by whom they are to be "trained up in the way they should go," — covers the whole period of human life, from infancy to *old* age, from birth to the grave; and the teaching or training therefore which it is to impart, must run parallel, and be found adapted to, every age and period of human life. As it regards the periods of infancy and of mature age, this responsibility and duty of the church or people of God is acknowledged, attempted, and in some degree met. As it regards infants, parents, by the very solemn pledge of baptism, are bound to teach them as soon and as far as practicable what they ought to know; while both parents and others combine their efforts, through Sabbath schools, infant classes and other means, to carry on and perfect this work in their hearts. And as it regards persons of mature age, the services of the Sanctuary upon the Sabbath, and the social meetings of the week, together with all the various schemes of benevolence which they are called upon to maintain and enlarge, are the means by which such individuals are "taught all things whatsoever Christ has commanded them." This duty of the church covers not only every age, it includes *practice* as well as *belief*, since Christ has commanded much to be *done* as well as *felt*, experienced as well as believed. Both are essential to the proper and faithful teaching of the church, and both are essential to the proper learning and practice of its members. The *agenda* constitute as necessary a part of the business of a Christian as the *credenda*. Doing is as necessary as believing. Practice is as important as profession. "Keeping the commandments" is not a whit less necessary than believing the promises and doctrines. And the spirituality, piety, evangelical holiness, and sanctification of a

believer, are promoted just as essentially by the life, as they are by the principle, of piety, that is, by "keeping all Christ's statutes and commandments blameless," and "living therefore not unto ourselves but unto Him."

There is, however, one period of human life regarding which and the teaching it, ought to receive, both as it regards faith and practice, the church or people of God have gradually become negligent.* They have in this respect forgotten their imperative and untransferable obligation to "teach every creature," both practically and theoretically, *until* they are old, and unto the end of their lives. That period of human life, thus overlooked by the church, is the school-going age—the period in which the child is trained and fitted for the active business or the professional pursuits of life. During all this period, the church *now* drops the reins from her hands and abandons all oversight, direction and control of the "teaching" of those who have been already "made disciples" by baptism, and over whom she claims to exercise direct spiritual superintendence. They are acknowledged, therefore, to be "disciples." To them the hope and expectation of the church are directed, and it is anticipated that when they "grow older" they will become friends, supporters and members of the church. Still however, during all this period, the whole of that teaching by which their mental and moral habits are formed;—by which their views of men and manners, of truth and duty, of right and wrong, of honor and dishonor, of manliness and meanness, are *to an unalterable extent* implanted,—is abandoned by the church to the world. And yet, it is apparent that this period of human life is immeasurably the most important and the most promising.† It is in fact the formative season—the

* The Assembly of 1839 adopted Resolutions on this subject, and in 1840 unanimously adopted Dr. Miller's Report, which has been published by the Board—"The Christian Education of Children and Youth of the Presbyterian Church," in which it is shewn that the Reformed Churches provided for Domestic, Scholastic and Ecclesiastical instruction, and that we have abandoned Protestant principles and practice, both of which ought to be restored.

† On this subject Dr. Arnold (Sermons, vol. 3, p. 8-10) says,—"The years subsequent to childhood lose the interest of the imagination, without yet acquiring the deeper interest of our habitual sympathy; nor can it be concealed, that life in these intermediate years, is far from wearing its

spring and summer of human character. It leaves its subjects men and women. It infixes indelible imprints upon the soul. It makes men in a great degree independent of, and indifferent to, all future teaching on the part of the church. Home example, instruction and influence, are in very few cases, of themselves, sufficient to counteract worldly and selfish tendencies — “the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eyes, and the pride of life.” And the consequence is, that under the present system of education, parents look with fearful apprehension to the maturity of their children, and are not surprised, however much disappointed and distressed, to see them alienated from the church and religion of their fathers, utterly indifferent to the whole subject, or even positively hostile. Cases of an opposite kind are the exceptions and not the rule, and where one family are united in their faith and hope and joy, and feel how supremely “good and pleasant it is,” for a whole family “to dwell together in unity,” thousands there are whose children are found like “lost sheep, every one wandering in his own way,” — where there is an absolute dissonance of views on the all important subject of religion ; — where this in fact is necessarily excluded in order to avoid collision and controversy ; — where every child has learned that he knows more and better than his parents, that he has a sovereign right to form his own opinions, his own associates and his own habits, and thinks that he is all the more manly and all the more noble, the more he casts off the authority of the parent, of the Bible, and of the church. Over this state of things the church weeps tears of unavailing sorrow, while heart-broken parents learn with stoical indifference to see their children go on in that “broad way which leads only to destruction.” The reins have fallen from their hands. The young steeds have been mettled by the wild freedom of unlicensed liberty, and they now scorn the voice or the restraining hand of the master, as their “vaulting ambition overleaps” the boundaries of true wisdom. Thus does

most engaging aspect ; it may be likened to the cold and backward springs of our own climate, the most unlovely season of the year, because we expect luxuriance of growth and beauty, and find all chilled and hard and dull. Such is very often the season of boyhood, the innocence of childhood is manifestly tainted, and the fruits of manhood are not come, and many times show as yet no blossom.”

Zion mourn over her desolations. "There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she has brought forth; neither is there any that taketh her by the hand of all the sons whom she has brought forth." (Isa. 5, 18.)

Now, "be it known unto all men" that this state of things is an innovation. It is novel. It is of modern origin. It is of gradual introduction. Up to a comparatively recent period, the church or people of God felt it to be their duty and their appointed charge, to take the oversight, management and control of children, during the whole period of their school and college "training" just as surely and just as effectively, as during the period of infancy and of matured manhood. They undertook this work as a part of their business;—not as a matter of choice, but as one of conscience and duty. This commission of Christ was read by our fathers plainly, literally and reverentially. Its authority was felt, its command was obeyed, its warrant was confided in, and its promises were acted upon. In the primitive church every congregation, as a general rule, or several, according to their ability, had their school;—and larger districts their Catechetical or higher Seminaries and Colleges. Here, during the dark ages, the only light that still glimmered was preserved and kept burning. And here, at the Reformation, the torch of learning was again lighted, the darkness scattered, and "the true light" which now irradiates the nations, enkindled and shed abroad. There was not a single church of the reformation that did not recognize the duty of the church to maintain, under her own supervision and control, common and grammar schools, academies, colleges, and universities.* This system constituted in an especial manner a part, and a *main part* of the arrangements of every Presbyterian church, and gave vigor and character, morals, religious purity and constancy, to every country in which it was carried out—as for instance, in Geneva, in Scotland,† in

*See the article in the Biblical Report of January 1849, on Catechizing, for much valuable information.

† Scotland was once the best educated country in the world. Thanks to the labours of the early Reformers and their pious successors, and the blessing of God upon them, she had above 1000 parish schools. The nation was not half so large as now; so that they were really *national*; and with other endowed and private schools, made our fathers the most gene-

Holland,* in Prussia, and among the Puritans of Old and New England.

"It should not" says Dr. Channcey Colton, President of Bristol College, "be concealed from us, that we are in some danger of perpetuating errors which have been *gradually superinduced* upon the system of liberal education at first introduced into this country. In some of our oldest literary institutions, the Bible *had*, at the first, a commanding place as a sacred classic; and the Hebrew language, nearly the position which ought to be allowed to it, in every college and university. The modifications which our courses of collegiate study have gradually undergone, manifest but too clearly that men of secular views and irreligious spirit have been "wiser in their generation than the children of light." In the exercise of their influence it has been but natural that they should push, by degrees, the Bible from the high place *assigned to it by our Christian fathers*. Various circumstances have concurred to further this effort, and to produce results which are certainly worthy of attention in a country still so new as ours — a country in which the great work of education is to employ so many of our most highly gifted and richly cultivated minds." After meeting some objections Dr. Channcey shews by what has been, what ought to be. "THE BIBLE MUST BE STUDIED AS A SACRED CLASSIC. Those who attempt to teach its inspired lessons in the college, lecture, and recitation room, must be first themselves taught of God — profoundly versed in sacred literature — as familiar with the scenery of Palestine, as Greece — as thoroughly acquainted with the eastern as the western mind — and capable of bringing the Holy Scriptures before their classes in such a manner as to shew them not only that they embody and embalm the elements of a universal literature, but that they are in truth the inspired word of God, the authoritative "Document of Faith;" — that they constitute not only an original, pure and inexhaustible fountain of thought — a safe and unerring

rally intelligent race in the world. The godly education given in most of the schools was equally important, and produced moral and religious results equally striking.

* See the full and specific regulations on Schools, and Religious teaching in them, adopted by the Synod of Dort, in the above article, p. 80, 81.

standard of taste, but that they contain also, whatever a Christian student “ought to know and believe to his soul’s health.”

“The highest efforts of Grecian and Roman intellect” he adds, “should be made familiar—the languages in which they are embodied should be critically and thoroughly mastered; and this can never be done but by a patient and long continued study of them; — but all this should be effected, or at least attempted in *connection* and *contrast* with the Holy Scriptures in their originals, studied and recited with every help in the way of faithful exegesis, which an accomplished professor would use with a favorite classic author embraced in his course. Let the “*Archæology*” and “*Commonwealth*” of Jahn be as familiar to the student of the Hebrew Bible, as the “*Antiquities*” of Potter, — the best treatises on the geography of the Holy Land as thoroughly read as the “*Classic Geography*” of Butler. Let the student be conducted from Peneus to the brook Cedron, from the passes of the Rubicon to the Red Sea, from Thermopylae to the valley of Ajalon, from the vale of Arno and Tempe to the hallowed shades of Patmos, and the mount of Transfiguration, and the Hill Calvary.” “Let the student distinctly understand that another and higher object in his education is contemplated, by the course of study assigned in the Apostolic writings, and the Evangelists, than mere verbal criticisms.” “Let each student be made familiar with the claims the Hebrew Language has upon him as a Christian scholar — let him clearly understand that it is the repository of the oldest and richest literature, of the most sublime productions, and of the purest and only just ideas of God and of the religion of the ancient world. No Christian student, under proper instruction, can remain indifferent to “the language in which Moses wrote, in which Isaiah breathed the eloquence of heaven, and through which the soul of David poured forth itself to God.” “We are believers in the general advancement of Christianity; and we know not how a pure Christianity can extensively prevail, and exert its legitimate influence upon the human mind and heart, without thoroughly Christianizing our systems of education. Let not the remark be misunderstood. We do not mean to say, that our present systems of education, be-

cause they have so much to do with the pagan element, are necessarily anti-christian. No : we are by no means certain that some of the great masters of classic intiquity will not find a place in the schools of millennial times. But if so, who doubts that they will be studied in a manner altogether subordinate to the commanding claims of revelation — that they will be held up as feeble lights before the great luminary of truth — the Bible? As the spirit of a purer age advances, and as the seats of human science become hallowed by Christian piety, the Scriptures will gradually, it cannot be doubted, be elevated to their appropriate place in the *liberal education* of immortal minds."

Upon such a system of school and college education, our own church in this country was founded, and owes, to it, its maturity and power, as will be shewn by the abundant and incontestible demonstration, given in the facts adduced in the last Report of our General Assembly's Board of Education.

And now to look from the past to the present, to what, more than to her zealous adoption of this system, does the Free Church of Scotland owe her growing efficiency, popularity and permanency? In her opinions, as Dr. Candlish expresses it, every teacher of every order ought to be religious, and ought to imbue their teaching with a religious spirit. But says he, "we come back to the schoolmaster, as that title is usually and currently understood among us. We single him out from the general body of instructors of youth; and we affirm that, while they should all be religious teachers, he, in addition, IS A TEACHER OF RELIGION. And, to come at once to the simple and broad ground on which we base our affirmation, we say that he must be a teacher of religion, because he is intrusted with the forming of the mind. He trains as well as teaches; he educates or draws out the soul; he moulds the character; and in order to his doing all this aright, he must not only teach religiously every thing else he teaches — he must directly teach religion. This, as it seems to us, is a legitimate and indispensable part of his office or function. * * * * *

* * But the Schoolmaster is not merely, as a teacher, to make all his teaching religious, and, as a believing man, to use freely the opportunities which his profession gives

him for seeking to make all whom he can influence religious. Our proposition is, that he is to teach religion; and that it is a real and proper part of his profession or office as a Schoolmaster to do so."

"Our cause," adds Dr. Candlish in another paper in which he shews the progress of their plan, "is, and must be, a growing one. Already we have nearly six hundred salaried teachers upon our roll, exclusive of a considerable number more who receive grants or donations as teachers of side schools; and it is a low estimate we make when we reckon the number of children under instruction as fully fifty thousand.* We have probably more of the youth of Scotland in attendance on our schools, than are to be found in all the endowed parish schools taken together. Our grammar schools, at some of the principal towns, and our two Normal seminaries at Edinburgh and Glasgow, furnish to all classes of our people the means of preparation for useful professions; while again our missionary schools are making inroads on the dense ignorance that prevails in too many districts, both of town and country, in the land. Everywhere Sabbath schools are taught in connexion with the week-day schools; and in the ordinary week-day instruction, not only are daily prayers offered up, and the Bible and Catechism in constant use, but all pains and pre-

* Mr. Macdonald of Blairgowrie got £50,000 subscribed for building our first set of schools. It was payable in five years. Four have now passed, so that £40,000 has become due, and about £36,000 has been collected. The arrear of £4,000 is very small, considering the many changes by deaths, and the pressure of the times. Several hundred schools have been built, and many others are being built; and that they have been well placed is proved by the fact that the *average* attendance in each of them is already 73, while 48 was the average attendance in each of the parish schools in their best days. The schools established by the church are of every different grade, from these down to side schools in the poorer districts of the country, and missionary schools in the wretched parts of towns and villages. It is a main object of the scheme to give, not only the best education that can be had for time, but the best for eternity. The Bible and the Catechisms of the Church are regularly taught, and every endeavour is used to exclude all but godly teachers. But, at the same time, it is a rule, that whatever parents object to *their children being taught our religious doctrines, such wish shall be strictly attended to.* Happily this objection scarcely ever occurs. Surely this is not only a Christian and missionary, but a patriotic and national undertaking, well deserving the cordial aid of every lover of his country, even if he did not claim that higher name, a lover of Christ. And all that love Christ must rejoice in the progress of the scheme, and give it a helping hand.

cautions are taken to secure that the teachers shall be persons themselves under the influence of religious principle, and fitted to exert a religious influence over others. We have such an opportunity as never Church had before of imparting to the education we supply, a high spiritual as well as secular value, and making it a discipline for forming, by God's blessing, the minds and hearts of the young, according to his gospel, as well as an institute for imparting information, or the means and facilities for acquiring it.

"The Free Church of Scotland, we cannot doubt, will seek to know the time of her visitation, and to acquit herself of the responsibility under which she lies, in respect of her claim to represent the historical and hereditary Church of the first and second Reformations. In this character, she is bound to be preëminently educational, wielding the school along with the church, as a prime instrument of the national regeneration she contemplates. And looking to present exigencies and future hazards, as well as to the associations of the past, she has a high and holy calling." *

From what has been said it is evident that the church and people of God, in this country, have, therefore, *abandoned* one essential part of their duty, and one main element of their strength and hope, in abandoning the direct control, supervision, religious training and discipline of common schools and academies and colleges. Christ commissioned His church or people to teach those within their influence, "all things whatsoever he commanded," and according to the faith and standards of the Reformed churches "when

* In order to obviate the force of these facts, it is said that the circumstances of the Free Church were very different from ours in this country. Very different indeed. Where we have every thing in our favour she had every thing against her — every thing to do — and but little to do all this with. She had to contend against civil power, the establishment, the episcopal and every other rival sect, and with old, venerable, and revered schools, colleges, and universities. She had to secure schools, scholars, and schoolmasters. We have unlimited civil freedom, a very partial and imperfect system of school and college education, under State patronage; and under voluntary support, schools and colleges of every name and character. In no country in the world can or do, denominations act more denominationally than ours. Here, therefore, there is neither civil, social, or pecuniary obstructions, and here we are only called upon to restore what we have lost and to follow in the steps of many who have had wisdom sooner to discern the times, and zeal to meet the pressures of their coming claims.

Christ ascended on high. He gave," not only "pastors and officers," to His people, but "teachers" also, * in order that they might fulfil His command not only to proclaim "the Gospel," but also to "disciple," "teach," and "train up," in the way they should go, "all nations," and "every creature." In principle at least, those churches were right, for it is impossible, by any ingenuity of reasoning, to exclude the school and college training of children from the "all things" commanded by Christ, and from the "discipline" and "teaching," which constitute the unquestionable duty of the church. This forms the minor proposition in the syllogism to which the argument on this subject may be reduced. All that Christ has commissioned His church and people to accomplish, they are bound to undertake and perform to the utmost of their ability and opportunity. But Christ has commissioned His church and people to train up the young until they are old, teaching them all things necessary to fit them for that way in which they should *then* go, under the assurance of His blessing upon them and upon their children. Therefore, it is the duty of the church to do this. This proposition we shall now endeavour to make clear.

This might be done by shewing that as no education can be effectual to its desired end but one that is thoroughly religious, it is plain that the church which is the only authorised teacher of religion, can alone impart it, and that She ought therefore to give, under her own direction, an education thoroughly imbued with religion. Now that no education is of any certain efficiency, unless it is religious, is becoming the universal sentiment of Philosophers as well as of Divines. "Education, to deserve the name, must be

* 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11, 12; Rom. xii. 7.

The *Scotch Book of Discipline* says, "The office of Doctor or Catechiser is one of the two ordinary and perpetual functions that travel in the world." "They are such properly who teach in schools, colleges or, universities."

The *Westminster Divines* say, "The Scripture doth hold out the name and title of teacher as well as of the pastor." "A teacher, or doctor is of most excellent use in schools and universities, as of old in the schools of the prophets."—*Book of Discipline*. "As the Christian Church seems to have been modelled after the synagogue, we may presume that the office of Teacher was not materially different in the primitive Church from that of Scribe, Doctor, or teacher in the Jewish."—*Howe on Theol. Ed.*, p. 62.

Owen's Works, Vol. xx. p. 468.

moulded and leavened in every part, by the word and Gospel of Christ. There is here no middle ground. A mere neutrality is impossible in its very nature. Education must be godly, or else it will be godless. What, indeed, is the true nature and purpose of Christian education? Nothing less, assuredly, than the training of immortal souls for an everlasting kingdom of glory. To profess to believe the Gospel and still to aim at any lower object, is folly and madness. To impart some dry details of science or history is not to educate, in the Christian sense of the word. This is, indeed, a far higher and nobler work. It is by instruction and moral suasion, by discipline and prayer, to persuade men to secure those high ends for which they were created, to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever. The very drift and purpose of education cannot be seen, without faith in the great doctrines and hopes of the word of God. It must be, not a training for this world only, an intellectual luxury that dazzles and deceives, but a training for immortal life; a moral discipline of which the fruits will abide and endure forever."

But we will not dwell on this general view of the subject. Whatever, therefore, we remark, is necessary to the end required of Her, is necessarily a part of the duty of the church. But the church never can "TRAIN UP" children,—as she is required to do,—in that way in which as men and women "they should go," unless she takes direct oversight and control of their school and college education. The words in Proverbs, 22: 6,—"*Train up a child in the way he shall go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it,*"—which are of course explanatory of the duty of the church or people of God now and always, can mean nothing less than this. *Train up*, catechise, initiate, instruct or imbue, *A Child*, that is, a youth. The word in the original is by no means confined to childhood. It refers far more emphatically to the period when reason is in exercise—to active sprightly youth—to young men and women.* It covers therefore the whole period of human life up to manhood—childhood and youth.† *In the way he should go*. Literally even to the mouth of his way. This means even to

* See Gen. 14, 24; 18, 7; 22, 5; 1 Sam. 1 22, &c. &c., and Parkhurst's and every other Lexicon.

† See Analytical Heb. Lex.—D. L. V.

the very mouth or entrance of his or her way in life. It means also that this training is to have reference to capacity, talents, and turn of mind.* It means, too, that this training is to be adapted to fit and prepare youth, for that course or manner of life they are designed to follow. And further, this training is to begin from the beginning and continue to the end of education, comprehending all that is necessary, intellectually, morally, and spiritually. *And when he is old.* Then, when thus trained, *tum cum rite institueris puerum pro ingenii sui capter.*† The training of Christ's disciples under the guidance of his church — which is His TRAINER, — is therefore to be adapted to the children of the church, from their earliest to their latest period of instruction.

Nor is this duty of the church less implied in the words of Christ's commission. Children are to be made disciples or scholars in the school of Christ — for what else is the Church but a school or nursery. They are to be “entered,” or “discipled,” or “matriculated” from their earliest infancy as “babes in Christ,” and “lambs of His flock.” They are to be thus early “planted in the house of the Lord,” that there they may take root, grow up, and “flourish in the courts of the Lord.” They are therefore to be “fed with food convenient for them.” As “babes” they are to receive “the sincere milk of the word.” As “disciples” they are to be “taught all things.” As “lambs” they are to be “gathered in the arms,” and “led with tenderness.” As “sheep” they are to be led to the “green pastures and besides the still waters.” As “plants of righteousness,” they are to be digged about and pruned and watered, “that they may bear much fruit.” Thus are the children of the church to be “BROUGHT UP,” (words which appear to be a reiteration of those in Proverbs,) “in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” They are to be both theoretically and practically instructed. They are to be perfectly indoctrinated and “thoroughly furnished for every good word and work.” They are to be “able to give a reason to every one that asketh it, of the hope that is in

* See Rosenmuller in Loco and Pooles Annot.

† Rosenmuller. See Virgil. Georg. ii. 272., and Horace Ep. l. i. ep. 2, 69.

them," and at the same time, be "ready to distribute, willing to communicate, and zealous for good works." Children therefore remain "disciples," until able and prepared, "because they are strong" to enter personally upon the active duties of life, and to fulfil their appointed destiny, and they continue to be "lambs," until as "sheep" they are able for themselves to seek out their own food and pursue their own paths. They remain under the government and teaching of the church until they become "perfect men," and having arrived at the measure of the stature of the fullness of "Christian nurture," "are no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Never should the children of the church leave the house — the family — the school of God, for "a child left to himself bringeth his parents, and the church, to shame." There "as children" they are to "speak" and be spoken to — to understand and be instructed — reason and be reasoned with, — and it is only when they become men and women they are to be "put away" from this "nurture and admonition," this "yoke which it is so good to bear in their youth." The church, therefore, is the true Alma Mater of her youth — their true and proper guardian and teacher. It follows, then, that since the church cannot be and do all this, during the most important and eventful period of life except in schools and colleges under her own management and discipline, she is under obligation to have such schools and colleges of her own.

Again, there is nothing, we affirm, really proper, useful or essential to the education of a child that is not commanded by Christ, and enjoined upon his church; and whatever therefore is necessary to a complete education, ought to be provided and imparted under the teaching and supervision of the church. In whatever way they should go *when old* — whether as men of business, or men of letters, or men of professional occupation — in "THAT WAY" is it the business and the duty of the church to "TRAIN UP" the youth brought within her influence. The children of His church God claims as specially his own. (Ezk. 16 : 20.) They are His "heritage." They are His "plants." And having been "planted in His house," they are to remain and

"flourish there," under the constant care of His appointed gardeners. God commands them to be "nursed" and "trained" "up *for him*," not by a wet or a dry nurse, but by His own chosen nurse, in his own chosen household, and with the "sincere milk" of his own provision. "In the Old Testament we have repeated recognitions of the duty of public instruction, as in the instances of Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, (2 Chron. xvii. 9, xxx. 22, and xxxv. 3,) in all of which instances we find the offices assigned to the Levites, and described as "teaching the book of the law of the Lord," "teaching the good knowledge of the Lord," "teaching all Israel which were holy unto the Lord." "But we attach more importance to the special instructions given to the Israelites, simply as parents, in reference to their children — (Deut. iv. 9, vi. 7, xi. 19; Ps. lxxviii. 5, &c.) as these are made general and universal in the New Testament precepts which bear on the relation of parents and children, as well as by the whole tenor and spirit of the economy of grace. Or, in other words, taking the general command, "Train up a child in the way he shall go, and when he is old he will not depart from it," we cannot but regard it as fully covering and comprehending the function of the Schoolmaster. He is entrusted with the training of children in the way they should go; and he cannot discharge that trust without directly, and as a part of his proper business, teaching religion." So speaks Dr. Candlish in the name of the Free Church, and as the scriptural authority and warrant for her parochial system.

Again, in order to receive God's promised blessing the training of children is to continue until "old," or mature age, when the object of training is accomplished by an entrance upon the business of life. If the church or people of God persevere faithfully to TRAIN UP children UNTIL they enter upon active life, THEN they have the promise that they will not depart from the right way, in opinion and in practice. The case of Dr. Chalmers is a pregnant one. I feel quite sure, says he, in his Scripture Readings, "that the use of the sacred dialogues as a school book, and the pictures of Scripture scenes which interested my boyhood still cleave to me and impart a peculiar tinge and charm to the same representations when brought within my notice. Perhaps when mouldering in my coffin, the eye of my dear

Tommy * may light upon this page, and it is possible that his recollections may accord with my present anticipations of the effect that his delight in the Pictorial Bible may have in endearing still more to him the holy word of God. May it tell with saving effect on his conscience, in whatever way it may effect his imagination; and let him so profit by its sacred lessons of faith and piety, that after a life of Christian usefulness on earth we may meet in heaven and rejoice for ever in the presence of our common Father." Certain it is that the failure which exists, to such a dreadful extent, under the present system, is not in the promise of God which is "yea, and amen in Christ Jesus," but in the practice of the church. Children are not now "trained by her UNTIL THEY ARE OLD," they are not "BROUGHT UP in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," and therefore it is, that they so early and so generally "depart from the way in which they should go."

Again, this training imposed upon the church and people of Christ, has respect to every proper occupation and profession of life. ALL these are under the providential direction of God the Holy Spirit, who assigns to every man his sphere and business, "giving to every man" natural endowments, capacity, and taste "severally as He will." Every occupation is "a calling" in life, and to every calling the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit ought to be sought. "Every man is after his own order," but "no man liveth to himself" but "unto the Lord." He is bound therefore to acknowledge and glorify God "in all his ways" both in advancing *towards* the business of life, and when attained, *in* whatsoever occupation he is led finally to select, (1 Cor. 10; 31,) seeing that "WHATSOEVER is not of faith is sin."† "As therefore God has distributed to every man — as the Lord hath called every man, so let him therefore walk, and so ordain I in all the churches."

* His grandson Thos. C. Hanna, then in his sixth year.

† The term called is a metaphor,* referring both to the command or summons by which a person is verbally invited and directed to any duty, and to the vocation or employment to which he is summoned. It is, therefore, the command—addressed to any individual through His word, by the Holy Ghost,—to engage in any work or duty, or to enjoy any privileges and blessings. It is used in Scripture generally for every state

* Dr. Jamieson's Reality of the Spirit's Work, p. 293.

(1 Cor. 7; 17.) And hence the church and people of God must TRAIN UP their children for whatsoever occupation their natural endowments, the providence of God and the Holy Spirit may design them, and it is not until they are actually engaged in such a calling their training is completed and the promise takes effect. But this "training"—which is the charge of the church, indubitably covers not only every calling in life but also every department of human industry and every branch of human study necessary to fit and prepare children for them. THERE IS NO USEFUL "KNOWLEDGE, DEVICE, OR WORK" WHICH ARE NOT EITHER COMMANDED OR COMMENDED in the moral and historical portions of the word of God. This is the reason why in the wisdom of God the scriptures cover such a wide range. Knowledge of every kind is here commended to the diligent pursuit of all according to their several

and condition of life to which any one is destined by God—for which God gives the requisite capacity and qualifications, opening the way for an entrance unto it—and blessing and supporting those who engage in it. The Holy Ghost is represented as the efficient agent in carrying out, in reference to every individual, the *providential* purposes of God, as well as the dispensations of His grace.* To every such state, condition and duty, whether in the family, the church, or the commonwealth, the Holy Spirit calls, and his people are called; and hence, these employments are termed callings, or a man's vocation.† A call, therefore, is necessary to the proper discharge and enjoyment of any business or occupation, and this call is the more clear and evident, in proportion as the duty is peculiar, responsible, and attended with temptation and difficulty.‡ A Christian is to expect such a call, and a comfortable persuasion or assurance of duty in all that he undertakes.§

* See Bishop Heber's Bampton Lectures on the Holy Spirit; Owen on the Spirit; Hurron on the Spirit; Buchanan on the Holy Spirit, &c. 1 Cor. 7: 24. Eph. 4: 28. 1 Peter, 4: 10. Gal. 5: 13.

† On this subject the old divines are full, though now the term call is more commonly restricted in books to the effectual or saving call of the Gospel, or to the call of the Ministry.

‡ Perkins' Works, Fol., vol. 3, p. 61; vol. 1, p. 64; vol. 2, p. 50. See Commentary on Revelation by the celebrated James Durham, author of the "Sum of Saving Knowledge," 4to., Glasgow, 1788, p. 78. No man, he teaches, ought to become an author without such a call, and every one may know that he has it, p. 77-79. See also Bucani Theol. Instit. Geneva, 1612, p. 492. Bayne on the Ephesians, Fol., London, 1643, p. 4, 350. Hildersbram on John, chap. 4, Fol., 1632, p. 238-240. Works of Rev. William Bridges, vol. 5, p. 75-77.

§ That he may ascertain this and how, see Perkins, vol. 2, p. 159, &c. Corbet, in his Remains, makes a state of continence or single life one of these. See p. 231-236, &c.

ability. (Prov. 15: 14. Prov. 1: 5. Prov. 19: 2.) Many of the most exalted characters in the Bible — as Moses, Paul, and others — were eminently instructed in all kinds of knowledge and learning. Skill and proficiency in arts and sciences, are represented as having been imparted by God. (Ex. 31: 2, 3, &c. Ex. 38: 30, and 36: 1, &c.) Job discourses of natural knowledge at some length. In Ch. 28: 1, he traces up that wisdom by which nature's secrets are discovered, to God as its author and bestower, by whom every thing in nature is arranged and ordered.* Tubal Cain was therefore first God's scholar in order to become man's instructor.† The wisdom and knowledge granted unto Solomon by God (2 Chron. 1: 7, &c.,) excelled the wisdom of all the children of the East country and all the wisdom of Egypt for he was wiser than all men, and his fame was in all nations round about." (1 Ks. 4: 30, &c.) Now this wisdom evidently included *every* sphere of knowledge — ethics, politics, natural history, architecture, music, agriculture and commerce. (Do. 1 Ks. 10: 23. 2 Chron. 9: 1, &c. Prov. 2: 6.) In reference to all these departments of human learning and industry the Bible is full.‡ In poetry, in history, in biography, in political science, in morals, in natural history, in antiquarian lore, in science and in art, the Bible is rich. Without knowledge, without much and various knowledge in all its branches, the Bible in all its records, cannot therefore even be understood. In every walk in literature, in every investigation in science, in every problem in government, in every employment of life, the Bible is a companion, a patron, a guide and an instructor. The best models, and the most invaluable records are preserved in the sacred volume, to which the Poet, the Statesman, and the inductive Philosopher may alike resort as to "the treasure hid in the field." "The Law of the Lord is perfect," "thoroughly furnishing for every good word and work" and giving counsel, wisdom and improvement in every occupation of life. And hence it is *self evident* that as the Bible which is the text book, the manual, and the Treasury of the church, covers every

* Caryl on Job, vol. 8, p. 221-2.

† Exod. 36, 1. Ps. 144, 1. and Is. 28, 24, &c.

‡ See Talbot's complete Analysis of the Holy Bible, 4to., in xxx Books.

department of human industry and research ; — as it sanctions and sanctifies them ; — as it requires a knowledge of them in order to a perfect knowledge of itself ; — it is thus evident, we say, that the church, in training her children so as “from childhood up” to manhood, to make them “acquainted with the Scriptures,” and “perfectly” to understand them, must of necessity train them up in the knowledge of every department of human study and employment, and thus “thoroughly furnish them” for that “good word and work” to which they may be “called of God.”

That God’s education includes all the knowledge necessary to the avocations of life, Dr. Arnold proves from Deut. 11 : 19. “Ye shall teach these my words unto your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.” Now if, says he, we consider a little what were the circumstances of the Israelites, and what the extent of the words spoken in the text, it will help to throw some light upon this subject. “Ye shall teach these my words unto your children.” What words do we think are here meant ? Was it the Ten Commandments, as given on the two tables from Mount Sinai ? Or was it the five books of the Pentateuch, as we now have them, from Genesis to Deuteronomy ? No such thing ; the special thing meant to be taught, was a knowledge of God’s statutes and ordinances ; not the Ten Commandments only, not all the early history of their forefathers contained in the book of Genesis, but God’s law given to them his people ; his will respecting them morally and politically ; his will with regard to all the relations of private and public life ; with regard to their government, their limits and divisions, their property, real and personal, their rules of inheritance, their rules with regard to marriage ; their whole conduct, in short, in peace and in war, as men and as citizens. All this was laid down in their law ; all this was carefully to be taught them in their youth, that so, in whatever line of life they might be thrown, or whatever questions might be agitated, they might know what was God’s will, and therefore might know and do their own duty.”

“Undoubtedly,” he adds, “that is useless in education, which does not enable a man to glorify God better in his

way through life ; but then we are called upon to glorify him in many various ways, according to our several callings and circumstances ; and as we are to glorify him both in our bodies and in our spirits, with all our faculties, both outward and inward, I cannot consider it unworthy either to render our body strong and active, or our understanding clear, rich and versatile in its powers : I cannot reject from the range of religious education whatever ministers to the perfection of our bodies and our minds, so long as both in body and mind, in soul and spirit, we ourselves may be taught to minister to the service of God."

The essential part of education, however, is moral culture. Without this all other knowledge is vain and worthless, nay, it is positively hurtful and injurious. Now, as Dr. Bethune well states it, "To establish sufficient moral *principle*, there must be proposed *motives* to do right, convincing the mind and controlling the heart, superior at all times and in all circumstances over every possible motive to do wrong. To direct in moral *conduct* there must be an exhibition, by actual *example*, of the highest moral perfection. All these can be found only in Christianity. Hence we affirm that, though there are some auxiliary means, the BIBLE is fundamentally essential to the proper training of the young. Every attempt to build a sound education, except upon evangelical truths, will be a failure. For, besides that the Holy Scripture is a library of itself, containing the most ancient, authentic, and satisfactory account of things in their causes, narrative the most simple and impressive, biography the most honest and useful, eloquence the most powerful and persuasive, poetry the most sublime and beautiful, argument the closest and most profound, politics the justest and most liberal, and religion pure from the throne of God ; it alone teaches morals with sufficient authority, motive, and example — the authority of God, the motives of eternity, and the example of Jesus Christ, God-in-man." To secure, therefore, *the essential* part of education, the Bible must be studied, not merely in its history and its poetry, but in its doctrines. The Bible is "the power of God" to the moralizing, the purifying, and the holiness of any man, not because of its high moral standard, its pure and heavenly precepts, and its divine philosophy, but because "therein is revealed the righteousness of

God from faith to faith," and it is only when the mind is imbued with this "grace of God which bringeth salvation" that it "receives power" to overcome "the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eyes, and the pride of life," and all in the world that "is not of the Father." The Bible therefore must be spiritually enforced and understood, in order that "a young man by taking heed thereto, may cleanse his way." And since, therefore, no education without this is of any value, and such teaching can only be imparted under the superintendence, guidance, and warrant of the church, the church is bound to provide such education for all her children.

And as the Levites under the Temple, and the Scribes and Teachers under the Synagogue economy, were set apart as the Teachers of the Church in subordination to the Priests—for the services of the Temple, for general instruction in music, devotion and common life affairs,—so, as we have seen, were "Teachers" given to the church of Christ to enable her to fulfil the charge entrusted to her, in His commission, to "disciple all nations teaching them all things whatsoever Christ has commanded." And it is therefore to the increase and better conduct of such schools and academies among the Jews at the period of Christ's birth, which were carried on in connexion with the Synagogues, that the general knowledge of a future state, and other important doctrines, and their preparation by learning of all kinds, for the coming of the Messiah, and the spread of the Gospel is attributed by many learned men.*

We come then to the very solemn conclusion that this duty of Christian education THE WORLD CANNOT DISCHARGE. It *will* not do it.† It is not authorised to do it.

* See Law's Theory of Religion, p. 142. Vitringa Obs. Sacr. L. H., c. 14, § 8, 9. Some of the Jewish writers say there were 400 academies and as many schools at Jerusalem. Buddei Eccl. Hist., vol. 2, p. 2, § 7, p. 966. Dr. Lightfoot, Op. vol. 2, 140, 197.

†OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM.—The Episcopalians in Connecticut are making a movement to expel from the common schools of the State such books of history as contain facts which they regard injurious to their church and offensive to their conscience. We do not see why their demand is not reasonable and according to the spirit of our institutions. If we have a school system in common, we must not teach in the school any thing that is offensive to any of the partners in the concern. The books in our city have been expurgated to please the Romanists, and when any other sect discovers matter of which it complains, out it must be put, until the books,

It is neither warranted nor encouraged to attempt it. It is, on the contrary, prohibited and forbidden, — “for it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent,” that by the church may be shewn forth the manifold wisdom of God.* “All that is in the world” — not only “the lusts of the eyes and the lusts of the flesh,” but even “the pride of life,” — the proudest monuments of human wisdom and the best devised schemes of human improvement — “are not of the Father.” They may be good in their measure and in their way. They may accomplish much in civilizing, enlightening, and refining human society and in promoting intellectual knowledge and advancement, and *as long* as the mass of Society remain in rebellion to Christ, and reject His authority, His laws, and His church, all these may be, and doubtless are, absolutely necessary for the benefit of the mass of society. But they are utterly wanting in the true principle, spirit and power of “*THAT TRAINING*” which combines morals with religion, in every step and progress of education, — and which looks to the Spirit of God as the only efficient guide and Teacher to fit, qualify and prepare the young “when they are old” to fill whatsoever sphere He has allotted to them, with honor to themselves, with benefit to society, with advantage to the church, and to the glory of God. “Our doctrine and our system of religious education must therefore stand sublime above all the glory of the world, invincible by all its power, because it is not ours, but that of the living God and His anointed Son, our Saviour.”

Society remains corrupt under all the teaching of “man’s

like the parson’s wig which was clipped to please every body, are totally destroyed. Perhaps then, Christian people will send their children to Christian schools.—*N. Y. Obs.*

* “We desire,” says Dr. Chalmers, “to resist,” (and to subvert where it PRACTICALLY, though not LEGALLY exists, as among ourselves,) “such an unholy alliance between the civil and the ecclesiastical as might subordinate the affairs of Thy kingdom, O God,” (whether relating to the all-important concern of the education of its children and youth or to other matters,) “to the dictates (systems and institutions) of the secular power, and cause the sanctuary of Thy church to be trodden under foot of the Gentiles.” This question involves, it will be seen, the whole subject of Christ’s headship—His authority over and in His church—and the entire independence of that church. This argument we may on some other occasion take up.

wisdom" and "mans divising." The head may be developed, but the heart will be left "hardened through the deceitfulness of sin,"—and want of principle, want of character, want of probity, and want of religion, will remain like cancers to eat into the vitals of the body politic, and to undermine and destroy the integrity of our institutions and the purity and power of our churches. The church then must inquire for the old paths. "Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." Say not "we will not hearken." Depend upon it, in forsaking God's way and in "destroying the way of His paths," we "have made to ourselves crooked paths," in which "are wasting and destruction." Beware then lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ." "He therefore," says Calvin, "must deceive himself who anticipates long prosperity to any Kingdom which is not ruled, educated and nurtured by the sceptre of God, that is by His Divine word, for where there is no vision the people perish."

As Parents, we must see to it that our children are "trained up" under the supervision, direction and control of the church, through the whole course of their education, until they grow "old" and are fitted for their calling in life. (Gen. 18: 17, &c. 1 Thess. 1: 11. 1 Sam. 3: 13. Exod. 10: 2. Deut. 11: 19. Ps. 22: 30. 78: 4-7, &c.

As Officers and Members of the church, we must see to it that a School is provided under the superintendence and direction of the church, where our children may be made "wise in all the wisdom of men," and in all the branches of a liberal and enlarged education, and where they may at the same time be trained up in the way they should go and be made "wise unto salvation," even until they are fitted for business, or for a profession, or for "the work of the ministry." Christ enjoins and requires this at our hands. The interests of His church and kingdom demand it. The preservation and upholding of "the truth as it is in Jesus" demand it. The salvation of the souls of our children, and of our children's children demand it. Nay, the best interests of our country and of the world demand it, seeing that it is "righteousness which exalteth any nation," and

the favor and blessing of God which can alone build it up and perpetuate it in freedom and prosperity.

There are, however, in the minds of many, numerous and weighty objections to the system of parochial schools under denominational supervision. Now that such objections should be made by those who are beyond the pale of membership in the church, and who look at the question therefore merely in the light of public opinion, worldly wisdom, and temporal advantages, we are not surprised. Even on their own ground, however, it can be shewn that this system is most **REPUBLICAN**, — leaving to the people the direct management of the all-important matter of the education of their children according to the dictates of their own conscience ; — allowing every man the privilege and the hope of perpetuating in his children, principles for which it is his duty and desire “to contend earnestly,” and which he regards as lying at the very foundation of pure religion, sound morality, and public virtue ; — taxing no one beyond his own voluntary appropriation ; — securing the very best education under the very best auspices, and **YET LEAVING TO OTHERS AND TO THE STATE THE PRIVILEGE OF PROVIDING FOR THOSE WHO NEED OR WHO WISH OTHER INSTRUCTION.**

It is said, indeed, that there **CAN BE** only three systems of education, and that it must be conducted **WHOLLY** either by the church, or by the State, or by voluntary effort, since these are *incompatible* the one with the other. The fact however, is, that these three systems of education have always *co-existed*, and that they do now exist in every free government. Neither is there any conceivable difficulty in the Church sustaining its schools for such as prefer them, as it does its various other objects, (its churches, schemes, missions, periodicals, &c.,) — leaving the State to provide for such as prefer its schools ; and every one who chooses to do so, to organize voluntary Schools, adapted to the views of those who sustain them.

The Church has no *compulsory* power even within itself over its own members, and no power at all, over “them that are without.” It is only so far as it can “*commend* any object to the consciences of men” that it can morally constrain them to sustain it, and coöperate in its advancement. The objections, therefore, which have been recently

founded upon the supposition of a compulsory power on the part of the Church which it is ~~under~~ a divine requirement to enforce, are perfectly gratuitous, and are as contrary to the free principles and spirit, as they are to the free conduct, and action, of the Presbyterian Church. In no one particular does this Church assume, or exercise such power in carrying out any scheme, plan, or purpose, however she may believe them to be in conformity to divine appointment, and in furtherance of the divine will. Her office is ministerial and declarative, and she has, in many cases, *authority* to act, when she has *no power to coerce*, — where expediency, that is, a due regard to the great ends of the Church, determine her course and measure her progress, and where conscientious preference will in like manner determine the coöperation of her members. "Our Church," as Dr. Chalmers says, "wants no such discipleship as that which is grounded on blind submission to her authority, but only the discipleship of those who in the free exercise of their judgment and their conscience, honestly believe her doctrine to be grounded on the authority of the word of God."

The system of denominational education for which we plead *has worked well* for centuries in the most free and republican countries. And those doctrines and principles which make their actual and living professors better men of business, and better citizens; — and which, while they are "first pure," are also peaceable, gentle, liberal, full of mercy and of good fruits, law-abiding, and law-honouring,*

* "There are three systems of schooling. There is the first gratuitous or wholly endowed system, which is in general a very lax and careless system. The second is the converse of this, being wholly unendowed, and which I think very bad too, because it forces the people to pay too high fees; it does not meet the people half way. The other system is the parochial or medium system, established by the Fathers of the Reformation, where the two parties meet each other half way. The heritors of the parish pay a small salary to the schoolmaster, and erect the school house, in virtue of which the schoolmaster is enabled, not merely to live, but to live comfortably, and to furnish education to the people at moderate fees. This system, as I have said, meets the people half way; and by thus obtruding, so to speak, a school in every district of the country, it affords a standing intimation to the people of their duty in regard to education. By this system, too, you get the people to pay moderate fees, and thus bind them effectually to the cause of education, and perpetuate and diffuse it far more universally than it would otherwise be. I would say that the universality of Scottish education is to be ascribed to this medium system

—these doctrines and principles cannot surely produce contrary effects in children who are taught to walk in the steps, and to imbibe the spirit of their fathers. That this system of education *will* produce, as is alleged, variance, bigotry, and animosity, is not then true, because it *does not do it*, and “the tree is known by its fruits.” All such objections are founded, not upon experience, but upon prejudice,—upon theory and not upon fact,—upon worldly wisdom and not upon “the wisdom that is from above,”—or upon the unbelief of the carnal heart. They may all be triumphantly answered and they have been.* But they are irrelevant and out of place altogether. When God speaks man should be silent. When God commands man should obey. When God testifies “we are sure that His judgment is according to truth.” And when God commissions and warrants, it is for His servants to go forward in the execution of His will.

The Church therefore, has nothing to do with difficulties and objections when Christ has instituted and appointed her to be His agency—in training up the youth of the church

instituted by the Fathers of the Scottish Reformation, and I would say that the partial, broken and imperfect system of education in England, where all attempts have failed to make education so universal as here, is owing to the fact, that the two systems have been shared between the wholly endowed and the wholly unendowed.” “When Knox,” continues Dr. Chalmers (Wks., vol. 11, p. 143 and 147,) “came over from the school of Geneva he brought its strict and at that time uncorrupted orthodoxy along with him; and with it he pervaded all the formularies of that church which was founded by him, and not only did it flame abroad from all our pulpits, but through our schools and our catechisms, it was brought down to the boyhood of our land; and from one generation to another have our Scottish youth been familiarized to the sound of it from their very infancy; and unpromising as such a system of tuition might be, in the eye of the mere academic moralist to the object of building up a virtuous and well-doing peasantry, certain it is, that, as the wholesale result, there has palpably come forth of it the most moral peasantry in Europe notwithstanding.” * * To Knox we owe our present system of parochial education. By that scheme of ecclesiastical policy, a school was required for every parish, and had all its views been followed up, a college would have been erected in every notable town. On this inestimable service done to Scotland we surely do not need to expatiate. The very mention of it lights up an instant and enthusiastic approval in every bosom. And with all the veneration that is due on other grounds to our Reformer, we hold it among the proudest glories of his name, that it stands associated with an institution, which has spread abroad the light of a most beauteous moral decoration throughout all the hamlets of our land, and is dear to every Scottish heart as are the piety and the worth of its peasant families.”

* See Report of the Board of Education, for 1848.

in that way which can alone fit them to live holy lives, to die happy deaths, to glorify God here, and to enjoy Him hereafter.*

As to any practical difficulty, there is in this country at least, none. The parents and friends of any city, and of most country congregations, could with all possible ease organize and support a school, which would ultimately secure to our children the very best and cheapest education, and at the same time imbue their minds with sound principles of religion and morality, and with a heartfelt attachment to our doctrines and order. And what they ought to do and can do, they must do, if they will be faithful to themselves, to the truth, to the church, to their children, and children's children, and to their God and Saviour.

*The writer in the Watchman and Observer to whom we have alluded, proves that he has been ingeniously fashioning a man of straw in order as ingeniously to pull it to pieces, and that his arguments have no bearing upon *the actual* system of denominational education, by admitting and enjoining the very system which is here advocated. Academies and Colleges, he says, MAY PROPERLY POSSESS A DECIDEDLY DENOMINATIONAL CHARACTER; but shall not be made subservient to the indulgence or dissemination of bigotry. (Whoever desired or designed this?) In Presbyterian institutions, LET THE DISTINCTIVE PECULIARITIES OF OUR CHURCH, AS SET FORTH IN HER STANDARDS, BE TAUGHT, in every case in which there is no conscientious or denominational objection; but let conscience be free; and let those who are, and those who are not, Presbyterians or members of Presbyterian families, be admitted alike, and to equal privileges. In imparting religious instruction, let the principle be ever kept in view, "that truth is in order to goodness;" let the Students never be permitted to forget the wide difference between the best of uninspired books, and the word of God; nor to overlook the distinction between essentials and non-essentials. Let the object be to render them, by the blessing of God, not zealous partisans or acute disputants, but intelligent, consistent and devoted Christians. Academies and Colleges, denominational in the sense now explained, SEEM DESIRABLE; because the Students are necessarily deprived of that religious instruction which they might receive, each from his own parents and his own pastor, were they members of schools in their own respective neighborhoods.

ARTICLE IV.

A Plea for Amusements. By FREDERICK W. SAWYER,
New York, Philadelphia, 1847.

We have no means of knowing to what extent this little volume has been circulated and read. From the subject it treats of, the congeniality of the sentiments it expresses with those of a large class of our countrymen and countrywomen, its attractive style, and the fact that it is the only book, (as the author asserts,) that has ever been written on the subject of Amusements exclusively, we presume that it has obtained a considerable popularity. The writer seems to regard himself as the friend of morality and religion, although there is nothing in his book to indicate the existence in himself of any depth of piety, or any strongly evangelical opinions, and he has neglected to discuss the question of the influence of amusements on the progress of spiritual religion, and makes little reference to man's higher and immortal destiny.

We perfectly agree with Mr. Sawyer, in thinking that the subject on which he writes, is not unworthy of notice. It is indeed important "that we fix a just estimate on those mental, moral, and physical agencies that are classed under the generic names of Pleasures and Amusements. They are so intimately connected with us in all the relations of life, and occupy so much of our time, thoughts and attention, that any error in relation to them can not be otherwise than productive of infinite mischiefs. If a mere mote may be so misplaced as to introduce disorder and pain into the whole bodily system of man, what may not pleasures and amusements do, if equally misplaced." This subject has often been discussed in the pulpit: and is not, in our opinion, unworthy the consideration of even dignified Quarterlies. We should be glad to see some able and well-directed pen employed in its full discussion: and we doubt not that it is destined soon to become a highly exciting and much canvassed subject in our Christian commonwealth.

Many of the general opinions of the author of this plea receive our warm approbation. We agree with him in thinking that some amusements, some means of recreation, are necessary, not merely for children, but adults. Man is a social being, and social intercourse must be cherished. Our Saviour advocated it by his example : as Neander says of him, "In the joyous circle of a wedding, he performs his first miracle to gratify a social want. Thus he sanctifies connexions, feelings, joys, that are purely human, by his personal presence, and by unfolding his Divine powers in such a circle, and on such an occasion." Our author expresses himself well on the subject of bringing the amusements of society more under the control of religion and the influence of the pious. "Our amusements can never be made as healthy, and as useful, as they are capable of being made, until the religious portion of the community assume their true position towards them. They must assume a regulating, controlling care over them, the same as they do over the subject of education, and business, and political matters." The total banishment of some amusements, that are popular, may, however, be necessary to the regulation of amusements in general : just as it is necessary, sometimes, to dismiss some of the more vicious and refractory students in a college, to preserve discipline, and suppress insubordination among the rest. We cannot think it necessary, that the religious portion of the community may assume their true position towards amusements, that they take dancing and theatres "under their fostering care." As to the propriety of persons mingling together in society without regard to age, Mr. Sawyer expresses opinions which many will regard as just. He says, "The natural and only safe mode of enjoying amusements is in common. When one sex, or any one particular class, enjoy their amusements alone, they are sure to run into excess. The reason of it is obvious. The arrangement of society into different sexes and different ages, was instituted, in divine wisdom, as a means to an end. The influence of one sex upon the other, and that of different ages upon each other, was intended to accomplish a great good. Each sex, and each age, has its particular office to perform in fitting the other sex, and others of different ages, for usefulness, honor,

and happiness." "A late traveller through our country has remarked upon the too prevalent habit that our young people have of excluding their elders from participation in their amusements." Christians ought certainly not to allow their children to go where it would be improper for themselves to appear, and it would, doubtless, be improving both to the manners and the morals of our youth, to bring their amusements and social intercourse more under the supervision of their parents.

Our author has dispersed through his book some excellent reflections on the subject of making *home* attractive. The want of love for the parental habitation, which the writer represents as existing, to so great an extent, among the sons and daughters of New England, is by no means confined to them, but is a widely prevailing, as it is a deeply to be deplored evil, in every portion of our land. We must not suppose, however, that those who leave the home of their youth, are always those who are least attached to it. Many leave it with tears, from necessity, or for noble aims, who cherish for it until death the most affectionate remembrance. We have not noticed, however, that the youth of those families in which fashionable amusements are practised, are more attached to home than others: but we have noticed that attachment for home is strong, where spiritual piety has been displayed, and family worship performed beneath the parental roof. Some sorts of amusements may be necessary to give to home its strongest attractions. Whether these are such as Mr. Sawyer represents the Christian community as setting their face against, is another question. It ought to be borne in mind that a gayety may be cherished, that produces heartlessness.

The author of this plea represents the Christian church as almost unanimously opposed to amusements in general. In this he does gross injustice. We know of no such opposition as that he describes. There are some amusements which Christians approve as beneficial in their tendencies. There are others, which they condemn as hurtful, and many, doubtless, err in supposing some amusements beneficial, that are really hurtful, while others suppose amusements to be hurtful, that in fact are beneficial. But the assertion that the Christian church is opposed to all amuse-

ments is far too sweeping and indiscriminating. The writer is especially severe on Roman Catholics for their opposition to amusements. This we confess excites our astonishment: since, despite their asceticism, they are generally most devoted to those very amusements which he is most zealous in defence of. All the world knows that they have manifested their asceticism more by inflicting bodily tortures, and denying themselves enjoyments, which can hardly be called amusements, such as marriage, than by abstaining from what are commonly called pleasures. Indeed they seem to compound for their pleasures by their penances. We have never known Roman Catholics to express any opposition to dancing or the theatre. On the contrary, many among them, who are regarded as exceedingly devout persons, patronize these means of pleasure. This plea for amusements would, doubtless, find much more favour among Papists, except for the allusion to the Roman Catholic church, than among Protestants. The writer himself cites Roman Catholic France as an example of the beneficial effects of amusements. We know that the French pursue all the pleasures he pleads for. All the holidays which Mr. Sawyer so much approves, are observed in Catholic countries: in all of them is dancing practiced, and the theatre visited. Roman Catholics have always favored amusements more than Protestants. Yet Mr. Sawyer thinks that Protestants have introduced more liberal opinions on this subject. He represents the first great check to the unnatural warfare against pleasures and amusements as given by the reformers under Luther. We are not aware that Luther was a warmer advocate for amusements than Leo the tenth, his illustrious Roman Catholic contemporary. We resent, however, the insinuation of this writer that the Reformers themselves had no admiration for the beautiful. Many of them were poets by nature. They were not indeed devoted much to amusements, because they had vastly serious business that called for most of their time and energies. But even the Reformers did not advance far enough in this matter to meet the unqualified approbation of our author. They were wrong on this subject, in his estimation, as well as Roman Catholics: and the whole Christian church has been in error in regard to it

for nearly nineteen centuries : and he is the wonderful man, raised up by Providence, doubtless, to produce a reformation in this matter — to set the church right. Even now, we are told, opposition to amusements is “the great distinguishing feature between the religious man, technically speaking, and the man of the world.” If this be true, it furnishes strong presumptive evidence that the author’s opinions are not right. “*Quod semper, ubique, ab omnibus,*” is a motto to which we have no particular hostility, because, so much have the opinions of Christians differed on important subjects, that if you find an opinion in which all of them, of all centuries, have concurred, you have the strongest presumptive, we would almost say conclusive, evidence of the truth of that opinion. What, however, must be this writer’s demand for amusement, if he asks for more than the Christian church has, sometimes allowed, not to say encouraged.

Mr. Sawyer draws from the Scriptures an argument in favour of amusements which seems to us far from being conclusive. We do not say that the propriety of amusements of some sort may not be proved from the Scriptures, but that this particular argument fails, and it deserves notice, because it is adduced to vindicate certain amusements, for which the writer is especially zealous. He endeavors to prove the propriety of amusements from the institution of the Sabbath and the appointment of religious festivals. It is a question whether these days were set apart for amusement and pleasure. The Sabbath was designed as a day of rest and religious worship, but in no proper sense as a day of amusement. We are not persuaded that any of the annual festivals of the Jews were set apart “expressly for light-hearted, social amusements.” They all had a higher — a religious object. Even if merry-making was allowed in these feasts, nothing can be proved from them in favor of holidays in general. The Jewish economy was established for a specific purpose — that purpose has been accomplished, and that economy has passed away. God doubtless granted these feasts to the Jews, as he did some other things, for the hardness of their hearts. The Jewish worship was designed to preserve the minds of the Jews from the influence of the surrounding idolatries. For this

purpose the splendid and costly temple at Jerusalem was built, and for this purpose the Jewish feasts were established. They were intended to draw the Jews to the holy city, and uniting them as a people, to preserve them from false religions. These ordinances were carnal, made appeals to the senses, which were then necessary, God incarnate, the great cure of idolatry, having not yet come. The Jewish festivals can prove nothing more at most than the propriety of religious festivals—but even that, they do not prove, any more than the existence of Solomon's temple proves that millions should be squandered now in the erection of a house of public worship, any more than the existence of instrumental music in the temple proves that organs ought to be used in our churches, any more than the splendid vestments of the Jewish priesthood prove that ministers of the Gospel ought to preach in gowns of lawn and silk. The Jewish worship was, doubtless, as spiritual as the circumstances of men, at the time of its existence, would allow it to be. But the incarnation of Christ has rendered such a worship unnecessary, and a more spiritual worship practicable, since his person has become the most attractive object to believers, and the most powerful defence against idolatry.

The author of this plea argues for the propriety of amusements from their influence in securing refinement of manners. Some amusements doubtless produce this effect, amusements that are, in all respects, innocent. Some amusements refine the manners, while they pollute the heart, and of course will be discountenanced by all who prefer good moral principles and habits to mere external refinement. But all amusements do not possess a refining influence: some debase the manners as well as the moral feelings. Of the brutalizing effects of the gladiatorial exhibitions at Rome, the author of the plea speaks with feeling; and it is well known that many of the barbarous nations of the world are devoted to the dance. The Christian church is represented as opposed to amusements, but we do not conceive that it offers any opposition to a single amusement that is necessary to produce refinement either of manners or of feeling.

Our author endeavors to be very amusing at the expense

of the Puritans, as he draws from their history an illustration of his subject. He says that "they did not have enough of the exhilaration of the pleasures of life to keep their hearts warm, their feelings gentle, and their minds free from the fogs and vapours of superstition and bigotry. This we see in their rough treatment of their neighbours, the Indians, and their fellow Christians, the Anabaptists and Quakers, and in the tendency of their minds towards the superstitious and marvellous." If it be necessary to the formation of the high principles that Puritans cherished, that we should entertain the contempt for amusements here ascribed to them, let us have the principles without the amusements. The Puritans, probably, persecuted as little as any other persons who ever had power. But is it certain that the persecutions, of which they were guilty, are to be ascribed to the absence of amusements among them? Were there no persecutions in "Merrie England," which our author contrasts, with England as it now is, so much to the disparagement of the latter? Charles the 2nd was a very merry man, and a very unfeeling one. Did pleasure-loving Virginians, before the Revolution, persecute no Baptists? Puritan persecutions are nothing compared with some others practiced by persons very devoted to amusements, and would not be remembered at all did they not conflict with the noble principles of religious freedom, that those heroic men were the first to avow, and which through their influence are becoming diffused through the world. We believe, however, that the Puritans of New England were not altogether without amusements. Thanksgiving day has been a right merry season in Yankee land, from a very early period of its history.

The author of this plea seems to think that the reason why religion seems so gloomy to many minds, is that the church has set itself in opposition to amusements. If men thought they could be truly religious, and at the same time run to the same excess of riot with the world around them, they would certainly have no objection to religion. If the rules of the church were so relaxed as to allow professing Christians to engage in all sorts of worldly amusements, she might, doubtless, be able to enrol many as church members who now despise her institutions. But to make men profess religion by means of such a compromise, were not

worth the trouble and the sacrifice it would cost. It would do them no good. It would do the church incalculable and irreparable wrong and harm. It is not opposition to amusements that makes religion appear gloomy to the world : for the most happy and cheerful Christians are not usually those who are most devoted to worldly amusements. It is the prayerfulness, and self-examination, and repentance, and spirituality, that religion requires, that makes it appear forbidding to unholy men.

The writer of this plea for amusements, in his zeal as an advocate, has altogether over-looked the danger of an excessive devotion to amusements. He seems to apprehend himself, and would lead his readers to apprehend, no such danger. It seems never to have occurred to him that a man may become so fond of pleasure, as to become a lover of pleasure more than a lover of God. An excessive devotion to amusements destroys all earnestness of character, relaxes the moral principles, totally unnerves the moral man, and sinks the subject of it, sooner or later, into utter contempt. We have seen young men from their fondness for pleasures and amusements neglect important business, or fail to fit themselves for any useful employment, and become drones in society, so often, that we are compelled to think that there is temptation enough to the young to take pleasure and amuse themselves without their needing the spur of a written plea. Appeals and arguments, so unqualified, as this writer has presented, are adapted to lead worldly-minded professors of religion to excesses that would be deeply injurious to their spiritual interests, and seriously detrimental to the reputation of the church. Most earnestly do we hope that the opinions, that have been entertained, in the Presbyterian church, in regard to what are denominated fashionable amusements, will continue to prevail there, no matter how many of the *élite*, who will be conformed to this world, she may lose by maintaining the old land marks. We hope that on this subject she will continue to maintain the high conservative position she has hitherto occupied.

The author of this plea has warmly advocated several amusements which most serious Christians in this country have united in condemning. He speaks of dancing in terms of high approbation. He says, "It may be well to

consider the prejudice that exists against dancing. With some few exceptions, the whole Christian church has been arrayed against that amusement for centuries. It is true, some denominations of Christians are less rigid in that particular than others ; but the general sentiment has been, to discountenance it altogether. What occasioned that hostility, when it arose, what good it has accomplished, what evil it has prevented, is veiled in obscurity." He is fully of the opinion that, on the whole, dancing has been favorable to the best interests of man : and it is the promiscuous dancing of the sexes that he approves. He appeals to the scriptures to bear him out in his opinion ; and thinks himself strongly fortified by the fact that "the dance was employed by the Jews, as a religious rite." We cannot agree in thinking that the fact, to which he alludes, shows the propriety of using the dance for merely social purposes. A writer of unquestionable authority (Rev. R. Jamieson,) says, "In early times, those who perverted the exercise (of dancing) from a sacred use, to purposes of amusement, were considered profane and infamous ; and hence Job introduces it as a distinguishing feature of the ungodly rich, that they encouraged a taste for dancing in their families. (Job, 21: 11.) They send forth their little ones like a flock, and their children *dance*." It is evident too that the sexes did not join promiscuously in the Jewish dance, and therefore, it can furnish no argument for dancing as now practiced. The writer just quoted says, "It remains to notice further that the Jewish dance was performed by the sexes separately. There is no evidence from sacred history that the amusement was promiscuously enjoyed, except it might be at the erection of the deified calf, when, in imitation of the Egyptian festival of Apes, all classes of the Hebrews mingled in the frantic revelry." It is not true that no argument can be adduced against dancing. The most conclusive argument, that experience has proved its evil tendencies, may be preferred against it. Dancing communities have generally been found to be composed of light, frivolous, and worldly-minded persons. Dancing families have rarely been found decidedly and eminently pious. Dancing Christians are not usually distinguished for their attainments in grace. Although it should be admitted that this amusement is not unfriendly to external morality, it

may be injurious to vital piety, unfavorable to revivals of religion and growth in grace. The fact that so little can be said against the amusement of dancing in the abstract, when considered in connexion with the other fact that Christians generally have opposed it at all times, deepens our conviction of its impropriety: since a custom, to which there exist so few palpable objections, would not have been disapproved so greatly and so generally, unless it had been proved by experience to be injurious at least to the interests of piety. Even the worldly portion of society regard dancing as too frivolous or too exciting an amusement for a Christian, and entertain a degree of contempt for those professors of religion who engage in it. It is often said that dancing parties are not more injurious than other large parties where there is no dancing. We are no apologists for large fashionable parties of any sort. Small social parties that meet early and separate early, are far more to our taste. But there is a peculiar excitement in dancing parties, which renders them injurious in proportion as they are fascinating, of which those who attend them need not be informed. They are peculiarly *dissipating*. Mr. Sawyer thinks that the effect of the opposition of Christians to dancing has been "to change it from the family circle to the public hall." But we know that the effect of this opposition has been, in many places of considerable size, entirely to suppress dancing, and that in most small towns, and in country neighbourhoods, where a religious influence prevails, public balls are very uncommon. We object to private dancing, on the very ground, that in our country at least, it leads, almost inevitably, to public balls, those scenes and sources of dissipation. Those, who never dance in private families, will never attain any great proficiency in the art of dancing, and will not be likely to attempt an exhibition of their skill in it, on a public arena.

The writer of the plea for amusements argues for the propriety of fostering theatrical entertainments. He commends them to our approbation, because they had a religious origin. That they originated in connexion with the idolatries of Greece and Rome, does not commend them to us. Nor does the modern drama seem worthy our regard because "we find the first rude effort to give it system and laws in the mysteries and miracles of the middle ages,"

that dark period of Roman Catholic corruptions and superstitions. Of course this writer thinks that the theatre, as it now exists, needs reform. He admits that "the denunciation of theatres, as they are, is right, and no one should patronize them, while they are arranged and conducted as they are," but he thinks, that Christians "can make theatres useful if they please." Truly theatres are now schools of vice, and, when considered with all their appendages, fountains of the grossest corruption. But the question is, can they not be made better. We believe that most of the evils that we see connected with the stage, are inseparable from it. We judge the future from the past, and that which has, always and under the most favorable circumstances, been deeply pernicious, we cannot hope to be rendered healthful. It is well known that the drama was expelled from Athens, and subsequently from Rome, on the ground that it corrupted the morals of their youth. The most judicious of the heathen even, are represented as denouncing the theatre, as Solon, Plato, Cato, Seneca, and Tacitus. It would be indeed a dangerous experiment for Christians to attempt to purify the stage by yielding it their patronage. Garrick is said to have attempted to make the theatre at least not a source of positive corruption, but although he occupied a more favorable position for effecting such a reform than any other man ever has, his efforts were unsuccessful. As long as human nature continues the same, the theatre must be a source of moral pollution, because the majority of those who patronize it must always be the idle, the dissipated, the vicious, and play-actors, like other men, will suit their wares to the tastes of those who buy. What Pollock has said of the theatre deserves the consideration of all Christians.

"The theatre, was, from the very first,
The favourite haunt of sin, though honest men,
Some very honest, wise, and worthy men,
Maintained it might be turned to good account,
And so perhaps it might, but never was.
From first to last, it was an evil place:
And now such things were acted there, as made
The devil blush; and from the neighbourhood,
Angels and holy men, trembling, retired."

The author of the plea for amusements is a zealous advocate for the observance of Christmas. Of all the holidays

there are none, to his mind, so dear in association, and so worthy of universal observance. He regards it as unquestionably of divine origin: yet thinks that it is properly observed as a day of recreation, feasting and sport. We must express a doubt as to its divine origin. There is certainly in the New Testament no command to observe it. Many good christians have supposed that the precise day of the Saviour's nativity can not be ascertained at all, and has been concealed to prevent its celebration, as the body of Moses was concealed to prevent the idolatrous worship of his bones. The origin of Christmas was heathen rather than divine. It is well ascertained that it originated among the Romans. More than three and a half centuries of the Christian era passed away before it was at all observed in the East. According to Neander, "Chrysostom, in a discourse pronounced at Antioch, on the twenty-fifth of December, 386, says expressly that Christmas had become known there less than ten years before." The same historian informs us that this feast first makes its appearance, as one generally celebrated in the Roman church, after the middle of the fourth century: although he asserts, at the same time, that it was not then wholly new. Selden in his "Table Talk," probably, gives the true origin of Christmas. He says, "Christmas succeeds the Saturnalia: the same time, the same number of holidays; then the master waited on the servant like the lord of misrule."

The moral and religious influence of the observance of Christmas has never been good. It has usually been a day of unhallowed mirth, of sinful festivity, a day spent in intemperate pleasures. The mode of its observance has, no where, been suitable to the anniversary of the birth of the author of a spiritual religion and the Saviour of the world. We would object to its observance, even if performed in a better spirit: for the experience of the church has shown that to observe periodically other religious days than God has appointed inevitably diminishes the respect that ought to be paid to the day that God has certainly hallowed.

Our author admires the olden mode of celebrating Christmas in England. He speaks with admiration of "the gallant youth, who did not forget to hang up the mistletoe with

its white berries, to the imminent peril of all the pretty maids that ventured beneath it." He faintly intimates the propriety of decorating churches with ever-greens on Christmas day: the origin of which custom his allusion to the mistletoe, might have led him to think of as Druidical.

We are not informed whether the personal character of Mr. Sawyer lends any weight to his opinions. We do not question the purity of his motives and the honesty of his aims in presenting this plea to the public. We give him credit for a full persuasion, that, by its publication, he is advancing the interests of religion as well as the general welfare of society: and we acknowledge that, in the discussion of his subject, he has presented much that is worthy to be admired and approved. But besides disapproving of many of the particular amusements that he has chosen to recommend, we regard the general spirit of his book as opposed to vital piety and even common morality, and as having as little harmony with evangelical doctrines, as many of the amusements, that he advocates, have agreement with the habits and character of the Puritans.

ARTICLE V.

. ROMANS, 9TH CHAP. I—V. VERSES.

1. *I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost.* 2. *That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart.* 3. *For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.*

Some have made the expression, "I speak the truth in Christ," an oath, thus: I speak the truth by Christ. This

is rather an unusual translation of ἐν Χριστῷ, and as this is a very common expression in New Testament usage to denote union with Christ, it is better to understand it to mean, I speak as a Christian man. To testify in the Lord, is to testify as one united to the Lord. (2 Cor. 12: 19.) "We in Christ," "Of whom ye are in Christ." It is hardly necessary, therefore, to consider these words as Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others have done as an oath. They simply contain a solemn asseveration.

"My conscience bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost," some connect with οὐ ψεύδομαι. I do not lie, by the Holy Ghost, so as to make it an oath to correspond with ἐν Χριστῷ. Others connect them with συνειδήσεως, my conscience enlightened by the Holy Ghost. Others connect these words with συμμαρτυρουσῆς my conscience testifies with the Holy Ghost, both are witnesses. The first is harsh and unnatural. The second would require the article τῆς to be repeated before ἐν πνεύματι, to make it evident that such is the meaning. The third opinion is therefore most reasonable. The sense is also good.

V. 3. This wish of Paul has been interpreted, 1st. to refer to the past time, I did wish ηὐχόμεν being certainly in the imperfect indicative. 2nd. Some think that the wish is real and unconditional: that Paul was really willing to be damned for the glory of God, as some of the extreme Hopkinsians in this country have held. 3rd. Others make the wish conditional, I could if it were lawful, or possible. 4th. Others again interpret it to mean temporal calamities, connected with spiritual darkness.

1st. As to the use of the imperfect ηὐχόμεν in a conditional sense. There can be no doubt of such an usage in Greek, as Mark 14: 21. καλὸν ἦν, It would have been well, if he had never been born. ἐβουλομένη Acts 25: 22, means, I also could wish to hear the man;* this is the doctrine of all the grammars. Some say the imperfect, because it does not signify a completed action, and is used to signify an effort or endeavor, is adapted to convey the idea that a thing is conditional; as Bernhardt. ἂν added to the verb would make the wish impossible.† This, there-

* See also 2 Peter 2: 21. Acts 22: 22. 2 Cor. 12: 11.

† See Kühner on *αν*, and Winer, page 222.

fore, may be regarded as a settled point. Beyond all question Paul would have used the aorist ἠυξάμεν, if he had referred to his wish when an enemy of Christ, because the action would have been a completed one in the past time.

The first thing to be done is to settle the meaning of the word ἀνάθεμα; for on this every thing depends. From its etymology it might mean any thing separated or set aside, for any purpose whatever. But it is not so used. As things devoted to God were separated it meant a gift hung up in a temple; and then among the heathen, one devoted to the infernal gods.* But its meaning will better appear by considering its usage.

In the Septuagint this word is used fourteen times, and is generally the translation of *hherem*, which in its ground form means "to cut off;" and then to devote to destruction. It is used to denote the cities devoted to destruction when Canaan was conquered by the Israelites. It came to mean in the Rabbinical Hebrew, "excommunication," and generally the greater excommunication. The word ἀνάθεμα is used to denote a town, or city, or thing, which was to be destroyed, as for example, Jericho is called anathema, Joshua 6: 17; the two hundred shekels of silver, the golden wedge, and the Babylonish garment, are called anathema five times in the seventh chapter of Joshua; and yet the gold and silver was, by an express law, required to be consecrated to God, and not to be destroyed. The cities of the Hittites, the Amorites, the Hivites, &c., are called anathema, in which nothing that breathed was left alive. Deut. 20: 17.† In this case, however, men are included, but temporal death is probably the extent of the idea attached to the word. In Deut. 13; 17, the spoil of the Canaanites is called anathema. The prophet Zechariah uses this word, 14: 11, to denote the destruction of Jerusalem. Of a city enticing Israel to idolatry, Moses says, it shall be destroyed utterly: the Septuagint has it, shall be anathematised with an anathema. In Deut. 6: 7, it is unquestionably applied to men, and not to things. Thou

* It is the testimony of some Greek writers that ἀνάθημα is an Attic form of the word, and ἀνάθεμα a Hellenistic form. Whatever the true theory may be, it is certain that ἀνάθημα is used in the New Testament for gifts in the temple, and ἀνάθεμα in a bad sense.

† See Fritzsche.

shalt not bring an abominable thing into thy house, lest thou be an anathema like it. These are all the cases in which the word is used in the Old Testament. In only one case is it used in reference to men alone, though they are included in one or two other cases. I know that it may be inferred that eternal destruction took place in the cases in which men are mentioned, but it is only an inference; for nothing is plainer than that in a passage where household furniture is declared to be destroyed, and the lives of irrational animals, temporal death is all we can certainly affirm of men, who are in the same category. We have then no clear case in the Old Testament in which this word means eternal death. As to its use by the church fathers, little need be said. Early in the fourth century, (324,) it began to be in the canons as the form of excommunication.* Hesychius, a grammarian of the City of Alexandria, of high authority, who lived in the third or fourth century, gives as one definition of this word, "*excommunicated*." It came then early to mean excommunication. It also retained the meaning, "everlasting destruction," and was used for profane and impure things.

We must now consider the New Testament usage of this word. It is found in Acts 23: 14, when more than forty Jews bound themselves by a curse, anathema,† neither to eat or drink until they had killed Paul. This vow or oath was taken by Jews, and not by Christians, or persons under Christian influence, and is therefore to be interpreted according to Jewish notions on the subject of vows or oaths. I have carefully examined Lightfoot,‡ and other authorities, on Jewish vows. I find no place in which any imprecation as to the loss of happiness in another world accompanied a vow or oath. I have found examples in which the person swearing or vowing calls down on his head temporal calamities, but in most cases there is no imprecation of any sort whatever. If such imprecations exist, they are merely implied in the nature of an oath or vow.

* The Apostolic fathers do not use this word; nor does Justin Martyr.

† This word is rendered in both the Syriac Versions by the word *hherem*.

‡ Page 200 and 201, Vol. 1.

If these views are correct, then, so far as there is any presumption on the subject, it is decidedly against the idea of eternal death, being connected with the word anathema.

The next places in which the word occurs are 1 Cor. 12: 3, and 16: 22, in the first of which it is said simply that no man can call Christ anathema by the Holy Ghost; and in the second "If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be anathema maranatha." The first simply states a negative proposition which settles nothing as to the meaning of the word, except that it is the opposite of faith and love to Christ. The second simply states the fact that the enemies of Christ shall be accursed when he comes, which we are ready to admit implies eternal destruction if the coming is to execute final judgment.

The last instance of the use of this word in the New Testament, is in Gal. 1: 8, 9. "If we or an angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel, let him be anathema." The idea here surely cannot be eternal death, because the man who thus preaches might repent and be saved. To preach another Gospel was very common then, as it has been since; and its effect has been to procure the exclusion of the person preaching it from the society of the faithful.

We are now prepared to enquire into the meaning of Paul's wish in the passage under consideration. That it cannot be, that he was willing to be forever lost, for the glory of God, seems to be evident, without much reasoning; for man's salvation more glorifies God than his ruin, according to the Scriptures, and to be willing to be lost is to be willing to blaspheme God forever. It is also contrary to one of the strongest and most unconquerable instincts of our nature, the desire of happiness and self-preservation.

As to the third opinion, it is encumbered with many difficulties. If the wish is conditional, what is the condition? I could wish myself accursed *if it were lawful*, or *if it were possible*? Both have their advocates. If the first is adopted, then the meaning of the passage is, I could wish to be eternally lost, but it is not lawful. Then the unlawfulness of the wish is the only reason why it is not carried out. If it were lawful, it would be a real *bona fide* wish. There is then no impossibility in the wish. Its unlawfulness, however, is an addition which we are not warranted in making.

The conditional particles in Greek are not of this character, nor are the conditional modes to be thus interpreted. As to the second, it destroys all sense in the passage. I could wish *if it were possible*, means that it is impossible to wish it and therefore I have no wish on the subject. The true interpretation of the condition here implied is, that the wish would have been fulfilled if in so doing Paul could have saved his Jewish brethren.

The fourth interpretation, which we are disposed to adopt, is surrounded with scarcely less difficulty than the rest. It makes Paul willing to be banished from the church and to die a temporal death, to become a *piaculum*,* as Bretschneider has it, an expiation for the Jews, if that would save them. The difficulty in this interpretation arises from the phrase *απο χριστου*. To translate it, by Christ, as some have done, or to make it mean *the church* as others have done, though there is usage for both translations, seems to be rather forced, especially as the idea of separation is certainly in the word *anathema* itself.

Ver. 5. Who is God over all blessed for ever.

The Socinian interpretation of this passage is, either that the connexion with what goes before is broken at the word *σαρκα*, or after the word *παντων*, so as to read "*God is over all blessed for ever*," or Christ being over all the fathers, *God be blessed for ever*. The Arian interpretation lets the passage stand as it is and gives the word *θεος* such a meaning as suits his views. The Trinitarian view is that Christ has true and proper divinity ascribed to him here. The words *κατα σαρκα*, as they state the origin of Christ's human nature, make it reasonable to suppose that some other nature is expressed or understood, which is contrasted with it and which he did not derive from his Hebrew fathers. This is very naturally supplied by the part of the verse now under consideration. If Christ has only one nature it would seem to be absurd to say, *according to the flesh* he descended from the fathers.

* Bretschneider is of opinion that *anathema* means *piaculum*, and he is ridiculed for it by Fritzsche. But if a man devoted to the infernal gods is denoted by this word, he is in a heathen sense a *piaculum*. And if it means destruction in a Christian sense, then the idea that it is done to satisfy divine justice is in the word, and this is not very different from a *piaculum*. Bretschneider then is not far wrong. See Bretschneider on the word, and Fritzsche, in loc.

ὁ ὢν stands here for ὅς ἐστι as in John 1: 18. ὁ ὢν who is in the bosom of the Father, and John 12: 17. 3: 13, and 2, Cor. 11: 31.

The position of εὐλογητός is not as it is in all cases where there is a doxology. It is in such cases before and not after θεός. In thirty-four cases in the Septuagint in which there is a doxology *God be blessed*, εὐλογητός is found before θεός, and in three cases in which it is simply asserted that God is blessed εὐλογητός is found after θεός or κύριος. The same order is observed in the New Testament. In four cases in which there is a doxology εὐλογητός is placed before θεός, and in two cases in which it is simply asserted that he is blessed, it is put after it.*

It would also seem to be proper, as on the Socinian supposition a new subject is introduced, that there should be something to indicate the change, such as δὲ. The relative ought to agree with an antecedent, but in this case the rule is violated, and *who is* does not refer to Christ according to Socinians. The break in the sentence is so harsh and abrupt on the Socinian hypothesis that it is difficult to see how a candid man can maintain it. No parallel case can be found in the New Testament, ἐπὶ πάντων is equivalent to saying Christ is the supreme God.

* Luke 1: 68. 2 Cor. 1: 3. Ephes. 1: 3. 1 Peter 1: 3. For other usage Rom. 1: 25. 2 Cor. 11: 31. εὐλογημένος the participle is used eighteen times in the Septuagint, on precisely the same principle, so we have at least forty-eight cases clearly establishing this usage.

ARTICLE VI.

1. *Correspondence between the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions, the Rev. S. B. TREAT, and the Prudential Committee of the A. B. C. F. M. Missionary Herald for October, 1848.*
2. *The Negro Law of South Carolina, collected and digested by JOHN BELTON O'NEALL, one of the Judges of the Courts of Law and Errors of the said State, under a Resolution of the State Agricultural Society of South Carolina. Columbia: Printed by John G. Bowman, 1848.*
3. *Considerations upon the nature and tendency of Free Institutions, by FREDERICK GRIMKE, Cincinnati. H. W. Derby & Co., publishers. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1848. 8vo. 544 pages.*

"The powers that be are ordained of God." Here is the Christian doctrine of the origin of government. Civil polity is not a device of man, but the institution of God, nor is it the result of a compact between the individuals of a multitude, each of whom was previously the sole master of himself. It is rather the offspring of the nature and providential circumstances which God has assigned to man. It is pure fiction to assert that the state of nature ever was a state of individual independence. Mankind from the beginning never have existed otherwise than in society and under government. The principle of subjection to government is not that principle of common honesty which binds a man to his own engagements, nor yet that principle of political honesty which binds the child to his ancestors' engagements; for of all the rightful subjects of government that do now exist, or ever did exist, not one in a million ever yielded his consent, or was ever asked for his consent to any such compact. The principle of subjection to government is a conscientious submission to the will of God. The Creator originally destined man for society and civil-

ization. These, and not barbarism and personal savage independence, are his natural state.* And consequently, all those rights and all those various subordinations of personal condition, which are necessary to the perfection of society and to the full development of humanity, are strictly and perfectly natural. That is as truly natural to which nature in its progress invariably conducts us, as that which is actually born with us.

The acquired perceptions of sight are no less natural than those which are original.

If, therefore, the "state of nature," commonly so called, be a mere dream of the imagination, what are we to say of "natural rights," as founded upon that fictitious basement?

We say that, as to an absolute equality among men, it neither has existed nor does exist as a fact; nor yet is it any where demanded by the Scriptures.

* The opinion that in the earliest periods of time mankind in every part of the globe were in a state of absolute savagism, forms the basis of Lord Kaimes's well known work called "Sketches of the history of man." The late Dr. Doeg of Sterling, replied to Lord Kaimes, in "Two letters on the savage state," illustrating all his positions by a great number of particulars from ancient and modern history. Among other propositions, Dr. Doeg established the following:

"The more populous kingdoms were civilized at a period prior to the records of history, and the presumption therefore is, that they were civilized from the beginning."

"No people once civilized, and then again reduced to barbarism, have ever recovered without foreign aid."

"No savage nation has ever been known to move one step towards civilization, till impelled by some external cause."

"There appears in savages a natural and rooted aversion to a civilized state."

"There seems to be in human nature an innate propensity towards degeneracy, even in a state of the highest improvement."

And in concluding he challenged Lord Kaimes to point to *one* state, nation, or society, once confessedly savage, which ever did, solely by the gradual exertion of its own internal powers, after passing successively through the steps and states specified in Lord K's. sketches, at length arrive at civilization.

Shortly after the publication of these "Letters," Lord Kaimes invited the Doctor to visit him, when, after much discussion, his Lordship candidly and fully acknowledged himself in error and his opponent right.

Dr. Doeg traced the "idea of a state of universal savagism to the chimerical cosmogonies of Mochus, Democritus and Epicurus." We see only one difference between this idea and that of the author of the "Vestiges,"—one goes a little further back than the other. Lord Kaimes developes civilized man out of a *savage*,—the other writer out of an *oyster*! But Christian minds that shrink with horror from the one theory are quite familiar with the other, all contrary as it is to Bible history.

The Poet well says :

“Tell the truth, yea, tell it out,
Nature! without fear or doubt.
Tell it out that never yet
Have two utter equals met.
Leaves and fruits on every tree,
Fowls and fish of air and sea,
Stars on high with all their host,
Pebbles from a Kingdom's coast,
Search them all, some difference still
Clings to each for good or ill;
Search the world—all worlds around,
Perfect twins were never found;
Babes of various realm and race,
Men of every age and place;
Gifts of God, or wise denials,
Pleasures, sorrows, triumphs, trials :
All things differ every where,—
Never two could start quite fair—
Never two could keep the start,
In soul or body, mind or heart;
While the shortest winter's day,
To its morrow gloom'd away.”

And, *as to the Bible*, it gives no countenance to the common radical notions on this subject. It teaches, indeed, that we are *all Brethren*. But Esau and Jacob were brethren of whom before the children were born or had yet done good or evil. God said, “The elder shall serve the younger.” The Bible presents God as the sovereign Arbiter of human affairs, dividing to the nations their inheritance—yes, and “setting every individual member in the (great social) body just as it hath pleased him.” (1 Cor. 12: 18.) The subjection, by God, of one man and one nation to another man and another nation, is supposed throughout the Bible as an ordinary and constantly recurring fact. The Christian fathers, too, for many centuries after Christ, are totally silent as to any opposition of Christianity to slavery. It was a common saying among them however, that slavery is not man's natural state, but a result of the fall—in other words, they viewed it as one of the allotments of Providence to man, as having sinned and so forfeited liberty and every other blessing with life itself.

In this day of wide spread agitation about rights of liberty, and of rising agitation too about rights of property, rent, land, &c., the Bible is our stronghold. In the tenth Commandment, graven with God's finger on marble, we find

a divine solemn recognition of *rights of property*: "Thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbors." Do you find yourself *without things*, that is, *poor*? See that you do not even *wish* in your heart to have your neighbor's things, however abundantly the sovereign but righteous Lord of all may have bestowed them upon him in contrast with yourself. The same divine Commandment sanctions even the *right of property in a human being*, and thus gives warrant to our rights of authority as slave holders. The Lawgiver says, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's." Does the almighty God then count slaves as human cattle? Is the slave a mere thing? Far from it! He is an immortal man, but has a human master by God's appointment, and that master has a right of property in him—has a right in his services which no other man can innocently covet. Nay, the slave himself must not covet or take what belongs not to himself. But on the contrary, it is said to him, "Art thou called being a slave, care not for it."* (1 Cor. 7: 21.)

The Scriptures then did not originate the idea that all men, simply from the fact of being *men*, have a natural right to an equal amount of property, or an equal share of personal liberty. There are rights unquestionably, which belong to man as such, and which can not be wrested from him without the destruction of his intellectual and moral constitution. Without them he could not be a *man*. But there are other rights which accrue in the progress of society, and which appertain not to man *as such*, but to man in particular providential circumstances and relations. These rights are as natural as others, because society and civiliza-

* On the other clause we quote, without any expression of opinion, a note from Babington's Hulsean Lecture on the *Influence of Christianity in promoting the abolition of Slavery in Europe*, p. 15.

"The doubt is what *it* (not expressed in the Greek) means; several very eminent commentators quoted in Pool's Synopsis, and also Usher and Neander say, 'liberty:' but Chrysostom, Jerome, Theodoret, Isidorus, Pelusiot, Œcumenius, Photius, and Theophylact, explain 'it' by 'slavery'; and this sense, it must be confessed, suits the context admirably; not to add that *ei καὶ* commonly signifies not 'if' but 'although.' See Cramer's *Catena in Epist. Paul.* 5: 1, p. 141, for some of these authorities. Chrysostom mentions that others took the verse quite the opposite way, and Saverianus, his contemporary, appears to have done so. Cramer, l. c."

tion, which develope them, are natural; but they cannot be separated from the circumstances and relations which determine them; and hence, men in other circumstances and other relations can lay no claim to them.

It is a mistake to suppose that because these rights are *natural*, therefore they belong to humanity, essentially considered, and must accordingly be conceded to every human being, because he is a man. The rights of a father are natural, but they belong only to fathers. Rights of property are natural, but they belong only to those who have property. There is a natural way of becoming a father, and there is a natural method of acquiring and indefinitely increasing property.

Where then do we place the foundation of all rights? In the nature which God has given to man. It is that which renders him capable of rights. A brute can neither have property nor dominion; for rights can no where exist, except among those who are susceptible of moral obligation.

Of course, therefore, all those rights which belong to men as such, should be conceded to the race. None should any where be deprived of them. But the rights which belong to particular conditions, those which result from the circumstances and relations in which men are placed, must obviously admit of as great a variety as those circumstances and relations themselves; and these rights are distributed under the providence of God, according to those laws (as natural as society itself,) in conformity with which men come to be found in these circumstances and relations. Some are rulers, some subjects; some are rich, some poor; some are fathers, some children; some are bond, some free. And if a man is justly and providentially a ruler, he has the rights of a ruler; if a husband, the rights of a husband; if a father, the rights of a father; and if a slave, only the rights of a slave. Hence the force and propriety of the legal maxim, *Partus sequitur ventrem* — that is, all men have an equal and perfect right to the *status* in which they are born, with all its established rights and privileges, and also to whatever else they can legally and meritoriously acquire. Our true and only titles to liberty and property are *Inheritance*, or *honest and legal acquisition*, (both dependent upon the discriminations of Providence,) and not

any *abstract natural Equality*, stepping in at every succeeding age, among the social and political inequalities necessarily produced even in one generation, and laying all level in confusion and destruction. We hold such an Equality to be—

“A dull, debasing, sordid thing,
Crushing down each generous spring;
A stern Procrustes’ iron bed,
To rack the feet or lop the head.”

It is nothing but—

“Vanity and Sloth and Crime that stand,
With low Ambition hand to hand,
And scheme and plot a cunning plan,
Utterly to ruin man;
They seek to level love and hate,
And grind to atoms all things great.”

The only way of evading the statements now made, as far as slavery is concerned, is to deny that this condition is consistent with the appointments of Providence, or the will of God — in other words, to assert (as we both wonder and regret to see the Prudential Committee of the American Board asserting) that Slavery is “Anti Christian and always and every where sinful.” That cannot be Anti-Christian however, which Christ and the Apostles never condemned. And slavery must just be left to stand upon the same footing with any other inequality of condition, until some higher revelation than the Bible’s shall shew that the revelation itself is inconsistent with the moral nature of man, and deprives him of his ethick character; — in other words, that man cannot be a slave, and yet fear God and work righteousness.

That these were the principles of the English and American Revolutions, is obvious from the fact that the patriotic actors in those great events professed to contend for nothing but a lawful inheritance; — rights which had long before been connected with the circumstances and relations in which they were providentially placed. “Your subjects have *inherited* this freedom,” * was the language of the

* Macauley, in his recently published History remarks, vol 1, p. 23, “The change, great as it is, which the policy of England has undergone

petition of right (drawn by Selden and other profoundly learned men,) and addressed by Parliament to Charles I. To that Parliament which resisted Charles' encroachments on their inherited rights are due the thanks of their American as much as of their English posterity. We repudiate the popular idea that our Revolution freed us from British slavery. We were no Slaves. Our fathers contended for their lawful franchises, not on abstract principles as the *rights of men*, but on legal principles as the *rights of Englishmen*, and as a patrimony derived from their forefathers.

But we are only laying down general principles. We do not forget that every case of Revolution is to be decided on its own merits. "Times and occasions teach their own lessons." "Circumstances (which with some pass for nothing,) give in reality to every political principle its distinguishing color and its discriminating effect." We have undertaken to set forth the general bearing of Christianity on human rights. We understand the general doctrine of the Scriptures to be, that a nation, and that individuals,

during the last six centuries, has been the effect of gradual development, not of demolition and reconstruction. The present Constitution of our country is, to the Constitution under which she flourished five hundred years ago, what the tree is to the sapling, what the man is to the boy. The alteration has been great. Yet there never was a moment, at which, the chief part of what existed was not old. * * * * Other Societies possess written constitutions more symmetrical; but no other society has yet succeeded in uniting revolution with prescription, progress with stability, the energy of youth with the majesty of immemorial antiquity. * * * * There is no country where statesmen have been so much under the influence of the past. * * * *

History is (by us) regarded as a *repository of title-deeds*, on which the rights of governments and nations depend. * * * * Our laws and customs have never been lost in general and irreparable ruin. With us, the precedents of the middle ages are still valid precedents, and are still cited on the gravest occasions by the most eminent statesmen. Thus, when King George III. was attacked by the malady which made him incapable of performing his regal functions, and when the most distinguished lawyers and politicians differed widely as to the course which ought to be pursued, the houses of Parliament would not proceed to discuss any plan of regency, till all the examples which were to be found in our annals, from the earliest times, had been collected and arranged. Committees were appointed to examine the ancient records of the realm. The first precedent reported was that of the year 1217: much importance was attached to the precedents of 1326, of 1377, and of 1422; but the case which was justly considered as most in point was that of 1455. Thus, in our country, the dearest interests of parties have frequently been staked on the results of the researches of antiquaries.

who enjoy political freedom, have the same, and no other, right to it which the rich man's son has to the property he was born to; and that other nations or individuals, born under despotic governments, are bound to submit to the inequalities of their position, just as the poor man's child who inherits nothing; unless like many a poor man's son he can legally and meritoriously acquire what he has not inherited. If a Monarch is born to the arbitrary sway of millions, or a slaveholder to the rule of hundreds, the Bible teaches respecting both, that Cesar has his "things" which must be rendered to him. If the subjects of either Cesar refuse him his "things" they sin. If they seek to wrest away his rights that they may increase their own, they commit the same fault, as if the many poor should rise and forcibly take away the possessions of the few rich. Nations and individuals have no scriptural right to get either freedom or property in this way. They are in God's hands, who has put upon them this burden, and they must be content to remain in God's hands, doing their duty in the place he has appointed them.

Do we then maintain the doctrine of *passive obedience*? We regret this error of the "old exploded fanatics" of slavery with as much abhorrence as we do that of our "new fanatics," of equal universal freedom.* Magistrates and Kings, and Masters too, are to be obeyed as such, and not otherwise. The veriest Despot on earth is obeyed as one that has arbitrary, yet not unlimited power. If the Shah of Persia were to prove himself a human tiger, immolating his subjects, just to please his infernal cruelty, we say that, even under that despotism, Christianity would authorize the nation, not *any individual*, but *the nation collectively*, to put him off his throne.† "Tyranny from policy may justi-

* "The speculative line of demarcation where obedience ought to end and resistance must begin is indeed faint, obscure, and not easily definable. It is not a single act or a single event which determines it. Governments must be abused and deranged indeed, before it can be thought of, and the prospect of the future must be as bad as the experience of the past. When things are in that lamentable condition, the nature of the disease is to indicate the remedy, to those whom nature has qualified to administer in extremities this critical, ambiguous, bitter potion to a distempered State," and "a Revolution will always be the very last resource of the thinking and the good." But even here the general principle is very plain.

† In this connexion it is well worth our while to observe the method by which God delivered his chosen people from the land of Egypt. Though

fy rebellion from principle." God made the Shah of Persia a Despot, but he gave him no authority to kill after that fashion. That is not one of "Cesar's things."

So, much more under a constitutional government, the people have a right, nay, are bound to defend what Providence has given them, — what they have *inherited*, whether of liberty or of property. The Commons of England had a right to resist the encroachments of Charles I. The English nation, in 1688, had a right to resist the second James. And our fathers of the Revolution had a right to contend for their old inheritance, as Britons, of the right of being represented where they were to be taxed.

Thus, according to our views of the Christian doctrine on this subject, the duties and the rights of nations both differ according to their circumstances. Of some, the duty is obedience and submission to authority even the most arbitrary; while others may have to guard watchfully, and faithfully defend their inheritance of freedom. Their duties differ, because their providential position differs. They may be servants of their despot, and then they must obey. They may be masters of their public servants, and then they must see that these do faithfully perform their various offices and functions.

We would not deny that there has been in the affairs of men, under providential guidance, a progress of liberty. And this progress of liberty it may be the will of the Almighty Ruler to extend, until free institutions become universal. Nor yet do we deny that, in the providence of God, liberty has often changed hands. Nor would we question that the most wicked and bloody revolutions may be by God over-ruled, for the final general good. We believe all events are so over-ruled. Still, such a merciful divine interposition does not exculpate the guilty movers of rebellion.*

in bondage to Idolaters, who oppressed them in the most cruel manner, they strike not one blow for themselves, nor take one step in flight, till the authority which God had put them under was made willing to say, "Get ye out." So too, at a later day, when captives in Babylon, they were directed, "seek the peace of the city, whither I have caused you to be carried captives, and pray unto the Lord for it, for in the peace thereof ye shall have peace." Jer. xxix: 7. Waiting through the whole period of 70 years, they are peacefully led back to their own land, as God disposes the heart of Cyrus to favour their return.

* See all these sentiments fully sustained in Calvin's Institutes, Book IV., chapter xx, Sections xxix, xxx and xxxi.

We hold to the general principle before stated, that every soul must be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God.

It may be said that we have written to no purpose, seeing that we have only set forth very general principles. But we think the principles we have set forth are neither more nor less general than the Bible's. We have developed, as we think, the Scriptural doctrine of human rights. The world is governed by ideas. "Theories industrial, social and political—abstract opinions, Utopian dreams are upheaving the old world." The new is also agitated by a theory—the theory of free soil and free slaves—yes, and "questions in obscurer channels, about rent and property, and the right to labor, and to the land, are spreading themselves through the land." Thousands are proclaiming that there is no right of property in human beings, and *hundreds have begun to shout* that there is no right of rent, and that no man has a right to any more land than he can cultivate. Against all these general principles we set ours,—nay, not *ours*, but those of God's inspired word.

It is indeed a very practical, and not at all a mere abstract question; what is the influence of Christianity upon Slavery?—upon the *Slave*, upon the *Master*, and upon the *permanency of the relation*.

It has been said by a Northern divine that, "if the gospel were as evangelically preached at the South as it is at the North," (say in New England,) "Slavery would soon come to an end." The Prudential Committee of the American Board, also, in their letter to the Choctaw Missionaries, say, that if our Saviour's golden rule "were carried out to its legitimate results, Slavery in all its essential features would cease at once."

But what is Slavery? There is no end to this discussion, because different parties use Slavery to mean very different things. Dr. Whewell's definition prevails, we suppose, very generally in New England. "Slavery converts a person into a thing, an object merely passive, without any of the recognized attributes of human nature."

This was Aristotle's idea when he advised Alexander to deal with the Barbarians as with brutes or plants. This was the spirit, and letter too, of the Roman law, which held slaves, "*pro nullis, pro mortuis, pro quadrupedibus*." But

these are not our modern, our Southern ideas of Slavery. And old school Presbyterians at the North have given another, and what we take as the true definition of the term, "All the ideas (says the Biblical Repertory) which necessarily enter into the definition of Slavery are, deprivation of personal liberty, obligation of service at the discretion of another, and the transferable character of the authority and claim of the master." It may be that some bad, very bad laws have been passed to regulate Slavery. There may be some unchristian abuses of the master's power — some sinful accessories attaching to the institution — but the essence of slavery is the master's right to use and control and dispose of the services of his slave.

Now Christianity *unquestionably sanctions Slavery*, as thus defined. This is one manifest bearing of Christianity upon the institution. We do not say that Christianity sanctions Slavery as Aristotle sanctioned it, when he said that the Greeks might rightfully go and by war reduce the Barbarians into bondage. But we think we are often so misunderstood at the North. Our statement that the Bible sanctions Slavery arouses much needless indignation, because the North will not distinguish between the right to govern our Slaves, as being providentially placed under our control, and the right of going and enslaving men free-born.

And here we will refer to another expression of opinion at the South, which very likely is often misunderstood. Southern politicians say, "Slavery is a positive blessing." In the fear of God we, and all other Christians that we know of, say the same thing, *absolutely*, as respects the negro. As respects the whole community of whites and blacks, whom an unscrutable but wise Providence has joined here together, we also say the same thing, *as comparing Slavery with Emancipation*. But as comparing the present advantages of our white population with what they might have been, had not the negro been introduced, the Christian people of the South have never yet said that Slavery is a positive blessing, and we know not that they will ever be driven by all the fierceness of the attacks upon them to say so. Why should they say so, or why should they say the contrary? Why waste time in vain speculations about unsupposable cases, when we have so much practical duty not yet overtaken?

We repeat, Christianity sanctions the relation of Master and Slave. The Bible is the best book for those who are low down as well as for those who are high up in the scale of life. It suits people living under a despotic government, quite as well as it suits those who live under a free government. It is as safe a book for the subjects of the one as for the sons of the other.

But Christianity also civilizes the Slave. It is as good for Slaves, however fierce and ungovernable naturally, as it is for the Convicts of the Penitentiary, or the Lunatics of the Asylum. Not that it renders force always unnecessary. We must keep a rod for the backs of wayward children and Slaves, if not for those of soldiers and seamen. But men are no where on earth governed mainly by force. Moral means are mightiest, and of all moral means Christianity is the purest and the strongest. The British government once dreaded, but now fosters, the influence of the Missionaries, even the American Missionaries, in India.

In a word, Christianity improves the Slave in all parts of his character. It takes away piece-meal the mass of barbarian ignorance, superstition and corruption. It is advantageous to their whole physical, intellectual and moral nature. It makes the Slaves better, more intelligent, industrious, tractable, trusty, — better men, better servants of God, better servants of man. "The Slave," says Neander, in reference to the first three centuries, (Vol. 1, p. 71, Rose's translation,) "remained in all his worldly circumstances a Slave, and fulfilled his duties in that station with greater fidelity and conscientiousness than before." The same is true of our negroes. Christianity has improved them, both as men and as slaves. Compare them with their forefathers! By how many degrees the barbarian has already been elevated in all parts of his nature.

And what is the effect of Christianity upon the Master?

It softens his spirit, in the sternness of law and discipline, while it confirms and establishes their just bonds. Whatever was formerly harsh in the relation is gradually removed. Mutual intercourse is sweetened by it — the master is no tyrant, the slave no rebel. "Authority ceases to be severe; obedience ceases to be a task." The essence of Slavery, viz, the master's right to use and dispose of his servant's time and labor, is untouched by Christianity, ex-

cept to establish it on a moral and religious foundation, and yet the master learns to feel that he and his slave are children of the same God and Father, and while he cannot admit him to the social privileges of a Brother, he recognizes in him a valued and esteemed, though humble dependent. And this effect of Christianity on the master grows with the growth and advance of the legitimate influence of Christianity on the slave. Good slaves make good masters, as well as good masters good slaves.

And then there is an influence of Christianity in removing the abuses which may attach to the exercise of arbitrary power.

It was so under the Roman empire. Under Augustus, Adrian and Antoninus, putting Slaves to death was no murder, but the first Christian emperor laid down that "if any one, after the brutal manner of the barbarians, caused his Slave to expire under the torture, he should be guilty of homicide."

So also he made a law (A. D. 398) forbidding the forcible separation of servile families, whether by sale or partition of property. "For who can endure (said he) that children and parents, wives and husbands, should be separated from each other?"

Clement of Alexandria, who lived in the 3rd century, says, "We must do by our Slaves as we would do by ourselves, for they are men as we are; for God, if you consider, is the God of the freeman and of the slave alike."

And so Christianity makes us feel now. We recognize our Slaves as not being things, but men. When we buy and sell them, it is not *human flesh and blood* we buy and sell, but we buy or sell a *right*, established by Providence, and sanctioned by Scripture, to *their labor and service for life*. We still bear in mind that they are *men*, and have immortal souls; — that Christ shed his blood to redeem them as well as ourselves, and that we are put in charge of their training, as of that of our own children, for his kingdom and glory.

It is, then, as plain as daylight, that Christianity condemns all laws of the State, and all ideas and practices of individuals which put aside the immortality of the Slave and regard him in any other light than that of a moral and responsible fellow-creature of our own. We have no hesita-

tion in declaring that we accord with Judge O'Neill, in earnestly desiring the repeal, for example, of the law against teaching the Slave to read. Not that we suppose it possible for the laboring class in any country to make much actual use of reading — nor that we forget how the Apostles converted a world by oral teaching chiefly; but because we conceive the law referred to is both useless and hurtful. It is a *useless* law, for very many of our best citizens continually break it, or allow it to be broken in their families. Besides, very many of our Slaves can read, and do teach and will teach others. No dangerous negro can be hindered from getting knowledge by such a law. "It sharpens our appetite," said an old negro in Savannah to an English traveller and writer. But the law is *hurtful*, inasmuch as it throws an obstacle in the way of that which it is plainly the wisdom of the State to foster and encourage, viz., the religious instruction of the young negro population.

The question of the effect of Christianity upon the permanency of Slavery in this country, is one certainly of the profoundest interest. What light does the past history of Christianity shed upon it?

Adam Smith, Hallam, and Macauley also, in his recent History of England, all speak of the Abolition of Slavery in Europe as having been very silently and imperceptibly effected, neither by legislative regulation nor physical force. What share Christianity had in effecting this abolition, has been much disputed. Guizot, Muratori, Millar, Sismondi, and the Pictorial Historian of England, allow her very little influence. On the other hand, Robinson, the historian of Charles V, Biot, an elaborate French author, who got a gold medal from the French Academy of Mor. and Pol. Science, for his work "*De l'Abolition de l'esclavage ancien en occident*," and the Rev. Churchill Babington, of St. John's College, Cambridge, who got the Hulsean prize for the year 1845, for an essay on the same subject, all these, and others, ascribe the greatest influence to Christianity, as the only influence which has lasted long enough, or been universal enough, or unmixed and constant enough to accomplish such a task.

But it is curious indeed, as a question of Historical philosophy, to see how exceedingly *gradual* was the process by which Christianity operated in the abolition of Slavery.

Not only Guizot, on the one side, declares (Guiz. Civilis. en Europe, Sec. vi., p. 14,) that "Slavery subsisted a long time in the bosom of Christian society, without any great horror or irritation being expressed against it," but *Biot*, on the other side, tells us that "no Christian writers of the first three centuries speak of the abolition of Slavery as a consequence of Christianity. — *Biot*, p. 26.

And Babington, after quoting many passages from Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome, and other early fathers remarks, "Not one of these writers even hints that slavery is improper or unlawful." Page 29.

This same writer also refers to the fact that Christianity has for eighteen centuries been operating upon European servitude. Page 117.

He also remarks "Christianity has been constantly producing such an effect upon society that when a *thousand years* had passed away, strict personal slavery had, in most parts of Europe, begun to disappear." Page 180.

What then is that influence, which, in our day, is so clamorous for the abolition of slavery?

It is, certainly, not Christianity; for Christianity, both in the days of the Apostles, and for centuries afterwards, did never so lift her voice. Christianity operated and operates in a much profounder, far gentler, and more wholesome manner.

What then is it? It is partly *humanity* excited by exaggerated, and in a great degree, false statements — it is partly *political self-interest and jugglery* — and it is partly the *democratic* principle. It is the radical doctrine of "equal rights," — it is the idea that the slave is unjustly deprived or debarred his natural rights — that he is entitled to liberty and prepared for it.

Let Christians at the North take their stand, if they will, but let them do it distinctly and fairly, and openly, as apostles of civil liberty, — and let them preach a crusade for natural rights. But, let them not tell us that their Master came to do such a work, or that the Gospel, evangelically preached, would soon put an end to Slavery. Let not Mr. Treat, or any one else, tell us that the law of love, if applied between slave holders and their slaves, would immediately rupture the bonds of society amongst us. Unchristian

abuses that law has reformed and is reforming, and (when the public mind at the South shall be no longer stung to madness by insults and reproaches,) will still reform. But the essence of slavery, the master's right to his slave's labor, is no more assaulted by Christianity than are the property rights of rich men at the North. The true interpretation of the golden rule on the subject of Slavery is to be found in the Apostolic instructions to masters. If there be any better way of applying the law of love to the system of slavery than these rules set forth, why did not the apostles who said so much to masters shew it to us, instead of leaving it to be found out by the men of this age?

Are we then asked whether we believe Slavery among us will be perpetual?

We say, as far as Christianity is concerned we do not see why it might not be perpetual, and yet we do not see reason to say that it will be so. It is a question for speculation, or rather it is not a question for speculation, for how can we judge before-hand what God intends to do? It is then more properly a question of Providence. It is in God's hands, and there we wish it to be.

We cannot reason that Christianity will operate now as it did of old upon Slavery, because new elements have come in.

There is the new element of democracy on the one hand, which may not allow Christianity to work in its own healthful and peaceful way — which sneers at such declarations as Bishop Butler made when he said, "Men are impatient and for precipitating things, but the Author of nature, (and the Bible,) appears deliberate throughout his operations," — and which would serve the most complicated questions and the most tangled relations, as Alexander did the Gordian Knot.

On the other hand there is the new element of a *difference of race*. Of old there was no similar obstacle to emancipation. Will Christianity ever allow us to manumit here our three millions of Africans — our three millions increased to five or ten millions? Will Christianity, that unquestionably makes masters benevolent, ever satisfy us that it is possible for two such dissimilar races to dwell together on equal terms.

Or will Christianity and the Providence of God ever point out a way for their removal to their own or some other country?

We count it almost profane to hazard one speculation about such hidden things of God.

One thing, fellow citizens of the South, is plain! It is ours to do the duties of intelligent, decided, fearless, conscientious Christian Masters, and future events we may leave with Him, who will direct them well.

And let our Northern Christian brethren join us in leaving Divine Providence to work out his own plans. We say to them respectfully and kindly, cease your attempts to rouse our consciences about the sinfulness of Slavery. Dismiss your anxieties about the civil liberty of the Slave. He does not need that — it would be no blessing to him. He needs another and a better freedom. That is the great point. Exhort us, reprove us, rebuke us, help us, pray for us in reference to this point! You have begun at the wrong end. You would abolish that which must be, and ought to be, fortified and confirmed. The Master's authority must not be withdrawn. Our system of Slavery is a civilizer and a christianizer. We must leave it for God to remove, when his time comes; meanwhile, we must maintain it, always administering it according to the law of love as explained by the Apostles.

The American Board has long stood fast and firm on the high Scriptural ground respecting Slavery. At their meeting in Brooklyn, some years ago, all the tremendous pressure that was brought by Abolitionists to bear upon them could not drive them from maintaining that slave-holding cannot scripturally be made a test of Church communion. And it would indeed seem hard, that they who have nothing directly to do with Slavery in these States, should, because unwilling to take the position of a lever to act on us, be made to share with us the burden of popular odium at the North. But, very remarkably indeed, the Providence of God has actually thrown upon that body an immediate responsibility in this matter. In two of their missions among the Indians of this country, slavery exists. Their church members hold slaves; their Missionaries hire them, which

is, in principle of course, the same as owning them. The Abolitionists are now urging a new issue on the Board. If slave-holding Indians can not be excluded from Missionary churches, at least the Missionary must be prohibited from hiring slave labor, however necessary to the comfort of his family, and however impossible it may be to obtain any other kind of domestic assistance. We shall await with interest the next meeting of the Board, to see how they will dispose of this question.

But the Prudential Committee, in their correspondence through their Secretary, Mr. Treat, with the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions, have already submitted to the Missions the alternative of giving up either slave labor, or their schools. We would make one single observation on this point. If those Indian Missionaries are morally bound thus to abjure Slavery as "a system always and every where sinful," why are not all we, who live in the American Slave States, morally bound to do the same thing? But, does the Prudential Committee mean to declare that, in their judgment, all Christian ministers and Christian people at the South should at once relinquish slave labor as sinful? In other words, (since the example of all the Christian people would be of course omnipotent,) would they wish to see the South plunged into all the horrors of Emancipation?

The Committee are much changed from what they were, if they would take this ground. But if the system must necessarily be maintained, then who has any right to blame good men for aiding to maintain it?

But the Committee do, in Mr. Treat's letter, cast censure upon all such good men. That letter holds their slaveholding to be "*prima facie* evidence of guilt." Here is a man, (says Mr. Treat,) involved in a system unchristian and sinful, and yet, (dreadful presumption indeed,) "he requests admission to the table of our blessed Lord." Yes! and Mr. Treat does not hesitate to say, that the Christian Missionary or Minister must stop the Slaveholder as he approaches the communion table, and require him to "prove," (what the Apostles have left no trace of their requiring the slaveholding candidate in their day to prove,) viz: "his freedom from the guilt of the system, before he

can make good his claim to a place among the followers of Christ." "Such an enquiry, (says Mr. Treat,) is in all cases fundamental." We only reply, shew us your proofs.

As to the paragraph which follows this statement of the principles, upon which alone any Slaveholder can, according to this letter, be, in any case, admitted to church fellowship, we have only to say in concluding this article, that *it cuts off all the Southern Churches*. Not one benevolent Christian Master in a thousand at the South could shew that he is "an involuntary Slaveholder;" that he "retains the relation at the request of his Slaves, and for their advantage;" or that he "utterly rejects and repudiates the idea of holding property in his fellow-men." And if the American Board should take the ground of Mr. Treat, that there is "no warrant whatever for receiving any but such Slaveholders to the privileges of the people of God," then we cannot see but they will have yielded every thing to the Abolitionists, and that we must be cut off, (as we shall then be well content to be cut off,) from their fellowship.

ARTICLE VII.

PAUL'S REBUKE OF ANANIAS.*

As far as we are informed, the general, if not the universal opinion of those who have commented upon that striking passage in the life of St. Paul, is, that it was an opprobrious epithet applied by him to Ananias, in the same sense in which it was used by the Saviour towards the Pharisees, whom, for their hypocrisy and iniquity, he likened unto *whited sepulchres*.† With great deference for an opinion so long entertained, and we believe, without ques-

* Then Paul said unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law. Acts xxiii: 3.

† Matth. xxiii: 27.

tion hitherto, we will attempt, very briefly, to show in what manner we have come to the conclusion, that St. Paul attached a very different meaning to his severe censure of the High Priest.

Between the two figures, there is a slight analogy, it is true, as to the meaning of the words. But it may be contended, that Paul, who was an accurate Greek scholar, if he had meant a *whited sepulchre* — *τάφος κεκοσμημένος* — would have said so, and not used for it, what we propose to show he did mean, a *whited wall* — *τοιῖχος κεκοσμημένος*.

It was a custom among the Romans, and at the period in question, was sanctioned by long usage, that the Prætor, as soon as he went into office, wrote upon a *whited wall* — *paries dealbatus*, in order to make it known to the people, in what manner he would construe the law, during the term of his magistracy.* To this construction he was forced to adhere, as much so, as our courts of law are held to the precedents set down in the Reports of decided cases.† The whited wall of the Prætor was therefore always appealed to by any one aggrieved by the decision of that officer, when contrary to the construction, which he had declared should govern him.

St. Paul, as a Roman citizen, was doubtless well acquainted with the laws and usages under which he held the privilege of citizenship, then regarded of so much importance,‡ and mistaking, as he did, the office of the High Priest, he very naturally imagined him to be a Prætor or Judge, called to decide between him and the incensed multitude, who had followed him to the council. When that officer had commanded the by-standers to smite him on the mouth, Paul therefore very properly rebuked him, — “God shall smite thee, thou *whited wall*: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?”

* Gravina, De ortu et prog: Jur. Civ. Lib. 1. xxxviii. pp. 38, 39, and Heineccius, Antiq: Jur. Rom. Syntagma. Lib. 1. Tit. 11. p. 51. note (m).

† C. Cornelius, Trib. pleb. Legem tulit, ut prætores, ex edictis suis perpetuis, sive fixis jus dicerent: neque lis toto magistratus anno recedere liceret ab eo jure, quo se usus initio magistratus civibus denunciasset. Grav. de ortu et prog. I. C. Lib. 1. p. 39.

‡ And the chief Captain answered, with a great price, obtained I this freedom. Acts xxii: 28.

It appears clear to us, that it was the Roman, and not the Jewish law that Paul referred to, because, by the former his privilege as a Roman citizen exempted him from scourging or blows, unless for a capital offence,* which the Prætor could not try, and he had no such immunity under the Jewish code, for according to the Mosaic law — “If the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, the Judge shall cause him to lie down, and to be beaten before his face, according to his fault.” † This is made evident by Paul's subsequent conduct. For when his mistake was corrected by those standing by, who said to him, “Revilest thou God's High Priest?” he replied, “I wist not, brethren, that he was the High Priest.” ‡ Paul abandoned the ground he had taken, when he perceived that his censure was misapplied. Towards the Roman magistrate, he stood up inflexibly for his rights as a Roman citizen—he yielded without a murmur to the “ruler of his people.”

From this point of view, we can clearly see the force of Paul's rebuke. Understanding him as comparing Ananias to a *whited sepulchre* — “which indeed appears beautiful without, but within is full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness,” — the simile is far fetched, and the reproof, as applied to an officer of judicial or priestly character, is coarse, meaningless objurgation: but regarding Paul, as mistaking the Jewish High Priest for a Roman Prætor, who had refused to be governed by a law that he had declared should control his judgement, it is just, severe and pointed censure, according to the meaning we have given to his words. “Thou *whited wall*: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, ‡ and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?” If we suppose that Paul intended to compare Ananias to a *whited sepulchre*, all connection between the two parts of the sentence is interdicted, or the whole to us is rendered absurd. This, however, is not permissible, either in the original, or in the translation, as the particle *καί* in the original and *for* in the translation, show the dependence of the latter on the first part of the sentence. St.

* Heinec: Ant. J. R. Syntag: Append. lib. 1. xxviii. and Livy xxxiii. 36.

† Deut. xxv: 2.

‡ After the law — *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* — i. e. according to the law.

wh. as the wall was high priest
- the wall was the high priest
proper. If this article is sub-
versive of Paul's rebuke means
the wall for the usual abuse of

Paul, as it appears to us, never wrote any Greek that could be translated into such unmeaning English as the following, — “Thou *whited sepulchre*: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law.

It may be mentioned in connection with the view of the question we have taken, that St. Jerome, who wrote at a period when the Latin was still a spoken language, translates in *the Vulgate*, the Greek words into *paries dealbate*, and although before his time,* the various edicts of the Prætors had been digested into the *Edictum Perpetuum*,† and the use of the *whited wall* abolished in consequence, yet he must have been acquainted with a custom which had been sanctioned by such long usage among his countrymen.

* St. Jerome must have translated the Vulgate about the conclusion of the 4th, or the commencement of the 5th century.

† The *Edictum Perpetuum* was digested into a code, by Salvius Julian, under the reign of Hadrian.

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *A Greek-English Lexicon, based on the German Work of FRANCIS PASSOW, by HENRY GEORGE LIDDELL, M. A., late Student of Christ Church, now Head Master of Westminster School; and ROBERT SCOTT, M. A., Prebendary of Exeter, some time Student of Christ Church, and late fellow of Balliol College, with corrections and additions, and the insertion in alphabetical order of the proper names occurring in the principal Greek Authors, by HENRY DRISLER, M. A., adjunct professor of the Greek and Latin languages, in Columbia College, New York. Harper and Brothers, publishers, 82 Cliff street, New York: 1846.*

This is not merely a reprint. It is to some considerable extent a work of American talent, industry and research, as its publication in such a style of care and elegance is a splendid evidence of American enterprise.

The English work by Messrs. Liddell, now head of Westminster school, and Robert Scott, Prebendary of Exeter, is an enlarged translation of the celebrated Greek Lexicon of Passow, which was only accessible and of use to, the German Scholar. That work, however, has taken preëminent rank, and hence no Lexicon has probably ever so rapidly superseded and unquestionably preceded all competitors as the present. Its superiority is found in the order and ease of its arrangements — the fullness and propriety of its significations — and the accuracy of its quotations, so as to cover all remaining Greek authors. It condenses and presents, in compact form and order, all the learning and researches of past ages, and especially of the German Scholars, who have labored so indefatigably in this field of investigation.

"From its first appearance," we are told, "this Lexicon was adopted in the English schools, to the almost entire exclusion of all others, received the stamp of public approbation, and was awarded the palm of decided superiority over the only other Lexicons of equal pretensions, that were then in use, (Donnegan's and Dunbar's,)" by high critical authority, in an able and discriminating article in the *Quarterly Review*, from which we extract the following passages:—

"In speaking of Messrs. Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, we have awarded it the praise which we think it deserves—we have shewn (we hope) satisfactorily its superiority over its rivals."

Again, "This great principle," (*viz.*, to make each article a history of the word referred to,) "the only sure foundation on which to build a good Lexicon of the Greek language . . . was very beautifully exemplified for the first time in Passow's Lexicon—Donnegan seems to have disdained it, Dunbar to have been ignorant of it: Messrs. Liddell and Scott have made it the basis of their work. And the consequence is that Passow's Lexicon was, as far as that went, admirable; Donnegan's and Dunbar's, objectionable and mischievous; Messrs. Liddell and Scott's, excellent and useful.

"And here another question naturally proposes itself to us—Have these last carried out in their work this principle, which they hold forth so prominently in their preface—have they constantly kept it in view, and regularly acted upon it? We have examined their Lexicon with great care and patience, as well with regard to this as other questions, and we answer without hesitation that they do appear to have kept constantly in view this great fundamental rule.

"Professor Dunbar himself, the editor of one of the rival Lexicons, testifies to the value of Messrs. Liddell and Scott's labors in the following language:—'They have produced a good Lexicon; and, notwithstanding the aid they received from Passow, their additions indicate great industry, laborious research, general accuracy, and respectable scholarship. . . . Their work proceeds from a university long famed for elegant scholarship

and high pretensions, whose name and influence may be supposed to give the stamp of authority to every thing that emanates from it.'

"It is no wonder then, that their volume should have cleared the field of England of almost all its competitors, supported, as it may be supposed, independent of its merits, by many scholars attached to the *genius loci*."

The American is founded upon the second and revised English edition, with many corrections and numerous editions, of which the nature and catalogue will be found in the preface.

The English work is not merely a translation of Passow. It is, in many respects, original, and the result of many years labor.

"We at first," say the Editors, "thought of a translation of Passow's work, with additions. But a little experience showed us that this would not be sufficient. Passow indeed had all that was necessary for Homer and Hesiod, so that his work has become a regular authority in Germany for the old Epic Greek. But he had done nothing farther, completely."

The Editors, therefore, (see Preface, xix. and xx.) have done for a great part of the Greek literature, what he had done for part, so as to make the Lexicon as universal as possible.

"Our plan," they add "has been that marked out and begun by Passow, viz: to make each Article a History of the usage of the word referred to. That is, we have always sought to give the earliest authority for its use first. Then, if no change was introduced by Latin writers, we have left it with that early authority alone — adding, however, whether it continued in general use or no, and taking care to specify, whether it was common to prose or poetry, or confined to one only. In most cases the word will tell its own story: the passages quoted will themselves say whether it was used or no both in poetry and prose: for there are few words that do not change their significations, more or less, in the downward course of time, and few, therefore, that do not need many references."

We are happy to recommend a work which brings them such

valuable auxiliary aid, to every Minister and Student, in his investigation of the Scriptures.

2. *The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament, being an attempt at a verbal connection between the Greek and the English Texts: including a Concordance to the Proper Names, with indexes, Greek-English, and English-Greek. New York: Harper and Brothers, publishers, 82 Cliff street. 1848.*

This work was published by one of the first publishing houses in London, where it soon reached a Second Edition. From that edition it has now been republished by Messrs. Harper and Brothers, New York.

It is a large Royal octavo volume, of 882 pages, and uncommonly well executed. This work we have had in use for some time, and as it will undoubtedly come into very general circulation in preference to others, we will give our readers some account of its nature, design and plan.

This work then is designed to connect together the Greek and English texts of the New Testament, so that under every Greek word, in alphabetical order, as in a Dictionary, may be found its pronunciation, and the various passages throughout the New Testament, in which it occurs, quoted in order, with the word used to express the Greek printed in italics. In the index will be found, also, every English word with its Greek term or meaning opposite, and the place where it may be found.

The design then, of this work, is to put the Greek Testament, that is, the original of our most divine and holy faith, within the reach of every one, who has even an imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, nay, to some extent even of one who understands only English.

By the help of this Concordance, the inquirer may find what the Greek of any word is, and where it is used in the New Testa-

ment, with all the meanings there attached to it. He can thus judge of the original word as he does of the English, by comparing one passage with another, and thus form an opinion as to its true meaning, in any particular passage.

This is the reason of the title of the work. It is intended to give an English reader, or a very imperfect Greek scholar, the advantages of a knowledge of the actual use and meaning of the original Greek.

The work is got up in very fine style. The price is also reasonable, for so heavy and large a work, not one-fourth of what the English edition, which we have used for some time, would cost.

There are three Indices or Appendices. 1, A Concordance of Proper names. 2, English and Greek, which is considered the best key extant, to the Scriptural Greek synonyms. 3, Greek and English, in which the English meaning, and the page where it is considered and treated of,—of every Greek word, is given. 4, A full list of the places in which some of the pronouns and particles are found.

This work, therefore, is really an elaborate work, and as useful to the scholar as it is absolutely essential to those who cannot use similar works written in Latin and adapted only to the learned.

An interesting history of the origin, progress and construction of the work will be found in the introduction.

-
3. *A Discourse, delivered in the Baptist Church, Carlowville, Ala., by the Rev. CHARLES A. STILLMAN, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Eutaw, Alabama.*

This is an earnest and practical discourse upon the contested passage found in Heb. 6: 4–6. After a brief introduction, in which it is shewn that “these verses furnish no argument in favor of the notion that true Christians may totally apostatize and

finally be lost," the speaker applies them to "overthrow the false hopes of hypocrisy and self-deception." That the argument and appeal commended themselves to the judgment and conscience of the hearers, is evinced by the fact, that the discourse is published at their request, in which the members of three distinct denominations are found to unite.

4. *Two Discourses on the popular objections to the doctrine of Election*, by HENRY A. BOARDMAN, D. D., *Pastor of the 10th Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.*

As this title indicates, these Discourses are not designed to establish the truth of the doctrine of Election; but, assuming its truth, to vindicate it against two classes of objections with which it has been pressed. In the first Discourse, Dr. Boardman proposes to shew that the doctrine in question is not derogatory to God. The objection assumes that if God be infinitely good, he cannot discriminate between his Creatures, as Election implies. It is rebutted by shewing that, nevertheless, this discrimination does exist, as a matter of fact: and the only alternative before us is, to admit the righteous sovereignty of God, or else to deny his Almighty Power. The latter is shewn to be as infinitely gloomy to man and derogatory to God, as the former is hopeful to the one and honourable to the other.

In the second Discourse, after some preliminary remarks upon the intrinsic sufficiency of the Atonement, and the free warrant given to all in the unrestricted offer of the Gospel to avail themselves of it, Dr. Boardman discusses the objection that the doctrine of Election is discouraging to man. He is at some pains to establish in a popular and striking way, the four following propositions:—1, That no sinner has the right to assume either that he is elected or not elected. The result only can determine it. 2, That nothing in the decree of election prevents men from acceding to the terms of the Gospel. 3, That the certainty of

the result to the eye of God compromises no one's freedom; and 4, That the decree of election requires the use of means. We have read these Discourses with pleasure, as evincing the style of instruction which prevails in Presbyterian pulpits; and rejoice that their publication will extend the circle of their influence.

-
5. *Biblia Hebraica, secundum editiones Ios. Athiae, Johannis Leusden, Jo. Simonis. Aliorumque, imprimis Everardi Van Der Hooght, D. Henrici Opitii, et Wolfi Hcidenheim, cum additionibus clavique Masoretica et rabbinica Augusti Hahn. Nunc denuo recognita et emendata ab Isaaco Leeser, V. D. M. Synagogae Mikre Israel, Phila. et Josepho Jaquett, V. D. M. presbyter prot. Episc. Ecclesiae, U. S. Editio Stereotypa. Philadelphiae. Novi Eboraci: sumptibus Johannis W. Moore. Johannis Wiley. 1849.*

The above is the title of the American reprint of Hahn's Bible. The text, as the title page informs us, was first edited by Jos. Athias, who was a Swedish Rabbi, and a printer at Amsterdam. His text was founded on manuscripts as well as on the previous printed editions. One of these mss., as Leusden in his preface informs us, was 900 years old. The edition of Athias was published in the year 1661, and has been the basis of many subsequent editions, in some of which the authority of additional manuscripts has been resorted to. The edition of Hahn has long been a favorite, especially in this country and in Germany. Its accuracy, beauty, and cheapness, have equally commended it to the approbation of Hebrew scholars. Though we do not think the American equals in beauty the German copy, it is still a specimen of Hebrew printing, highly creditable to the publishers. The paper is good, and the typography clear, distinct, and easily legible. Among the numerous students of this sacred tongue in the Christian ministry, and among our citizens

of the Jewish faith, it is hoped this book, which is offered at a moderate price, may find a ready sale.

6. *A Key to the Book of Revelation; with an Appendix*, by JAMES McDONALD, *Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Jamaica, L. I.* Second edition. New London: 1848. 12mo., pp. 210.

This little book has impressed us with the judiciousness, discrimination, and ability of the writer. It aims not at being critical and learned, but at indicating the general drift and scope of this prophetic writing of the New Testament. In the Introduction, the leading question of the date of the Apocalypse, the settlement of which is so necessary to the true interpretation of the symbolic representations which follow, is briefly, but well discussed. Mr. McDonald supposes the book written in the reign of Nero, a conclusion which has been reached by many others, especially in Germany, and by Prof. Stuart, in this country. Chaps. iv-xi: 14, he refers to the Jewish persecuting power. Chap. xi: 15,—xiii: 10, to the Pagan persecuting power. Chaps. xiii: 11.—xix, to the Papal persecuting power. Chaps. xx.—xxii, describe the Latter Day glory, the battle of Gog and Magog, the Final Judgment, and the Heavenly State. The main outline of interpretation nearly coincides with what we have supposed to be the true one, though there are many particular passages where we still desire more complete satisfaction than we have yet attained.

7. *University Sermons. Sermons delivered in the Chapel of Brown University*, by FRANCIS WAYLAND, *President of the University.* Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 59 Washington street, 1849.

This is a selection from the discourses delivered by Dr. Wayland to his pupils. Our attention has been especially drawn to

three Sermons "on the duty of obedience to the Civil Magistrates," and two others "on the recent Revolutions in Europe." The text on which *the former* are based is Matt. xxii : 21. "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

In his first discourse, Dr. Wayland remarks that the people were at this time living under an absolute monarchy, and that the reigning Sovereign was a tyrant of atrocious wickedness. And yet our Lord directs that the government be respected and the tribute paid. But this is only a part of the precept and the remainder is at least equally important. "Render unto God the things that are God's." Should therefore Cæsar claim the things of God they must by no means be rendered to Cæsar. Here then, the disciple of Christ seems to be furnished with two apparently opposite rules of conduct. The one is *obey*, and the other *obey not*, the civil Magistrate. The solution of the difficulty is as follows:—Governments have only limited authority, conferred for definite and specified objects, and these objects to be accomplished by innocent means. Within these limits we must obey; beyond them, we may, and perhaps must disobey.

What then are the legitimate objects of civil government? The great object is to protect every man in the enjoyment of the rights conferred on him by his Creator. These rights are defined to be the right to use his body and his mind as he pleases, provided he do not interfere with the rights of his neighbor. Society is formed, therefore, for the protection of individuals. Government may use force in giving this protection, both at home and abroad. War is therefore justifiable in certain cases.

The second discourse treats of the duty of a citizen to scrutinize the acts of his government. We are all responsible for our associated as well as our personal actions. We may disobey if government require us to do wrong. This is illustrated at length by reference to the case of an unjust war; the author doubtless having the late American war with Mexico in his mind.

In the third discourse, the author still further illustrates the position that societies may do wrong as well as individuals; and that

the members of such an erring community are individually responsible. The manner in which a Christian citizen may innocently deliver himself from the guilt of wrong perpetrated by the government of his country is there set forth at length, under the following items:—He must make himself acquainted with the constitution under which he lives, and with the just and right relations of his country with other nations. He must express his views. He must carry out his principles at the ballot box.

These three discourses do not in our view at all answer to the high reputation of their author for ability and eloquence. They are characterised neither by profoundness, accuracy, nor force. As an exhibition of the rights and duties of free-born American citizens, they may be considered passable, but the author nowhere sets any such limit to his investigations. He professes to treat of the duty of obedience to the civil magistrate. *Civil government*, not *the American government*, is his theme. Yet he never discriminates. And the young men of Brown University we suppose, were left by these three discourses of their honored President, without the remotest conception that our rights and duties as citizens of this Republic differ in any manner or degree from the rights and duties of all other men on the face of the globe.

Dr. Wayland has not only studied moral and political science, but he has also written and published largely on the subject. We therefore deem altogether unpardonable the want of discrimination he exhibits in these sermons. What, for example, can be more loose than his statement on p. 259? "Every man is conscious that he is an independent moral agent, responsible to God for the use of the powers with which he is endowed, and at liberty, so far as man is concerned, to use them as he will, provided he do not interfere with the correspondent rights of his neighbor. The muscles, the sinews, the senses, the whole body of a man, are his own, and provided he use them without injury to another, he may use them as he will." Supposing this absolutely true of American citizens, it certainly is not true of many other classes of our fellow men. Some of the rights of men are doubtless inalienable, but others are creatures of society, creatures of law.

All mankind have an inalienable right to obey God rather than man. This right can be invaded innocently by none — it can be surrendered innocently by none. If all mankind have a right to obey God, they have also a right to learn God's will, and so far it is true, as Dr. W. says, that "every man's mind is his own." But even rights of conscience are not without some limits. Not only is it true, as our author himself says, that our freedom of conscience must "not infringe upon the rights of others," but there are unquestionably many situations in life which subject the conscience of one human being to the sense of duty of another. The minor; the soldier, the sailor, and the slave, are all, to a certain extent, under the guidance of the conscience of others. But as to a man's free use of his intellect, body and time, these never can be considered as inalienable rights. They may be innocently alienated by the man himself. They may be legally and justly taken from him, in certain cases. They are in certain cases withheld from him by the unerring Providence of God. Man may be *Man* without any of these rights, and they are therefore not inalienable from man.

But why should Dr. W. confine the natural rights of man to the free use of his mind and body. What would man do if he had nothing but mind and body? He needs a foothold on the earth; he must have food to eat and clothes to wear. And God has given the earth to the children of men. If, then, Dr. W. may appeal to "every man's consciousness" to say whether he is not at liberty, so far as man is concerned, to use his muscles, sinews and senses as he will, why may not the Socialist appeal to every man's consciousness to say whether he is not entitled to his fair share of the earth and its fulness? Writers who sneer at prescription and prerogative in the dispute about political or personal freedom, may live to see the day when they shall have to answer their own arguments. Already have we in some parts of America, tenants, whose "consciousness" tells them that another man has no right to possess his thousands of acres, while they are destitute of a homestead.

In Dr. W's. well known work on Moral Science, (pp. 192-3,)

he very properly declares that "men stand to each other in the relation of *equality*—not *equality of condition*, but *equality of right*." This is just what Burke said, "Equal rights but not to equal things." Dr. W. explains: "God has placed men in just such circumstances as it hath pleased him. He gives wealth, intellect, physical strength, health, to all in different degrees. But each separate individual is created with precisely the *same right* to use the advantages with which God has endowed him, as every other individual." These are precisely our own views, and we apply them to the subject of American slavery, thus: It has pleased God to put masters and slaves among us into their relative positions; and the advantages and disadvantages of their respective positions belong by equal rights to both classes, and both classes have equal obligations to perform their relative duties, which are all set forth in the Bible.

Upon *The recent revolutions in Europe*, we think it becomes every thoughtful man to speak with great caution. Dr. W. himself observes, that "no one can possibly foresee the direction in which nations thus excited will move, unless he can lay claim to a knowledge of their intellectual and moral character, such as cannot be possessed by a created understanding." Yet our author shrinks not from the expression of his "opinions respecting the tendency of these remarkable social changes." "All that we can do," says he, (we think it would be doing much,) "is to indicate the condition by which the future must be governed."

From the bottom of our hearts do we wish that all the good which Dr. Wayland anticipates, may flow from these astounding revolutions. The advancement of the cause of universal peace, of freedom of opinions, (or soul-liberty, as Roger Williams called it,) and of the development of the human intellect, are results that every lover of mankind must rejoice to contemplate. But as to "the prestige of the throne and the dynasty" being "gone forever," neither our opinions nor our desires agree with those of our author. We are of those who believe thrones and dynasties to be of the most sacred value and importance in certain

stages of society. And we are disposed to think what Dr. W. seems to feel unable with any confidence to deny, that the people of Europe are not generally prepared for any other Government than that of the throne and dynasty. And sure we are, that if not prepared for any thing else, they cannot long maintain any thing else. If they must have masters, they will find them.

"The permanent reign of irresponsible power in the civilized world," (says our author,) "is, I hope, to be numbered among the things that have passed away." "That institution (the throne) can never henceforth be an object of veneration, which can be subverted or overawed by a small assemblage of the workmen of a city, in the sight of the very army enrolled and maintained for the sole purpose of supporting it. Despotic Governments are from this time forth impracticable." And yet on almost the next page we are told that "our only hope for the extension of human freedom rests upon the cultivation of the moral character of the people." Without this, "the overthrow of existing governments can confer no advantage; nay, it may tend to sink the nations yet deeper in barbarism. Anarchy, despotism and revolution, will succeed to anarchy, despotism and revolution, until the children of men have learned that the Heavens do rule. And hence it may be demonstrated that free political institutions can never be permanently maintained in any nation, except it be imbued with the precepts of the Gospel of Christ."

That the European nations are imbued with the principles of the Gospel, Dr. Wayland of course does not believe. And we do not see how he can anticipate for them any thing but what he himself describes as a "succession of revolutions, and all the usual changes from freedom to anarchy, from anarchy to despotism, and from despotism to fitful and short-lived freedom." The prospects of European freedom, then, according to the showing of the author himself, are bad enough. And the hopes of good men for Europe must be now, just as before, altogether based on God and Christianity. Dr. Wayland concludes the last of his two discourses with this sentiment; but we think it

should have pervaded them. It is not civil liberty in any form that constitutes the chief want of Europe; and it is not the principle of civil liberty that can regenerate her. Nor can civil liberty be established permanently there, without large effusions of the Divine Spirit's influence. We have no confidence whatever that the prestige of the throne and dynasty, and the rule of the irresponsible power, are ended in Europe. We are just as little confident that they ought to end at present.

These two discourses on the recent revolutions present the same erroneous views of human rights which characterize those on obedience to the civil magistrate. Dr. W. says (p. 311,) that these revolutions have "disclosed the fact, that no divine ordinance hedges about the majesty of thrones, but that they are really and of right dependent for their existence on the will of the people." This is certainly going as much to the one extreme as ever Filmer did to the other. And how does it consist with Dr. W's. acknowledgements on pp. 255-7, that Christ commanded the people in his time to render obedience to the reigning sovereign, although a tyrant of atrocious wickedness?

On page 316, our author says, "The truth that every man is responsible for all his actions to God, presupposes the right to universal freedom." On page 305, the same sentiment is expressed. But slaves, for example, are responsible to God for obeying their masters; and however much you cause them to feel this responsibility, you make them none the less slaves.

On page 308, Dr. W. says, "Wherever the Bible is read, and man learns the nature of his responsibility to God, he learns at the same time his right to do as he pleases, provided he violates the rights of no other human being." But Dr. W. of course puts rights of masters as low as rights of kings, "which are not hedged about by any divine ordinances." And so Dr. W's. opinion is, that the Bible teaches slaves that their masters have no rights over them, and that they have "the right to do as they please." In fact, he says, (p. 306,) for "men to be restrained by their fellows from innocently seeking out their own happiness as they will, is an insult to our common nature, a tyranny to be

resisted even unto death." On this point, we commend to the attention of President Wayland, (revered by us as the faithful and kind preceptor of early life,) the following truly philosophical observations from one of Mr. Calhoun's latest speeches :

"Man, for the purpose of reasoning, may be regarded in three different states: in a state of individuality ; that is, living by himself, apart from the rest of his species. In the social ; that is, living in society, associated with others of his species. And in the political ; that is, living under government. We may reason as to what would be his rights and duties in either, without taking into consideration whether he could exist in it or not. It is certain, that in the first, the very supposition that he lived apart and separated from all others, would make him free and equal. No one in such a state could have the right to command or control another. Every man would be his own master, and might do just as he pleased. But it is equally clear, that man cannot exist in such a state that he is by nature social, and that society is necessary, not only to the proper development of all his faculties, moral and intellectual, but to the very existence of his race. Such being the case, the state is a purely hypothetical one ; and when we say all men are free and equal in it, we announce a mere hypothetical truism ; that is, a truism resting on a mere supposition that cannot exist, and of course one of little or no practical value.

"But to call it a state of nature was a great misnomer, and has led to dangerous errors: for that cannot justly be called a state of nature, which is so opposed to the constitution of man, as to be inconsistent with the existence of his race, and the development of the high faculties, mental and moral, with which he is endowed by his Creator.

"Nor is the social state of itself his natural state, for society can no more exist without government, in one form or another, than man without society. It is the political, then, which includes the social, that is his natural state. It is the one for which his Creator formed him, into which he is impelled irresistibly, and in which only his race can exist, and all his faculties be fully developed.

“Such being the case, it follows that any, the worst form of government, is better than anarchy; and that individual liberty, or freedom, must be subordinate to whatever power may be necessary to protect society against anarchy within or destruction without; for the safety and well-being of society are as paramount to individual liberty as the safety and well-being of the race is to that of individuals; and in the same proportion the power necessary for the safety of society is paramount to individual liberty. On the contrary, government has no right to control individual liberty beyond what is necessary to the safety and well-being of society. Such is the boundary which separates the power of government and the liberty of the citizen or subject in the political state, which, as I have shown, is the natural state of man—the only one in which his race can exist, and the one in which he is born, lives and dies.

“It follows from all this that the quantum of power on the part of the government, and of liberty on that of individuals, instead of being equal in all cases, must necessarily be very unequal among different people, according to their different conditions. For just in proportion as a people are ignorant, stupid, debased, corrupt, exposed to violence within, and danger from without, the power necessary for government to possess in order to preserve society against anarchy and destruction, becomes greater and greater, and individual liberty less and less, until the lowest condition is reached, when absolute and despotic power become necessary on the part of the government, and individual liberty extinct. So, on the contrary, just as a people rise in the scale of intelligence, virtue and patriotism, and the more perfectly they become acquainted with the nature of government, the ends for which it was ordered, and how it ought to be administered, and the less the tendency to violence and disorder within, and danger from abroad; the power necessary for government becomes less and less, and individual liberty greater and greater. Instead, then, of all men having the same right to liberty and equality, as is claimed by those who hold that they are all born free and equal, liberty is the noble and highest reward bestowed on mental and moral development, combined

with favorable circumstances. Instead then of liberty and equality being born with man; instead of all men and all classes and descriptions being equally entitled to them, they are high prizes to be won, and are in their most perfect state, not only the highest reward that can be bestowed on our race, but the most difficult to be won, and when won the most difficult to be preserved.

"They have been made vastly more so, by the dangerous errors I have attempted to expose, that all men are born free and equal, as if those high qualities belonged to man without effort to acquire them and to all equally alike, regardless of their intellectual and moral condition. The attempt to carry into practice this, the most dangerous of all political error, and to bestow on all, without regard to their fitness, either to acquire or maintain liberty—that unbounded and individual liberty supposed to belong to man in the hypothetical and misnamed state of nature, has done more to retard the cause of liberty and civilization, and is doing more at present than all other causes combined. While it is powerful to pull down governments, it is still more powerful to prevent their construction on proper principles. It is the leading cause among those which have placed Europe in its present anarchical condition, and which mainly stands in the way of re-constructing good governments in the place of those which have been overthrown, threatening thereby the quarter of the globe most advanced in progress and civilization, with hopeless anarchy, to be followed by military despotism."

8. *Phrenology Examined, and shown to be inconsistent with the principles of Physiology, Mental and Moral Science, and the Doctrines of Christianity. Also, an examination of the claims of Mesmerism.* By N. L. RICE, D. D., *Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati.* New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1849. 12mo., pp. 318.

The title of this interesting book sufficiently reveals its general contents. If it does not bear the marks of a closely reasoned

and philosophic Essay on the subjects of which it treats, it proposes in a more popular way, difficulties and objections to the pretensions of Phrenology and Mesmerism, which their advocates will find it hard to meet. There are, according to phrenology, thirty-two distinct organs of the brain, indicated externally by so many protuberances on the surface of the skull, and each agreeing to some propensity or faculty of the mind. It is an objection to this, that often there is no concavity on the inner surface of the skull answering to the protuberance without; and that the most careful dissection has failed of discovering any relation between the convolutions of the brain and the organs which phrenologists have mapped out upon the skull. The actual powers of the human mind, as ascertained by our consciousness and observation, do not at all correspond with those assigned to it by phrenology. Memory, for example, is divided between three different organs, as it refers to places, persons and things. Love, as a propensity, is divided between two or three more. The two systems of intellectual philosophy, as deduced by reflection and mental analysis, and as exhibited by phrenology, are, as Dr. Rice has shown, and as appears to us, inconsistent with each other. The one has been the result of the study and reflection of wise men for ages; the other is a novelty, newly elaborated, yet striving, though resting on an uncertain basis, to dispossess true philosophy of its rightful territory. It introduces, likewise, confusion into the province of morals and religion. That we are blameworthy for the possession of an ill-formed head, is contrary to the common sense of men. And if we lack the organs of veneration and conscientiousness, how can we ever be religious in our characters; and if secretiveness, acquisitiveness, and destructiveness, are unusually developed, how can we be otherwise than thieves, robbers and murderers. In order to meet the sad necessities of humanity, the plan of salvation should have provided for a change in our phrenological developments, of which, however, we read not in the word of God. Dr. Rice, to us, satisfactorily shows the incompatibility of this system with morality and revealed religion, and its tendency to the grossest doctrines

of materialism. For mesmerism he has as little respect. While he denies not the phenomenon of mesmeric sleep, which perhaps resembles that of the somnambulist, he regards most other circumstances connected with it as mere coincidences, when they are not the result of collusion and deception. When the manipulations of mesmerisers are likened to Elijah's restoring to life the widow's son, and Elisha's calling back to consciousness the young Shunamite, or when, in like connection, the analogy is traced between the laying on of the hands of the Messiah in healing diseases, and the passes and touches of the Mesmeric operator, it is quite time for the Christian to pause, and to inquire whereunto will this thing grow.

9. *Nineveh and its Remains: With an account of a visit to the Chaldean Christians of Kurdistan, and the Yezidis, or Devil-Worshippers; and an inquiry into the manners and arts of the Ancient Assyrians.* By AUSTEN HENRY LAYARD, Esq., D. C. L. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: George P. Putnam. 1849.

A very remarkable volume, full of the most romantic adventures, written in a style of unaffected simplicity, and revealing to us the monuments of the city of Nineveh, "that great city," built by Nimrod less than 200 years after the deluge, and which have lain buried and forgotten for nearly 2500 years. The announcement of these discoveries is full of interest to the Biblical student, and indeed to all intelligent men. The labors of Mr. Layard at these ruins, and at other sites of ancient cities of which an account is given in these volumes, extended from November, 1845, to April, 1847. The late hour at which we have received the first volume, the only one which has yet reached us, prevents us from saying more in reference to these important discoveries, which we doubt not are worthy of a more extended notice from our hand.

10. *A Sermon on the death of the Rev. Wm. M. Atkinson, D. D.*
By the Rev. BEVERLY T. LACY, Pastor of the Presbyterian
Church, Winchester, Va.

An appropriate, feeling, and consoling discourse, in memory of an useful, active, and self-sacrificing minister of Christ, and a generous, affectionate, and noble-minded man. In common with all who knew the brother whose lamented departure was the occasion of the discourse, we can but mourn over the loss which the church has experienced, while we acknowledge it is meet that the faithful servant should be permitted to enter upon his final reward.

THE MECKLENBURG DECLARATION.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTICE.

The Declaration of American Independence in May, 1775, by the good citizens of Mecklenburgh, in North Carolina, has been discussed at some length in these pages. The reality of that Declaration we were then required to *prove*. It was still a problem and to some sagacious minds the fact, and its inferences, were alike gratuitous. That problem has now become a demonstrated fact, and those inferences have assumed corresponding importance. It will be interesting to put on record in these pages the evidence of this fact. We take it from the North Carolina Standard of January 10th.

A few days since, in the Senate, Mr. Shepard submitted a report from the Committee to whom was referred the communication of the Governor, in relation to the Colonial and Revolutionary History of North Carolina, accompanied by the following highly interesting letter from Mr. Bancroft, the American Minister to London, to the Hon. D. L. Swain, of this State. The letter is as follows :

"90 EATON SQUARE, London, July 4, '48.

My Dear Sir : I hold it of good augury, that your letter of the 12th June, reached me by the Hermann, just in time to be answered this morning.

You may be sure that I have spared no pains to discover in the British State Paper Office a copy of the Resolves of the Committee of Mecklenburgh ; and with entire success. A glance at the map will show you that, in those days, the traffic of that part of North Carolina took a southerly direction, and people in Charleston, and sometimes even in Savannah, knew what was going on in "Charlotte Town," before Governor Martin. The first account of "*the extraordinary Resolves of the people of Charlotte Town, Mecklenburg County*," was sent over to England, by Sir James Wright, then Governor of Georgia, in a letter of the 20th June, 1775. The Newspaper thus transmitted is still preserved, and is the number 498 of the South Carolina Gazette and Country Journal, Tuesday, June 13, 1775. I read the Resolves you may be sure, with reverence, and immediately obtained a copy of them ; thinking myself the sole discoverer. I do not send you the copy, as it is identically the same with the paper which you inclosed to me ; but I forward to you a transcript of the entire letter of Sir James Wright. The newspaper seems to have reached him after he had finished his dispatch, for the paragraph relating to it is added in his own hand-writing, the former part of the letter being written by a Secretary or Clerk.

I have read a great many papers relating to the Regulators ; and am having copies made of a large number. Your own State ought to have them all, and the expense would be for the State insignificant, if it does not send an Agent on purpose. A few hundred dollars would copy all you need from the State Paper Office on all North Carolina topics. The Regulators are, on many accounts, important. Their complaints were well founded, and were so acknowledged, tho' their oppressors were only nominally punished. They form the connecting link between resistance to the Stamp Act, and the movement of 1775 ; and they also played a glorious part in taking possession of the Mississippi valley, towards

which they were carried irresistably by their love of independence. It is a mistake, if any have supposed, that the Regulators were cowed down by their defeat at the Allemance. Like the Mammoth, they shook the bolt from their brow and crossed the mountains.

I shall always be glad to hear from you, and to be of use to you or your State.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE BANCROFT.

D. L. Swain, Esq., Chapel Hill, N. C."

The above letter establishes the fact beyond all question, *that Independence was first proclaimed in Mecklenburg, North Carolina, in May, 1775.*

The letter of Sir James Wright, referred to by Mr. Bancroft, closes as follows: "By the enclosed paper, your Lordship will see the extraordinary Resolves of the people of Charlotte Town, in Mecklenburg county; and I should not be surprized if the same should be done every where else."

It may also be interesting to our readers to present extracts from two communications recently received from a gentleman who has made our Revolutionary history the subject of long and extended research, and who promises to give to the public the result of his studies in two projected works. The Author is an Episcopalian, and the quotations are given, not merely because he, as others have done, admits the force of our reasoning, but because they bring to light some facts which are interesting and well worthy of preservation.

Under date of January 29th, he says:

"Please accept my sincere thanks for the two Pamphlets from your pen. I have perused, with great interest, the one respecting the origin of the Mecklenburg and the National Declaration, and I cannot but fully concur with you in the theory therein advanced. Who can doubt, after carefully noticing the character of the Reform movement in Britain, in *religious* matters, and the Reform movement in America in *political* matters, that the steady advance made toward our political independence, immediately preceding and during our Revolutionary struggle, have, for their common origin, the examples and teachings of the Scotch Reformers and English Puritans, during a period of some 200 years. The principles of religious freedom which nerved those religionists to the severance of the strongest ties, both of allegiance to their Government and of consanguinity, are traceable to the same pure and exalted sentiment,—*"All men are born free and equal, all are endowed with certain inalienable rights,"*—the foundation of the political faith upon which rests our Constitution.

I believe that I possess a strongly concurrent proof in support of your theory. I have an old and valued friend, residing upon the banks of the Hudson River, near Poughkeepsie, Col. Henry Alexander Livingston, the eldest son of Rev. Dr. Livingston, late President of Princeton College. He has in his possession portraits, (painted on panel,) of John Livingston and his wife, the progenitors of all the Livingstons in America. He was the grandson of the Scottish Earl of Linlithgow, and being a Reformer, he fled with his wife and some of his flock, to Holland, about, if I remember correctly, ten years before the triumph of Cromwell, and the death of Charles I. His son, Robert Livingston, a man of strong mind and stronger faith, emigrated to America from Scotland, (with whom came an ancestor of mine,) about the year 1680, and was the first "Lord of the Manor of Livingston," upon the Hudson. From him, the numerous

branches of the Livingston family are descended. Col. Livingston has also a genealogical tree, very carefully prepared, containing the pedigrees, &c., of all of the Livingstons, from the Earl of Linlithgow to the present time, and it is astonishing to see how many of our Revolutionary Patriots, either by immediate descent, or by intermarriage, appear upon that record. There is Phillip Livingston, (grandfather of my friend,) one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, Robert R. Livingston, his cousin, one of the Committee appointed to draft the Declaration; William Livingston, the republican Governor of New Jersey; Lord Sterling, who fought so bravely for us, &c. &c. Philip Livingston, you doubtless remember, was the official correspondent of the New York Assembly, with Edmund Burke, when that eminent Statesman was the Colonial agent for that colony; and that correspondence was long kept up after Tory influence in the New York Council held sway. It was to Philip Livingston that Burke was chiefly indebted, not only for his original bias in our favor, but for that minute information respecting American affairs, which he used with so much force, while eloquently pleading the cause of freedom, upon the floor of the British House of Commons. Through the kindness of Col. Livingston, I have a copy of those ancient portraits, and also of the genealogical tree, both of which I intend to publish in my work. And I think it will be found, upon examination, that nearly, if not all, of the old Livingston family, and their collateral branches, were of the Dutch Reformed, or Presbyterian order. I remember, too, in reading the Pictorial History of England, that McFarlane, the author of "Civil and Military Transactions," department of that work, in quoting from Gordon's History of our Revolution, cautions his readers to remember that what he quotes is from "the Presbyterian Gordon." I can only say that I wish the church organization to which I am attached, could show an equal degree of patriotic influence and action, with the Presbyterians. True, there were many shining patriots of that communion, but I fear the ministers too often prayed *sincerely* for "the King and all others in authority." It was somewhat natural that it should be so, for there was an intimate tie with the mother church, whose destinies, particularly in temporalities, seemed inseparably connected with the throne.

I perceive that in your quotation from Jefferson, he mentions that they "retired to the Apollo." That "Apollo" was a room so called in the old Raleigh tavern, at Williamsburgh, Va., used for public meetings. It was in that room, you may remember, that Dabney Carr first proposed to Jefferson, Lee, and others, the system of "Committees of Correspondence," that strong engine of the Revolution. I made a drawing of that identical Room, when at Williamsburgh, it then being precisely the same, in wainscot and easement, as in the Revolution. It was well I was there the day I was, for a person who had just leased the building, had masons and carpenters at work, and they were then taking out the windows and unhinging the doors of that very room in order to *improve* it. The whole of the old tavern, (on the front of which is still the bust of Raleigh, in wood,) was in process of *improvement*—in that case, but another word for *desecration*. I could not help parodying in my mind, the "Old Oak Tree," and wanted to say to the man,

Vandal, spare that house,
Touch not a single stone,—
Disturb not Rat or Mouse,—
Vandal! I say, begone."

Under a later date, the same gentleman, after the perusal of our second article on the subject of that Declaration, and of our Revolution and Constitution generally, remarks :

"I am exceedingly pleased with the contents of those two pamphlets you gave me, containing, as they do, such a mass of testimony to prove that our Declaration of Independence, and the fundamental doctrines of our Constitution, are but vigorous plants, whose seeds germinated in the soil of a pure Christianity. For some time previous to the conception and maturing of the plan of the work I now have in hand, I had been collecting materials for a work in popular form, suited *in price* to the ability of all who might desire to purchase, to be entitled "A Political History of Christianity." The principal design of the work will be to trace the progress of the Christian religion, from its advent to the present time, and to point out its salutary effects upon Governments, Society, the Arts, &c., wherever it became rooted, and flourished, in the least degree, in its purity. It is my design, when the work I now have in hand, shall be completed, to pursue the inquiry, and if I find the subject and the material promise to be useful, I shall prepare a small volume with the above title. I apprehend that such a volume, properly prepared, without any reference whatever to sects and creeds, viewing solely the political and social aspect of the influence of Christianity, might be made useful, not only in strengthening the affection of *professors*, but in engaging the esteem of the *contemners*, of religion. And these pamphlets, my dear Sir, present a very strong item, in the aggregate, of proof and argument, which I desire to embody.

You mention in this larger pamphlet, that the idea of independence did not take possession of the popular mind in America until a short time previous to the adoption of the declaration, or rather of the *Congressional discussion*, of the subject. Allow me to refer you to the words of President Dwight, of Yale College, on that point,—“In the month of July, 1775,” says Dr. Dwight, “I urged, in conversation with several gentlemen of great respectability, firm Whigs, and esteemed friends, the importance, and even the necessity, of a declaration of independence on the part of the Colonies, and alleged for the measure, the very same arguments which afterwards were generally considered as decisive; but found them disposed to give me and my arguments, a hostile and contemptuous, instead of a cordial reception. Yet, at this time, all the resentment and enthusiasm awakened by the odious measures of Parliament, by the peculiarly obnoxious conduct of British agents in this country, and by the recent battles of Lexington and Breeds Hill, were at the highest pitch. These gentlemen may be considered as representatives of the great body of the thinking men in this country. A few may, perhaps, be excepted, but none of these durst, at that time, openly declare their opinions to the public. For myself, I regarded the die as cast, and the hopes of reconciliation as vanished; and believed that the colonists would never be able to defend themselves unless they renounced their dependence on Great Britain.”—See *Dwight's Travels in N. England*, Vol. I., p. 159.

Patrick Henry, however, as early as 1773, seemed to have an almost prophetic vision of coming events. He was asked by Colonel Samuel Overton, if he thought the Colonies sufficiently strong to oppose successfully the fleet and armies of Great Britain. Henry replied, “She *will* drive us to extremities; no accommodation *will* take place; hostilities *will* soon commence; and a desperate and bloody touch it will be. I will be candid with you,” continued Mr. Henry, “I doubt whether we *shall* be able, *alone*, to cope with so powerful a nation; but where is

France? where is Spain? where is Holland? the national enemies of Great Britain. Where will they be all this while? Do you suppose they will stand by, idle and indifferent spectators to the contest? Will Louis XVI. be asleep all the time? Believe me, no! When Louis XVI. shall be satisfied by our serious opposition, and our Declaration of Independence,—that all prospect of a reconciliation is gone, then, and not till then, will he furnish us with arms, ammunition and clothing; and not with them only, but he will send us fleets and armies to fight our battles for us; he will form a treaty with us, offensive and defensive, against our unnatural mother. Spain and Holland will join the confederation! Our Independence will be established! and we shall take our stand among the nations of the Earth." Subsequent history shows how remarkably prophetic were these words.

You speak of the probability that to the writings of Sydney Hampden, &c., Jefferson and his companions were, in a great degree, indebted for their political doctrines. Permit me to give you corroborative evidence of the fact, second hand from the lips of Mr. Jefferson himself. My father-in-law, who is a native of Manchester, England, and is now 76 years old, came to this country about the commencement of the present century. He, with Cobbett and others, were engaged in a political movement there, similar to that of Chartism of the present day, and being threatened with arrest and prosecution for treason, they came to America. My father-in-law, (who is a man of extensive reading,) was deeply imbued with the republican principles of Algernon Sydney, and soon after his arrival here made arrangements with a printer in Baltimore, to republish, in this country, Sydney's Essays, &c., on Government. He undertook to procure subscribers for the work, to be paid for on delivery; and, in order to give the list an importance among the then democracy, he called upon Mr. Jefferson, then in the Presidential Chair, and procured his name to head the list, and also his very hearty approval. During that interview, Mr. Jefferson spoke in the highest terms of the work, as one that was greatly needed here, and remarked—"We regard Algernon Sydney as one of the wisest political writers the world has ever produced, and his works form the text book from whence we derive our best and most laudable theories of true government,—theories which we are endeavoring to put in practice." Mr. J. strongly recommended the enterprise, and my father-in-law procured the names of all his Cabinet, and a large proportion of Members of Congress, many of them federalists, but who highly valued the writings of Sydney. The printer, however, failed to perform his contract, and the work was not published. My father-in-law named his second son Algernon Sydney.

You justly remark that other denominations of Christians made patriotic contributions to the cause of liberty, Quakers among others. It is true, the Quakers were generally peace-men, and their very *passiveness* was imputed to toryism, yet some were actively alive in the cause. Allow me to mention an instance that now recurs to my mind. When Washington had conceived the bold design of attacking the British and Hessians, at Trenton, in 1776, he felt the necessity of procuring a certain amount of hard money, to pay those troops promptly therewith, whose terms of service were then expiring, to induce them to remain a little longer. Knowing how tardily Congress moved, and feeling the necessity for striking the determined blow, speedily, he applied to Robert Morris directly, for \$5000 hard money. At that time, you are aware, Morris could raise \$1000 upon his own credit, when the credit of the Continental Congress could not raise \$100. But even *his* credit was then strained, in

behalf of his bleeding country, to its utmost tension, and the "merchant prince" received the requisition with clouded hopes. The messenger came just as he was retiring from his counting-room. For the first time depression weighed upon the spirit of the patriot financier. In thoughtful and almost gloomy mood, he proceeded towards his dwelling, there to ponder upon the effort to be made. On his way, he met a wealthy Quaker friend, unto whom he made known the wants of the Commander-in-Chief. "What security canst thou give, friend Robert," asked the Quaker. "My note and my honor," was the prompt reply. "Thou shalt have it," answered the Quaker, and in a few hours the hard Spanish dollars were on their way to Washington's camp, the Delaware was crossed, and the Hessian standard, with a thousand men, that rallied under it at the call of the brave Rahl, fell into the hands of the Americans. That Standard is now in the Museum at Alexandria, I have a drawing of it, which will appear in my work. *Perhaps* the known security of Morris, and not the patriotism of the Quaker, drew the hard dollars from his coffers.

Excuse me for troubling you with so long a letter. You must be perfectly familiar with all I have above written, and if so, I have "carried coals to Newcastle." Please, then, accept the good intention."

Prin

✓